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The enemy today is the U.S. Government itself and it is, by every standard of measure, the most evil thing that has ever existed on earth.

— James Mason

Murka is done, it is finished. It is a thermodynamic, spiritual, and cultural wasteland. Except for its obedient pooch, Israel, it does not have a friend in the world. It spirals towards its Puritanical, Evangelical-New Zionist, preordained destiny. It has been hot-wired for ontological decadence since 1776.

Empty of spirit and culture, undergone a lobotomy of racial memory by the scalpel of popular culture, the Jewnited States of Murka is a done deal. Amerika has not been a nation since at least 1865. There is no ‘America’. There is only the ethno-racial Melting Pot of its chosen destiny: to become New Zion.

— Sebastian Ronin

White nationalism is an impossible chimera between National Socialism and Americanism.

— the present author
Preface

The other book I compiled, *The Fair Race’s Darkest Hour*, collects essays by other authors. The vast majority of the essays that I collect here are mine. I put them in the chronological order in which I published them from the past decade to the current year and wrote them with English as my second language, although I couldn’t afford that a native-language checker proofread these articles. Both *The Fair Race* essays and the ones I publish here originally appeared on my website *The West’s Darkest Hour*.

These two books represent a paradigm shift in white advocacy. White nationalists err in their diagnosis of blaming only Jewry, as if whites were not responsible for their own decline. The real diagnosis of the decline of the West—Christianity, or rather Christian ethics—has been exposed in *The Fair Race*.

I am afraid to say that there are no apostates from Christianity among westerners, not even atheists. Their great sense of guilt and so-called human rights are self-abasements and Christian ethical mandates in a secularised form. Not wanting to see it—and the final essay in this book includes a critique of Kevin MacDonald for being in denial—means that the pro-white movement is in its infancy. In Europe the situation is even worse, since after the Second World War all racism was mercilessly banished by the American Diktat. So we have no choice but to keep focusing on American racialists.

There is a lot of doublethink in believing yourself Jew-wise and continuing to live by the precepts for Gentile consumption that a Jew wrote in the New Testament. Concurrently, white nationalism is reactionary, not revolutionary as National Socialism was. None of the important figures in the current movement is proposing armed revolution like *The Turner Diaries* as the only way out. The pacifism of white nationalism is a consequence that the Americans who promote it have been unable to break away from the bourgeois and ethno-suicidal lifestyle that sells us both the gospel and secular
liberalism. Today’s generation of whites, feminised to the core and worshipers of Mammon, is the perfect antithesis of the Spartans, the Republican Romans, the Vikings and the Nazis we studied in *The Fair Race*.

Of the present collection, the texts authored by other authors are ‘The Red Giant’ by a Swede, ‘How awake are you?’ by Mauricio and ‘On the Origin of the Word Racist’ by an American. As you can see in Mauricio’s rating scale, white nationalists are psychologically stagnated in levels four and five (the following ‘turner diaries’ levels can only be reached after transvaluing Christian values). I included ‘The Red Giant’ because it represented a eureka moment in my intellectual life. Before reading it I idealised not only Christianity but the United States itself (as we can see in that text).

I have modified many of the articles for inclusion in this book, and some of them have been heavily edited. For example, the first article that I collect here was written in 2006. I recently added a short sentence about the hand that Jaime Lannister lost in the third season of *Game of Thrones*, an episode that did not premiere until 2013. In some of the following articles I also added, or subtracted, several sentences when reviewing the text. From my magnum opus, *From Jesus to Hitler*, this book only translates a couple of chapters and the text about the Turin shroud that appears in ‘Introjection’. In the Contents page I have indicated in bold-type those chapters in addition to other serious essays that exceed 5,000 words. Most of the articles in this book, by contrast, were originally short blog posts.

Only the Aryan race has the potential to attain divinity, as can be seen on the cover image, *Daybreak*, which is also the image I chose in the original incarnation of *The West’s Darkest Hour*. The moment the white man sees that the religion of his parents is responsible for the darkest hour in the West will represent the breaking of dawn.

*César Tort*

*September 2020*
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‘Obviously, the greatest tragedy that can happen to Christian Scientists occurs when they die of a curable disease after postponing a consultation with a medical doctor. A more subtle kind of tragedy afflicts believers who, after not being healed by faith, assume that the failure is a defect in themselves’.

—Martin Gardner

On August 9, 1985 I arrived at midnight to the San Francisco international airport from Mexico City. I was alone and awaiting the immigration department officer, who was interviewing another young man. When the officer finally came to me he inspected all of my luggage belongings. It surprised me he was amicable and that he easily let me go out into the city as a tourist. I had deceived him: my project was to become an immigrant. I told to myself with enthusiasm:

‘They don’t know what they’re doing! They don’t know what they’re doing! They have no idea about the menace I represent! Now the end of the world is at hand…’

I believed I had the key to develop paranormal powers. I believed that I and those who developed such powers would force the eschaton in history; that we would irrupt in human destiny to the point of thoroughly transforming the world just like the novel Childhood’s End.

How could such a bizarre idea get into my mind?

I had been indoctrinated in a cult called Eschatology. My plan was based on the expectation that I only needed to complement the Eschatology training I received in Mexico with parapsychological studies in American libraries and institutes.

But how did I fall prey to such a cult?

As a teenager, I was crushed emotionally by my parents and a witch-doctor they hired (see my eleven-book De Jesús a Hitler). It’s understandable that, once the adolescent crisis was over, in a state
of utter confusion I fell in a cult. Although I expected it would save me, the cult damaged me even more. Since I believed that Eschatology would solve my problems it made no sense to go back to a school I had abandoned due to the extreme abuse at home. But instead of recounting my misadventures in Eschatology I better talk about the kind of cult I fell and how I escaped it cognitively.

Mrs. Eddy

Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910), a sensitive New Hampshire girl, probably was abused like me at home. Mary became disturbed. The physicians who attended young Mary were as naive as today’s psychiatrists: they approached the family problem with physical treatments. Mary rightly became resentful of conventional medicine. The disorder caused by abusive parenting was profound. After getting married and becoming an early widower, for decades Mary’s life shipwrecked until she found shelter in the fatherly figure of Phineas Quimby, one of the typical American quacks who flourished in the 19th century inspired by Franz Mesmer. Like Mesmer, Quimby believed in the power of the mind and suggestion to treat diseases. The encounter was crucial. Instead of physical methods Quimby was interested in Mary as a person, and without explicit intention Quimby helped Mary to transfigure her family’s Calvinism into a more benign version of Christianity with no hell at all. Quimby sometimes used the expression ‘Christian science’ for his quack teachings, a term that Mary Baker subsequently appropriated to name the church she formed.

With no credit for Quimby as her mentor, in 1875 Mary Baker published the first edition of her textbook *Science and Health with the Key to the Scriptures*. The following year she formed, with some of her followers, a society and in 1877, at fifty-six, she married again, with Asa Gilbert Eddy. In 1879 Mary Baker Eddy officially founded a church, which in 1890 counted with four thousand followers. Since then the established Church and its numerous churches grew up exponentially. In 1895 a temple was built in front of New York’s Central Park, and by 1906 another immense temple was built in Boston when Eddy already was eighty-five years old. Stefan Zweig wrote:

In twenty years out of a maze of metaphysical confusion she created a new method of healing; established a
doctrine counting its adherents by the myriad, with colleges and periodicals of its own; appointed a Sanhedrin of preachers and priests; and won for herself private wealth amounting to three million dollars.

Zweig adds that since Queen Elisabeth and Catalina of Russia no woman obtained such a triumph over the world, nor lived to see on Earth a monument to her rule as Mary Baker Eddy. Her followers were Legion: hundreds of quacks and dozens of minor sects with varied names sprouted throughout the United States, factions by apostates or those who had been expelled by the church. One of them was a young man, William Wilfred Walter (1869-1941).

Will Walter

Starting as a barber, Will Walter had to earn a living at seventeen in Aurora, Illinois. At twenty-one he married Barbara Stenger and the couple had a son. In a cult it is difficult to obtain basic information about the founder, but one of the very few pieces of biographical info about Walter is that in his late twenties he got a job as a buyer in a large warehouse. He initiated contact with the local Christian Science church after he developed tuberculosis. Walter ignored that spontaneous remission is not unusual in cases of pulmonary tuberculosis; he remained convinced that a church practitioner had healed him by purely psychic means. He thus became a devout follower of the church and reached the position of ‘first reader’ (though officially there is no clergy in the church, the first reader may appear to outsiders as the equivalent to a Protestant pastor).

In 1912 Walter’s revolutionary idea of God distanced himself from the church. Or perhaps he was excommunicated. The information from eschatologists I have is contradictory. At any event, Walter accepted the title ‘The Walter Method of Christian Science’, which served his followers to distinguish the incipient organisation from the mainstream church. He received correspondence from disillusioned Christian Scientists and claimed to heal his clients through mental means alone. In 1917 he taught his first-class at home, but not until 1928 he changed the name of his small movement to ‘Eschatology’.
Except for his abandonment of theism, Eschatology shares almost all the incredible Christian Science doctrines, such as the belief that for advanced understanders it is possible to heal any illness and even old age to the point of staying centuries in this world.

But Eddy and Walter died at the common ages of dying. Walter died without having finished a series of booklets that he promised would be forty. In 1940 he wrote: ‘This is booklet number thirty-one. The first of the fourth series of ten of the Common Sense Series’. But soon after he wrote booklet #34 death surprised him. On 6 March 1941 the Aurora Beacon News, the newspaper of the small town in which Walter spent most of his life, published the note: ‘William Walter Dies Suddenly in Florida Home’. The article specified that that house was Walter’s ‘Winter home’, and that he died ‘of heart attack’. After he passed away the information I possess is, once more, contradictory. Some say that the movement fell apart; others, that Walter’s wife passed on the torch to Genevieve Rader. At any event, in the 1960s the organisation moved to California, where all sorts of New Age movements flourish. In the 1970s the wealthy Mexican Mario Estrada, who studied with Rader, brought Walter’s doctrines to Cuernavaca. Estrada was the teacher of Juan del Río, whom I met in Mexico City in 1977 through one of his sons.

Well: 1977 had been precisely the year in which my parents confabulated with a witch-doctor to control me through drugs that my mother poured furtively in my meals. Such criminal behaviour
could have destroyed my life and I escaped by the skin of one’s teeth. The abuse explains the state of confusion in which I found myself at that time, and why I entered the world of Eschatology.

*Walter’s doctrine*

Even though Christian Scientists are not very devout of theism, Walter understood deity more or less as the posterior New Age: he became to believe that each individual is God, something like democratising for mankind what Christians had been claimed about Jesus Christ since an early council, the famous *Vere homo, vere Deus* formula. But Walter suffered terrible inner struggles to get rid of the theism he had been taught in a very large Catholic family where he was the youngest of his siblings: an agony that reminds me of my own religious agonies. Walter was able to overcome the parental introject by exorcising from his mind all belief of God as a personal being. In my opinion, chapter 14 of *The Sickle*, the first textbook of Eschatology, where Walter recounts his religious agony, is the only relevant chapter of *The Sickle* for the non-eschatologist.

In Walter’s worldview Jesus of Nazareth, despite having been the individual who has better understood the Science of Life (called ‘Eschatology’ by Walter) and that developed paranormal powers best, was a man like any other. Potentially everyone can develop extrasensory perception as Jesus read the thoughts of the Samaritan woman; and psychokinesis, the domain over the material world as Jesus healed people and walked on the water. The ‘Master Mind Jesus’, Walter tells us, learned those powers thanks to a long Hebrew tradition of understanders of the Science of Life, as registered in the Bible albeit in veiled form to hide the psi development formula from ‘the evil-minded’. (In parapsychological literature ‘psi’ means both extrasensory perception and psychokinesis.) Walter wrote:

> The so-called wonders wrought by Moses were done through his own understanding of the mental power; and therefore, they were not miracles, but the producing of mental phenomena through known methods. With the same amount of understanding they could be again reproduced in this age. The fact is that greater so-called wonders are now being produced by students of Mind.
Since not only Jesus but every human being is God incarnate, Walter deduced that the age in which mankind attains consciousness of its divinity, and therefore of its potential powers, will arrive when his students understand—as Jesus and Walter understood—the Science of Life. When this happens the consequences will be eschatological. In *The Sickle*, a title extracted from a passage of the Book of Revelation, Walter tells us that after the publication of *The Sickle* the understanding of the application of mental power will come, and with it the end of the age.

All of these grandiloquent, though megalomaniac ideas of Walter and his followers infected the altogether confused lad I was and explain my soliloquy at the San Francisco international airport. To understand my alienation I have no choice but to enter into detail in the art of developing mental powers as Walter taught it.

*The Law of Importunity*

In Eschatology there are three laws that Juan del Río (1923-2001) taught me and my female classmates since the first formal class we attended in December 1978: laws that I interpreted in a very practical way.

The first one, the Law of Cause-effect, tells us that given our divine nature we can create *ex nihilo* whatever we desire.

The second one, the Law of Proportion, tells us which quality our thought should have to be ‘causal’: it must be an absolute feeling in the objective reality of our desire. Walter interpreted that this is what Jesus tried to say: ‘Therefore I tell you, all things whatever you pray and ask for, believe that you have received them, and you shall have them’ (Mk. 11:24). The textbook illustration chosen by del Río was that of an Apothecary scale. When a pan of the scale accumulates 51 percent of our positive thoughts and feeling (‘Believe that you have received them…’) the scale will tip on the bottom stop and the manifestation of our desire is automatic (the opposing pan would represent the ‘appearances’ or ‘misleading’ shortages in our lives). Hence the name of ‘proportion’ for this Law. But the real problem starts here. If we possess the ability to cause (the First Law) and we know the quality our thinking must have to be causative—a profound conviction (the Second Law)—how can we reach such a conviction?
The Third Law, the Law of Importunity, does the trick. According to the eschatologists importunity means ‘to pray insistently and persistently until the mind yields’, that is, until the sum of thoughts generates a positive feeling without a doubt. This is something that Walter also deduced from Jesus’ teachings: the parable of the man and his neighbour in the midnight that asks for some bread; the man answers that everybody is asleep but, because of the neighbour’s importunity, he wakes up and gives the neighbour what he wants (Lk. 11: 5-13). The idea is repeated in the metaphor of the widower that with great persistence importunes a judge pleading for justice, a parable with the moral ‘to pray always without becoming weary’ (Lk. 18:1-8). Walter interpreted the praying of these verses not as a pledge to a nonexistent personal God, but as the mental practice of the advanced student of the Science of Life. The way to reach the state of profound conviction (‘believe that you have received them!’) is a repetitive and bothersome mental exercise, an importune praying to oneself which culminates in the feeling of conviction. Following the metaphor of the Apothecary’s scale, through the importune repetition of thoughts the individual mind accumulates the needed 51 percent on the ‘right’ pan for the scale’s arm to lean toward our favour, that is, to generate the feeling of conviction.

Juan del Río

To illustrate how an underuster could utilise these three Laws let us suppose that he lost a hand (say, as Jaime Lannister lost it in an episode of Game of Thrones) and wants it back. According to the First Law he can since his thought is causative and can create from nothing. According to the Second Law, to achieve it he has to feel that he already has his hand. Now then, to generate a feeling that contradicts all appearances he must ‘pray’, the Third Law tells
us, he has to say to himself that the hand already exists with
inexorable importunity until the conviction is achieved. The way to
do it is to withdraw to a solitary place, maybe hiding the stump
where the hand ought to be so that the appearances will not disturb
the eschatologist, and to repeat a line of thought such as ‘My hand
exists and I know it’s here’ with as much feeling as he can put into
it. With time, the theory goes, thanks to importunity a mental state
will be reached in which the accomplished eschatologist will really
believe he has a hand. That would mean fulfilling the Second Law
and, voila, in the objective world a new hand will appear.

Of course: students are taught that to achieve such a feat
they must start with much lesser goals such as healing oneself from
the flu or a nervous ulcer. These modest accomplishments will be
the platform to develop an invincible faith in one’s own ability to
cause; a faith that, with the step-by-step feedback of successes, will
allow the apprentice to solve increasingly difficult problems (such as
the re-expression of an amputated limb).

_Cognitive dissonance_

In essence, that is the formula to develop psychokinesis
according to Walter: a power that, _The Sickle_ claims, when quite a
few eschatologists develop it the end of the age will arrive. (In this
article I use the terms ‘psychokinesis’ and ‘psi’ but the
eschatologists do not use parapsychological terms.)

Decades ago, when I believed fervently in Walter’s
apocalypse, I imagined that if Eschatology teachers got sick, old and
died like any other mortal it was because they didn’t apply the
teachings adequately; I believed they were mediocre individuals with
no ambition whatsoever. One of the reasons I distanced myself
from Juan del Río and my second teacher, Jaime López, was that I
didn’t see any psychokinetic result not only in my life, but in theirs.
Del Río, who died of cancer in 2001, looked like a man of his age,
fifty-six years old, when I studied with him in 1979. Once a new
student told me he had asked del Río in front of other students if
he knew at least a single eschatologist who did not age. Del Río
stayed silent for a little time and responded in the negative. ‘Then
Eschatology still doesn’t iron out wrinkles!’ exclaimed the student. I
thought exactly the same. Where were the centenarians that had to
exist perforce once Eddy and Walter rediscovered the ‘Science of
Life’ that had originally been discovered by understanders like Methuselah and the other Biblical centenarians? In theory, the most elemental development of psychokinesis ought to control, through psychic means alone, one’s own body. Eddy herself taught that her science could forestall the ravages of old age, and many of her devout followers did not expect her to die. What I saw flatly contradicted what Walter had promised.

Walter devoted two chapters to the subject of how to overcome old age in *The Sharp Sickle*, the other textbook of Eschatology. In the chapter ‘Youth and Maturity’ Walter wrote:

Youth, being a sense of youth, can be consciously continued or maintained with all its vigor, energy, and good emotions. That this is not a mere theory can be established by the longevity of the Bible characters, who understood this fact.

Walter’s disciples swallow this paranormal claim like fundamentalist Bible worshipers. In one of her booklets Florence Stranahan, a faithful disciple who studied with Walter, wrote: ‘You say yours [the hair] is prematurely gray. Age has nothing to do with it. It is your own thought’. That eschatologists believe they possess the elixir of youth is also apparent in the commentary by Genevieve Rader, the director of Eschatology when I was a student, on those chapters of *The Sharp Sickle*: a commentary that is read to the advanced students. But like Eddy, Stranahan and Walter himself, Rader, who for forty years directed Eschatology until 1981, got old and died. So the great masters were getting old and dying just like everyone else. That didn’t concern me much since I also swallowed the eschatologists’ rationalisations: that Eddy, Stranahan, Rader and many others didn’t understand quite well the Science of Life, and that Walter did his ‘transition’ to the next world because he wanted.

Believing these silly rationalisations allowed me to continue my studies of Eschatology. During my first year in the cult I tried countless times to fulfil the tortuous Law of Importunity but I couldn’t. I felt like a fool parroting so many lines of thought without any result whatsoever and never accomplished the marathon sessions of hours or even days that, del Río told us, Walter had performed. I was twenty years old and wanted to become a virtuous praying man—importunity—to manifest my youthful desires. But it never occurred to me to question the existence of such powers. It didn’t occur to me that the fault was not mine, or
that other eschatologists had passed through similar difficulties in the praxis of importunity. I didn’t dare to think they had fulfilled the Law of importunity with no result, and even less did I dare to think that the stories of the marathon sessions of Walter were just tale-telling by the eschatologists. Jaime Hall, my closest Eschatology friend (who passed away in 1996 due to sudden heart failure), also told me that Walter had prayed for days. The extraordinary claim was that he needed money and a former student sent him a check by mail: a miracle he attributed to his importunity marathon. It never occurred to me to question that miracle or those attributed to Jesus. I couldn’t conceive that what the gospels tell could not have been historical but literary fiction, and that the ‘metaphysical’ interpretation of Eddy and Walter about the New Testament was nonsense. Years, oh how many years had to pass to call into question the historicity of the Biblical tales!

Now that I have abandoned all faith in the existence of such powers I can see some fairly elemental things that I didn’t see due to my blind faith. If Eschatology were a science and its laws as real as the gravity law or the thermodynamics laws, it’s more than elemental that I would have witnessed plenty of demonstrations of such laws by my teachers Juan del Río and Jaime López. (A vignette: During a conversation with my father in the early 1980s I once referred to the latter as ‘Yoda’ since we had just watched The Empire Strikes Back.) Gravity does not need demonstration: we see it every day. But neither I nor any Eschatology student had seen a relatively modest paranormal feat such as moving a small object psychically, let alone a centenarian Methuselah who re-expressed amputated limbs.

*They die younger...*

To anyone close to fell prey of Eschatology or any other New Age cult I would recommend considering this litmus test to distinguish a false science from the true sciences:

Scientists can demonstrate the reality of their sciences at the sight of everyone: electricity, engineering, computing, medicine, aeronautics, petrochemistry, automotive mechanics and many more. Pseudoscientists can’t. Had I reasoned this way before moving to the States I would have realised that I didn’t need to travel in pursuit of ‘serious’ parapsychological materials to strengthen my
eschatological faith. The fact that no eschatologist kept himself or herself young, or at least healthier than the norm, should have been enough for not seeking my salvation there.

According to the *Journal of the American Medical Association* of 22 September, 1989 thousands of deaths of Eddy’s followers were registered along with a control group. If Christian Science was a real science one would expect that its followers lived longer than the control group. But the journal revealed something different. The death rate among Christian Scientists from cancer double the national average, and six percent of them died from causes considered preventable by doctors. The non-‘Scientists’ on the average lived four years longer if they were women and two longer if they were men. Contrary to what they believe, followers of Eddy die younger of cancer than the average American due to their reluctance to go to the doctor. If similar studies were performed on Walter’s followers, who are also reluctant to ask for help in medicine because ‘belief in disease causes disease’, I bet that a study would throw identical results. My former teacher Juan del Río fell seriously ill precisely because he forfeited medical check-ups even after he became rich as a result of a large following of students, and when he developed symptoms the cancer was already in an advanced stage.

I must say that the best lesson I ever received about the Law of Imporunity was given to me by del Río in private. His exposition was clearer and more didactic than the very chapters of *The Sickle* that teach the student how to ‘pray’. Twenty years later, when the cancer was detected, del Río had a window of opportunity of more than four years to pray with importunity and overcome the disease. But he failed miserably. And he failed for the simple reason that cancer has no ‘mental’ aetiology nor it is healed by ‘healthy thoughts’ or by ‘eradicating all hate’ as predicated by Walter. My other teacher, Jaime López, went even further than del Río regarding the dilemma of whether or not going to the doctor. He once made a critical remark of the del Río family since they practiced prophylactic vaccination (Juan was a physician and he practiced his profession before entering the cult). In his study at Puebla, López told me that he didn’t vaccinate his sons, and that Juan and his wife had disappointed him for doing it. Jaime López ended his commentary telling me that he behaved in life ‘as Walter says’.
It is important to notice that Raquel Hall, Juan del Río’s widower, continued the teaching to hundreds of students of Eschatology, a cult she now calls ‘Mental Application’. The long agony of her husband did not move her to question the dogma that cancer is curable by mental means alone. The believer in a cult, religion or pseudoscience rarely grows up when confronted with what psychologists call a shock of cognitive dissonance (like her husband’s death).

Yes: as a young man I was ignorant about the study of the American Medical Association and believed that the teachers’ old age and death was caused by their lack of understanding that Jesus and the Old Testament centenarians had. Once more: it never occurred to me that the ‘Laws’ of Eschatology simply did not exist, that it all was megalomania, a grandiose fantasy. It didn’t occur to me because I could not conceive the inexistence of the paranormal: an idea that my father had inculcated me as a child with his beautiful tales about the miracles of Jesus. Although as a young man I had abandoned Christianity, I erroneously believed that the existence of extrasensory perception and psychokinesis, on which the systems of Eddy and Walter are tacitly based, had been demonstrated scientifically by parapsychologists and that I only needed to check and see it for myself in the American labs of parapsychology. Hence the need to emigrate and my mad soliloquy that night at the airport.

Please levitate this ship!

The disturbing experiences after I left the airport are the subject of my fifth and eleventh autobiographical books. Here I will only quote a passage from my diary that shows the maturity of my eventual apostasy from the cult:

2 September 1997

Yesterday I read two chapters of The Sharp Sickle after years of not reading it and something important happened in my mind. For the first time I doubt Walter’s honesty. Remember my handwritten note in that Skeptical Inquirer article about how should I have reacted before the claim of the Law of Importunity?:

Guru: ‘Don’t take my word for it. You can learn to do psychokinesis yourself’.
Sceptic: ‘Great! I’d love to! But before I put in the time and shell out the cash, I want to do a little consumer research. How about a demonstration?’

This is the crux. Neither Walter nor Genevieve or Robert Durling could even do a little psychokinetic demonstration like what Walter claims on page 219 of *The Sharp Sickle*: that with his pure thought he affected pieces of steel, rubber, stone, wood and clay. Today my attitude would be to request a demonstration (‘before I put in the time…’) or not trying to fulfill the interminable hours of the alleged Law of Importunity. It’s on this point where I have changed. He who now reads this *Sickle* is another man: a sceptic.

It’s a gem what Walter says on page 207: ‘Investigate the works [emphasis in the original!] of those you chose as leaders and you will not be far misled’, because he died abruptly. ‘That Mrs. Eddy did not discover the whole is seen in that she is no longer here’, Walter wrote in the most treasured book by eschatologists. Another gem, since there’s nothing more fatal for Eschatology’s credibility that Walter died even younger than her! At the end of his chapter ‘Conclusion’ I wrote with red ink: ‘OK, Walter or contemporary teachers of Eschatology, I ask you this with no scorn whatsoever: Teach me a Yoda-like lesson by levitating the ship in front of Luke as in the film *The Empire Strikes Back* and tomorrow I’ll humbly re-start studying the first booklet of the *Plain Talk Series*!’

The *Plain Talk* booklet is the text for the first classroom lesson in Eschatology.

It is worth mentioning that in his time there were people who considered Walter a swindler. Florence Stranahan, one of his most loyal disciples, wrote in the booklet *Messages on Christian Science series I*: ‘You write that Mrs. __ says that Mr. Walter is a crook [...] and that he is promoting a money-making scheme’. Stranahan doubted that the accusation of the unnamed woman was accurate. But Oliver Roberts de La Fontaine, a rich man from Wells Fargo & Co. in California, wrote in *The Great Understander* that Walter charged him $10,000 for a course for the initiate (the value of a mansion in those times). In his book Oliver confessed that when he heard such a figure he momentarily harboured the thought that Walter had been chasing him with previous courses so that, once convinced, charge him a fortune. But Oliver did pay Walter what he
wanted. The anecdote moves me to point out that some paragraphs of the textbook of Eschatology suggest a lack of ethical principles. Walter wrote:

There are two positive stages of unfoldment which precede conscious transition [for eschatologists ‘conscious transition’ is going to the next world without experimenting death]; and these must be fully understood and demonstrated before the third stage of conscious transition can be understood and demonstrated. Therefore, whenever any student of mine will prove to me through demonstration that he or she understands these first two stages, I will gladly give him the law governing the third stage. The first stage is the demonstration of invisibility. Jesus could accomplish this at will, as is stated in the Scripture. The second stage is the transfiguration.

Did Walter really believe this? In his words (‘whenever any student of mine will prove to me through a demonstration that he or she understands these first two stages…’) it is implicit that, if Walter asked the student such a demonstration, he had already made himself invisible, and transfigured as Jesus transfigured himself on a mount according to the gospel of John.

Years ago I used to think that Walter was simply a crackpot. Now I am starting to look at him under a more sinister light. If Walter failed to make himself invisible he wasn’t delusional. He was a charlatan. The difference between a deluded guru and a charlatan is that the former believes in his doctrines, whereas the charlatan swindles consciously. Martin Gardner distinguishes between the two in his hilarious Science: The Good, the Bad and the Bogus: a crank is someone like Velikowski, who believed in his lunatic astronomy; a charlatan is someone like Uri Geller, who deceived us with his ‘psychokinetic’ tricks. So I repeat: Did Walter really believe what he asked his students, that with time they could make themselves invisible? As I said, in such a request it was not only implicit that he, Walter, did master invisibility but that he had transfigured his body as Jesus did. But it is a fact that Walter never demonstrated he could make himself invisible before the men of science in his age. Had he done that he would have revolutionised the scientific world.

Presently I do not believe that Walter made himself invisible. And that can only mean one thing: that Walter lied to his pupils and readers by implying, in the above-cited quotation, that he
could achieve such paranormal feat. This conclusion will upset eschatologists, since Walter ended *The Sickle* stating that, above all, one must be honest with oneself.

It is impossible to prove a negative; for instance, that Walter did not become invisible. But it is possible to show what science is. There are two basic rules of the thumb in the sceptical community about paranormal claims. The first one is ‘Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence’, for example, not only evidence that Walter had demonstrated invisibility publicly but that advanced eschatologists could do it today. But in his book Walter does not even bother to describe an ordinary proof for his extraordinary claims, let alone an extraordinary one (the same fault appears throughout the textbook of Walter’s mentor, Mary Baker Eddy). The second one is ‘The burden of proof rests upon the claimant alone’. It has been noted that in pseudosciences the burden is inverted; for instance, the teacher requests the student to make himself invisible—even if the teacher himself has not previously demonstrated invisibility! (Just contrast this irrational demand with the demonstrations performed by the teachers of magic in the *Harry Potter* films.)

Let’s assume for a moment that Walter could make himself invisible. Why didn’t he perform public demonstrations? Was it to hide his secret formula of importunity to develop such powers from the evil-minded? Don’t make me laugh, Walter! How absurd it would have been that Edison, just after he invented the electric light bulb, showed it to nobody but kept his most important invention to himself. Let’s imagine that he asked his students that they, not the inventor must show Edison how to create a light bulb—before letting them enter into his lab to see the shining light bulb of the teacher!

After pondering over the two *Sickles* with a healthy dose of scepticism, the inescapable verdict about Walter is that he may well have behaved as a crook, just as the woman mentioned by Stranahan stated in the above quotation.

To fully understand Walter and company it may not be a bad idea to read the biographies about the mischievous lives of the creators of religious empires on American soil: from Joseph Smith to L. Ron Hubbard and the reverend Sun Myung Moon passing through those who, like Walter and a myriad others, couldn’t create large organisations and their followers are barely known. Martin
Gardner’s *The Healing Revelations of Mary Baker Eddy* is a good starting point.

*October 6, 2006*
The Red Giant

by Conservative Swede

‘In England one must rehabilitate oneself after every little emancipation from theology by showing in a veritably awe-inspiring manner what a moral fanatic one is. That is the penance they pay there. — We others hold otherwise. When one gives up the Christian faith, one pulls the right to Christian morality out from under one’s feet’. — Nietzsche

We are witnessing the historical demise of Christianity. When a star dies, in its last phase it expands into a red giant, before it shrinks into a white dwarf. Liberalism is the red giant of Christianity. And just as a red giant is devoid of its core, it expands thousandfold while losing its substance and is about to die. The world I live in consists of Christians and liberals. It’s their world and I do not belong to them. I leave their limited wars, knee-jerk Islam apologetics and World War II mythology to them. They are not about to change. On the contrary, they are continuously generating new problems with their way of acting.

There were certain sites, certain bloggers, even certain countries, that I had put hope in. But now it has become clear that they are all part of the same big train of lemmings. Bye-bye! Denmark, nope. Brussels Journal, nope. View From the Right, nope. Gates of Vienna, nope. This is the way it goes in the world of liberals and Christians. It’s their world. I can do nothing but sit on the side and laugh at it. They are too stuck in their inner fears and hang-ups to be able to do anything useful. They will do what they are programmed to do: demise. These people are just not prepared for

1 Editor’s note: I have added the Nietzsche epigraph. This article consists of excerpts from an August 2007 blog entry in the blog ‘Conservative Swede’, and after the asterisks from a long monologue that the Swede posted in the comments sections of ‘Reversal is Possible’ and ‘Hellish Saviors’ on Gates of Vienna in July of 2009.
a proper fight. They are too much driven by superstitious fear and emotions. And there is not exactly anyone else around.

So what’s the future for people like me? Because even if I belong nowhere politically, I belong somewhere socially and ethnically. Well, the world is being homogenised. Tomorrow the whole world will be like the Third World. People like me, of European ethnicity, will have no home, no nation. We will live like the Jews as elites in other people’s nations, preferably a non-Muslim nation.

* * *

I have written: ‘People today live in a historyless, now-bubble-world, and have forgotten about all previous [axiological] reversals, many of which happened in the last century’, therefore the widespread and deep sense of hopelessness, I forgot to add.

It’s hard to conceptualize a situation outside of the bubble, or the bubble not being there, when living inside of the bubble. However, history provides us with numerous examples of such reversals, of bubbles bursting, and of course new bubbles being built (we are bubble mammals after all). This is my happy message, my gospel. People just need to let go their precious beliefs and myths, these huggy teddy bears. When deeply invested in the core beliefs of the bubble, it becomes impossible to look outside of the bubble, to think of a world without the bubble, and everything looks utterly hopeless. Well, it’s not. On the contrary, the bubble will burst.

Unlike how it is presented, the relation between left and right is not symmetrical. Instead the left is the norm, and the people to the left are the holy people of secular Christianity. The right is just dancing along, effectively not being much more than an alibi for the whole setup, dancing in circles around the left, who is the one setting up the direction of ‘progression’. Occasionally pulling the break, but never setting up a new general course. The direction of the course is built into the paradigm, and never fundamentally questioned by the right.

Another evidence for the asymmetry between left and right is how right-wingers fear and loathe to being associated with any person or organisation even slightly to the right of themselves (they feel that this would totally undermine their reputation), while willing
to make connections magnitudes further into the left. Such as appearing in left-wing media, which often makes these right-wingers hilarious, since they feel they have gotten a stamp of approval thereby; while they can be paralysed by fear of the thought of being published in a right-wing magazine just slightly to the right of themselves…

America is seen as right-wing in the current political theater. However, historically America together with France has been the main force in pushing our civilisation to the left.

After World War II European patriotism was seen as the root of the evil, which had to be held down. The only permitted patriotism were American and Israeli. Britain and France got away with some, but after the Suez crisis in 1956 they were effectively out of the picture too. Now offensive military actions were only accepted from America and Israel.

In the 1950s and the 60s America and Israel were celebrated as model countries of progressivism. European conservatism had been rooted out in the cultural revolution imposed by America in Western Europe. But the Europeans learned fast. First they learned to follow the American example and see America as the model country. The Europeans could pick this up fast since the ideas were rooted in the Christian gospels. But soon they learned that America didn’t live up to code of moral goodness that they had imposed on the Europeans. And left-wing anti-Americanism was born. And to be precise, even anti-Americanism wasn’t born in Europe but also imported from the US. The problem for America was that in their quest to end all ‘evil’ empires, they had effectively become the big empire themselves, for example by inheriting the role of maintaining the Pax Britannica. Then they had to do all the sort of things they had taught the Europeans were wrong. The Europeans soon learned to beat the Americans in their own game, becoming the leading in progressivism and ‘holier than thou’. And curiously enough, thus America ended up being seen as right-wing. The original right-wing had been rooted out in a collaboration between America and the European socialists in the wake of World War II. The turning point came by the end of the 1960s—the Vietnam war and the Six-Days war. The image of America and Israel shifted, and they were no longer seen as the model countries of progressivism but as ‘evil’ right-wing countries.
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We should remember that our progressivist paradigm (which is always going left) is based on Christian ethics. And Christian ethics means the inversion of values. So it’s the weak that is considered good, while the strong is considered evil. In World War I and World War II America had defeated all the strong (and therefore evil) European empires. The job was completed in the Suez crisis in 1956 by turning against their former allies. But you can never win with Christian ethics, because now America became the strong one, and therefore the evil one. So now American and Israeli patriotism becomes highly questioned and opposed, though not based on restoring any other patriotism but by going even deeper into deranged progressivism. Thus, in effect, American and Israeli patriotism are still the only permitted patriotisms. Surely now the holiest priests of our leftist paradigm condemn the actions of America and Israel. But in effect it is tolerated, while if any other (white) country acts militarily offensively it’s seen as a major global crisis (e.g. Serbia, Russia). So this gives a background to why Geert Wilders, Vlaams Belang and others have a pro-American and pro-Israeli profile, and even stress these patriotisms more than their own.

When the threat of Islam is added to the historical situation I gave above, there are westerners who wake up from their deranged progressivism. But they generally revert back to the 1950s (I myself reverted to before World War I). In the face of Islamic aggression their patriotism gets heightened. But this is a patriotism based on a narrative of hate of Germany and Russia.

So when intensifying this American patriotism in order to build-up the necessary hate against Islam, the hate against Russia and Germany heightens simultaneously. There does not seem to be a way to slide this parameter up without this happening. NATO was after all built on the motto of ‘Keeping Russia out, Germany down, and America in’. And since this narrative in its previous step is based on the de-legitimisation of European patriotism in general, and how hate and demonisation of Germans is the blueprint for white guilt and self-hatred, we have a more general problem here too.

---

2 Editor’s note: Conservative Swede was called ‘Nietzschean of the North’ by the American-Jewish commentator Lawrence Auster.
There’s surely no way to stop the chaos coming. But just as surely, from the ashes of the chaos, a fantastic renaissance will grow. We will prevail, severely hurt yes, but with an ironclad inspired spirit. I just hope the chaos will start soon enough, so that I will be able to live when the turnaround happens. My conclusion is that we’ll have to revert far back in history to find something sustainable to build on, to cut off the rotten and infected areas. For some things a hundred years, for some a thousand years. It’s definitely not enough to revert the social revolution of the ’68.

Gates of Vienna’s editor Ned May commented: Part of the modern Liberal ideal is the foolish notion that we can simply abolish by fiat millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition.

Conservative Swede responded: This is a very important sentence which conveys so very much, if we just examine it closely. Not only the liberals, but also most people (anti-liberals), who see and fear the fall of the liberal world order, have forgotten that these things cannot be erased. But neither the rise nor the fall of liberalism can take away millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition. This is what Chechar refers to as my optimism. It’s just following the conservative principle you gave here. But unfortunately the effect of the current belief system is so strong even on anti-liberals, that they cannot see that.

So it’s the liberal layer (on top of evolution, culture, and traditions) that will get peeled off, together with those traditions that led to liberalism in the first place. The fall of this liberal world order will hit us hard (together with the destruction that liberalism has already caused). But we won’t suddenly just disappear. And as long as we are around we have millions of years of evolution, thousands of years of culture, and centuries of tradition on our side.

Even if there would be only 100 million left of us, we are the best people in the history of mankind. As Huntington pointed out, we have always been superior in the ability to apply organised violence. As soon as the will power is there, we can achieve anything we please. We can rule any continent where we choose to live, as long as the liberal layer gets peeled off. And it’s bound to
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3 “Chechar” was the penname I used for the first time in the Gates of Vienna forum in 2009.
come off, since it’s just a cosmetic layer. The reason that it has not come off yet is that it has not yet become obvious to the collective mind that it has failed. But that is about to change…

Norse mythology is a much more useful mythological narrative than Christianity, which does not only mean adherence to universalist individualism and the importation of a foreign god (and in its final stages the importation of a lot of other immigrants), but also has a mythological narrative where the survival of our people hold no significance whatsoever.

The only people that are guaranteed to survive until the end of days in Christianity are the Jews. Swedes, Italians, etcetera, are of no significance whatsoever. We see all these tenets of Christianity manifested around us today: even in how the struggle for ethnic survival of the Jews is accepted within our current paradigm, while it is not accepted for the other people of our civilisation. *Each ethnic group needs her great mythological narrative, starting with the birth of her people and guaranteeing their existence until the end of times.* Without such a narrative the dissolution of the ethnic group eventually becomes self-fulfilling: nothing is holding it together.

We see this happening around us in the very now with eager work to dissolve our countries and ethnic groups. In Christianity the Germanic people cannot (as a people) have a relation with god, only the Jewish people has. Germanic (and other) people can only have a relation with god as individuals. People are directed by myths more than anything else, so with a narrative where your ethnic group is of no importance, it will eventually become self-fulfilling (i.e., the opposite effect of self-confidence as a group).

*A commenter said:* In that case, I would be very interested to hear what you propose should be done to save western civilisation.

*Conservative Swede responded:* And there is your assumption again: that the Western Christian civilisation should be saved, that it can be reformed, be mended; while I’m assuming that the current order, the current belief system, will selfimplode. And as the current order is the last and terminal phase of Western Christian civilisation, which has reached a dead end, this means the end of

---

Western Christian civilisation as such. Yes, we are seeing something like the fall of Rome before us.

I’ve been clear about this from the very beginning. For example, three days ago I wrote: ‘Likewise many people, who are ideologically invested in the current paradigm instead of in their ethnic group, will see the fall of the Western Christian civilisation as the end of the world; commit suicide, etc. But instead the fall of the Western Christian civilisation should be celebrated. This is the paradigm that stands in the way of our saviour. This is the key knot in need to be untied’.

Yes: the Western Christian civilisation is exactly the problem, and the problem is solved by it going away.

What we should hold on to are our ethnic groups and European civilisation and culture in the deeper sense. Western Christian civilisation is a novelty and now it failed. Western Christian civilisation is just the tip of that iceberg. It’s just a way of politically organising our peoples. We should not save this format, but save the matter.

The Western Christian civilisation is what happened when Germanic people met Christianity. But nothing lasts forever. Quite as the Roman Empire it can be compared with a fruit, going through all the stages: bud, flower, incipient fruit, green fruit, ripe fruit, overripe fruit, rotten fruit. With this I’m saying: (1) indeed Western Christian civilisation has meant many good things, and (2) it’s all over now.

It is unsustainable for Germanic people to keep Christianity. It would indeed mean their death. And since the Western Christian civilisation is all about Germanic people meeting Christianity, the necessary turnaround for Germanic people also means the definitive end of Western Christian civilisation. Africans and Italians sticking to Christianity do not make a Western Christian civilisation.

When I talk of Christianity I use it in the same sense as Huntington or Qutb. That is, it doesn’t matter those who claim to be atheists, they are equally much Christians in this perspective. In fact, you will find that they stick to Christian ethics even stronger than the nominal Christians: trying to be holier than thou, as if trying to get in line before the nominal Christians to the heaven they don’t believe in.
Medieval Catholicism was nicely mixed and balanced with Roman and Greek components. The explosive and revolutionary message of the gospels was kept secret from the general public. The Protestant Reformation changed that. Christianity became purified into its Hebrew component, and the explosive and revolutionary message of the gospels were set free. This purification was taken even further, and completed, by the Puritans and the Quakers that left across the Atlantic, to found America. And these are the people who rule our civilisation today.

There are several reasons why Christianity leads to secularism in its latter phases. Let me get back to that if there is interest, since this is becoming very long as it is.

Secular Christianity has thrown out god and Christ, but keeps the Christian ethics (inversion of values, etc.). And Christian ethics actually gets heightened and unfettered in Secular Christianity (I have written much about that in my blog). With Christ as part of the equation, the Christian ethics of the Gospels became balanced. Humans were seen as imperfect and it was Christ who covered for us with his self-sacrifice. In Secular Christianity each person has to be like Jesus himself, doing self-sacrifice, since there’s no other way to fulfill Christian ethics. On top of that, with the Industrial Revolution and the surplus it created in our societies, we came to the point where all the good deeds of Christian ethics could finally be executed by giving off our surplus to all the poor and weak foreign people around the world: food, Western medicine, and other aid.

Thus the Western Christian civilisation caused the population explosion in the Third World. It is entirely caused by the Western Christian civilisation, since these Third World countries were completely unable to do this themselves. Christian ethics commands that every single human life should be saved if possible. Before, more than half of the children in Third World countries died. Now virtually all survive, and we have the population explosion.

What this will lead to is the following:

With the dollar collapse and the complete breakdown of our economical (and then political) world order, mass starvation will spread like a wildfire across the southern hemisphere. This since their population numbers are not supported by themselves, but entirely backed by us. It will all fall apart.
So the concrete effect of Christian ethics here is to make the number of people that will die in starvation and suffering as high as possible once it hits (we are speaking of billions thanks to Christian ethics). Only the devil himself could think out such a brutally cruel scheme, and Christian ethics of course, in which case it’s according to the idiom ‘The road to hell is paved with good intentions’.

But that’s not enough. This mass starvation, where we can expect something like two-thirds of the people dying in the Third World countries, will slash these societies into pieces, and they will meet a complete breakdown. In the alternative scenario, where the Christian ethics would have kept its fingers away, these countries would have supported themselves: every year many children would have died at a pretty constant pace. But this is a stable phenomenon that does not at all threaten the stability of their societies. When the Western economical order falls apart, they would not be the least affected.

But Christian ethics cannot stand the sight of little brown children dying. They must help them, or they will freak out. They cannot keep their fingers away. So they are dooming them to mass starvation in the billions and complete breakdowns of their societies. This is the concrete effect of Christian ethics. At this point it wouldn’t help putting back god and Christ into the equation. Instead we need to leave Christian ethics.

I have already stated how Western Christian civilisation = Germanic people + Christianity. I will now clarify why specifically Germanic people need to leave Christianity.

Look at the phenomenon of clan mentality around the world. In many places around the world it is strong, in Europe it is not. But even within Europe there are clear differences. Indeed we find clan mentality in Southern Europe, while there’s none of it in Northern Europe (among Germanic people).

There are historical reasons for this. In the cold north people lived far apart. Human contacts were few, and strangers were therefore treated with friendliness. This was the best survival strategy in this context. However, the Mediterranean area was crowded, and there was always competition about land and resources. The best survival strategy in such a context was to stick to your clan, in this tight competition.
The whole point of Christian ethics, when it works well, is to have a balancing effect on the morality of people. In the Mediterranean area it had a balancing effect on the natural clan mentality, leaving a good result. However, Germanic people, as described above, have a natural altruism. When combined with the unfettered Christian ethics of the latter stages of the Western Christian civilisation, it creates an interference that goes completely out of bounds. The morality of Germanic people has reached a point where it has to be balanced back, or we will perish. To create this balance Germanic people have to leave Christian ethics. (Romance and Slavic people can keep Christianity. It’s not a matter of life or death for them.)

What we are witnessing in the present time is the great tragedy of Germanic people.

With the lack of clan mentality, we find that Germanic people are the ones that most faithfully turn their loyalty towards the nation. But due to the inherent universalism of Christianity, we see in the current incarnation of Western Christian civilisation how nations are considered illegitimate and gradually being dissolved. The nationalist loyalty of the Germanic people becomes redirected to universalist loyalty; still lacking clan mentality.

Germanic people do not use the power of their family to solve problems. They go to a higher level, the authorities. To use the power of your family to solve a problem is here considered a sin; we are supposed to abide by the law. In Italy or Spain people do use the power of their family to solve problems.

There is an abundance of stories in blogs from Northern Europe of kids who go through their whole school time being beaten up by Muslims every week. The furthest the parents of these children would do is to bring up the problem with the authorities (and possibly having a ‘dialog’ with the Muslim parents). Which of course will do nothing about it, since the belief system of the authorities doesn’t allow for it. And even so the parents never use the power of their family to deal with the problem. They are programmed to abide by the law and the order.

I cannot see this happening in Italy or Spain. There is a whole different mentality. There would be an outrage, and the whole family would be engaged in the matter. Mostly not going into mafia methods, but in some places yes.
Germanic people are simply wired the wrong way to be able to survive in a multiethnic context. Or to be exact: Germanic people adhering to Christian ethics are. We managed fine in the age of the great migrations and as Vikings. Now we are entering a world of multiethnic societies at a planetary level. And the Germanic people adhering to Christian ethics are constitutionally unfit for this. Unless we leave Christian ethics, we will perish. Or rather, those who cling to Christian ethics will perish, according to the law of the survival of the fittest.

Leaving Christian ethics has nothing to do with becoming secular (as I explained above). To the contrary, it makes it worse! _What is needed is to introduce another great mythological narrative into the minds of the Germanic people._ This is the only way to replace the moral grammar of Christianity. Something with roots in our long history. This must be done by political means, by a regime with such a focus. But given that focus, it’s not such a big thing to achieve. There are numerous historical examples of how to do it. And it only takes a generation to make the change (even less). And in a dire situation, after a major trauma, it will be even easier.

And thus we are speaking of the deepest level of a paradigm change here. Our very concept of good and bad, our moral grammar, has to be transformed. In sort of perspective, even the apparent moral tautology ‘We should strive for what is good, and fight against what is bad’ no longer holds.

Our very concepts of good and bad are what has to be transformed. It’s hard to think outside of this box. But that’s the whole point of the word paradigm. It’s a box that it is virtually impossible for people in general to think outside of. I recommend reading Thomas Kuhn’s _The Structure of Scientific Revolutions_ for a deeper understanding of the concept paradigm. It’s truly a mental box we are trapped within. In the same way we are about to witness the transformation of our whole grammar of morality, quite as our grammar of morality was different before the Age of Christianity. When the paradigm shifted from Newton to Einstein, it didn’t mean the end of science. I just meant the end of a scientific era, which became replaced with a new one. In the same manner the fall
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5 Emphasis by Ed. Unlike the Swede, I believe this narrative was best represented in National Socialism.
of the Western Christian civilisation does not mean the end of European civilisation in the larger sense. It just means a new era. Quite as when the Roman-Greek civilisation was replaced by the Western Christian.

A commenter said: The latter [the Protestants], being literalists, conceived of themselves as the direct successors to the ancient Israelites who had been given divine authority to kill the Canaanites and establish Israel. The Protestants looked on themselves as the New Israelites and the Native Americans as the New Canaanites to be wiped out.

Conservative Swede responded: It’s sad indeed that Christians have to imagine themselves as Israelites to become truly good fighters, which implies effective total war, and the psychology of will power to win at any cost. Once again it is the same pattern of Christianity that I discussed above, when discussing permitted patriotisms. Our ethnicity is utterly insignificant in the Christian narrative, while the Jewish ethnicity holds a pivotal position. So Christians have to use this substitute ethnicity to find true confidence and strength.

Good total war has been waged by Christians when imagining themselves as Israelites aiming for building the New Jerusalem. They can also fight a limited war in the name of the universal good, or for the sake of Israel (for example the crusades). But war by Christians in the name of their own ethnicity is considered illegitimate; well, not even of importance. In Christianity we cannot be ourselves. We have to pretend we are someone else.

I still think the Russians can efficiently use their Christianity, just since their Christianity hasn’t been washed through the Enlightenment, quite as the American pilgrims and the Boers, discussed above, hadn’t. Nor Spain of La Reconquista, of course. But we can stay assured that the Christians having been washed through the Enlightenment—and then the Industrial Age, liberalism and secularism—won’t be able to see themselves as Israelites. So this strength is not coming back within the context of Christianity. Why not be ourselves instead? Replace the current mythological narrative with one where we are ourselves. After all, that is the simple truth: We are ourselves. Christianity is based on deception and distortion of reality. Another way to go, for those unable to imagine themselves as the Israelites, is at least to make
Christianity universal instead of Jewish. Such as we saw recently here at Gates of Vienna in how many people in Poland for example do not see Jesus as Jewish. There’s no way to win within the frames of Christianity.

A commenter said: I agree that Christianity is at the end of its tether and is unable to assert itself without breaking its own value system. Probably something similar must have happened in India during Muslim invasions, where Buddhist ideas of compassion and Karma (you get what you deserve, because you produced the cause) left them completely defenseless. They indeed had no narrative that would support their collective existence.

Conservative Swede responded: This is an excellent historical comparison. A universalist religion of goodness is replaced with the original national gods, when faced with a threat of existential magnitude.

A commenter said: Altogether, yours is the most complete argument for the death of Christianity I can imagine, certainly more complete than what Nietzsche has ever written.

Conservative Swede responded: Thanks, that’s a very nice thing to say. Of course, I had an unfair advantage, since I could read Nietzsche but he couldn’t read me.

A commenter said: I am always impressed by the fact that the further North you go in Europe, where people are more Germanic, the more harmonious mastery of mind over nature you can see.

Conservative Swede responded: Yes, we have focused on fighting nature instead of each other. All due to our historical situation. If we didn’t fight nature we died. If we hadn’t isolated our house and stored up well for the winter we died. Out of this a special kind of cooperation between people grew. A traditionalist form of egalitarianism, which apart from Sweden and Norway we only find in America (this is an interesting topic in itself, but no time for that now). However, if you put unfettered Christian ethics on top of that...

A necessary condition for a Germanic project—and the renaissance of Europe altogether—is the return of Germany. Germany today is the planetary bully victim, bound and caged in many layers of chains and bars. Not permitted to show even a single shred of national self-confidence. We won’t see that until American
troops have left Germany and the whole NATO regime has been reversed. But it will come. Rest assured.

Above is the first step, and, let’s say, how far I think we’ll come in this century. We will be in a situation with China as the great power. There will also be competition with Russia. Probably China will be first in occupying the oil fields around the Persian Gulf, but we will be competing with them about it.

America together with France and Britain will be utterly discredited, seen as the guilty ones for the greatest treason in the history of mankind against their own people (as Fjordman put it); while Germany was completely innocent in this, and will hold the morally superior position.

France might no longer exist, having first been overrun by Muslims, and then reconquered by Germanic people.

The United States will no longer exist. But the Confederation of the Northern US States will be a natural ally to the Germanics.

Maybe there will be something as a Germanic empire at this point. Or maybe even two, one German-speaking and one English speaking. But I’m not as sure about the English speaking one (I’m not saying people won’t speak English, only that there might not be a separate empire with English as the official language).

Will American troops reside in Germany forever? No. When it comes to the imminent fall of the current order, there are too many factors in motion at the same time that each alone has the potential of making it fall: dollar collapse, ethnic civil war, Iranian nukes, weak and paralysed leadership.

I find Germanic people boring and square, but sort of brilliant (history clearly shows that). After about a decade out in the cold, I have once again taken Germanic people to my heart because I can see their great tragedy. I think I can see their dilemma and how to solve it while at the same time it makes perfect sense for Poles, Spaniards and Celts to take an interest in this for the political stability it would give to all of Europe, once the current order falls. Without it there would be a huge power vacuum.

Who would expand into that? Russia, China, Islam? Or first Islam, then Russia, and finally China? That’s the good thing with the day the American troops leave Germany, because at that time the Germanic European will be forced to immediately build a
strong military power. And you could imagine how many of the good things that we have discussed here would be catalysed by that.

When I say that I want Christian ethics to go away, it’s not because I want to see a 180 degree turn away from it. Instead it is Christianity that ended up in steep imbalance. What I want to do is to balance things back. So what I have suggested is:

1) A new great mythological narrative where our ethnic group is given the pivotal position; 2) A constitution where citizenship is reserved for people of our ethnic group. 3) Alien ethnic groups, typically from the Third World, that do not identify with our ethnic group, will have to be removed one way or the other...

I think it is clear that the people won’t turn away from the current belief system with less than a major catastrophe.

But this time the catastrophe is not something as benign as a ‘Western civil war’, but something of a higher magnitude, and of real external threats (which we are not the least prepared for). If we had only been facing something as harmless as World War I or World War II, I wouldn’t have been speaking of the end of the Western Christian civilisation. If there only had been two strong sides of the West fighting each other to death, we wouldn’t have been facing this discontinuity of our civilisation.

But now it is our very belief system that makes us unable to fight and defend our civilisation. And the threat is external, and when we lose, it means this discontinuity. Losing here means losing our dominant position, not that everything is lost.

Our current empire will fall, that is, America, and not to another Western empire as before—since this time there is no one standing in line—but to external forces.

If we do not meet a major catastrophe within the next twenty years, we will be silently walking into our demographic eclipse, something that could indeed mean the end European civilisation and the values that you have talked about. The demographic forces in motion are so great, yes exponential. Not so much our declining birth rates, but the population explosion in the Third World that we are causing and the mass immigration and demographic Jihad in our own lands. If this process continues we will end up in Diaspora as the Jews. And with white people as a mere 2-3 percent of the world’s population and without our own homeland, that’s indeed the end of European civilisation altogether,
and we can say goodbye to the manifestation of all these values that you and I cherish.

It’s the Western Christian civilisation that feeds all these processes (population explosion etc.). So the Western Christian civilisation is in fact the worst enemy of what I call European civilisation: another reason for wanting the Western Christian civilisation to go away. If it would continue a few decades more it will mean the definitive goodnight for all of us.

So to summarise: When I speak of civilisation as in the Western Christian civilisation, I speak of a concrete manifestation, an empire. And when I speak of civilisation as in European civilisation, I speak of the existence and self-government of white people, and the values and lifestyle that is integral in our beings. But now we have come to a point where the former is the greatest threat to the latter. In Aristotelian terms European civilisation is the matter to the Western Christian civilisation, which is the form. That is, white people is the matter for the current Western Christian ‘empire’. But now the form is suffocating the matter.

Chechar said: ‘It’s the Western Christian civilisation that feeds all these processes’. Why do you say this? Wasn’t everything relatively okay up to the 1950s, before the radical feminists almost took away our highest divine right from us: women? If lots of women would still be with us at home having lots of beautiful kids, as the Pope likes, the present problem wouldn’t exist, would it? Doesn’t the sexual revolution is to blame for the demographic winter? And isn’t Islamisation of the West a mere by-product of our dwarfing ethnicity? If so why do you blame Western Christian civilisation? Rome fell precisely because infanticide (the abortion of classical times) and contraception was practiced massively since the times of Julius Caesar. However, since Constantine and Theodosius the Church made enormous efforts to stop infanticide.

I agree that a major catastrophe is needed. That’s why, as I have iterated elsewhere, every morning I wake up with yearning dreams of mushroom clouds above Western cities to wake me up—and waking up the West. But couldn’t we reject the 1960s revolution without America necessarily falling?

Yes: I know you want to delve deeper into the root cause. But I still think that solid arguments based on demographic winter show us that the West took a very wrong turn in the middle ’60s. I
mean, the West was still healthy in the year in which I was born! (maybe because you were born after that you haven’t seen the healthy West with your own eyes). We tried to trick the god Eros through contraception and the liberation of women. We are suffering now for having messed with the laws of Nature. Our present problems with a revived Islam are Venus’ revenge. Curious that I am not a Christian—like Tannhäuser I look for the grotto of Venus—yet I admire conservative Protestants and Catholics on this issue, eh?

Conservative Swede responded: You need to read more carefully, because you missed my point. I repeat what I said:

The demographic forces in motion are so great, yes exponential. Not so much our declining birth rates, but the population explosion in the Third World that we are causing and the mass immigration and demographic Jihad in our lands. It’s the Western Christian civilisation that feeds all these processes.

Our declining birth rates have a slow effect in comparison with the exponential growth that the population explosion and demographic Jihad means. And it’s exactly because of Christian ethics that people, like for example you, entirely look at our birth rates (narrowly blaming feminism, etc.), instead of focusing on the much bigger and alarming problem caused by us: the population explosion in the Third World.

For the very same reason that Christian ethics abhors infanticide, it causes the population explosion in the world. It’s a deeply held doctrine within Christian ethics that every single human life across the planet must be saved if possible. According to Christian ethics it is forbidden and unthinkable to think in terms of not saving every little brown child across the planet. But the consequences of this mindset are catastrophic, not only for us but also for them, as I have already explained. But since people are so programmed according to Christian ethics, what I’m saying does not seem to enter their heads. The thought is too unthinkable to be absorbed. It’s an utter taboo.

You asked, ‘Wasn’t everything relatively OK up to the 1950s?’ Sure it was. But the better our lives got, the more we destroyed, and the faster we destroyed it. It was exactly in the ’50s that this problem started. In the ’50s people of European descent was 30 percent of this planet, today we are just a little more than 10 percent. Not by us decreasing (in fact we are more than in the ’50s)
but by the rest of the planet exploding in numbers, from 3 to 7 billion people—all caused by us.

The population of Africa is four and a half times higher than in 1950. And the population in Asia almost three times higher.

As I have already explained: With a highly developed industrial society, the Western people got a huge surplus of resources, and much more time at their hands. Since Christian ethics mandates what it does, they have since gone around the world to save every single little life that they could: using Western medicine, modern fertilizers, GMO crops, and all other means possible, to keep as many alive as possible. Thus the population explosion.

This is derived from the deepest moral grammar of Christianity. But it took all these centuries until we had an industrialised society that made it possible to enact. And because of that, Christian ethics mandated that we caused this Third World population explosion. Something that could never have achieved themselves, which makes our deed so deeply irresponsible in so many ways, just because it’s artificial. Which means (1) they are not adapting their life-style accordingly but continue and continue to explode in numbers, and (2) they are completely depending on us, which means their societies will break apart once our economic world order collapses. That means that we will have to remove the industrial society, if we want to keep Christian ethics. Think over which one you appreciate the most.

You asked, ‘But couldn’t we reject the ’60s revolution without America necessarily falling?… the West took a wrong turn in the middle 1960s’. No, this is not a matter of reverting the ’60s revolution. It goes far deeper than that. You know, the ’60s revolution wasn’t brought to us by extraterrestrials. There is an internal logic to our civilisation, and its ideals, that led to that. It wasn’t an accident. Start looking at the French Revolution.

In general your answer is about rejecting the ’60s and going back to older Christian values, rejecting for example abortion and contraception. But this is just a stronger version of the Christian dogma to save every single human life possible. If anything it would just make the Third World population explosion worse! The population explosion is not caused by liberalism: it is caused by Christianity in its most general form. And if you bring in more deeply Christian people, it will only make it worse.
First the dollar bubble will burst, and soon after, the population explosion bubble. At this point people will see that Christian ethics caused this whole thing, and it will be utterly discredited. This narrow-minded dogma of saving every possible life will, instead, have caused more death and suffering than if Christian ethics hadn’t meddled with the situation in the first place.

It’s like a plan the devil had thought out. To give birth to billions of people that could then be killed in one single blow in mass starvation.

What this Christian dogma hasn’t taken into consideration is that each society needs to be self-dependent. Because sooner or later there comes hard times. And if we have made them utterly dependent on us what they will face then is death since they cannot support themselves.

So what this Christian dogma will have caused is the death of societies. So much simultaneous death will kill also the societies. This would never have happened if this Christian dogma hadn’t entered the picture in the first place. A constant degree of child deaths, while being self-dependent in the traditional way, would have been the best thing for these societies. It wouldn’t have hurt them or us.

I think that once it has happened, people will see this point clearly, and change their ways.

‘Feed the world’ beats saving the resources of our planet (i.e. actually saving the planet), according to the moral grammar of our current belief system. Quite as multiculturalism and Islamophilia beats for example feminism (as they say: ‘Race beats gender’). Our moral grammar is full of such hierarchies, from which the priorities are derived, once the objectives end up in conflict with each other. To save every single possible human life is one of our deepest dogmas, but try to discuss overpopulation with these anti-CO2 freaks (i.e., 90 percent of the westerners). Even when believing in their theory about ‘global warming by human CO2’ it would be clear that this problem would be strongly connected to overpopulation. But to address that as a problem is an utter taboo for these people.
And just a general note: People here at Gates of Vienna focus on the immigration problem. But mass immigration is just the local projection of this much larger and more fundamental problem of which I’m talking of here; that is, the planetary population explosion and our attitudes towards it (which also caused it). It won’t help to address the immigration problem without addressing this global problem. That is, it won’t help to be a lonely Polish if surrounded by Arabs, Pakistanis and Africans all along the border. What is happening across the world is the large scale version of what is happening within our countries. Our relative numbers are diminishing by theirs increasing exponentially, in both cases.

Things will not be able to turn around until the current belief system breaks apart, and makes a 180-degree turn. The main thing we can do today is to thoroughly prepare for that moment. These preparations also help to protect ourselves from violence and hardships in any sort of context. So no matter what future scenario one envisions, I’d say that the breakdown of the current belief system is not that far away.

I’d give it around a decade.

_______ & ______
On depression

*A Stone Boat* (Faber & Faber 1994)

*The Noonday Demon* (Scribner 2002)

When we repress our anger, writes Susan Forward in her bestseller *Toxic Parents*, we will likely fall into depression. But not all cases of depression, the most common form of mental disorder, are the result of repressed anger. It may originate from existential causes: the infinite gamut of insoluble problems in life. However, in cases of repressed parental abuse cathartic anger may be a balsam for its cure. Colin Ross, who coined the term trauma model of mental disorders, believes that ‘anger is the most powerful anti-depressant in the market’. Andrew Solomon takes the opposite stance: he idealised the parent and repressed his anger, as I’ll try to show in this essay-review of his books.

Andrew Solomon

Solomon is a very peculiar writer, the son of a millionaire of Forest Laboratories: a company that manufactures psychiatric drugs. That we are immersed in the matrix of Big Pharma is evident in the compliments that *The Noonday Demon* has received, especially the compliments of those who have suffered from depression. I find this so scandalous that I must write this essay, especially because *The Noonday Demon* was in the New York Times bestseller list. The pseudoscientific propaganda that inundates *The Noonday*
Demon through its 700 pages (I read the Spanish translation) is such that I could have written a much longer essay-review.

The Noonday Demon received the National Book Award in 2001. Solomon has thus contributed to what Thomas Szasz calls the pharmacratic status quo. Although Solomon mentions Szasz and Elliot Valenstein, he omits to say that they and many other mental health professionals disagree with the biological theories that Solomon presents as fact. It is not even apparent that Solomon has read the dissident scholars. For example, in the 860 references that he boasts in The Noonday Demon he does not mention a single reference of my critical bibliography on psychiatry that I recommend at the end of this article.

An American pandemic?

According to Solomon’s bestseller, almost twenty millions Americans suffer from depression. Solomon confesses in his book how he suffered from this malaise since his mother died, and he recounts the therapeutic odyssey he found in a psychiatric profession that he considers benign. The ‘noonday demons’ was a religious metaphor used since the Low Middle Ages to describe what since the Renaissance would be called ‘melancholy’, and in our times ‘depression’. Through the centuries, those who have been in panic when these demons attack have been prone to experiment with all sorts of quack remedies. Solomon himself tried a magical ritual in Africa; standard psychiatric medication, and New Age alternative remedies. He even experimented with alcohol, cocaine and opium, as he confesses in his book.

Tom Szasz, perhaps the most famous psychiatrist in the United States, proposes to abolish involuntary psychiatry. Szasz doesn’t propose to ban the prescription of drugs for adults, always provided that the professional maintains well informed his client about the risks (something they rarely do). A great deal of the economic power of psychiatry rests on this not so obscure side of the profession, the voluntary side: something that blinds people like Solomon to see that the profession has a darker side.

If an individual wants to take drugs, whether tranquilizers, stimulants, anti-anxiety pills or even illegal drugs, he should be free to do it according to Szasz. Solomon goes beyond this and mentions cases in which people in panic solicited electroshock.
Although shock treatment is sometimes voluntary, I don’t believe it should be legal. Solomon himself cites the case of a young woman who told him that after a shock session she forgot everything she had learned in law school. Solomon also cites the grotesque testimony of an individual that requested psychosurgery to eliminate his persistent depression, and the neuropsychiatrists performed it (a pointless surgery, of course, because the problem was in his mind’s software, not in the brain’s hardware).

Those procedures affected the faculties of these voluntary patients, the remedy resulting worse than the illness, because psychiatry is an iatrogenic profession. If we keep in mind Colin Ross’ words about ‘anger, the best antidepressant in the market’, instead of these harmful treatments I would recommend a depressed patient to write a long letter to the parent who caused the crisis (I myself did it, as we shall see). This is what Sue Forward recommends in *Toxic Parents*. Alternatively, I would recommend talking with survivors of parental abuse. Forward describes her group therapies for neurotics; Ross describes the same for people in psychotic crises. In the worst of possible cases, say schizophrenia, I would recommend a Soteria-like house, although there are very few of them because the medical profession monopolises treatments.

What neither Solomon nor the orthodox psychiatrists understand is that, by medically treating those who have been abused at home, they promote a status quo that ought to change. Those who want a better society do not propose prohibiting the drugs that are voluntarily consumed. We want to eliminate the conditions that cause mental stress and disorders. However, we do point out that with the medical model of mental disorders we are heading toward the dystopia described by Aldous Huxley. In October of 1949, when *Nineteen Eighty Four* was published, Huxley wrote to Orwell a letter telling him that the totalitarian state would not control people with a boot on the face as in *1984* but through much more subtle forms of manipulation: the voluntary drugging in the

*Brave new world*

The efficacy of antidepressants, that started to be manufactured a few years after Huxley sent his letter to Orwell, has been enormously exaggerated by the pharmaceutical companies. Solomon ignores that, just like homeopathic meds, the
antidepressant that his father distributes basically functions like a placebo: the power of suggestion and autosuggestion. Studies show that a considerable percentage of the people that are told that a marvellous antidepressant has just been discovered are cured of their depression although they were given sugar pills. This effect is called ‘placebo’ in the medical profession. The companies like the one that made Solomon’s father a rich man also minimise the side-effects of the antidepressants.

In a market society it is very difficult to find the study of an independent researcher about the effects of antidepressants. The few existent studies, say those by Peter Breggin and Joseph Glenmullen, have not been rebutted either by the companies that make the drugs, or by the psychiatrists who prescribe them. Breggin, a graduate Harvard psychiatrist, recommends stopping taking any sort of psychiatric meds. It’s irritating that my dust jacket has Solomon as ‘profoundly human’ when Solomon advises people suffering from depression not to stop taking drugs. He even confesses that he got mad with his aunt’s gerontologist because the good doctor advised her to stop taking Celexa (citalopram): the very drug that Solomon’s dad distributes.

As I said, Solomon writes about psychiatric theories as fact. Curiously, at the same time he recommends alternative treatments. Lots of them! Just as the race of birds in Alice in Wonderland, in Solomon’s book all sorts of therapies, allopathic, homeopathic and alternative, win the first price in the treatment of depression. In Solomon’s wonderland absolutely everything is recommended, from the most diverse forms of popular quackery to lobotomy. Since I only have the Spanish translation of The Noonday Demon I cannot quote Solomon verbatim in English (libraries in Mexico are very poor in their English section). But he certainly says that dozens of treatments, from Saint-John’s-wort to psychosurgery, are reasonably promising. If such quackery apparently gets results, it’s all due to the placebo effect.

Solomon’s book is inundated with incredible treatments, personal testimonies from his depressed acquaintances, and with the theories of biological psychiatry. For example, Solomon writes that some people who abuse stimulants also suffer from depression in the same family. To him, this indicates that there’s a ‘genetic predisposition’ for the consumption of cocaine and other stimulants.
It doesn’t occur to Solomon that there can be no genes responsible for addictions for the simple reason that the genes of our species are older than the making of these chemicals. For instance, a putative gene that moves the alcoholic individual to drink cannot exist because alcohol is chronologically more recent than the genotype of the alcoholic individual, and there have been no substantive changes in our species since the caveman. Similarly, Solomon’s claim that the type of drugs that his dad makes represents real medicine is unsupportable. For example, he recognises that cocaine heals depression, but he disapproves of it because it’s illegal. On the next page Solomon recognises that Xanax pills (alprazolam), a benzodiazepine, caused him unpleasant symptoms. Xanax is the anxiety killer that Solomon used to take: the very drug that made George Bush Sr. vomit in Japan during his presidency. According to Solomon, with this drug he could crash into a heavy sleep plagued with dreams. However, he does recommend it because it’s legal.

Solomon never reveals in his book that Ritalin (methylphenidate) can be moral and illegal in the adult who takes it without prescription, but that it can also be immoral and legal if it is administered to a child to control him at school. Instead, he reasons like the good boy of the establishment: the legality of his dad’s company makes those drugs, by definition, moral; and the illegality of cocaine and ecstasy makes them immoral. Solomon talks about the permanent damage in the brain’s dopaminergic systems caused by cocaine. But he omits to say that Zyprexa (olanzapine), the neuroleptic that the psychiatrist prescribed him, causes exactly the same damage. Similarly, Solomon talks about the withdrawal symptoms that cocaine causes, but he does not dissuade his readers from taking neuroleptics although akathisia is pretty similar to such symptoms. Curiously, Solomon says he would accept taking cocaine or ecstasy to cure his depression, but that the withdrawal symptoms made him have second thoughts. In another part of his book Solomon recognises that while alprazolam killed his anxiety during the depressive attacks, it converted him into an addict. In a magazine article Solomon confessed he used to take about twelve pills per day, but when he’s in another mood he states that the aetiology of his depression is purely existential.

The cocktail of psychiatric drugs that Solomon has taken for years includes Zoloft (sertraline), Xanax (alprazolam), Paxil
(paroxetine), Navane (thiothixene), Valium (diazepam), BuSpar (buspirone), Wellbutrin (bupropion) and Zyprexa (olanzapine).

Even though this suggests that Solomon believes in the medical model of mental disorders, he often talks of souls in pain. He writes that he ‘discovered something that should be called the soul’. Other times he appears as the spokesman of psychiatric biologicism. His book is a contradictory compendium of both explicit apologetics of biopsychiatry and soft criticism of biopsychiatry; of existential testimonies of depressed people, and the biological myths of the profession. He advertises Prozac (fluoxetine) and on another page he recognises that his mother complained about its side-effects. (If Prozac and the antidepressants work as placebos, the so-called ‘side-effects’ are in fact the primary effects, the only effects of the drug; and the antidepressant effect would be caused by the power of suggestion.) Solomon also presents a mixture of both: existential and biological problems as the cause of melancholy. He sensibly concedes that extreme poverty and homelessness may cause ‘depression’, but he unreasonably recommends treating the homeless with psychiatric drugs. He adds the remarkable statement that more than in any other case, the homeless’ resistance to take drugs is a symptom of a ‘disease’. Solomon quotes the scientists or pseudo-scientists who say that the cause of the addictions is ‘in the brain’, when common sense contradicts this bio-reductionist approach. Asian people for example would disagree that their gambling is in their defective brains. The same could be said of those westerners who are addicted to shopping in a consumer-oriented society: the problem is in the culture, not in their brains.

In his book Solomon contradicts himself in a thousand ways. As a master of doublethink, he accepts both the medical model of mental disorders, and the trauma model of mental disorders when both are mutually exclusive. In his chapter about suicide he repeats the slogans of the psychiatrist, for example when he says that we got to understand that suicidal ideation is the result of mental illness, and that mental illnesses are treatable. He recommends electroshock. Not even the horrendous case-stories that he mentions awakened Solomon’s compassion. He didn’t condemn the psychiatric institutions that maintain them alive against their will. But when he writes about the suicide of his mother, Solomon turns suddenly into a compassionate son, and suicide is nothing else than an act of a tormented soul. However,
Solomon didn’t condemn the nets he saw in Norristown Hospital that maintained alive patients like mosquitoes in cobwebs to prevent that they killed themselves. They were strangers to him and he accepts involuntary therapies applied to them. But double-thinker Solomon confesses that nothing causes him more horror than the thought that he would be prevented from committing suicide.

**The ‘unacknowledged revenge’ on mother**

Throughout my reading of Solomon’s book the question came to my mind: How is it that someone like me, who writes in a state of virtual poverty in the Third World, never fell in depressions while Solomon, the American junior who spent a fortune in treatments didn’t only suffer from the common blues, but of horrible depressions? Could it be that Solomon has not listened to what Stefan Zweig, the biographer of tormented souls, called the daimon?

Let me explain myself. Solomon writes about some children whose parents took to the psychiatrist’s office for anger therapy. Solomon completely omits to say that this was probably due to child abuse at home. Once the legit anger is crushed in the therapeutic sessions, the shrinks acknowledge that the children fell into a melancholic state (remember Ross’ equation about anger and depression being inversely proportional to each other). Those children are, again, strangers to Solomon and he doesn’t pity them. But in another part of his book Solomon recognises that his depression originated after his mother died. And it was precisely a conflict with his mother, who hated Solomon’s sexuality, what had moved him to write another book: *A Stone Boat*.

I must confess that what moved me to write this essay-review is my literary project that I have written in Spanish and that I would love to see published in English. Alas, the subject is such a taboo that more than twenty publishing houses in Spain and Mexico have rejected it. There’s an almost symmetrical antithesis between the first of my books, *Letter to Mom Medusa* and *A Stone Boat*. Also, there’s an almost symmetrical antithesis between my second book *How to Murder Your Child’s Soul* and *The Noonday Demon*.

*A Stone Boat* is an autobiographical novel in which Solomon eludes discharging the rage he feels toward his mother. In *The
Noonday Demon Solomon mentions *A Stone Boat* quite a few times as a description of real events of his life, not as a fictional novel. Unlike *The Noonday Demon* I do have an English copy of it and can, at last, quote this homosexual writer. Solomon wrote:

I can remember days… that this secret [his sexual preferences] was my unacknowledged revenge on her. I would lie in the silence of my room and imagine the pain I would later cause my mother.

Although on the next page he writes: ‘I wanted somehow to take the unspeakable vengeance’, in the balance *A Stone Boat* is a politically-correct confessional novel: Solomon is afraid of speaking out the whole truth of his sentiments. The plot starts when the main character, Solomon’s alter ego, arrived in Paris to confront his mother because of her attitude toward his male lover.

I set off to Paris in anger, determined for the first time to act upon anger… I was, at best, trying to see my life as separate from my mother’s.

But he couldn’t. Upon arriving he discovered that his mother had cancer.

Perhaps I was angrier that week than I remember, but I think in fact that when I first saw that my mother might be sick, my anger got put away somewhere, and my mother became as glorious to me as she had been in my childhood.

Hence, writes Solomon, ‘through I had gone to France to sever ties’, the beatific vision continued until she died. In the last chapter of *A Stone Boat* Solomon confesses:

I forgive my mother as though I were spokesman for the very gates of heaven.

Solomon ignores that unilateral forgiveness is a psychological impossibility. The grace of forgiveness only reaches us when the offender recognises her fault. Neither in real life nor in the novel did his mother repent. And Solomon forfeited to confront her directly (the opposite of what another Jew, Kafka, did in *Letter to His Father*). Moreover, Solomon recounts that in the funeral he saw his mother ‘like an angel’ and, by seeing her in this way, he delivered himself into the open arms of the goddess of Melancholy.
The literary genre that I would like to inaugurate would not only oppose the biologism that is breathed throughout *The Noonday Demon*, but the elegant prose of *A Stone Boat*: a poetic novel that has been described as a reach toward Proust. Vindictive autobiography doesn’t take care of the literary form at all: it’s a barbarous genre that breaks the millenarian taboo of honouring the parent. Without scruples, repressions and with the real names, vindictive autobiography throws in the parent’s face what s/he did to us. Conversely, *The Noonday Demon* is a book that approaches depression from every possible viewpoint, an atlas of the world of depression as the subtitle says. But what we need is more profundity, not amplitude. This is true not only of *The Noonday Demon*, but of many other quack books on the subject. The cause of the mental disorders with no known biological marker is in the psyche’s nucleus, not on a surface that a scholar’s ‘atlas’ may explore. In his autobiographical novel, my antipode Solomon wrote:

> It was terrible how much I loved my mother. It was the most terrible thing in the world.

This was reinforced by the family dynamics:

> My father expected everyone to understand at once that my mother was more important than everyone else [and Solomon] was as much in the habit of believing it as he was. [To the extent that Solomon] thought that if she died I would also have to die.

Solomon’s girlfriend told him: ‘Enough is enough; if you spend every minute with her, you’ll go crazy’. He further writes that ‘to be in the room’ with his mother ‘was like being splattered with blood’. He loved her despite that ‘in the first weeks of her illness, my mother was to reveal more clearly her terrible brutality: She could be harsh, and she was demanding, and she could be selfish’. The metaphor of a stone boat came from his girlfriend referring to Solomon’s idealisation of a perfect family: a myth that, according to her, would sink in the sea.

But she was wrong. Solomon didn’t sink the stony idea in a sea of truth. He continued to idealise his mom as it is surmised from the fact that, after he published *A Stone Boat*, Solomon embarked on a huge enterprise: the writing of a treatise to repress the aetiology of his depression even further, *The Noonday Demon*. In
this later work, his magnum opus, Solomon tells us that the old Freudian precept of blaming the mother has been discarded.

Solomon is wrong in all counts. Blaming the mother is neither a Freudian principle (it’s Frieda Fromm-Reichmann’s), nor has it been discarded (cf. the work of Alice Miller), and Solomon himself has to get his ass even with his mother’s if he is to win the battle against depression. That’s Sue Forward’s advice, who recommends the depressed adult to read a vindictive letter to the late parent in front of the grave to achieve inner peace. As a researcher, I have been in anger therapies in the Ross Institute for Psychological Trauma in Dallas. The level of overt fury and hate toward the invoked perpetrators shocked me. The emotions I witnessed there were not creatures of the surface but the demons of the Old World that Solomon and his depressing fans don’t dare to invoke.

*The daimon*

Those who fall in depression are like extinct volcanoes that have long passed by the tectonic plates’ hot spot beneath them. Solomon has not done a good introspection: he’s an extinct volcano. Only thus can we understand when he writes that one of the most terrible aspects of depression, the anxiety and the panic attacks, is that volition is absent: that those sentiments simply ‘occur’. Obviously Solomon has no idea of the demonic magma that inhabits beneath him and that desperately needs a way out. The bestselling author on depression doesn’t know what depression is: psychic congestion or a cooled crag that, blocking the escape valve, impedes the deliverance of a monster. Had Solomon choose the genre of the eruptive epistle instead of the toned down novel or a scholarly treatise, he could have confronted the inner daimon that haunts him and vomit the hell out of it.

There’s a passage in *The Noonday Demon* that suggests this interpretation. Solomon writes that he once believed that his sexuality was responsible for the suffering of his mother: suffering she endured until she died. The mother hated Solomon’s homosexuality, and that hatred was a poison that started to impregnate Solomon’s mind. I’m not inventing this: I’m rephrasing what Solomon wrote from the translated copy of his Noonday that I have access to. Solomon even writes that he cannot separate his
mother’s homophobia from his own homophobia to the point of exposing himself to the HIV virus. And he further confesses that this exposure was a way of converting an inner self-hatred into a physical reality. In *A Stone Boat* he writes that his mother told him: ‘No child was ever loved more than you’, and in the following pages he adds: ‘A minute later I thought of killing her’ to end the mother’s agony. Mom’s cruellest tirade had been telling him she would eat poisonous maggots and die, and that only then would Solomon regret having been a naughty child.

Solomon’s confessions can help us to understand his depression in a way that Solomon can’t. As he writes in *The Noonday Demon*, which unlike *A Stone Boat* is not a novel, his mother committed suicide to stop the pain of her ovary cancer. On June 19, 1991 in front of Solomon his beloved mother swallowed red pills of Seconal (secobarbital: a barbiturate). He and the rest of his family assisted the suicide. Solomon confesses us that his mother’s suicide was the cataclysm of his life; that it’s buried in his guts like a sharp knife—these are his own metaphors—and that it hurts every time he moves. In some of the most emotional passages Solomon tells us that his mother took pill after pill, the ‘poisonous maggots’ she had threatened would make him feel really bad. Solomon even writes that by imitating her he later learned to take handfuls of anti-depressants, ‘pill after pill’…

The psychic radiography of Solomon starts taking shape. However, like the proverbial prodigal son that represses in his mind the parent’s behaviour, Solomon tells us that it is nonsense that teenagers reproach their parents when they have done everything for them. His non-reproached resentment metamorphosed into acute melancholy: just what happened to the children whose shrinks eliminated their anger. But it is the prohibition of touching the mother what makes this Ēdipus write that we should not deceive ourselves; that we don’t know the cause of depression and that we don’t know either how it came about in human evolution.

That, my dear readers, is biological psychiatry: the art of blaming the body for our cowardice to confront mom.

Ēdipus’ struggles with the daimon

In his desperate attempts to escape the harassment of his inner daimon, Solomon found the exit door by a fluke. In *The
Noonday Demon he paraphrases the psychoanalysts who have written insightful passages about melancholy. For example, Solomon writes that, in order not to castigate the beloved person, the melancholic individual re-directs the anger and the ambivalence he feels for the loved one onto the patient himself. And following Sigmund Freud and his disciple Karl Abraham he self-analysed himself well enough when he wrote that during his first crisis, after his mother’s death, he incorporated her into his writing. Unfortunately, he also writes that he lamented the pain he caused to her, and this false sense of guilt persisted. He further writes that her death prevented that his relationship with his mother had a healthy closure. In A Stone Boat he had written: ‘Our flashes of intense hatred had never really undermined our adoration of each other’.

Solomon never crossed through the very door that he opened. In contrast to John Modrow, the valiant memorialist who published a touching autobiography about his maddening parents, Solomon’s struggles with the daimon of honouring the parent never ended. When he published A Stone Boat the daimon of guilt assaulted him once more. In The Noonday Demon he writes that when he published the novel it made him feel like a defiant son, and that the guilt feelings began to consume him. He even writes about an internalised love-object, his mother, and about internalised sadism: what Solomon did to himself. Solomon wasn’t only masochist to defend the idealised image of his mother (cf. what Ross says about ‘the locus of control shift’ in his book The Trauma Model). He broke pictures of himself hanging in his home, and he left the hammer in the middle of the broken crystals.

Once he even attacked viciously a friend to the point of breaking his jaw and nose. The man was hospitalised and in The Noonday Demon, where we wouldn’t expect fiction or literary embellishments as in the novel, Solomon confesses to us that he will never forget the relief he felt with each of his vicious punches. He found himself even strangling his friend and says that could have killed him. However, Solomon omits to say if he was arrested or if dad’s attorneys kept him out of jail. He does confess, however, that he hasn’t repented from what he did. He justifies his actions and he wrote that otherwise he would have become mad. And he adds that part of the sensation of fear and impotence he suffered in those times was alleviated by those savage acts. And still further he adds the illuminating confession that to deny the curative power of
violence would be a terrible mistake, and that the night of the fighting he arrived at home covered with blood with a sensation of horror and euphoria at the same time.

Miraculously, that night he felt completely released from his daimon! But was the struggle with it over? Nope!: this acting out was nothing else than the displaced fury he felt toward his mother.

Alice Miller has taught us that displaced rage is infinite. It never ends. One is left to wonder what would the hospitalised friend say of Solomon’s fans, who have described him as ‘compassionate and humane’. On the next page of Solomon’s fight he gives us the key to enter his mind. Solomon wrote that he realised that depression could manifest itself in the form of rage.

This cracks the daimon’s cipher. Those who fall in depression and go to the shrink office to pop up a bottle and take a pill don’t know what’s happening in their heads! What these people actually feel is rage and fury toward the perps. But God forbid: we cannot touch them. Parents are to be honoured. A Miller reader would argue that only when our selves get integrated about how and when we were abused, we won’t displace our rage on innocent friends. Solomon also confesses to us that he displaced the anger he felt on his lover: ‘I hated Bernard and I hated my father. This made it easier to love my mother’. This reminds me what Silvano Arieti said in *Interpretation of Schizophrenia* about one of his patients who ‘protected the images of his parents but at the expense of having an unbearable self-image’. The dots start to be connected. Solomon imagined that he ‘would mutilate his [Bernard’s] cat’. But that was not enough:

I wrote him a letter carefully designed to make him fall in love with me, hopelessly in love, so that I could reject him brutally. I would castrate him with a straight razor. [And also fantasised] putting rat poison in his coffee, but I couldn’t remember why.

Of course he couldn’t: he was still displacing his anger onto a scapegoat (in *The Noonday Demon* he ratifies the actual existence of the person he called Bernard). Solomon was looking for a safer object to transfer his unconscious affects toward his mother, a mother about whom he wrote: ‘You don’t love me. You are obsessed with me, and you keep trying to drag me down into your illness’. Since displaced anger is infinite, in *The Noonday Demon*
Solomon confesses that, in desperation, he went to Senegal looking for an exorcism. The persistent daimon had to be expelled at all costs, and he tried the ritual called ndeup. But witchcraft didn’t work. The powerful spell that his witch-mother had cast unto him wasn’t broken in black Africa.

After his Senegal experience Solomon continued to look for the cause of depression in psychiatry’s blame-the-body theories, and he also tried many pop remedies. It’s fascinating to see that quite a few of his quack remedies are identical to what Robert Burton prescribed in his famous 1621 treatise on melancholy. Both writers, the 17th-century Burton and the 21st century Solomon, recommend Saint-John’s-wort! And parallel to these Old Age and New Age quackery, Solomon writes a ‘scientific’ chapter on evolutionary biology to answer how could it be possible that natural selection allowed depression!

If we take into account that depression is a crack in our attachment systems due to unprocessed abuse, the above is a pretty stupid question. While I only have minor quibbles with Solomon’s stupidities, when he mentions involuntary psychiatry he sides the parents and the professionals against the patients. The pages that infuriated me the most are the ones in which Solomon sides the parents who label their sane children as mentally ill to control them through psychiatric drugs, especially at school.

It is understandable, therefore, that Solomon didn’t dedicate The Noonday Demon to the child victim of involuntary psychiatry, what I do with my texts. He dedicated it to his millionaire father who financed his investigation and whose income depends on the selling of those drugs for social control.

Recommended readings:

Criticism of language is the most radical of all criticisms. The following is the first book of my list because, if in our vocabulary we don’t root out the Newspeak of psychiatrists, psychoanalysts and clinical psychologists, it will be impossible to understand the family, social, economic and existential problems that we all have:

On the importance of vindictive confessions:


On psychoanalysis and all sorts of psychotherapies:


On the pseudoscientific nature of biological psychiatry:


Postscript:

Updated anti-psychiatric information can be watched in Robert Whitaker’s videos in YouTube (not to be confused with white nationalist Robert W. Whitaker who has passed away).

October 25, 2009
What in America could still be seen in the 1940s, exemplified in Maxfield Parrish’s paintings—Aryan beauty and those women with the most delicate facial features—is the crown of the evolution. Presently, however, the magic of that beauty cannot be seen in our decadent culture.

Americans had these paintings at their homes, especially *Daybreak*: Parrish’s masterpiece. The girls were surrounded by paradisiacal worlds with mountains at the horizon, like those in Finland; near a beach and at dawn light, always with the Leitmotif of the nymphs on the foreground.

But let’s get down a bit from this ethereal art to talk about women of flesh and blood...

Any truly emergent man who has watched the comparatively recent films *Sense and Sensibility* and *Pride and Prejudice*, both based on novels by Jane Austen, will see what I mean. When I recorded one of my subtitled videos about another film, *The Lord of the Rings* I had in mind a woman, Éowyn in the capital of Rohan, with those torn sentences coming from an eight-string fiddle, typical of Norwegian folklore. In that video, I said that contemplating Éowyn at the top of the city of Edoras and the Golden Hall of Meduseld was a numinous experience; that it transcended eroticism and took me onto a divine plane.
So this is what pains me the most: that it’s fashionable among whites—even among the Germanic people—not to breed anymore. Mixed marriages with Neanderthaloid primitives are now tolerated, as it is to import millions of Orcs into the West. And if we consider that blondness is the result of a recessive gene, that if the two parents are not blonde they cannot transmit it to the next generation, we are talking about the sin against life’s holy ghost.

January 27, 2010
A lightning in the middle of the night!

These days of February 2010 have been the most important since I discovered the subject of the Islamisation of the West in September 2008 and that there was a substantial body of literature on white nationalism a year later. Until recently, Lawrence Auster’s writings had been a lighthouse to approach these subjects. The fact that all of his great grandparents were Eastern European Jews did not bother me the least bit. But... a single phrase that I recently discovered in a June 2009 Gates of Vienna exchange had the effect of a lightning bolt in the middle of the night. It made me revaluate my values in a subject that I previously called ‘antisemitism’. Take note that Gates of Vienna is a philosemitic blogsite, with a big Star of David on its main page stating ‘We Support Israel’. Below I quote a comment from the 2009 exchange at Gates of Vienna.

Avery Bullard said:

As I have often pointed out, socialism is by and large a disease of the intellectuals, and Jews are over-represented among intellectuals, due to a high native intelligence and a tradition of giving their children as much education as possible. Jews were also over-represented amongst musicians, physicists, and capitalist entrepreneurs. But they are never over-represented in organisations or movements that represent the interests of the ethnic majority, only those that weaken that majority [the bolt of lightning!]. That is why they’ve been expelled from so many very different countries over so many centuries. Yet with the possible exception of Albert Lindemann (Esau’s Tears) they never want to know the reasons why they’ve been so disliked in order to prevent more tragedies in the future. Instead they dismiss all anti-Semitism as scapegoating. In other words: are Jews more responsible for communism, based on their proportional representation amongst the intelligentsia, than any other intellectuals? If they are over-represented in the
intelligentsia then they had disproportionate influence in the direction the intelligentsia took. Many Russian intellectuals were Slavo-philes. Before Jews could access the most important U.S. universities the old WASP intelligentsia in the U.S. was much more traditionalist.

Bullard’s comment in the words I italicised above was the bolt of lightning that changed my worldview: from philosemitism to antisemitism in a single stroke! The lightning struck my mind so hard that I must say something about the Austeresque masthead I had chosen for my blog. If by March I don’t get a convincing rebuttal of the Bullard statement by my visitors, with the accompanying relevant facts, I will add a hatnote in all of my previous entries where the Jewish question is mentioned, something like: ‘I no longer believe in the philosemitic opinions expressed herein…’

February 24, 2010
All is about valour and honesty

The article by Hunter Wallace, ‘The Jews and White Nationalism’ republished on October 4, 2009 (before the lightning bolt) at The Occidental Quarterly Online when it was under the watch of Greg Johnson, opens with the sentence:

Surfing the blogosphere, I stumbled upon The West’s Darkest Hour, a blog written by a TOQ Online reader and Lawrence Auster fan who has some concerns about the presence of anti-Semitism in the White Nationalist movement. Like Tanstaafl, it appears that Chechar learned of us through his involvement in the anti-Jihad movement. In his previous post about White Nationalism, Chechar described his odyssey from liberalism to spectator of the racialist underworld as being like awakening from ‘The Matrix’. Each revelation is the tip of a much larger iceberg.

The next year after the article was published I deleted the two articles linked by Wallace because they spoke of a stage when I still held politically correct views about the Jews and Judaism.

In this article I will briefly recount how, after a series of revelations, I finally woke up.

In an unpublished work that consumed more than a decade of my life, Hojas Susurrantes (Whispering Leaves), I recount how I grew up in a traditional family and how I was relatively well treated in my childhood. Alas, both of my parents started to abuse me and my sisters when we reached adolescence. Since in those times nobody talked about child abuse or was willing to listen (I was born in 1958), my sisters and I grew up carrying over ourselves massive doses of unprocessed pain. My Hojas is a sort of mourning to deal with the pain caused by our parents’ betrayal and society’s deafness toward the calls for help coming from the minor that I was. The mourning I endured since my late teens and throughout my twenties allowed me to see through the denials of the society. And
it was precisely the long mourning and the consequent soul-building that allowed me, a year ago, to see the stark realities of the Jewish question.

Perhaps only those whose souls have been ploughed through pain could understand what do I mean. In the chapter ‘The Soul and the Barbed Wire’ of *The Gulag Archipelago* Solzhenitsyn wrote insightful passages about how the human soul rotting in solitary confinement finds salvation through a metamorphosis that allowed him to turn the abyssal pain into wisdom. Like so many abused children and teenagers, the barbed wires of the Gulag drove many Russians mad. Solzhenitsyn managed to escape psychosis through soul-building as his defence mechanism. This is not easy. Not easy at all. But every time I read those Gulag pages I see myself through all those years in the self-imposed confinement of my study to find out how on earth could such tragedy befall upon my beloved family. However, what Solzhenitsyn calls the ascent of the soul is such an enormous subject—wasn’t it Voltaire who said that man could know the universe but that it would need eternity to learn something about his soul?—that I will leave it like that.

*   *   *

Fleeing from Zapatero’s degenerate Spain, on September 11, 2009 I printed and ring-bind twenty-five articles of *The Occidental Quarterly*. One of the first articles that I started to read crossing over the Atlantic, ‘The Seven Pillars of White Nationalism’, fascinated me: especially the author’s stance about how ‘National Socialism might save us’. I had never read anything like that in a serious journal. The author’s views seemed extreme to me; I stopped reading the article, and tried to get some sleep on the plane.

The following days, weeks and months the whole business of White Nationalism struck me as extremely engrossing. Regardless of what I then perceived as a flaw in the movement, antisemitism, I found myself discovering that the matrix in which I was previously sleeping was far deeper and alienating than what I previously thought. So alienated from reality I was that it may be said that in the last fifteen years I have been awakening from a series of different though inter-chained matrixes, with ‘each revelation as the tip of a much larger iceberg’, until reaching the real awaking point.
In 1995, after a long process of digesting the literature of the sceptics of the paranormal, I gave up my old belief in psychokinesis: the subject of the first article of this book. Alongside with my awakening from para-psychological beliefs, in my thirties Octavio Paz’s essays debunked in my mind much, though not all, of the ideologies of the Spanish-speaking Left. His many critiques in the *Vuelta* literary magazine represented a fresh waking up from the dogmas I had been taught in High School. But those awakenings were transformations allowed within the matrix system in which I still mentally inhabited, as was my next awakening.

Closely related to child abuse are the mental health professions that during intergenerational conflicts always side the parents, and therefore, the perpetrators of the abuse at home. For example, on the parents’ behalf some psychiatrists prescribe psychiatric drugs to rebellious, albeit sane, children, especially males. It was not until a 1998-1999 mental health course at the Open University of Manchester that I discovered the most important books of the main critics of psychiatry and psychoanalysis. I awoke to the fact that such professions function like a political pseudoscience to enforce the will of abusive parents, which moved me to write down those findings in my native language. What precipitated that awakening was the footnoted information that I collected still within the fringes of the university system. Then in 2002 I discovered the work of Swiss psychologist Alice Miller, who unlike the previous critics of the mental health professions is a real taboo in academia. Only thanks to her I discovered that the psychic toll of parental abuse on children is a forbidden issue in all societies (I write about this in the third book of my *Hojas*).

But that was not all. In 2006 another non-academic author surprised me. Lloyd deMause answered my email questions about child abuse in the Ancient World and advised me to read a couple of chapters of one of his major works. I was impressed. The discovery of deMause’s psychohistory widened the vision I had previously learnt in Miller’s works. After assimilating psychohistory I found myself with a meta-perspective that comprised child abuse studies from early civilisations to modern man. The ‘unified field’ provided by my inward soul-searching process thanks to Miller, and the outward historical research provided by deMause, made me feel
I had an unrivalled point of view to see the tragedy of my family in particular and *Homo sapiens* in general.

I was deluded, if we take into account that psychology is not unrelated to sociology and that an authentic free press only started with the advent of the Internet.

By the end of September of 2008 I discovered the blogosphere; watched some online documentaries about the Islamisation of Europe, and learnt how the prolific Muslims may overrun Western civilisation by the end of the century. Originally sceptical about these apparently preposterous claims, in Madrid I purchased a translated copy of Bruce Bawer’s *While Europe Slept*. By the end of 2008 I was still a liberal and could only read fairly liberal stuff. Since the family that destroyed my life are very traditional Catholics, conservatives had been anathema throughout my intellectual life. Only after Bawer convinced me that there was indeed a demographic problem in Europe I dared to purchase English-Spanish translated copies of both Oriana Fallaci’s trilogy on the Islamisation of Europe and Robert Spencer’s *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam*. Spencer is only a scholar on Islam. But it took me a Sabbatical year to digest the material from the more intellectually-inclined counter-jihad blogsites in English.

The extensive reading on these broader socio-political issues not only shattered my former liberal worldview and turned me into, God forbid, a conservative: it convinced me that those concerned about the Islamisation of the West were right, and their Lefty detractors in gross denial. Now I surely was mature psycho-historically and politically, I thought.

I was a chick still struggling to break free from his eggshell to glimpse the real world! By the time I started to read *The Occidental Quarterly* at the international airport I knew that there was a group of people who in the previous decade had coined a new term, White Nationalism. It is true that by the end of 2009 I still disagreed with the nationalists about the Jewish question. This difference aside, after discovering the existence of such a group of intellectuals that the system had screened off from my vision for half a century of my life, I felt I had finally broken the last of the Russian dolls-like eggshells and that I could finally hear the voice, ‘Welcome to the real world!’

Alas, I was still sleeping! But the last Morphean dream could not last long. In February of 2010 I was ‘struck by a lightning bolt’
that cracked the last shell. I realised that I had gotten the Jewish question all wrong and that the Jewish problem was not hallucinatory as I used to believe. It was all too real after all!

Before that crucial day of February 24, 2010 I used to interchange emails with two of the best Jewish minds in the blogosphere active in counter-jihad, Larry Auster and Takuan Seiyo. Paradoxically, these pair helped me to wrap my head around the question of their tribe. Of course: both got mad after I flipped sides. But what convinced me of the essential truth of antisemitism is that neither of these two intellectuals could say anything rational about my February challenge, cited in my previous article. After such provocative challenge the pair did not engage in civil discussion. They simply ignored the new world I was starting not only to glimpse beyond the outer, now ripped membrane, but also ignored the clarity of my vision once I finally passed through the shell and stepped outside this last prison for the white mind.

One of them, Auster, said in his webpage that he would never talk to me again unless I reverted my paradigm to my previous views on the Jewish question. The other intellectual, Seiyo (misleading penname—he’s not Japanese but Polish!) behaved even more irrationally. Infuriated, Seiyo told Tanstaafl: ‘I see you as my direct and mortal enemy’ and threatened in my blog that he would ‘have nothing to do with Chechar as long as he has anything to do with you’.

The Jekyll-Hyde transformation of a famed author for the readers of The Brussels Journal took me by surprise. But the reaction of the non-Jews—the Christian, agnostic and pagan commenters at the blogsite Gates of Vienna where I had originally met them all—taught me a lesson. Ned May, the Gates of Vienna admin emailed me telling that he would stop publishing the rest of my psycho-historical book (that now can be read in Day of Wrath). Neither he nor other of these deracinated whites dared to discuss the issues. For we gentiles, criticism of Jews is considered beyond the pale. Nationalist readers will find comical that the Norwegian Fjordman, one of the most notable bloggers in counter-jihad, has stated: ‘It appears that the only people who can denounce genuine antisemitism yet at the same time criticise liberal Jews are people who are part-Jewish themselves, such as Larry Auster or Takuan Seiyo’. In other words, only the Jews can criticise Jews. (Postscript
of August 2011: It now looks that Fjordman is Jewish on his father’s side.)

These guys are beyond our reach however we approach them. The sad truth is that due to their unwillingness to see the elephant in the room gentiles like Ned May, who fancy themselves as defenders of the West, are, inadvertently, undermining their civilisation. Granted: like May I was a philosemite most of my adult life. I blame Hollywood and the general culture for this nasty and hard-to-crack outer shell that walled-off my mind from the real world for so long. But the main difference between me and these Jews and non-Jews who cling to neo-conservatism is honesty or the lack thereof.

If there is a moral that can be deduced from my spiritual odyssey is that the dishonesty of the family, psychology friends and counter-jihad conservatives I left behind is a by-product of deep, ingrained cowardice. In my teens, when I was abused at home, I believed that compassion was the main virtue of humankind. In my twenties and thirties, when I struggled with the religious demons of my parental introjects, I believed that reason in the sense of the Enlightenment philosophers was the main virtue. In my forties, when my haughty family refused to read my heartbreaking autobiography, I believed that humility was the main virtue.

In my middle age I have come to realise that all is about valour and honesty.

April 5, 2011
The difference between me and white nationalists is that they are literally obsessed with the tip of the iceberg—Judaism. Most of them cannot see what lies beneath the sea: the bulk of the iceberg: a Christianity and Neo-Christianity that suffers from an out-group altruism that no pre-Christian, Western civilisation ever suffered. The following was my comment on one of the threads of The Occidental Observer about out-group altruistic Sweden. Those were times when I believed that it was possible to make a dent in the worldview of the commenters of Kevin MacDonald’s webzine:

How would we have felt if, as children, our father returned home with a boy of an alien ethnic group and forced him into our bedroom as a new brother? How would we have felt if, after resenting this betrayal and picking on the unfortunate intruder—as children usually do—, our father sends us, not the intruder, to a boarding school? Forget every film you have seen to date: because that’s how the real *Wuthering Heights* novel began. In his travels Mr. Earnshaw finds a homeless boy. Once more, forget every Hollywood image because the skin of this boy was similar to that of ‘a little lascar’. Mr. Earnshaw decides to adopt him and name him ‘Heathcliff’. Brontë describes Heathcliff as ‘dark-skinned gypsy in aspect’. Naturally, Mr. Earnshaw’s legitimate son, Hindley, finds himself robbed of his father’s affections and becomes bitterly jealous of the little lascar. (The poor intruder was not even a half-bro or an illegitimate child of Mr. Earnshaw with a gypsy woman.) Every single critic of the novel, even the most conservative, seems to have missed the racial aspect of this drama.

I would go so far as to suggest that, once the ethnostate is established *Wuthering Heights* will be picked as one of the classics to symbolically convey the tragedy of pushing, against the legitimate heir’s will, an illegal alien that after some time hostilely takes over the entire family estate and starts hunting down key Anglo-Saxon
characters in a life dedicated to revenge (such is the plot of *Wuthering Heights*—gypsies are so good at that...).

Furthermore, the real *Wuthering Heights* is no love story at all. The 1939 adaptation with Lawrence Oliver is as detached from the original story as, say, Disney’s *Pinocchio* from the original, and far more sinister, Carlo Collodi tale. Catherine and the gypsy are the polar opposite of heroine and hero. The first Catherine is precisely an early embodiment of the contemporary out-group altruism that has been destroying the West since we committed the blunder of empowering women.

The drama of the novel only ends when—after the deaths of Mr. Earnshaw, Catherine Earnshaw, Isabella Linton, Edgar Linton, Hindley Earnshaw and Linton Heathcliff, the son of the gypsy who dies as a result of the abuse perpetrated by his father—Heathcliff finally dies and the second Catherine can, at last, reclaim a life together with her first cousin: the survivors.

Only pure whites survive at the end of the drama. How come no one has done such an obvious reading of this classic of English literature, that the tragedy only ends when the gypsy dies?

*Wuthering Heights* ought to be presented to European-descended peoples as the perfect metaphor of what Europeans have been self-inflicting in the last decades by importing millions of hostile ‘gypsies’ to displace the native ‘Hindleys’. In fact, in the novel Mr. Earnshaw, whose altruistic fondness for the gypsy boy would cause havoc, reminds me the proverb ‘a dog that wags its tail for strangers and barks at its own people’. He also reminds me what these Swedes are doing not with a single family, but with their entire nation: a deranged Christian sense of compassion à la St Francis transmuted into out-group, runaway altruism.

The drama of *Wuthering Heights* was located, of course, in the Yorkshire manor. But presently this is happening through non-white immigration into every white heartland; Sweden, just one of the most notorious examples.

Reread Brontë’s novel to understand the Swedes!

*May 14, 2011*
Giton’s magic

In *El Retorno de Quetzalcoatl*, the fourth book of *Hojas Susurrantes* I refrained to reproduce this image for the simple reason that it would have meant retro-projection, in the sense of projecting our psyche back onto the psychoclass of these ancient people:

In the image we see women, presumably the mothers, trying to rescue their children from propitiatory child sacrifice to Moloch Baal. But in real life the parents themselves handed over their crying children to the assistants of the priest, hence the inflammatory sentence with which I ended my *Quetzalcoatl*: ‘In the final book of this work I’ll go back my autobiography, and we shall see if after this grim findings mankind has the right to exist’. In Hollywood projections are ubiquitous in movies about the historical past. For instance, *Australia*, a pro-aboriginals film set before the Second World War, had an upset Nicole Kidman telling another white person, ‘No mother would leave her child!’ when in real life, as

---

6 *Day of Wrath* contains most of my *Quetzalcoatl* translated into English.
recounted in my *Quetzalcoatl*, quite a few Australian *abbos* not only abandoned some of their babies but killed and ate them.

Westerners, and incredibly, child abuse researchers included, have not awakened to the fact that there have been very dissimilar ‘psychoclasses’ or ways of childrearing in the world; and that this has had enormous implications for the mental health of a people, primitive or modern. For example, in my *Quetzalcoatl* I said that Rhea hid Zeus and presented a stone wrapped in strips, which Cronus took as a swaddled baby and ate it. Cronus represents the pre-Homeric Greeks, the archaic Hellas. After the breakdown of the bicameral, or schizoid mind, historical Greeks considered barbarous the practice of child sacrifice, symbolised in Zeus’ successful rebellion against his filicidal father. Though they still practiced the exposure of unwanted babies, the historical Greeks at least stopped ritually sacrificing them: a practice that their neighbours continued. Nonetheless, if films on both Homeric and post-Homeric Greeks were historically accurate, the exposure of babies would be visually depicted.

In recent years I saw two films that I had not watched for a long time. In the 1959 Hollywood interpretation of *Ben-Hur* starring Charlton Heston, Tiberius’ Rome and Jerusalem are idealised far beyond what those cities looked like in the times of Jesus. Think of how, to impress the audience with the grandeur of the Roman circus in a Hollywoodesque Palestine, for the chariot race sequence the director made it look as large as Constantinople’s circus. Conversely, in Federico Fellini’s 1969 movie *Fellini-Satyricon*, freely based on Petronius’ classic, the Roman Empire is oneirically caricaturised to the point that the film’s extreme grotesqueries bear no visual relationship whatsoever to the empire of historical time. Both extreme idealisation in Hollywood, and oneiric caricature, constitute artistic ways to understand the soul of Rome. One may think that an Aristotelian golden mean may lie somewhere between *Ben-Hur* and *Fellini-Satyricon*, but not even in HBO’s *Rome*, a purportedly realistic TV series that claimed to pay more attention to historical women, dared to show that such women abandoned their babies who died on the hills, roads and the next day were found under the frozen streets: a custom approved even by Plato and Aristotle.

Growing in a ‘late infanticidal’ culture, to use Lloyd deMause’s term, makes members of that psychoclass greatly
different compared to our modern western psychoclass. (One could easily imagine what a shock for the modern mind would represent the spectacle of white babies dying near Vermont, Bonn or Florence with nobody bothering to rescue them.) So different that I believe that, once digested, the hostile takeover I did of deMause’s psychohistory to deliver it to the dwellers of the future ethnostate has chances to influence the understanding of history in the future.

Another example of such differences is what Andre Gide called normal pederasty, the ancients’ infatuation for adolescents. Gide did not condemn such customs. On the contrary, he considered his Corydon, published in 1924 and which received widespread condemnation, his most important work. But unlike the literary pundits I can only understand the Geist of a culture through the visual arts. It would help if readers of this article watch the YouTube scenes of the movie Fellini-Satyricon depicting Encolpius, who looks like in his middle twenties, and his boyfriend Giton, who looks like a sixteen-year-old leptosomatic lad. Cinematic experiences aside, what are scholars saying about what I call pseudo-homosexuality: pederasty (which must not be confused with pedophilia)? In the introduction to On Homosexuality: Lysis, Phaedrus, and Symposium, Eugene O'Connor wrote (no ellipsis added):

The composition of [Plato’s] Symposium owes much to the Greek tradition of ‘banquet literature’, often a collection of informal discussions (in prose or verse) on various topics, including the power of love and the delights of young men and boys. Indeed, a whole body of homoerotic literature grew up around the themes of male beauty and how one ought to woo and win a boy.

The customary social pattern was this: a boy in his teens or, at any rate, a younger man (called an eromenos, or ‘beloved’) was sought out by an older male (called an erastes or ‘lover’), who might be already married. Women in classical Athens were kept in virtual seclusion from everyone but their immediate families and their domestic activities were relegated to certain ‘female’ parts of the house. As a consequence, boys and young men—partly by virtue of their being seen, whether in the gymnasium, in the streets, or at a sacrifice (as in the Lysis)—became natural love-objects.
Strict rules of conduct bound both parties: adult males could face prosecution for seducing free-born youths, while Athenian boys and young men could be censured for soliciting sexual favours for money. That would make them in effect equal to courtesans, who were hired companions and lacked citizen status. This erastes-eromenos (lover-beloved) relationship, although it was sexual and in many ways comparable to typical, male-female relations, with the man assuming the dominant role, was meant ideally to be an educative one. The older man instilled in the younger—in essence, ‘made him pregnant with’—a respect for the requisite masculine virtues of courage and honor. Socrates in the *Phaedrus* describes how the soul of the pederast (literally, ‘a lover of youths’) who is blessed with philosophy will grow wings after a certain cycle of reincarnations. In recent centuries, the word ‘pederast’ has come to be viewed with opprobrium, fit only to describe child molesters. But in ancient Greece the word carried no such negative connotation, and was employed in a very different context. Surrounded as he often was by the brightest young men of Athens, Socrates jokingly compared himself, in Xenophon’s *Symposium*, to a pander or procurer. These are witty, humorous characterizations of Socrates to be sure; yet, in the end, Socrates was the best erastes of all; the loving adult male teacher who sought to lead his aristocratic eromenoi (male beloveds) on the road to virtue.

I have read Xenophon’s *Symposium* and in chapter VIII it does look like Socrates and others had intense crushes with the eromenoi.

In his *Corydon* Gide shares the Platonic view that what he calls ‘normal pederasty’ (to distinguish it from child molestation) is a propitious state of the mind to shed light on truth and beauty. In the last pages of his slim book Gide concludes: ‘I believe that such a lover will jealously watch over him, protect him, and himself exalted, purified by this love, will guide him toward those radiant heights which are not reached without love’. In the very final page Gide adds that ‘From thirteen to twenty-two (to take the age suggested by La Bruyere) is for the Greeks the age of loving friendship, of shared exaltation, of the noblest emulation’, and that only after this age the youth ‘wants to be a man’: to marry a woman.

Not only I need visuals to properly understand a culture: visuals that we still lack today in the cinematic and documentary
industry. Narrative, which dramatically contrasts with cold academic treatises, is fundamental too as a way to get into the unfathomed depths of a bygone world. There is a tale recounted by an old poet, Eumolpus in the first long novel that Western literature knows, Petronius’ *Satyricon*, that merits reading. It starts with the words: “When I went to Asia”, Eumolpus began, ‘as a paid officer in the Quaestor’s suite, I lodged with a family at Pergamus. I found my quarters very pleasant, first on account of the convenience and elegance of the apartments, and still more so because of the beauty of my host’s son’. Those pages of the real *Satyricon*, which contrasts with Fellini’s nightmare, merits reading as a window to the past. However, the erastes-eromenos relationship was not always as hilariously picaresque as Petronius depicts it. In the 1978 treatise *Greek Homosexuality*, K.J. Dover writes:

Ephoros, writing in the mid-fourth century, gives a remarkable account (F149) of ritualised homosexual rape in Crete. The erastes gave notice of his intention, and the family and friends of the eromenos did not attempt to hide the boy away, for that would have been admission that he was not worthy of the honor offered him by the erastes. If they believed that the erastes was unworthy, they prevented the rape by force; otherwise they put a good-humored and half-hearted resistance, which ended with the erastes carrying off the eromenos to a hide-out for two months. At the end of that period the two of them returned to the city (the eromenos was known, during the relationship, as *parastateis*, ‘posted beside…’ or ‘brought over to the side of…’) and the erastes gave the eromenos expensive presents, including clothing which would thereafter testify to the achievement of the eromenos in being chosen; he was *kleinos*, ‘celebrated’, thanks to his *philetor*, ‘lover’. [p. 189]

John Boswell, a homosexual professor at Yale University who died at forty-seven of complications from AIDS, specialised in the relationship between homosexuality and Christianity. Boswell abstains to mention the word ‘rape’ which Dover unabashedly used in his treatise published by Harvard University. But in *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe* Boswell describes in less academic, and more colourful, language the legal arrangements regarding such abductions:
Apart from the abduction aspect, this practice has all the elements of European marriage tradition: witness, gifts, religious sacrifice, a public banquet, a chalice, a ritual change of clothing for one partner, a change of status for both, even a honeymoon.

The abduction is less remarkable, by the standards of the times, that it seems. The ruler of the gods, Zeus, mandated a permanent relationship with a beautiful Trojan prince, Ganymede, after abducting him and carrying him off to heaven; they were the most famous same-sex couple of the ancient world, familiar to all its educated residents. Zeus even gave Ganymede’s father a gift—the equivalent of a dower or ‘morning gift’. The inhabitants of Chalcis honored what they believed to be the very spot of Ganymede’s abduction, called Harpagion (‘Place of Abduction’).

Moreover, as late as Boccaccio (Decameron, Day 5, Tale 1) an abduction marriage that takes place seems to find its most natural home in Crete.

Hetero-sexual [my emphasis] abduction marriage was also extremely common in the ancient world—especially in the neighboring state of Sparta, with which Crete shared its constitution and much of its social organization, where it was the normal mode of heterosexual marriage. It remained frequent well into modern times, and even under Christian influence men who abducted women were often only constrained to marry them, and not punished in any other way. In a society where women were regarded as property and their sexuality their major asset, by the time an abducted woman was returned most of her value was gone, and the more public attention was focused on the matter the less likely it was she would ever find a husband. And in a moral universe where the abduction of Helen (and of the Sabine women) provided the foundation myths of the greatest contemporary political entities, such an act was as likely to seem heroic as disreputable. The Erotic Discourses attributed to Plutarch begin with stories of abduction for love, both heterosexual and homosexual. [pp. 91-93]

This last sentence about the foundation myths of both the ancient Hellas and Rome is absolutely central to understand their moral universe. However, Boswell omits to say that Zeus would be considered a bisexual god with strong heterosexual preferences—
Hera and many other consorts—according to current standards, in no way a homosexual god. Furthermore, unlike the same-sex unions of today, the erastes-eromenos relationship wasn’t meant to be permanent. The continuance of an erotic relationship was disapproved. In dramatic contrast to contemporary ‘gay marriages’, romantic relationships between adult coevals were disrespected. In fact, the former eromenos might well become an erastes himself with a younger youth when he got older. Boswell, who strove to use classic scholarship to support the so-called ‘gay marriage’ of our times, overstates his case in other passages of *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*. What struck me the most of his study was that on page 66 he misled the readers by claiming that the *Satyricon* protagonists, Encolpius and Giton, are simply a same-sex couple. I have read a couple of translations of the *Satyricon* and it is clear that Boswell omitted a fundamental fact: Giton’s age, an underage teen for today’s standards.

Classic pederasty did not resemble at all what in Newspeak is called the ‘gay movement’. The causes of pederasty are to be found not only in what O’Connor said above: women being kept in seclusion and men transferring their affections to younger boys. On the other hand, in sharp contrast to Lloyd deMause’s psychohistory, which is hostile to Greece and Rome, my educated guess is that the Athenians should have treated the children well enough to allow the explosion of arts, philosophies and policies that we have inherited.

*   *   *

*Hojas Susurrantes* introduces a category that potentially could revolutionise our understanding of ourselves. There exist hells at home where, psychically, children suffer far more than the adult experience in concentration camps: experiences far more destructive for the spirit than what the common prisoner suffers. However, without assimilating that central message what I am about to say will neither be appreciated nor understood. There must be legitimate cases of pederasty: those that help the abused teenager escape the homes of schizogenic parents: something that totally and absolutely escaped deMause’s approach to psychohistory.

Some clinicians say that abused adolescents often dream about a window of escape from their homes. For a long time, but this is the first time that I commit myself to write it down, I
harboured the idea that, thanks to that window of escape, mental health grew exponentially in Ancient Greece. After all, Greek pederasty was the exact opposite of the Christian incarnation of it as performed in secrecy by the priests and, until recent times, without any warning provided to the unsuspecting kid. Conversely, in the Greek and Latin world the ‘lovers of youths’ were out in the open, in the Palestra, Gymnasium or even in homely tutorship with parents; with friends and acquaintances warning the budding boy about the satyrs, or older males of dubious reputation—something that never happened in Christendom in the monasteries or more recently with the altar boys.

I have said that without grasping the concept of schizogenic parents the point I am trying to make will be incomprehensible (read Day of Wrath to see my point). To complicate things further, in our culture blaming parents for the mental disorders of their children is such a heresy that a whole profession, biological psychiatry, has been created to conceal the work of what causes neuroses and psychoses (see my 2020 articles in this very book, Daybreak). But apparently it was not such a taboo in Pericles’ Athens. Think of Euripides’ plays Iphigenia and Electra, the former taken to the silver screen by Greek director Michael Cacoyannis and the latter a play I watched in theatrical representation. Succinctly, Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter Iphigenia and his wife Clytemnestra drove another of her daughters, Electra, mad: perfect examples of what I call soul-murderers or infanticidal psychoclass. If the modern mind could break the taboo that the ancient tragedians started to break before their suicidal Peloponnesian War, under this new perspective of the human mind could we use Gide’s phrase ‘defence of pederasty’ in a sense that Gide never imagined? More importantly, could it be possible that, centuries later, the abolition of the erastes-eromenos institution by Christian emperors resulted in a psychogenic regression at the beginning of the Dark Ages? At present, the trauma model of mental disorders is not accepted either by academia or the general culture. But given the basics of developmental psychology and attachment theory, perhaps only those who followed Gide’s words—‘such a lover will jealously watch over him, protect him’—would be able to open an escaping window, conferring the victim the ability to flee the schizogenic home. But could it be possible that in real life providing for an abused teenager until he reaches maturity could only happen in a
world where poetry and sculpture manifested a predilection for adolescent bodies? Gide claims that bucolic poetry started to sound phony when the poet loved the pastor no more. Even Nietzsche, who abhorred Plato, wrote in *Twilight of the Idols* that Plato ‘says with an innocence possible only for a Greek, not a Christian, that there would be no Platonic philosophy at all if there were not such beautiful youths in Athens: it is only their sight that transposes the philosopher’s soul into an erotic trance, leaving it no peace until it lowers the seed of all exalted things into such beautiful soil’.

It is not possible to turn the clock back to the sexual mores of the Greco-Roman world. The simple fact is that the custom of excluding women at home does not exist in the West anymore, and hence there is no actual lack of women for a legitimate transference of Eros towards the creatures that resemble the fair sex the most: the underage ephebes. In other words, what homosexual apologists like Boswell try to do, using classical scholarship to support the LGBT movement, is nonsense. It reminds me of those silly Mexicans who, after centuries that the sacrificial institution was abolished, try to imitate the Aztec custom utilising sugar skulls instead of the real decapitated skulls used as trophies in pre-Columbian Mesoamerica, believing that they are ‘rescuing a tradition’. We should never forget that facts of importance in history occur twice: the first time as tragedy and the second as farce. This may be applied to both the incorrigible indigenistas and the apologists of homosexuality.

In our times the erastes-eromenos institution could only be restored as a substitute for the abusive parent, but not for the healthier families. Psychoclasses have evolved: with the exposure of babies abandoned in Europe, 18th-century England was more integrated than, say, Roman Britannia. But let me respond in advance a few issues that the readers of this article may take with these novel ideas:

**Tough Question #1:** If you claim that heterosexuality is healthier than homosexuality and at the same time promote a YouTube clip of this cute adolescent, Giton, how would you deal with a ‘leptosomatic’ son of yours?

In the coming ethnostate, citizenship will be gradated. If my ‘Gitonsque’ son had homosexual preferences I would not reprimand him severely in his teens or even early twenties. But by his middle and late twenties the laws of the Republic would
gradually make a dent in his mind. By his thirties, he had to be faithfully married to a woman of breeding age for the couple obtaining an A- or B-class citizenship. Deterrents such as laws that permit no claiming any inheritance in cases of permanent homosexual behaviour, but getting D-class citizenship instead, would be more than enough. I disagree with Harold Covington’s idea of using psychiatry to repress overt homosexual behaviour in the coming Republic (see ‘From the Great Confinement to chemical Gulag’ in this book). And speaking of the coming ethnostate, if the demographic winter caused by feminism gets nasty—and I mean finding us in the necessity of raiding the enemy country, Amerikwa, to abduct Sabine women to found families—, as a desperate measure we will have to resort to the massive cloning of the reluctant nymphets. On the other hand, the cloning of feminine leptosomatics like Giton on an industrial scale makes me extremely nervous, as I will try to explain in the following paragraphs.

It is true that in Arthur C. Clarke’s first novella, *Against the Fall of Night*—my favourite among Clarke’s novels—, in seemingly two ageless cities shielded from the worldwide desert, Lys and Diaspar in the year 10 billion c.e., the impression the reader gets is that in those isolated oasis only whites existed: beautiful females and androgynous males. Non-whites and almost all of today’s species, plant and animal, had become extinct. Like Diaspar, in Maxfield Parrish’s 1913 murals of *The Florentine Fete*, ‘The Garden of Opportunity’, with handsome youths walking in an Arcadian location for heterosexual courtship, males are depicted almost as feminine as the young women. I am curious about what happened to Max Born, the actor who played Giton in the Fellini film. (I do confess that, when I saw the movie at seventeen, I found his looks rather stunning.) He is now in his sixties. I wouldn’t mind having his genes for ages frozen for the creation of a couple of ephebes in a Lys-like Utopia. However, as I see it, it is the distant future what we also see in *The Garden of Opportunity*: a time when, after a more than a thousand-year imperial Reich, the problem of competition between the ethnic groups had been resolved in favour of the only race that inherited the Earth. Only then could it be permissible, according to my standards, to clone ephebes.

Back to the real world. With millions of non-whites with high IQs, like Jews and the Chinese, in no way can we afford
ultimate dolls like an adolescent Born massively cloned. That would not only be historically premature but hedonistically suicidal. What we need are ruthless soldiers imbued with Roman severitas and, above all, hypermorality.

* * *

What motivated me to write this article was not only the acceptance of adult homosexuality among some quarters of the white nationalist community, but also the degenerate music and Hollywood addiction in the broader movement. I must confess that my forte is not writing but a peculiar understanding of visual arts and music. So much so that, as to the seventh art is concerned, I consider myself as talented as Alfonso Cuarón, who also was born in Mexico City and studied in the same Madrid School I studied.

In Hojas Susurrantes I recount an unimaginable tragedy that befell on my family that cannot be conveyed in few words. In my blog The West’s Darkest Hour I confessed just the tip of the iceberg of the tragedy. At seventeen I constantly had themes from Mozart’s Requiem stuck in my head in an abusive, Catholic school after I was expelled from the Madrid. This was an earworm synchronised with the religious metamorphosis that was taking place in my mind, the change from the stage of perceiving God as the loving dad of my St. Francis to the vindictive God of the Requiem’s day of wrath: my abusive, introjected Father. Once my religious agonies were over, I could listen to Requiems no more and not even other sacred music. (Only in this sense I can empathise with those who turned over to pop, frivolous or hedonistic music.) But now that the fear of eternal damnation as an internal persecutor is almost gone, which psychological trick can I use to like sacred music again? I have discovered a way. To convey the idea I’ll have to indulge a little in a thought experiment.

Let’s imagine for a moment that I was never abused at home and that presently I am a famed film director. Being as fairly well off as Cuarón, after Jared Taylor’s conferences were sabotaged in the previous years I would invite Taylor and all conference participants, both speakers and non-speakers, to my large mansion somewhere in the Northwest Coast of the United States to celebrate the yearly conference. When entering the property, way before the conference reserved for the ballroom, I prepared the
participants a little surprise. The incomers are now seeing in an outdoor, circular place slightly above the ground meant to accommodate leisure activities, two singers, a male soprano and a male contralto interpreting Pergolesi’s *Stabat Mater*. Visualise the background with a string orchestra. Every time that the adolescent soprano reaches the highest notes he lifts his eyes toward the heavens. His song is full of mannerisms typical of those actors in intimate contact with God, but in the middle of a purely pagan environment with the colour of his eyes of a more intense blue than the sky-blue above him and the line of the sea behind both singers, in sharp contrast to the lad’s dark hair and nude feet touching directly the solid flagstone at the middle of the mansion’s garden.

![Ascyltus and Giton](image)

That would be Giton’s magic. The thought experiment inspired me to revisit sacred music after the soul-murdering tragedy that destroyed my family, which occurred when I had exactly his age (and his body). We are leaving now the autobiographical tunnel and back to my thought experiment.

Forget the academic content of the conferences that are now taking place indoors, in the ballroom. During the thirty-seven minutes that last the twelve sections of the *Stabat*, still at the mansion’s outdoors, even the most conservative attendants, after gluing their gaze onto the soprano for more than half an hour, start harbouring truly unchristian, Dionysian thoughts. Eros is the universe’s dialectic force, and the visual experience to the sound of religious music moves them all, to rediscover an elemental *thumos* to fight for a race so pristinely white as the alabastrine skin of the ephebe. But then, a nationalist could ask me the—:

**Tough Question #2: César: Aren’t you ashamed that besides this subliminal fantasy of yours in one of your recent threads you homophobically**
rant about ‘genocidal rage’ against homos like you?

I am not a homo for the simple reason that I’d find repugnant any contact with a masculine face, and its body. And no: I am not ashamed for what I said in that thread at all.

Precisely because they try to imitate them, queers represent a blasphemous insult to the nymphs and the underage ephebes. Faggots are like massive bears with the heart of a butterfly. Comparing Giton with any of them is like comparing a vulgar, Felliniesque fat harlot with the Florentine Fete girls.

The so-called gay movement is like if an Australopithecus africanus, after touching the black monolith of 2001: A Space Odyssey, has a glimpse of the mysterium tremendum of the universe. Alas, unlike the film this ape immediately fancies himself the astronaut Dave Bowman ready for the second leap forward in the path to Overman. Or even worse: he believes that he now wears a white miniskirt like the one that Asculytus threw over Giton in the Fellini film, and he further believes that the other apes will now consider this still primitive, apish missing link as if he was a consecrated soprano of the future worth to listen and contemplate. Nowadays, it does not occur to these Australopithecuses that a huge, four-and-a-half million leap forward is necessary for that specific dream to become true, or that presently only the androgynous ephebes, premature embryos of a yet not verified future, have the right of homosexuality—and only during his tender teens. But perhaps it would be the most conservative nationalist the one who asks me the filthiest question of all?

Tough Question #3: Why are you promoting this sort of homoerotism with that Fellini clip and photo of a boy, you pervert?

With this sort of question you are projecting onto me your perversions: what I call the Sin against the Holy Ghost—an unforgivable sin that, a few years ago, moved me to completely severe ties with my former colleagues on child abuse studies. Contrary to your projections, my point of view about ‘homosexuality’, if it may be called so (I don’t have homo friends but I doubt that they fancy Giton), is innocuous. It has nothing to do with either a traditionalist condemnation of the behaviour and much less with the so-called LGTB movement. I am located light-years apart from both. To find an ephebe is like searching a needle in dozens of haystacks. According to my definition, an ephebe is a
leptosomatic adolescent of such androgynous beauty as to make him undistinguishable from a nymph: a beauty that evaporates when he reaches manhood (either in Plato or Xenophon I read how a Greek mocked another who was still attached to a young lad who already grew beards). This esthetic bar is, purposely, unrealistically high. So high actually that Italian filmmakers—androgynous beauty seems to be an alien concept for American directors—have had enormous difficulties in the casting process to find genuine epheses.

Luchino Visconti’s search of Tadzio for his *Death in Venice* was so agonising that he had to travel out of his native Italy through several countries until he found Björn Andrésen in Sweden. Similarly, by pure chance an assistant of Fellini discovered Max Born, who eventually played the character of Giton in the mentioned *Fellini-Satyricon*, in London’s Chelsea living like a local hippy. My concept of ‘ephebe’ is such an obvious veiled homage to women that in the 1979 film *Ernesto*, where a handsome adolescent male is seduced by an androgynous ephebe, the director Salvatore Samperi did not even bother to do any agonizing casting outside Italy. He simply chose a girl, Lara Wendel, to play both the roles of the ephebe Ilio and his twin sister Rachele (I was very much surprised to discover this after reading the reviews on the film).

But my hypothetical, nasty interlocutor would interrupt me to rudely ask again: *Don’t go off in tangents. Stick to the point: Why are you promoting this homoerotism with images of underagers and your little ‘Gedankenexperiment’?*

Mark my words, punk: Because I want to destroy the self-christened ‘gay movement’ with the same vehemence that I want to destroy the ‘feminist movement’—and the degenerate music and film industry that has been, spiritually, interwoven in the creation of both. Have you heard the Hegelian word *Aufheben* my bigoted friend? The street man moves in comfort category zones such as the hetero thesis and its homo antithesis. That’s naive. The verb *Aufheben* translated to English means to sublate: the suppression and assimilation of both, the previous thesis and antithesis. This is the apparently contradictory implication of preserving and changing an ethos. While Hegel used that verb in his philosophy of history, this is my proposed myth:

*Mature, aufhebenized* hetero nationalists may try to destroy the homo antithesis not by combating it directly, but by assimilating
its luminous side and by turning homosexuality into almost heterosexuality through the contemplation of beauty among those rarest specimens that look like a mixture between humans, and angels. This is exactly what I pretended to do with my Quetzalcoatl, a prolegomena for a futural psychohistory that will only be fully developed in the ethnostate: destroying Christianity through aufhebenizing it, by assimilating its message (infanticide and abortion are wrong) and transforming it into a secular science.

Michael O’Meara said that only a myth would galvanise the white race. But I believe he is wrong in believing that Christianity, now a Red Giant star soon to become a white dwarf, will play a role in its creation. In The Philosophy of Beauty Roger Scruton states that beauty can be another name for religion. Only the divine physiognomies that we, the mortals, cannot reach may drag the human soul into the asymptotic axis of spirituality without actually never reaching the infinite. ‘Ultimate aesthetic catharsis must be sought in the inner assimilation of the distant figure of Beatrice’. The same can be said of a consecrated director seeking for Tadzio in several countries in order to capture his beauty for eternity, but not for sleeping with him. That would not only have meant the corruption of the fourteen-year-old archangel, but making a fool of oneself like the German professor gazing at Tadzio from afar with black drops of hair-ink mixed with sweat running through a ridiculous made-up face under the painful sun of a Venetian beach.
For unfathomable laws of the universe, unlike Zeus we cannot possess Ganymede and have a happy life after that. Even if we were as young and handsome as Encolpius, Xenophon warns us that such a level of passion would drive us totally mad. And let’s not forget the *Phaedrus*’ comparing the fondness of an erastes for his eromenos to the fondness of wolves for lambs. Moreover, according to my definition, with only a handful of ephebes in the world, when our object of forbidden love leaves the beloved for the arms of another erastes, even the blond Encolpius ends up contemplating the knife.

I imagine modifying Harold Covington’s Northwest Republic tricolor flag through placing the colours horizontally and adding the full image of the *Garden of Opportunity* in its middle. Not because in our search for the inexplicable superiority of the Venusinian we males should try to imitate Giton or Tadzio, which is impossible. But because only the unreachable archetype of the eternal feminine will lead the white race to the Absolute.

*March 14, 2012*
On Erasmus

When I was a boy my father mentioned Erasmus more than once, and I imagined that his famous book was about something like praising so-called ‘mad’ people in a world gone mad. Later, still before reading him, I imagined Erasmus was a great humanist who saw the madness of the religious wars of his time. I was not prepared in the slightest to find out that Erasmus himself was pretty much part of civilisational madness. When in 1996 I hit Kenneth Clark’s page 146 of his illustrated book *Civilisation* I was moved to get the excellent 1993 Penguin edition of *Praise of Folly* unsuspecting of what the contents were. A few days after I wrote on the book’s inside cover that Erasmus disappointed me; that, contrary to what I had expected, he did not see the folly of his age but was a fool himself.

A.H.T. Levi’s Penguin introduction to *Praise of Folly* is worth reading, and precisely on page xlii of the long introduction I was shocked to learn that no one in the whole Middle Ages had questioned Christian ‘truths’. Instead of challenging the accepted wisdom, I found in the introduction to Erasmus’ other works of scholastic discussions about whether or not the ancient Greeks and Romans would be saved—from eternal damnation!

Erasmus is truly an alien to the people of our time. The problems he struggled with—he never considered his *Praise of Folly* his most important book—are infinitely distant from the problems that overwhelm us today. His worldview is dead except for those who, like me, were tormented by our parents with doctrines of eternal punishment.

Erasmus was the most famous humanist of the so-called ‘Northern Renaissance,’ a man in touch with all leading princes and scholars of the time. Many consider him the central figure of the intellectual world of what, to my mind, was a pseudo-Renaissance (the real intellectual Renaissance would only begin with Montaigne). How could the ‘Northern Renaissance’ be compared to the Italian
Renaissance when its most emblematic intellectual, like Thomas à Kempis, was an Augustinian canon that took Pauline folly as a panegyric to Christian piety? Erasmus, who was deeply shocked before the pagan atmosphere of Julius II’s Rome, probably decided to publish *Praise of Folly* precisely to support the growing opposition to Julius in France. When the art of Michelangelo and Raphael were conquering the soul of Rome, Erasmus went as far as recommending a return to Scripture and the so-called ‘Fathers’: Origen, Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine; and Erasmus’ Greek New Testament was more feared by the Church than his *Praise of Folly*.

Now that I am talking of Clark’s *Civilisation*, let us remember the image that Clark chose to depict St Francis: Jacquemart de Hesdin’s *The Fool*. In Erasmus’ most famous book, women, ‘admittedly stupid and foolish creatures, are Folly’s pride. As we are informed in the same introduction to the Penguin edition, Erasmus takes a surprisingly modern, ‘liberal’ position, about the role of women in society. Since Folly praises ignorance and lunacy, Erasmus reasons, women must be instrumental for the Christian cause. In his book, Folly is only interested in following the example of Jesus, the exemplar of charitable simplicity against the budding intellectualism of the 16th century. The fact that Erasmus took St. Paul’s ‘praise of folly’ against the best minds St Paul encountered in Athens speaks for itself and needs no further comment.

It doesn’t take a great intellectual effort to recognise that the so-called Northern Renaissance was set against the real Renaissance of Italy, which had fallen in love with our genuine, Greco-Roman roots. Erasmus and others’ ‘optimist’ discussions around the subject of the predestination of both the elect and the damned represent the medieval mind. How could Erasmus’ work that discusses whether or not a personal God ‘predestined’ some of us to an eternity of torture be called ‘Renaissance’ by any stretch of imagination? It is true that, in Erasmus’ century, the current theology was Pelagian rather than Augustinian, in the sense that we were supposed to be allowed to earn salvation by our own efforts. But this is altogether medieval, not modern, thinking.

To understand Erasmus one must remember the bestsellers of his time. *The Pseudo-Gregorian Dialogues*, composed in 680 c.e. and translated to all known vernaculars, reinforced in the faithful what priests used to call ‘a salutary fear of hell’. The book implied that hell was eternal and that the soul, though spiritual, suffered...
physically from burning. Dante himself drew heavily from the
*Dialogues* ‘and its influence on popular piety was greater than any
other single work of piety in the history of western Christendom’.

Grüenwald’s *Isenheim Altarpiece* (detail above) in the times
when Erasmus published his book depicts the spirit of those still
dark ages far better than any scholastic treatise. Visualise yourself
one moment living under the sky of Erasmus’ age. Visualise
yourself trapped in the Church dogma and struggling with the
terrible discussion about whether the ancient Greeks could be
‘justified’—a nasty Lutheran word inspired in Augustine—and thus
saved from the eternal flames. For the so-called humanists of
Erasmus’ time this dilemma was all too serious theological business,
and they rationalised their wishes to save the ‘pagans’ after the
recent discoveries of Indian ‘souls’ in America, who had no
opportunity to receive the gospel through no fault of their own.
That such doctrines represented a slight advance from Augustine’s
‘pessimism’ (cf. Erasmus’ treatise against Luther, *On Free Will* and
Luther’s reply, *On Unfree Will*) will never refute the fact that
Erasmus and his ilk were chained in the trappings of medieval
thought.

I was moved to write this piece because all westerners,
including white nationalists, have forgotten what living under
Christendom was like. Except for the final section of my *Hojas
Susurrantes*, no contemporary writer that I know—no one—has said
something real about the horrors of the infinitely evil doctrine of
eternal damnation (or how that fear was so central in Christendom). On the contrary, modern westerners seem to retro-project their healthy psychoclass and never wonder about the subjective horrors that millions upon millions of whites endured during the Dark Ages as a result of such doctrine.

April 22, 2012
Terre et Peuple, Blut und Boden

Unless whites wake up, due to mass immigration throughout the West, they will become a minority in their own countries, facing subsequent extinction.

The notion that every people needs its own land is absolutely essential. The white race must acquire a Homeland of its own, some place on earth where white children can be born and raised in physical and spiritual safety, and where the numbers of European-descended peoples may be restored and the threat of racial extinction overcome.

Land and people, blood and soil

Catalina, the crown of the evolution: a girl I met in 1980.

June 5, 2012
The ascent of the soul

Before reading last year J. A. Sexton’s review of Thomas Goodrich’s *Hellstorm: The Death of Nazi Germany, 1944-1947*, I knew nothing of what the Allied forces had done to defenceless Germans during and after the Second World War. I confess that, throughout most of my adult life, I was infected with anti-Nazi propaganda. My mind had been colonised with films, books that I read, articles and documentaries about the evils of National Socialist Germany. Little did I realise that WW2 propaganda never really ended, which made me demonise the Third Reich in my inner thoughts for so many years. The System simply had covered up the history of what happened from 1944 to 1947—the best-kept secret in modern history!

Now that thanks to *Hellstorm* I have awakened to the real world I am moved to, in memory of the millions of men, women and children tormented and murdered by the Allies, keep a moment of silence out of respect for the victims. Freezing this website for a while with this entry at the top will provide visiting westerners in general, and Germans in particular, the opportunity to find out the grim facts about an unheard-of Holocaust perpetrated on Germanic people: a real Holocaust in every sense of the word.

As to the perpetrators of the crime of the age, in his *Gulag Archipelago* Solzhenitsyn, who in his younger years was involved in the rape and murder of civilian Germans, wrote:

> There is nothing that so aids and assists the awakening of omniscience within us as insistent thoughts about one’s own transgressions, errors, mistakes. After the difficult cycles of such ponderings over many years, whenever I mentioned the heartlessness of our highest-ranking bureaucrats, the cruelty of our executioners, I remember myself in my captain’s shoulders boards and the forward march of my battery

---

7 *The West's Darkest Hour* (https://chechar.wordpress.com).
through East Prussia, enshrouded in fire, and I say: ‘So were we any better?’ And that is why I turn back to the years of my imprisonment and say, sometimes to the astonishment of those about me:

‘Bless you, prison!’…

In prison, both in solitary confinement and outside solitary too, a human being confronts his grief face to face. This grief is a mountain, but he has to find space inside himself for it, to familiarize himself with it, to digest it, and it him. This is the highest form of moral effort, which has always ennobled every human being. A duel with years and with walls constitutes moral work and a path upward… if you can climb it.

Nikolai Yaroshenko, *The prisoner* (1878)

Through tragic personal experience I have corroborated that processing the mountain of grief was, certainly, the only way to develop the soul. Only the rarest among the rare have climbed the path, which is why in no website that I know such sort of forced initiation is even mentioned. But there are exceptions. In the comments section of this website, Goodrich wrote:
I wrote the above book…
I died a thousand deaths in so doing… Yet I felt I had to finish it—for them.

Thanks to Mr. Sexton for his review. Like himself, I have never been the same man since.

I am sad… but I am also extremely mad… extremely mad.

Last weeks I had to pause during my agonic reading of Hellstorm by taking frequent breaks, but like the author I had to digest the sins that the West committed against herself, and in addition to feeling outraged, paradoxically I also feel strangely calm and liberated. The psychological causes of self-loathing among present-day westerners had been an enigma. The idea is dawning in my mind that the false narrative about World War II is the main cause of our darkest hour.

Alas, since Anglo-Saxons did not examine their conscience as the Russian Solzhenitsyn did, and still celebrate their behaviour in WW2, the moral integrity of whites around the world is gone. Precisely because of the unredeemed character of this sin, what the former Allies did in Hitler’s Germany has created a monster from the Id that has been destroying our civilisation since then: a Morgenthau Plan in slow motion, or low-intensity exterminationist war, but this time for all white people.

It is true that I have abandoned Christianity. But I still believe in the salvific effects of the triad examining conscience, repentance and atonement: the painful soul-building that Solzhenitsyn experienced in his cell. If, unlike him, we haven’t had the opportunity of being committed to prison let us experience, in the gloomy solitude of our bedrooms, the same painful yet awakening process through pondering on the historical events exposed in Goodrich’s book.

Prison causes the profound rebirth of a human being… profound pondering over his own ‘I’… Here all the trivia and fuss have decreased. I have experienced a turning point. Here you harken to that voice deep inside you, which amid the surfeit and vanity used to be stifled by the roar from outside…

Your soul, which formerly was dry, now ripens from suffering…

September 14, 2012
The word ‘racism’

Racist is a control word for whites.

—Internet commenter

The fact that the word *racism* has been coined relatively recently explains why my grandmothers, who were born in 1888 and 1914, never used it when I lived with them. They had formed their minds in the late 19th and early 20th centuries respectively, when no one used a word that presently is used to control whites.

The critique of language is the most radical of all critiques. If we don’t uproot from our vocabulary the Newspeak of the anti-white societies—keep in mind that when all great European civilisations were at their apex the word ‘racism’ didn’t exist—, we won’t even be able to start discussing the issues.

Some linguists have argued that language is rhetoric, and that humans commit a fatal mistake in believing that, if a group of people uses a word in all seriousness, it means that something real exists behind it. ‘Newspeak’ is propagandistic language characterised by the inversion of customary meanings. According to Orwell, the objective of Newspeak is social control. While Orwell’s focus was a *hard* totalitarian dystopia, presently the word racist as a pejorative is used in *soft* totalitarian societies. As long as ‘racism’ is seen as the ultimate evil, we must be aware of the

*Viruses for the white mind*

If we translate the term back to Oldspeak—just as ‘pagan’ only really meant the usual adept of classical culture—we will see that ‘racism’ is a code word for ‘pro-white’. Detecting the psyops is an elemental step in the process of de-brainwashing westerners. Besides the most obvious words like ‘Islamophobe’ or ‘xenophobe’, below appears a short sample of Newspeak terms translated back to Oldspeak:

*Affirmative action* – Blacks stealing our jobs.
Antisemitism – The belief by gentiles that Jews may be criticised like any other group.

Civil rights – The coloured and spoiled white women have more rights than white males in the New World Order.

Diversified workforce – Much fewer white males are to be hired or promoted.

Disadvantaged – Unqualified and can’t speak English, German or French, so give them money.

Equal treatment and opportunity – Fewer opportunities for white people.

Hate – Anything pro-white.

Historic grievances – White people ended slavery, human sacrifice in the American continent and cannibalism in tribal societies.

Homophobia/gay-bashing – The healthy revulsion of Lot regarding Sodomite or Gomorrahite behavior.

Human Rights Commissions – Inquisitions denying free speech. Thought Police that enforce liberal political doctrine.

Immigration – Race replacement. Genocidal levels of immigration.

Interracial relationship – White women having non-white babies. Also called racial engineering or soft genocide of white people.

Misogynist – Anyone who disagrees with the racially-suicidal empowerment of women.

Multicultural enhancement – Destroy all European cultures.

Politically correct – Fines and/or jail for anybody not liberal and following the New World Order.

Respect and tolerance – Surrender. Tolerance for millions of immigrants means demographic genocide for whites.

Woman’s choice – Abortion and genocide of millions of white babies.

Be warned! The first step that a dissident of the anti-white regime should take is to reject the System’s Newspeak, the words that anesthetise our understanding and debase our self-image.

September 19, 2012
Postscript

I read most of the above translations to Oldspeak as a comment in a racialist forum. Racism could be a term mostly used not by our enemies but by us. Had values not been inverted by Christianity and its bastard son, liberalism, racist attitudes would be considered a virtue. After I published the above piece, the next month, on October 29, 2012 Hadding Scott published in his blogsite National-Socialist Worldview the following article.
On the origin of the word ‘racist’

by Hadding Scott

There is an urban legend that has been floating around for some years now, that the word racist was coined by Leon Trotsky, for the purpose of cowing and intimidating opponents of leftist ideology. In his *History of the Russian Revolution* Trotsky applied the word racist to Slavophiles, who opposed Communism.

Just from the word’s etymology (the word race with a suffix added) it is not immediately apparent why this word is supposed to be inherently derogatory. Words like anarchist, communist, and fascist have a negative connotation for many people, but that is because of their perspectives on anarchism, communism, and fascism, not because the words are inherently derogatory. The words anarchist, communist, and fascist have objective content toward which one may be positively or negatively disposed. Likewise the word racist. Objectively, it seems to denote somebody for whom race is a concern.

Is it not possible that Trotsky’s use of the word, regardless of what his feelings about racism may have been, was merely descriptive, insofar as the effort of Slavs to assert and preserve their Slavic identity inherently involves a concern with race? Are not racists, as Trotsky regarded them, essentially just a species of anti-Communist, rejecting submersion into nondescript humanity under alien personalities and interests?

Our so-called conservatives in the United States do not ask such questions. If the left uses a term with a negative feeling attached, our conservatives accept that what the term denotes is objectively negative. If leftists and Jew-controlled mass-media disapprove of racists and racism, our so-called conservatives will not dispute that value judgment; for the purpose of rhetoric they will even embrace it. Conservatives outwardly accept that racists and racism are bad, and will not challenge it.
What the conservatives like to do instead of debunking their enemies’ assumptions, which are also supported by mass-media, is to try to find a way to throw an accusation back at them, even a ridiculous accusation based on a specious argument and a flimsy premise. The legend that Leon Trotsky coined the word racist offers a basis for that kind of rhetoric. It seems a silly argument, but they will say something like, If you use the word racist then you are a bad person like Communist mass-murderer Leon Trotsky, because he invented that word!

Did Trotsky really invent that word? No, apparently not. The work in which Trotsky is supposed to have coined that word was written and published in Russian in 1930. I found several examples of the French form, raciste, preceding Trotsky’s use of the word by far. I find pensée raciste (French for ‘racist thought’) and individualité raciste (‘racist individuality’) in the volume of La Terro d’oc: revisto felibrenco e federalisto (a periodical championing the cultural and ethnic identity of people in southern France) for the year 1906. Here the word racist was used without a hint of negativity:

I express my best wishes for the success of your projects, because I am convinced that, in the federation of the peoples of Langue d’Oc fighting for their interests and the emancipation of their racist thought, the prestige of Toulouse will benefit.

This unfortunate South! He is a victim in every way! Ruined, robbed, brutalised, it’s a fate of conquered countries that one reserves for him, and whatever would be likely to characterize his racist [emphasis added] individuality and whatever’s survival or worship could make him regain consciousness of himself to snatch him from his torpor and safeguard his moral and material interests, is it good for anything except to be combated and ridiculed?

While racists were bad people for Leon Trotsky, some people in Occitania in 1906 did not share that value-judgment, because they had a different perspective and different interests. Why should I accept the value-judgments of my enemies? The label racist is only an effective attack if it is perceived as one, which means, only if the value-judgment attached to it is accepted. Don’t accept that! If you can stop worrying about being called a racist, if you can refrain from using a barrage of flaky counterattacks (the way ‘conservatives’ do) to avoid talking about your own real views,
then you can be sincere and really communicate with people. You might even have a chance to explain that almost everybody is racist and that it’s normal—which is a fundamental fact that every White person needs to know.

**Even earlier examples**

In Charles Malato’s *Philosophie de l’Anarchie* (1897) we find both *raciste* and *racisme*:

No doubt that before arriving at complete internationalism, there will be a stage which will be *racism*; but it must be hoped that the layover will not be too long, that it will be rapidly surpassed. Communism, which appears that it must inevitably be regulated at the beginning of its functioning, especially in regard to international trade, will bring about the establishment of *racist* federations (Latin, Slavic, Germanic, etc.). Anarchy—which we can glimpse at the end of two or three generations when, as a result of the development of production, any regulations will have become superfluous—will bring the end of racism and the advent of a humanity without borders. [emphasis added]

Although Malato was not in favour of *racistes* or *racisme* as such, regarding them as constituting an intermediate stage on the path from the destruction of the existing empires to his ideal of global anarchy, his use of those words back in the late 19th century was clearly not polemical but based on their objective content. Malato saw a tendency in Europe toward reorganising political boundaries and allegiances along racial (or ethnic) lines, and he called this tendency racism. Note also that Malato specifically refers to Pan-Slavism as a form of racism, thus anticipating Trotsky’s application of the word.

**First English usage**

A piece for National Public Radio (Gene Demby, ‘The Ugly, Fascinating History of the Word Racism’, 6 January 2014) cites the Oxford English Dictionary to the effect that the first use of the word racism (in English) was by Richard Pratt in 1902, five years after Malato’s use of *raciste* and *racisme* in French.

Pratt was a Baptist religious zealot who was particularly devoted to stamping out the identities of various North American
tribes through assimilation. NPR’s author for some reason finds it paradoxical that somebody who condemns racism would be trying to stamp out the racial as well as the specific ethnic identities of Cheyenne, Choctaw, or Muscogee, when in fact it is perfectly consistent.

Racism in its proper meaning, as we see with Charles Malato and the Occitanian separatists a century ago (contemporary with Pratt), means concern for one’s race (however that race is defined), and an impulse to preserve that race, and, in accord with that, organisation along racial lines. To condemn racism as such is ultimately to condemn the preservation of any race, with the mongrelisation of all mankind, explicitly hoped by some, being the predictable long-term result.

Deliberate destruction of races through assimilation and mixture, as advanced—although in a more direct and obvious manner than we usually see—by Richard Henry Pratt with his Carlisle Indian Industrial School, is the ultimate implication of anti-racism. It is remarkable that anyone pretends to be confused about this.

______ & ______
A postscript to my prolegomena

Further to what I said yesterday in ‘Prolegomena for the new religion for Whites’. A deeper response to the questions raised by Stubbs would imply reminding my readers that, at the end of his *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant said that there are two universes: the empirical universe and the subjective universe. Karl Popper comments that he who doesn’t believe in the second universe would do well to think about his own death—it is so obvious that a whole universe dies when a human being dies! What I find nauseating in today’s academia is that it is an institution that denies the existence of this second universe. One could imagine what would happen if a student of psychology or psychiatry tried to write a lyric essay about why Nietzsche lost his mind, like the one that Stefan Zweig wrote and I have been excerpting for this site (and wait for the next chapters where Zweig’s story reaches its climax…).

A proper response to Stubbs would require an absolute break from the epistemological error, a category error, so ubiquitous in academia. That is to say, we must approach such questions as if they were questions for our inner worlds. The best way to respond to Stubbs, following what I have said about psychoclasses, is imagining that a few whites have touched the black monolith of the film *2001*. Those who have touched it—and here we are talking of the ‘second’ universe that the current paradigm barely acknowledges—know that the most divine creature on Earth, the nymph, must be preserved at all costs.

This is not the sphere of objective science. Since we are talking of the ideals of our souls, let me confess that I became a white nationalist in 2009 when I lived in the Spanish island Gran Canaria, near Africa. The big unemployment that started in 2008 affected me and, without a job and completely broke, I spent a great deal of time on the internet. When I learned that a demographic
winter was affecting all of the white population on planet Earth I was watching a *Harry Potter* film featuring a blondest female teenager. I remember that I told to myself something to the effect that, henceforward, I would defend the race with all of my teeth and claws. However, to understand this universe I would have to tell the story of the nymph Catalina: a pure white rose who happened to live around my home’s corner decades ago, who looked like the girl in that Parrish painting. But I won’t talk here about a tragedy in my life. Suffice it to say that since then my mind has been devoted to her beauty and, by transference, it is now devoted to protecting all genotype and phenotype that resembles hers...

Once we are talking from our emergent universe (emergent compared to the Neanderthals who have not touched the monolith), Stubb’s questions are easily answered if one only dares to speak out what lies within our psyches:

*So let me think of some fundamental questions that need to be answered: Why does it matter if the White race exists, if the rest of the humans are happy?*

Speaks my inner universe: Because the rest of humans are like Neanderthals compared to Cro-Magnon whites. Here in Mexico I suffer real nightmares imagining the fate of the poor animals if whites go completely extinct (Amerinds are incapable of feeling the empathy I feel for our biological cousins).

*Why does it matter if the White race continues to exist if I personally live my life out in comfort?*

Speaks my inner universe: Because only pigs think like that. (Remember the first film of the Potter series, when Hagrid used magic to sprout a pig’s tail from Dudley’s fat bottom for gulping down Harry’s birthday cake.) We have a compromise with God’s creation even when a personal god does not exist.

*Why should I be concerned with the White race if it only recently evolved from our ape-like ancestors, knowing that change is a part of the universe?*

Speaks my inner universe: Because our mission is that we, not others, touch again the black monolith after four million years that one of our ancestors touched it.

*Why should I be concerned with the existence of the White race if every White person is mortal, and preserving each one is futile?*
Speaks my inner universe: It is a pity that no one has read *The Yearling* that I have been excerpting recently. I wanted to say something profound in the context of child abuse but that is a subject that does not interest my readers. Let me hint at what I thought after reading it. To my mind, the moral of the novel is not the moment when the father coerced his son to shoot Flag, but the very last page of Marjorie’s masterpiece. Suddenly Jody woke up at midnight and found himself exclaiming ‘Flag!’ when his pet was already gone.

The poet Octavio Paz once said that we are mortals, yes: but those ‘portions of eternity’, as a boy playing with his yearling, are the sense of the universe. The empirical (now I am talking of the external) universe was created precisely to give birth to these simple subjective moments: figments that depict our souls like no other moments in the universe’s horizon of events.

*Why should I be concerned with preserving the White race if all White people who live will suffer, some horribly, and none would suffer if they were wiped out?*

Speaks my inner universe: The boy suffered horribly when his father obliged him to murder Flag, yes. But the moment of eternity, as depicted in Wyeth’s illustration, *had to be lived*. It will probably leave a mark if another incarnation of the universe takes place…

*July 9, 2013*
My ‘pod’ cousin

Recently I have been complaining about the fact that American films and British and Spanish TV series are mediums for either anti-white propaganda or at least not pro-white messages (with the sole exception of the first episode of *The White Queen*). A naïve person could think that if I approach, instead, a series directed by one of my cousins the message would be a little more positive.

*Gritos de Muerte y Libertad* (Screams of Death and Freedom) is a Mexican television series based on the period of the war of independence of Mexico, produced by Leopoldo Gómez and directed by my cousin Gerardo Tort (pic above) and the lesbian Mafer Suárez. Several writers wrote thirteen episodes of the first season of the series advised by a group of historians. The series premiered on August 30, 2010 to mark the bicentenary of the independence of Mexico from Spain and ended on September 16 of that year.

I have already quoted Mexican intellectual José Vasconcelos (1882-1959) in this blog stating that the war of independence was ‘supposed to destroy the Spaniards, who represented the force and culture of the country… all under the pretext of freeing the Indian’. And two months ago I revealed here some hidden facts about Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, the father of the Mexican independence. All 19th-century paintings of Hidalgo, like the one you see in the Wikipedia article about him, are fake. All were based on an original
portrait of an Aryan man of Austrian origin who posed as Hidalgo because nobody had painted a portrait of the real Hidalgo by the time he was elevated to the status of father of the independence, and the man was long dead when the new nation needed a noble face to honour (just as the Americans have their portraits of George Washington).

Well, original spoken reports describe Hidalgo not like an Aryan but with a hooked nose! What does it mean? That the overwhelming majority of Mexicans ignore that the Catholic priest Hidalgo was probably the son of Jewish conversos. Presently even the Mexican Jews, no longer in the need to hide the Jewishness of their people, have acknowledged it.

Of course: my cousin Gerardo was only a hired hand to direct a script written by others. But since I know him I surmise that he did not object to the anti-Spain bias of the script. It is worth mentioning that at the beginning of the century Gerardo had made an ‘author film’ about homeless kids in Mexico City, and later filmed a documentary of his own about a Mexican guerrilla fighter he admires and perfectly fits his lefty ideology. I had not watched the series *Gritos de Muerte y Libertad* until yesterday but now that I am reviewing other television series I would like to say something about it.

In the first episode one of the pro-Spain characters says these words (in Spanish of course) about the pro-independence movement, ‘Imagine a government of Creoles [ethnic Iberian whites who hadn’t been born in Spain], Indians, mestizos and mulattos!’ In *Gritos de Muerte y Libertad* what I found most surreal is that the overwhelming majority of upper-class NewSpaniards are depicted as mestizos or harnizos (slightly whiter mestizos), not even as castizos (Iberian whites with a distant drop of Amerind blood) or true Iberian whites. The script that Gerardo directed mentions ‘Creoles’ many times in the textual dialogues, but during the casting he selected mestizo actors. Phenotypical Creoles do appear in the next episode, but that episode was directed by the lesbian.

Most surreal of all is that the Aryan-looking actor who was chosen for Hidalgo by both directors, the actor at the far left in the next photo, was—not in the series but real history—a kike with even the prototypical hooked nose, according to the spoken testimony of those who had seen the historical Hidalgo in the flesh. Also, in *Gritos de Muerte y Libertad* my cousin depicts José de
Iturrigaray, the Viceroy of New Spain from 1803 to 1808 (standing in the pic with a ridiculous wig), as an ignoble character; and for María Inés de Jáuregui y Aróstegui, his wife, he chose a mestiza actress (wasn’t the historical Inés an Iberian white too?).

So you have Gerardo, the phenotypical Creole, filming the Spanish Viceroy as the bad guy and the kike Hidalgo as the good guy of his movie. This said, I doubt that Gerardo knows that the historical Hidalgo was genetically Jewish. Like all Mexican leftists he is sleeping in a profound Matrix. In the other episodes of the series that my cousin also directed a dialogue caught my attention. A woman asks Hidalgo: ‘Removing the command from the Europeans and handing it over—to who?’ at the time of delivering a hostile look to a Mexican Indian beside her. Of course: the woman is depicted almost as a bigot.

Gritos de Muerte y Libertad includes explanatory notes to clarify the supposed historical events for the Mexican audience. In one of these texts it is announced that, once in jail and excommunicated by the Catholic Church, Hidalgo felt guilty that the mud mobs he had commanded massacred civilians in the Alhóndiga de Granaditas—a ridiculous claim since Hidalgo was very well known for his cri de guerre ‘¡Viva la Virgen de Guadalupe y mueran los gachupines!’ (‘Life to the Virgin of Guadalupe and death to the Spaniards!’). So clearly racial is the script of Gritos de Muerte y Libertad that it includes these words by a fearing Viceroy when Hidalgo’s mud mobs reached the capital of New Spain: ‘This is the main square of the Spanish crown! And no horde of zambos [half-breeds of Amerinds and imported Negroes] will claim it ever!’ This was the Viceroy who succeeded José de Iturrigaray, but my cousin also puts him under a bad light.
In subsequent episodes, Gerardo has Hidalgo incarcerated before his shooting after having lost important battles with the troops loyal to Spain. Once again my cousin used a mestizo actor for the jailer. Hidalgo recounts his adventures to the jailer and is depicted as noble and wise. The jailer even recognises that Hidalgo ‘is a good man, a son of God’. At least in that monologue my cousin has Hidalgo recognising that in Guanajuato his furious mobs killed women and children, but he didn’t dare to film the actual scenes showing the Mexican public that the victims were probably white, and the assassins Indians and zambos. This is shameful, since Damián Tort Roca, our ancestor five generations ago, had come to America as an assistant doctor of the royalist army in the war against the Indian and mestizo insurgents.

Gerardo filmed the platoon that shot Hidalgo, again, as a group of slightly mesticised Indians. I wonder if machines to see the past are ever invented and we could see the historic scene as whiter men shooting an obvious kike? But before the shooting Hidalgo delivers candies—yes: candies!—to his executioners and after the shooting one of them is on the verge of tears. How moving… I acquired two DVDs of Gritos de Muerte y Libertad, the next one dealing with Hidalgo’s successor, the mulatto José María Morelos, who continued the killing of Iberia nites after the death of his mentor. But I don’t have any humour left to watch this second DVD.

A few years ago, here in Mexico City some nacos (insulting pejorative for Indian-looking residents of Mexico City, analogous to what in the US is called nigger) assaulted Gerardo’s brother. Curiously, one of Gerardo’s two sisters once told me during a private conversation that the nacos must ‘have the same rights’. Yes… all of my white relatives are now Pod people. And a worse kind of Pods than the American liberals since among older American folks there is at least the memory of their nation being mostly white. Those who have watched the 1956 film Invasion of the Body Snatchers can see a nice California town populated exclusively by whites. This was California before Aztlán took over with the approval of body-snatched pods like my cousin.

Mexico, even for the three centuries when it was known as New Spain, has experienced no less than half a millennium of miscegenation. The remaining Creoles have been so thoroughly indoctrinated through centuries of Christian and liberal propaganda
that the sole mention of avoiding intercourse with the mudbloods would be considered a kind of unheard of heresy. I would go as far as to claim that after the dollar crashes dragging the Mexican peso with it and after my native town burns, the apocalyptic shock won’t be enough to awaken the remaining Creoles—like Gerardo—from their catatonic sleep.

_December 10, 2013_
On Spain and literature

Annoyed at the infamous TV series *Toledo* I tried to find some consolation in the epic film *El Cid*, a story of the life of the Castilian knight Don Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar who in the 11th century contributed to the unification of Spain. But even that movie released in 1961 starts with a politically-correct scene. *El Cid*, interpreted by Charlton Heston, spares the life of a Moorish king in the hope that the Moor will behave in the future after an anti-Christian raid (and he behaves like a gentleman the rest of the film). Then in the royal palace *El Cid* has a private conversation with the woman he loved, acted by Sophia Loren, and makes a speech about his pacifist intentions when he is accused of treason for having spared the life of the Muslim king.

Well, well… What about forgetting old and new movies altogether and focus instead on the Spanish literature of the Middle Ages? What will we find there? Big surprise: the historical *El Cid* found some work fighting for the Muslim rulers of Taifa of Zaragoza! This happened after his falling out of favour of Alfonso VI, king of León and Castile, who in 1081 ordered Rodrigo Díaz’s exile. But what else can the literature of the age say about the mores and zeitgeist of medieval Spain? Let’s take a look…

The above photograph of Soledad Anaya Solórzano (1895-1978) was approximately taken when she was the teacher of
literature of Octavio Paz, who would win the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1990. Anaya was the Principal of the Secundaria Héroes de la Libertad until her death, the Middle School in Mexico City where I studied. Of course, when Miss Anaya taught me she was in her late seventies and looked much older than in the photo, but she still was in command of her intellectual capacities. Anaya never married and was the single author of Literatura Española (1941), a textbook of more than thirty editions that we used in her classroom and I will use in this article. I must say that in the first chapters of Anaya’s textbook, first published during the Second World War, she unabashedly used the word ‘arios’ (Aryan) when referring to the first conquerors of the Iberian Peninsula.

About the first ancient text that Anaya analyses, the 8th-century legend of King Rodrigo and the Loss of Spain (pages 28-31), the Jew-wise reader is shocked to see that no accusation is made of Jews inviting any Muslim into the peninsula. The old legend tells instead that Florinda, a Visigothic maid (a purely Aryan young woman) was seduced by King Rodrigo, another Iberian white, in Rodrigo’s castle. As revenge the Count Julián, Florinda’s father, ‘opened Spain to Muslim expansion’ Anaya wrote: an expansion that had been previously contained by the Count himself. The Moors then invaded the peninsula ‘and easily destroyed the Visigothic power that already was much debilitated’. Anaya adds that ‘it is not known what happened to King Rodrigo, who caused so much harm’ and that the ‘historical happenings related to this legend occurred in 711 A.D’ (my translation). Note that King Rodrigo, not Count Julián—or the Moors—is blamed. Presumably, the accent of the legend rested on a peculiar sense of honour among the Iberians of those remote times.

Later, on pages 40-47 of the textbook I used in my middle teens, Anaya mentions the case of the legend of The Seven Infants of Lara, which recounts other Iberian whites using other Moors to take revenge about other cases of Aryan offences! This very famous medieval tale has Gonzalo Gustios, the crying father of the seven decapitated white lads in Córdova, marrying Aixa, the daughter of Almanzor (Almanzor, who had imprisoned Gonzalo Gustios, was one of the most powerful characters in the Caliphate). Mudarra González, the mongrel son of the Christian Gonzalo Gustios and the Muslim Aixa, is the one destined to avenge the father. The victim of course is not Almanzor, the Moor that ordered the
decapitation of the boys on behalf of the valiant knight Ruy Vásquez. The victim is Ruy Vásquez himself that the mongrel dispatches at the end of the story! Once more, for the medieval Spaniard race did not seem to be the central issue: but a knightly sense of honour, especially during in-group vendettas.

In the next chapter Anaya approaches the ancient texts about El Cid. His life inspired the most important epic poem of Spanish literature: the *Cantar de Mio Cid*. Now that I reread her book after forty years of reading it for the first time I was shocked to see Anaya’s sentence that El Cid was ‘the terror of Moors *and* Christians’ (my emphasis). When I finished the chapter I was surprised to learn that El Cid’s fame was not entirely based on the feat of expelling some Moors from the peninsula, but mainly on the chivalrous character of this historical and legendary figure of the Reconquista.

*   *   *

The reason I rarely include poetry in this blog is simple. Very rarely a poem reaches the innermost of my soul. The first poem that reached me was one by Luis de Góngora, which I read in the textbook of Miss Anaya in my middle teens. Góngora was a Baroque poet of the golden age of Spain. He and his contemporary Francisco de Quevedo are considered the most prominent Spanish poets of all time. Góngora flourished by the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries, when the Spanish language reached its maximum degree of perfection. Anaya tells us in *Literatura Española* that later in his life Góngora became a priest and lived in a chaplaincy of honour in Madrid in the palace of King Philip III.

Góngora composed his Sonnet LCXVI when he was twenty-one years old. Although poetry cannot be properly translated, following is Edward Churton’s translation. Góngora’s urgent appeal to a young blonde nymph to enjoy her youth before time destroys her made a huge impression in the lad I was:

```
While to contend in brightness with thy hair
Sunlight on burnished gold may strive in vain,
While thy proud forehead’s whiteness may disdain
The lilies of the field, which bloom less fair,
While each red lip at once more eyes will snare
Than the perfumed carnation bud new born,
```

114
And while thy graceful neck, with queenly scorn
Outshines bright crystal on the morning air:
Enjoy thy hour, neck, ringlets, lips, and brow;
Before the glories of this age of gold:
Earth’s precious ore, sweet flowers, and crystal bright
Turn pale and dim; and Time with fingers cold
Rifle the bud and bloom; and they, and thou
Become but ash, smoke, shadow, dust and night.

Apropos of what I said in my previous post about blaming the Iberians’ lust of gold for their inter-breeding in the Americas, let me quote a translation of some lines of one of the poems of Francisco de Quevedo (1580-1645), ‘Poderoso caballero es don dinero’ (powerful knight is don money) that I reread recently in the book of Anaya. When Quevedo writes, ‘in the Indies did they nurse him’ he means of course that gold is found in the newly-conquered West Indies, the lands of New Spain (now Mexico); and when he says ‘in Genoa did they hearse him’ he means that the gold is buried as jewelry with the corpses of the wealthy merchants of the Italian city Genoa.

Mother, unto gold I yield me,
He and I are ardent lovers;
Pure affection now discovers
How his sunny rays shall shield me!
For a trifle more or less
All his power will confess,
Powerful knight is don money.

In the Indies did they nurse him,
While the world stood round admiring;
And in Spain was his expiring;
And in Genoa did they hearse him;
And the ugliest at his side
Shines with all of beauty’s pride;
Powerful knight is don money.

Noble are his proud ancestors
For his blood-veins are patrician;
Royalties make the position
Of his Orient investors;
So they find themselves preferred
To the duke or country herd,
Powerful knight is don money.

Never meets he dames ungracious
To his smiles or his attention,
How they glow but at the mention
Of his promises capacious!
And how bare-faced they become
To the coin beneath his thumb
Powerful knight is don money.

I’m not sure if the translation of ‘to the duke or country herd’ conveys accurately the meaning. In the original Spanish it says that the yellow metal ‘hace iguales al duque y al ganadero’: makes the duke and country herd equals. You can imagine how the young and ambitious commoners in those times, like Cortés, looked for chances of upward mobility in the West Indies.

*The Culture of Critique*

I’ve read a classic in Spanish literature and would like to say something about it. Quoting Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas, on page 7 of *The Culture of Critique* Kevin MacDonald wrote:

A prime example is *La Celestina* (first edition dating from 1499) by Fernando de Rojas, who wrote “with all the anguish, pessimism, and nihilism of a **converso** who has lost the religion of his fathers but has been unable to integrate himself within the compass of Christian belief”. Rojas subjected the Castilian society of his time to “a corrosive analysis, destroying with a spirit that has been called ‘destructive’ all the traditional values and mental schemes of the new intolerant system. Beginning with literature and proceeding to religion, passing through all the ‘values’ of institutionalised caste-ism—honor, valor, love—everything is perversely pulverised”.

I confess that I found *La Celestina* quite boring, but I am not sure if it would be proper to catalog this comedy—because it is a comedy—as ‘destructive’ in the sense that MacDonald (who doesn’t seem to have read it) put it. However, Fernando de Rojas indeed felt alienated in the late 15th century Spain. Some of his biographers even claim that, when Rojas was a bachelor studying in Salamanca, he received the tragic notice that his father, a Jew converted to
Catholicism, had been condemned to die at the stake by the Inquisition. As crypto-Jews usually did, Rojas married a converso woman, i.e., an ethnic Jewess, the daughter of Álvaro de Montealbán. De Montealbán also suffered a trial by the Inquisition and, although Rojas was a very successful lawyer by profession, he was not allowed to defend his father-in-law because Rojas was also of Jewish heritage, and therefore suspicious.

*La Celestina* was a huge bestseller of the time, even in translations outside Spain, but Rojas was always scared for having written it in his youth and, for forty years, remained silent about his authorship. See my recent entry about the Spanish Catholic Kings Ferdinand and Isabella, who in 1492 promulgated a law to expel those Jews who didn’t want to convert to Christianity. The Jews who had lived in Spain for centuries had to go and the *conversos* who stayed became second-class citizens for the next centuries. The mission of the Inquisition was to keep under scrutiny the *conversos* and see if they continued to practice their religious ways in secret.

Except for the first act, which was not authored by Rojas but by a non-Jew (either Juan de Mena or Rodrigo de Cota), as I said I found the comedy boring. Whatever the influence of this searing exposé of the idealisation of women, an idealisation so common in popular authors those times such as Petrarch, it probably didn’t go beyond the similar exposé by Cervantes of the chivalric novels of the age. To my taste mentioning *La Celestina* in the first pages of *The Culture of Critique* is a little off the mark, especially when taking into account that the most hilarious pages against women were authored by a gentile.

Rojas died in 1541, four years after Pope Paul III granted the bachelor soldiers in America permission to have kids with Amerind women. Now that I’ve just read *La Celestina* I’d say that, although there’s a ring of truth in what MacDonald quoted, it should be obvious that the Spaniards’ lust for gold, together with Catholicism, were the main cause of their racial suicide in the Americas. In those centuries *conversos* rarely got—as Rojas did—positions of cultural influence in this society that seriously tried to get rid of the subversive tribe. For those knowledgeable of the history of Spain and Spanish literature, it would be laughable to hear that the book written by Rojas was a factor contributing to the blood-mixing in the New World.

*January 8, 2014*
Negroes and English roses

‘I’ve never seen a real nigger, only in pictures’.
‘Lucky you! That was kind of the idea behind the Revolution, sweetie, so you wouldn’t have to see one’, said Jenny.

*Freedom’s Sons*, page 579

Presently I am in the United Kingdom and am extremely dismayed at the quantity of mixed couples—a sort of wuthering heights throughout the island! There is also a general miscegenation and fraternisation among whites with non-whites in a country that still produces some of the most beautiful Aryan women, previously known as ‘English roses’.

I first visited London in 1982. I was not so racialist then but my mind did not register non-whites. Now, in 2014, I see that the native English have become a minority in their own capital. If it were not for a surprisingly large amount of beautiful blond children and adolescents I’ve seen in London, some of them tourists I guess, I’d have no objection in nuking the Sin City.

Even at Shakespeare’s Globe Theater, where I had to pay £40 for a seat to watch Antony and Cleopatra, several Shakespearean actors are now Mulattoes and Negroes, and among the audience I had to watch a pubescent white girl being fondled by
a dark Indian while watching the comedy. If we keep in mind that the Englishmen of other times treasured their Roses, you can imagine the astronomic shift that has taken place on the island since I was born more than half a century ago.

To boot, during my visit to the Guildhall Art Gallery I discovered that it was closed for reparations until September, which means that I won’t see the collection of ethereal nymphs depicted in the pre-Raphaelite masterpieces. In contrast to the paintings that I expected to see in real life but couldn’t, in this visit to the UK I have been bombarded with street and subway photos showing blacks everywhere as if they were the legit inhabitants of this country! A London Forum member told me that the media is even portraying blond women with black husbands and coffee-and-milk kids as something cool and fashionable. Even the front cover of a promotional brochure of the Museum of the Bank of England, that I visited, has a black girl beside a pile of gold bars. Fortunately, the English are as crazy Keynesians as the Americans, which means that the coming crash of the dollar will drag the sterling pound too, bringing this multiracial utopia into utter chaos.

Postscript of 28 August. I’ve now left the United Kingdom. Kevin MacDonald has published an article on an epidemic of non-whites raping pubescent white girls in the UK that perfectly diagnoses the runaway insanity in this previously great nation. This is one of MacDonald’s phrases in the article: ‘This is a pathology so extreme that it should really be considered a collective psychosis’.

August 28, 2014
On Paul Kurtz

In the past I praised Paul Kurtz, who died in 2012 and I used to call a ‘mentor’ for his work debunking the pseudosciences that made me lose many years of my life. The photo in the Wikipedia article on him was uploaded by me after I requested it directly to Kurtz.

Alas, after he died I discovered a video where in the last five minutes Kurtz said that ‘America is a universal culture’ and, mentioning the immigration fauna in the US, he added the phrase, ‘We are part of the planetary community’. Kurtz then agreed with the interviewer that ‘the genetic makeup of the human race is all one’ and, incredibly for someone who made a career defending real science against pseudosciences, he added: ‘There are no separate races. We are all part of one human family’. The interviewer defined Kurtz as the ‘father of American secular humanism’. I could not resist the temptation of severely criticising Kurtz in a comments thread of The Occidental Observer after I discovered the video, where Kurtz also stated that WASPs have no exclusive claim to North America, and mentioned the Inuit as a group that, according to him, settled here before whites. Go figure! Before I became Jew-wise once I even harboured the thought of dedicating my autobiographical book to this guy…

Looking directly at the camera by the end of the interview, Kurtz concluded that ‘the first principle in planetary ethics is that we ought to treat every person on planet Earth as equal’, after which he mentioned the races and the ethnic groups.

Well, well… I am still grateful that Kurtz’s writings, his magazines Skeptical Inquirer and Free Inquiry, and the organisation of sceptics he founded have helped a lot of people who, like me in the past, went astray in parapsychological cults. But when I met him personally in 1989 and 1994—in the 1994 Seattle conference of sceptics I also met Carl Sagan and shook hands with him—I ignored that both Kurtz and Sagan had Jewish ancestry.

March 29, 2015
‘I think the men’s movement will eventually go completely Nazi. Just a matter of time’ wrote Andrew Anglin recently. But it’s becoming increasingly clear that, like Harold Covington who admits women in his inner party—a feminist!—, Anglin and the commenters on *The Daily Stormer* are phony nazis. This Easter Anglin posted a Frankenstein piece trying to mix the unmixable, a Levantine cult and Aryan preservation:

Today is the holiest day on the Christian calendar, and it is important to remember why.

What is important to remember this Easter is that Christianity enabled the Jewish problem, as we saw in the other book I complied (see also ‘National Socialism and Christianity’ in this book).

Christ was an example, both in deed and in metaphor. The metaphor of the crucifixion and resurrection is the metaphor for all of life. Life is suffering, but it is through that suffering that we become something more. We must die in order to be born again. This is where the meaning is. In the fight. Victory is inevitable and absolute. But it is the struggle, this is where the transformation takes place.

Finally it’s clear to me why many white nationalists don’t treasure Pierce’s *Who We Are*. If Americans are philosemites it’s
precisely because of 'the gradual replacement of White tradition, legend, and imagery by that of the Jews. Instead of specifically Celtic or German or Slavic heroes, the Church’s saints, many of them Levantines, were held up to the young for emulation; instead of the feats of Hermann or Vercingetorix, children were taught of the doings of Moses and David’. Thanks Mr. Pierce! Anglin and other racist Christians are simply incapable to see the level of alienation that resulted from bringing into the Aryan citadel a Trojan horse: none other than the god of the Jews. Once I finish quoting from Hitler’s table talks by the end of the year, I will be translating more articles of Manu Rodríguez, who explains beautifully why Zeus must replace Yahweh to save the race.

Jesus fought the Jew, and when it seemed as though the Jew had won, killing him, he rose from the grave. So too are we dead, and so too shall we rise from the grave. Just so, each of us as individuals must suffer in order to truly become what we are meant to be.

With these neonazis who needs the Jews? A couple of days ago I told a commenter on The Daily Stormer that throughout the Old Testament the Hebrews taught ethnocentricity for the Hebrew people, but in the New Testament the Jew Paul teaches universalism for us gentiles. I confess I’m so upset with this nonsense in Murka’s neonazi blogosphere that I will skip Hitler’s table talk this day and post instead something about Easter. But I’m not sure if I’ll take the trouble to write a long article on the Resurrection. What is sure is that I’ll now remove The Daily Stormer from my blogroll list.

When we lost WWII, we died. We are now in Hell. But the dawn is about to break, and we shall rise from the grave, living flesh, moving toward Heaven. Hail Victory.

What Anglin and the Christians on The Daily Stormer ignore is that it was precisely because of Christianity that we lost World War Two. Read Tom Sunic’s ‘A war crime of the Bible’ in his book Homo Americanus. Why do I claim that Christianity is incompatible with National Socialism and that any attempt to merge the two is like Shelley’s novel about a student creating a grotesque but sentient creature? Just see what Hitler and Himmler said about the religion of our parents in The Fair Race’s Darkest Hour.

April 5, 2015
A priest of the 14 words...

§ sees all history and the world of ideas through the prism of Aryan preservation. It would be advisable if he becomes familiar with William Pierce’s *Who We Are* and the uttermost need to create the Aryan ecclesia;

§ like Hitler, the priest of the fourteen words is aware of the Christian problem, the Jewish problem and does not worship Mammon;

§ dreams about a Fourth Reich, which means expelling all non-whites from the Reich independently of the cost of human lives that the implementation of such project would require.

*April 29, 2015*
Ethno-suicidal nationalists

‘The century of 1930 to 2030 was providentially destined to be the Aryan century of all history, but it has become the Jewish century par excellence, courtesy of the Anglo-Saxons’.

‘White nationalists are still thinking like fucking civilians, not as freedom fighters’.

‘Anti-Nordicist is a codeword for anti-white’.

‘American white nationalism is a giant step backwards from German National Socialism’.

Liberals, conservatives and white nationalists are heading for the abyss. Londoner Joseph Walsh has said that even the pro-white movement seems to be carried away by the irresistible death wish suffered by contemporary whites. I would say: Led by the Jews, gentile liberals are driving the train toward the abyss. The conservatives are simply trying to slow it down, lightly stepping on the brake here and there to hinder the liberals’ ways. Off the train, white nationalists are headed in the same direction, but at a much slower pace: they go on foot. For the sake of clarity, let us compare the values of the white nationalists with the genuine defenders of the Aryan race:

- Hitler and the National Socialists organised a political party: the first step to make a difference in the real world.

  On this one, we must not be too harsh about the cyber-based movement of white nationalism that refuses to leave the homely comfort zone. They have good reason to do so: just remember the ambush perpetrated by the System at Charlottesville in the United States. Nonetheless, since the System won’t allow a peaceful reform, white nationalists ought to have concluded by now that violent revolution by whites is inevitable.

- The Germans clearly defined their ethnicity as Germanic, including Austria, the Scandinavian and Low Countries, Switzerland and parts of the old Soviet Union. Hitler even dreamt of sharing the
world with the Anglo-Saxons. For the eugenicists of the last century at both sides of the Atlantic, Nordicism was taken for granted.

Those who advocate white nationalism either ignore eugenics or do not care about Nordicism at all. Like the conservatives of the Republican Party who treat mestizos as equals, in order not to offend Mediterranean sensibilities white nationalists refuse to recognise that the standard of whiteness is the Nordic type. Many have no objection to concede amnesty to the whitish population in Europe with their bloodline compromised, even if that means the eventual mongrelisation of true whites. This is why I say that nationalists are going on foot toward the abyss. For example, the American Richard Spencer, who created the term alt-right (alternative right) and who in 2016 was filmed giving a salute in a conference that the mainstream media interpreted as a Nazi salute, married an un-Aryan woman and the couple had a child.

- Hitler and his closest pals abandoned Christianity, a religion of Levantine inspiration that only weakens the Germanic peoples.

Most white nationalists are either Christians or Christian-friendly and have been blinded about the toxicity of the Galilean cult (see for example our critique of Kevin MacDonald in the penultimate essay of this collection).

- National Socialists, including Catholics and Protestants, renounced Christian ethics and became pragmatic Nietzscheans.

White nationalists are frightened by history, for example the legitimate will of the Germans to conquer those Slavs who had handed over their country to the Bolshevik Jews. (If a Reich existed today, the same could be said about the legitimacy of conquering the Judaised United States by this hypothetical German empire.)

- Hitler and the National Socialists took sexual polarity as something to be taken for granted. Like all militarist cultures, the Germans subscribed patriarchy and no woman was admitted to the leadership class.

The men of white nationalism have become unrecognisably feminised. The alt-right has no problem with second-wave feminism, only with third-wave feminism. Even when first-wave feminism should be rejected, alt-righters have no problem accepting that women make careers; that they enter their conferences, and some among them fail to criticise that they practice ethnospicidal forms of natal control.
• The National Socialists pursued the fulfilment of their duty to the point of dying heroically for the fate of their race. Like the Republican Romans their *ethos* was severe, stoic and brutal. Manu, the already quoted Spaniard whom I used to correspond, recommended us Cicero’s *On Duties*. Throughout the West’s darkest hour a solemn character (*gravitas*) should govern our actions; young people should be demanded respect (*verecundia*) and purity (*pudicitia, integritas morum*). As for the training of citizens, propriety in public life (*dignitas*) constituted a virtue for the Roman citizen of the Old Republic. Each of these Latin terms had a wider semantic field than the one expressed in the above translation. *Sacrae patria deserere* and *deserere patriam* were Roman expressions that designated desertion of the old Fathers and the adoption of foreign cults (precisely what would become the Roman Catholic Church). In our century, all of these values can be reclaimed without any demerit.

On the opposite side of the hard Roman *ethos*, quite a few white nationalists live under the illusion of the American dream and the childlike pursuit of universal happiness. Like the late Romans when the Empire was already committing miscegenation, these degenerates lack the Teutonic spirit of tribal sacrifice. The saying ‘We don’t stand a chance unless our men become killing machines and our women birthing machines’ sounds like anti-music to their bourgeoisie ears. Very few want to sacrifice themselves for the fourteen words. Who really wants to become a bloodthirsty soldier or literally force our spoiled women to become birthing machines, as the early Romans did with the Sabine women?

• From early history, the number-one enemy of the Aryans has been the inexorable greed for riches at the expense of their race. Corneliu Codreanu, a Romanian politician who was the founder and charismatic leader of the Iron Guard, said: ‘A country has the Jews it deserves. Just as mosquitoes can thrive and settle only in swamps, likewise the former can only thrive in the swamps of our sins’. In other words, Jewry is a secondary infection. As to the primary infection, because of the corrupting power brought about on the white psyche by civilisation, Hitler and the National Socialists subscribed collectivism, honour, hierarchy and militarism always in harmony with the aesthetic impulse of the Aryan soul.

In the forums of white nationalism one does not read much criticism of the largest factor of white decline: modernity after the Industrial Revolution and the artificial comfort it provides. They
mention the Jews a lot, but not the mercantile societies that degenerated into runaway consumerist materialism: the most corrupting swamp for the Aryan soul per Codreanu’s metaphor.

- The National Socialists pointed to fascism, war and conquest. Just read the Führer’s various pronouncements about his projected empire in his after-dinner conversations or the quotations of Francis Parker Yockey at the very end of The Fair Race.

Many alt-rightists, light-years away from the spirit of Hitler or Yockey, seem to sympathise to some extent with the human rights proclaimed by the French revolutionaries. Even the secularists and atheists among them have not really broken away from Christian or liberal standards of morality.

- Hitler used to speak, enthusiastically, about the most beautiful European architecture, painting and classical music. All of this was omnipresent in the plans of what the Reich was to become after the consolidation of his conquests. At the same time, the Nazis recognised the problem of cultural degeneration in general and degenerate music in particular.

Many nationalists, including racially-conscious Europeans, listen to the Negro-American phenomenon of rock and watch the filth that the Hollywood Jews make us see on the big screen and our televisions. Uneducated neonazis of the kind of those who read James Mason’s Siege do not even know the plot of any of Richard Wagner’s operas.

But the most serious problem with white nationalists is that they have not realised that their race is their nation. Had they realised it, they would have repudiated the founding ideology of their American ‘nation’, capitalism plus Christianity (see Ronin’s epigraph at the beginning of this book), and would do something analogous to what the Jews have been doing for decades: denouncing the Hellstorm Holocaust that claimed more lives of innocent Germans than the alleged Jewish holocaust. Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Stalin and Churchill, who ordered that Aryan Holocaust after the war was over, ought to be considered the greatest Satans not only of the 20th century but of Western history. If American white nationalists knew that their race is their nation they would have sympathised with the true martyrs, their German cousins, and would have been reporting the Hellstorm Holocaust every morning, midday and evening until the West wakes up.
They do nothing of the sort because, ultimately, they are joining the Judaised liberals and the Judaised conservatives on their road to racial oblivion.

January 1, 2016
Freedom’s daughters

Harold A. Covington is a neonazi and a novelist. He advocates the creation of a new nation, a white Republic in the Pacific Northwest region of the US as a sanctuary to prevent the extinction of whites. Covington’s five novels present a fictionalised account of the rise of a future Northwest White Republic. This nation secedes from the US, ejects all non-white inhabitants from its territory and becomes a regional superpower, defeating the US attempts to re-conquer it. Corinna Burt (‘Axis Sally’) was Covington’s assistant, co-host and appeared on his weekly podcasts numerous times while… she was having sex with blacks! After leaving Covington, Corinna went back to her vomit: bodybuilding and a pornstar job. She even attacked Covington and white supremacy in her blog and YouTube channel.

How could this have happened to the best white nationalist novelist after William Pierce died? The answer is simple: because Covington believes that in the coming racial wars women are interchangeable with male soldiers. He even coined a term for such freedom fighters in his quintet, ‘gun bunnies’. If we keep in mind what John Sparks and the MGTOW blogger have been saying in my last twenty-nine blog entries we can see how silly this view is from the standpoint of natural science. The best way to illustrate
Covington’s feminist views is simply quoting from what he wrote in the last novel of his quintet, *Freedom’s Sons*, a book of almost a thousand pages. In the prologue he wrote:

Wingfield scowled after her: ‘I’m sorry if my order to keep our female comrades out of direct combat ruffled their feathers, and I know they’re all as brave as lions or they wouldn’t be here…’ [p. xxxvii]

Brave as men. Really?

A number of Nationalist soldiers wearing NDF [Northwest Defense Force] tiger-stripes—mostly female, in view of Wingfield’s ban on women in direct combat for the operation—were manning the electronic gear and talking into microphones, wireless phones, and typing on laptops. [p. xli]

From the feminist viewpoint the Northwest White Republic looks like America II.

‘Okay, comrades, we’re going to have a major troop movement of about four thousand men crossing the enemy’s front, and we need to make sure they don’t get hammered by the heavy stuff’, called out Wingfield. ‘Who’s hooked up with artillery fire control?’

A woman soldier raised her hand. ‘I am sir’. [xlili]

Covington is no natural scientist. The point of keeping women away from the front is that their wombs are too precious for the fulfilment of our fourteen words. In addition to their lower strength, lower resistance and lower IQs you simply cannot endanger them as if they were mere grunts.

‘Two of ’em at least are gone, sir’, Lieutenant Campbell said. ‘We have a Threesec spotter doing a Tarzan act up on top of the I-5. She climbed up there onto a beam or something pretty high up, where she can see over what’s left of the buildings along the river. She’s got a set of field glasses, one of our radios she got from somewhere, and a wireless laptop. What she can’t see, she can get off Google and CNN. She has a bird’s eye view of Edgewater golf course, the Arboretum and Delta Park East. She’s calling in to C Battery, that’s the 155s on the corner of Maritime and Columbia, and also to the Sector Two mortar crews’ fire control officer. That’s about twenty-five pieces, eighty-one mils mostly. She’s
dropping some heavy shit on those niggers along Martin Luther King and all the way down to Bridgeton’.

‘She?’ shouted Wingfield in exasperation. ‘Judas priest, did none of you ladies understand my order to stay out of direct contact with the enemy? I thought I was supposed to be a general or something? Army Council says so, anyway. Didn’t any of these mutinous gals get the memo?’

‘This girl says she’s Third Section and she knows you, sir’, replied Campbell. ‘Anyway, she didn’t ask me or anybody else here. She just went out there on her own. First we heard of it was when she started calling in to C Battery a few minutes ago’.

‘Pipe it up so I can hear whatever the hell she’s doing’, ordered Wingfield. [p. xliv] 

What would a real Nazi think about this American novelist? His fictional liberalism looks like a typical Jewish psyop to sabotage the military of an Aryan nation. In the first chapter of Freedom’s Sons, ‘A Madhouse of Ministries’ Covington wrote what is perhaps the most offensive lines of his long novel:

The new government department consisted of 32 people plus himself, about evenly split between male and female. [p. 8]

So in Covington’s neonazi cabinet more women were appointed than what Donald Trump is appointing for his cabinet this very day! Another offensive line appears a few pages ahead:

‘A lot of Christians and general Neanderthal male chauvinist types want to go back to an all-male army’. [p. 23]

You can imagine what would have happened to the Spartans or the Romans if their armies had been made up of men and women!

‘No more. From now on citizenship and the right to vote is something that has to be earned, and right now the only ones who have earned it are those who fought in the NVA [Northwest Volunteer Army] and the NDF. I have been told that there will be ways in which non-NVA veterans may apply for and receive third-class citizenship, which will get you one vote. Us guys who put our lives on the line for our race and our new nation will have two or three votes each, that’s true, but that’s as it should be. And there’s other ways you can get a vote. For example, one of the things they’re talking about
at the Convention in Olympia is allowing mothers with children to get third class citizenship right away, so long as you’re willing to take the oath of loyalty to the Republic. We understand that the results of an election that allows only NVA and NDF people to vote would be considered morally questionable, and so for the first couple of years until we can work up a whole new order of society and a whole new way of doing things, we’ll be kind of playing it by ear. [p. 43]

Unlike the Third Reich, democracy continues in the Northwest White Republic and to boot women can vote.

Robert, this is Millie, one of my part-time admin assistants from the high school. She graduates in June and she’ll be doing her Labor Service here at UM along with night school for a teaching degree, and so she’s getting a head start on things now, after school’. [p. 195]

The Northwest White Republic is indeed a sort of Second Incarnation of America. Women are still making careers like any other guy in today’s West. About a hundred pages later we read:

‘So what can we throw against these bastards?’ asked Morehouse.

‘Almost five million men and women under arms, including our regulars, who are the best trained and most highly motivated individual soldiers in the world. [p. 288]

Neonazi gals are perfectly interchangeable with neonazi guys, even in the army. Let’s jump 235 pages ahead and hit this lovely passage:

With Barrow was his blonde and Canadian-born wife, former NVA Captain Jane Chenault, who was now the senior Permanent Secretary for Education, essentially the senior civil servant working under the Cabinet Minister for that department. For the duration of the war, Jane had reverted to her reserve military rank of colonel, and she had promised her husband that if she were not allowed some role in the conquest of Canada, their future married life would be something to make him shudder. Like all wise husbands who know when their wives really mean it, Frank gave in immediately. Jane was proud and pleased to discover that her statuesque figure could still fit into her old Kevlar vest from her NVA days. [p. 524]
In Covington’s neonazi republic white women are not only empowered, they are still doing shit tests—and men comply! No wonder why Uncle Harold misjudged the character of Corinna Burt… The novel actually ends on page 537. The remainder of the book is like the sixth novel of Covington’s saga about the creation of an ethnostate. I guess that since Covington had promised his radio listeners that *Freedom’s Sons* would be his last novel, instead of recognising that it was not the last one he decided to insert the rest of the manuscript under a single cover. But the plot of the rest of the book is so different that a future editor would separate the books. (Actually, the feminist message of Covington’s fifth novel is so toxic to the fourteen words that it would be censored in a real ethnostate.)

In the climax of *Freedom’s Sons* a woman kills the president of the United States when he was about to nuke the racist ethnostate. Notice that the heroine is a woman. In the remainder of the so-called fifth novel the Republic is consolidated. If you read it the remainder represents a big anticlimax. Covington even goes back to the detective fiction genre of the first novel that he wrote of this saga, *The Hill of the Ravens*. In this ‘sixth’ novel another crime has to be solved within the now safe Republic. The very title of the first chapter of this ‘sixth’ novel betrays that is another book: ‘32 Years, Seven Months After Longview’. On the very first paragraphs of that chapter Covington wrote:

Colonel Robert Campbell, who at the age of 46 was now the head of the Civil Guard’s Montana regional Criminal Investigation Division, shook his salt-and-pepper head in bemused admiration. ‘I’m sorry’, he said, ‘I still can’t wrap my mind around it. Where the hell did you come from again?’

‘From down in the number four traverse trench’, replied his daughter-in-law, Allura Myers Campbell, a graduate student in archaeology at the University of Montana. She was wearing khaki shorts, a khaki work shirt, mud-caked work boots and knee socks, and a large floppy straw hat to protect her head from the sun, which in May was already becoming uncomfortably hot in the pine hills of Lost Creek. [543]

Two pages later we learn that this woman is an intellectual:
‘Nope, first time for both of us’, said Campbell. ‘Tom and I are going to be running point on the security aspect of this visitation of foreign eggheads. No offense, honey’.

‘None taken’, said Allura with a merry laugh. ‘I am an egghead’. [p. 545]

Allura is a 22-year-old girl of the ethnostate. So women not only compete with men in the military but also in the world of ideas. Covington doesn’t seem to realise that the feminist world he envisages is contradicted with what he writes on the next page: ‘a wide range of uncles, aunts, grandparents, cousins’ as if it was possible to have both radical feminism and prolific families within the same society. Three hundred pages later, on page 852, a female character made me feel sceptical. Not even tough guys have that icy nerves that this woman showed in a mission. A few pages later we see that the novelist pays attention to the education of the girls—multiplying fractions. What about kitchen tasks or preparing them for motherhood? Is this a novel written by a traditionalist? Covington can’t have a cake and eat it. Either these traditional families make their women submit or they become feminists. Covington seems to believe that with the American liberties of his fantastic ethnostate these career women would simply choose to have lots of kids. On page 864 we read:

She had experienced this on her first weekend at the Selkirk spread, when her new sisters and cousins had taken her down to Northwest Butte and gone on a shopping spree, fitting her out with a whole new wardrobe of hats, long dresses with fully sleeves, new lace-up shoes that displayed no immodest ankles, and assorted hats.

It is the women who chose to dress like a pre-1960s western society, not the patriarchal codes that obliges them to do so. Concurrently, Covington wants us to believe that some of the liberated women of his ethnostate would choose to have eight kids! On page 867 we are told, again, that they have the right to vote and what is worse: these little women are now applying for first-class citizenship. By the end of the long novel, on page 908 we learn that Nightshade is a national heroine of the ethnostate. I have read the whole saga. When I devoured A Mighty Fortress a scene of this gun bunny, Nightshade, struck me as psycho. She got upset with a comrade in arms and intended to poke a switchblade through his
eye. But of course ‘Nightshade’ is a woman and, like the sexually-starved Wyoming males that granted women’s suffrage in the 19th century, Covington apparently writes to attract bunnies although with Corinna he crashed into the wall of reality...

In conclusion, I stick to everything I published on January 1st about ‘Ethno-suicidal nationalists’. The ideology of today’s racists is both part of the problem and part of the solution. Crossing the Rubicon from liberalism to the other side involves several stepping-stones: the alt-light, the alt-right, white nationalism or southern nationalism, neonazism (white nationalism with nazi paraphernalia) and reaching the other side, National Socialism.

November 20, 2016

Postscript: Harold Covington died at sixty-four in Bremerton, Washington, U.S., between late morning and around 2:00 pm on July 17, 2018, Pacific Time.
Darwin’s exterminationism

‘It is very true what you say about the higher races of men, when high enough, replacing & clearing off the lower races. In 500 years how the Anglo-Saxon race will have spread & exterminated whole nations; & in consequence how much the Human race, viewed as a unit, will have risen in rank’. — Charles Darwin to Charles Kingsley, 6 February 1862.

‘At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised race will almost certainly exterminate, and replace, the savage races throughout the world... The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian [aborigine] and the gorilla’. —Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, 1871.

‘I could show fight on natural selection having done and doing more for the progress of civilisation than you seem inclined to admit. Remember what risks the nations of Europe ran, not so many centuries ago of being overwhelmed by the Turks, and how ridiculous such an idea now is. The more civilised so-called Caucasian races have beaten the Turkish hollow in the struggle for existence. Looking to the world at
no very distant date, what an endless number of the lower races will have been eliminated by the higher civilised races throughout the world’. —Charles Darwin to William Graham, 3 July 1881.

Revilo Oliver, one of the best minds that the US has produced, stated:

The population of the globe is going to be drastically reduced, and in the course of that reduction, it is virtually certain that the inferior races will become extinct, as Darwin foresaw, although not in the way he anticipated. The only question is which races will not survive the inevitable war for survival. So far as one can extrapolate from the present, disregarding our pathetic hopes for a psychological and biological miracle, there is one race which, by its own fatuity and degeneracy, seems likely to become extinct less than a century after it was master of the world.

More recently an American Renaissance commenter opined about Darwin’s remarkable statements:

It is much to my chagrin that for the near future (e.g., next 60-100 years) that Darwin will be shown to be incorrect. If not for the artificial and noxious interference by liberals—guilty Whites—evolution would be allowed to take its proper course. How I wish I lived in the alternate time line where this occurred and the earth only knew of the Negro in the manner that it knows now of the Neanderthal or Homo erectus. And if they were to perish? What would be lost? Really, what would the world lose that would not be replaced by such that is infinitely better?

New tablets of stone

The priest of the fourteen words is a legislator. The first commandments in his stone tablets are:

First commandment: ‘You will keep your blood pure’.

Second commandment: ‘Never use non-whites in any type of work’. How to achieve that? If we now remember the counsel of William Pierce in Who We Are on the dilemma extermination or expulsion the third commandment, inspired by The Turner Diaries, means the ethnic cleansing of non-whites so that creatures like the one on the cover of this book can flourish.
The following commandments: these must be dictated, inspired by pre-Christian Sparta, Republican Rome, the Norsemen and especially Nazi Germany, by other priests of the fourteen words.

October 29, 2017

8 The ‘tablets’ incorporates some words of Joseph Walsh that I quoted the next year.
Pilate or Jesus?

This article is a response to commenter Arch Stanton. Pay attention to what I said today in the hatnote of my 60th translation of *Christianity’s Criminal History*: ‘In a nutshell, any white person who worships the god of the Jews is, ultimately, ethnosuicidal’. Jesus of Nazareth is considered ‘god’ by Christians, mysteriously the same as the first person of the trinity, the god father: the same Yahweh of the Jews, right? Well, if the hatnote that accompanies the entries of Deschner’s series describes reality, you yourself, by holding Jesus high, are an ethnosuicidal white.

I will be very frank. I do not believe that what you say in your novel *The Conspiracy of Man: The Life and Times of Yeshu* was historical. As I let you know in other discussion threads, there are as many Jesuses as New Testament students who fall in the temptation to write a ‘Life of Jesus’. Already from the times of Albert Schweitzer it was known that writers of lives of Jesus only project their own ideals onto this literary figure. The New Testament is a very problematic text because it is a *kerygma*. It is not a true and objective testimony about biographical facts; rather, it preaches a new doctrine and a set of values. Wanting to extract history out of such a text is like wanting to extract history from what the Old
Testament says about Moses, when current scholarship revealed that Moses is a mythological character.

Let’s go to the point regarding your novel. The fight between Jesus and the High Priest that appears in the gospels, which culminated in the expulsion of the merchants from the temple and eventually in the crucifixion of Jesus, is to be understood as a quarrel between Jews. Every Aryan who takes a strong side in such a quarrel is Judaised. Even if the story was non-fictional, whatever happened between the preacher Yeshu—whose fictional mother Miriam was Jewish—and the temple authorities does not concern us. What concerns us is what the Romans thought: our people, the representatives of our culture. As Nietzsche said, the only decent character in the entire New Testament was Pilate. But you do not have the Roman Pilate as the man to admire in the New Testament story. You have a fucking Jew. You do not realise that, with that admiration, you, like so many American nationalists who are still clinging to their parents’ religion, are doing something harmful to the white race.

It is this kind of thing that produces a tectonic earthquake, it opens a grand canyon so to speak, between me and the nationalists. The white nationalists who maintain vestiges of Christianity are not aware that they are part of the problem.

April 19, 2018
From the Great Confinement to chemical Gulag

French psychiatrist Philippe Pinel releasing women from the Salpêtrière asylum of Paris in 1795.

Aristotle said that to obtain a truly profound knowledge about something it is necessary to know its history. To understand what happened to the orphan John Bell it is necessary to know how the profession that re-victimised him emerged. The following exposé about how the psychiatric profession was born is taken from Michel Foucault’s *Madness and Civilisation*, that I will paraphrase here.

In England, three hundred years before John Bell was born, the pamphlet *Grievous Groan of the Poor* appeared, in which it was proposed that the indigent be banished and transferred to the newly discovered lands of the Oriental Indies. From the 13th century it had existed the famous Bedlam for lunatics in London, but in the 16th century it housed only twenty inmates. In the 17th century, when the pamphlet to banish the poor appeared, there were already

---

9 Since this is a chapter within the second book of my eleven-book series, I will be adding explanatory brackets after some sentences.

10 Bell’s testimony appears in a post of *The West’s Darkest Hour*. 
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more than a hundred prisoners in Bedlam. In 1630 King Charles I called a commission to address the problem of poverty and the commission decreed the police persecution of vagabonds, beggars 'and all those who live in idleness and who do not wish to work for reasonable wages'.

In the 18th century, many poor and destitute people were taken to correctional facilities and houses of confinement in the cities where industrialisation had marginalised part of the population. Prisons for the poor were also established in continental Europe. The spirit of the 17th century was to put order in the world. After leprosy was eradicated, the medieval leprosariums that had remained empty were filled with the new lepers: the destitute. Foucault calls this period ‘The Great Confinement’ and emphasises the fact that the concept of mental illness did not exist yet.

Isolating the leper, a truly sick person, had had a hygienic goal in the Middle Ages. But isolating the destitute had no such goal: it was a new phenomenon. 1656 was an axial year in this policy of cleaning up human garbage from the streets. On April 27, Louis XIV ordered the construction of the General Hospital, a place that was hospital only in name: no doctor presided over it. Article 11 of the king’s edict specified who would be imprisoned: ‘Of all sexes, places and ages, of any city and birth and in whatever state they are, valid or invalid, sick or convalescent, curable or incurable’.

Lifelong directors were appointed to head the General Hospital. Their absolutist power was a miniature decal of the power of the sun king, as can be read in articles 12 and 13 of the edict:

They have all power of authority, direction, administration, commerce, police, jurisdiction, correction and sanction over all the poor of Paris, both inside and outside the Hôpital Général. For this purpose, the directors would have stakes and rings of torture, prisons and dungeons, in the aforementioned hospital and places that depend on it, as they deem it convenient, without being able to appeal the

---

11 Quoted in Michel Foucault: *Historia de la Locura en la Época Clásica (Volumen I)*, p. 106.
12 Edict of Luis XIV, quoted in ibid, p. 81.
ordinances that will be drafted by the directors for the interior of said hospital.\textsuperscript{13}

The goal of these draconian measures was to suppress begging by decree. A few years after its foundation, the General Hospital housed one percent of the population of Paris. There were thousands of women and children in the Salpêtrière, in the Bicêtre and in the other buildings of a ‘Hospital’ that was an administrative entity that, concurrently with the royal powers and the police, repressed and guarded the marginalised.

On June 16, 1676 another royal edict establishes the foundation of general hospitals in each city of the kingdom. Throughout France this type of prison is opened and, a hundred years later, on the eve of the Revolution, there existed in thirty-two provincial cities. The archipelago of jails for the poor covered Europe. The \textit{Hôpitaux Généraux} of France, the Workhouses of England and the \textit{Zuchthaüsenern} of Germany imprisoned young lads who had conflicts with their parents; vagabonds, drunks, lewd people and the ‘fools’. These prisons were indistinguishable from common prisons. In the 18th century an Englishman was surprised to see one of these prisons, ‘in which idiots and fools are locked up because they do not know where to confine them separately’.\textsuperscript{14} The so-called alienated were confused with the sane, though destitute, individuals; and sometimes it was impossible to distinguish one from the other.

In the Middle Ages pride was a capital sin. When banking flourished during the Renaissance it was said that greed was the greatest sin. But in the 17th century, when the ethic of work was imposed not only in Protestant countries but also among Catholics, laziness—in fact: unemployment—was the most notorious of sins. A city where every individual was supposed to become a cog in the social machine was the great bourgeois dream. Within this dream, groups that did not integrate into the machinery were destined to carry a stigma. 17th-century men had replaced medieval leprosy with indigence as the new exclusion group. It is from this ideological framework of indigence considered a vice that the great concept of madness will appear in the 18th and 19th centuries. For

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, p. 81s.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, p. 182.
the first time in history, madness would be judged with the yardstick of the work ethic. A world where work ethics rules rejects all forms of uselessness. He who cannot earn his bread transgresses the limits of the bourgeois order. He who cannot be integrated into the group must be an alienated.

The edict of creation of the General Hospital is very clear in this regard: it considers ‘begging and idleness as sources of all disorders’.15 Significantly, ‘disorder’ remains the word used by psychiatrists today. The very *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (or *DSM*, the ‘Bible’ of psychiatrists) uses the word ‘disorder’ instead of ‘illness’. As the 17th century marks the line in which it was decided to imprison a group of human beings, it would be wrong to believe that madness waited patiently for centuries until some scientists discovered it and took care of it. Likewise, it would be wrong to believe that there was a spontaneous mutation in which the poor, inexplicably and suddenly, went mad.

Imprisoning the victims of a big city was a phenomenon of European dimensions. Once consummated the Great Confinement of which Foucault speaks, the censuses of the time about the prisoners who had not broken the law show the type of people they committed: elderly people who could not take care of themselves, epileptics disowned by their families, deformed people, people with venereal diseases and even those imprisoned by the king’s letters.

The latter was the most widespread confinement procedure since the 1690s, and the petitioners that the king wrote a *lettre de cachet* were the closest relatives of those imprisoned. The most famous case of imprisonment in the Bastille by *lettre de cachet* was that of Voltaire. There were cases of foolish or ‘incorrigible girls’ who were interned. ‘Imprudent’ was a label that would correspond more or less to what in the 19th century would be called ‘moral insanity’ and which currently equals the adolescent oppositionalism or ‘defiant negativism’ in the contemporary *DSM*. I would like to illustrate it with a single case of the 18th century: A sixteen-year-old woman, whose husband is named Beaudoin, openly claims that she will never love her husband; that there is no law to order her to love him, that everyone is free to dispose of her heart and body as she pleases, and that it is a kind of crime to give one without the

---

15 Ibid, p. 115.
other. Although Beaudoin’s wife was considered foolish or crazy, those labels had no medical connotation. The behaviours were perceived under another sky, and confinement was a matter settled between the families and the legal authority without medical intervention.

People who would be committed were considered ‘dishonest’, ‘idle’, ‘depraved’, ‘sorcerer’, ‘imbecile’, ‘prodigal’, ‘impeded’, ‘alchemist’, ‘unbalanced’, ‘venereal’, ‘libertine’, ‘dissipater’, ‘blasphemous’, ‘ungrateful son’, ‘dissipated father’, ‘prostituted’ and ‘foolish’. In the records it can be read that the internment formulas also used terms such as ‘very evil and cheating man’ or ‘inveterate glutton’. France had to wait until 1785 for a medical order to intervene in the confinement of all these people: a practice that subsequently took shape with Pinel (painting at the top of this article). As I have said, moving away from the social norm would bring about the great theme of madness in the 19th century. It is from this point that we must understand the classifications of Kraepelin, Bleuler and the DSM of the 20th and 21st centuries.

In our century some psychiatrists openly say that ‘suicide is a brain disorder’: a blatantly pseudoscientific pronouncement. In the 17th century the pronouncements were not pseudoscientific yet, such as ‘murderer of himself’, a crime ‘against the divine majesty’ (i.e., the Judeo-Christian god). In the records of commitment for failed suicide attempts the formula used was: ‘he wanted to get rid’. It is to those who committed this crime against god that the torture instruments were first applied by 19th-century psychiatrists: cages with an open lid for the head and cabinets that enclosed the subject up to the neck. The transformation from an openly religious trial (‘against the divine majesty’) to the realm of medicine (a purported ‘brain disorder’) was gradual. What is now considered a biomedical disease in the 17th and 18th centuries was understood as extravagant, impious behaviour that endangered the prestige of a specific family.

---

16 Quoted in ibid, p. 213. It is interesting to compare the encyclopaedic history of so-called madness by Foucault that I have paraphrased above, written in opaque prose, with the brief though clear history of psychiatry by Thomas Szasz (e.g., *Cruel Compassion: The Psychiatric Control of the Society’s Unwanted*, Syracuse University Press, 1998).
In the 17th century, for the first time in history, people from very different backgrounds were forced to live under the same roof. None of the previous cultures had done something similar or seen similarities between these types of people (venereal, foolish, blasphemous, ungrateful children, sorcerers, prostitutes, etc.). That behind the confinement existed a moralistic judgment is discovered by the fact that people who suffered venereal diseases were locked up—the great evil of the time—only if they contracted the disease out of wedlock. Virtuous women infected by their husbands were not at risk of being taken to the General Hospital in Paris.

Homosexuals were locked up in hospitals or detention centres. Any individual who caused a public scandal could be committed. The family, and more specifically the bourgeois family with its demands to keep up appearances, became the rule that defined the confinement of any of its rebellious members. This was the moment when the dark alliances between parents and psychiatrists that would produce Dr. Amara’s profession started. Biological psychiatry would have an easy delivery with the gestation of the pair of centuries from the Great Confinement of the 17th century. The origins of the profession called psychiatry today can be traced back to that century.

Throughout the 18th century the confinement of people who did not break the law continued, and by the end of that century the houses of internment were full of ‘blasphemers’. The medieval Inquisition had had power in the south of France, but once the Inquisition was abolished, society found a legal way to control dissidents. It is known the case of a man in Saint-Lazare who was imprisoned for not wanting to kneel in the most solemn moments of the mass (this strategy was also practiced a century before). In the 17th century the unbelievers were considered ‘libertines’. Bonaventure Forcroy wrote a biography about Apollonius of Tyana, a contemporary of Jesus who was credited with miracles, and showed with this paradigm that the Gospel stories could also have been fictional. Forcroy was accused of ‘debauchery’ and imprisoned, also in Saint-Lazare.

The imprisonment of pariahs and undesirables was a cultural event that can be traced back to a specific moment in the long history of intolerance of post-Renaissance and post-Reformation Europe. The psychiatric values of Western man were
moulded in the 17th and 18th centuries, values that continue to determine the way we see the world.

‘Psychiatry’

At the end of the 18th century, there was no psychiatry as a medical specialty. The word psychiatry was coined by Johann Reil in 1808. The new profession took for granted a postulate that had roots in the medicine of ancient Greece. A postulate is a proposition that is admitted without proof. The postulated platform of the new profession assumed the organic origin of psychic disturbances. This postulate elevated to an axiom, and even to dogma, prevented the introduction of subjectivity in the study of mental disturbances.

As we saw with John Modrow [explained in a previous chapter of my second book], the reality is the diametrically opposite. Only by introducing the subjectivity of a soul in pain, and by rejecting the organic hypothesis, is it possible to understand what the hell is going on in the innermost chambers of those who suffer from mental distress and disorders. Objectivity in matters of the internal world of a subject is as impossible as the opposite case: approaching the empirical world in the manner of philosophers like Plato, who, from his idealist philosophy, despised the practical study of nature. This Platonic error cost the West the discovery of the scientific method, just as the antipodal error of reducing the humanities to science is misleading our civilisation. It is a categorical mistake trying to understand psychological trauma through neuroscience, as it is a categorical mistake trying to understand the empirical world, say astronomy, through social discourse. Postmodernist philosophers and psychiatrists represent two symmetrical, albeit diametrically opposed, attempts at extreme ideologies. The former want to reduce science to the humanities; the latter, the humanities to science: and none respects the other as a separate and intrinsically legitimate field.

The birth of modern psychiatry occurs when the outcast leaves the jurisdiction of the houses of confinement in France and the rest of Europe and is left in charge of the medical institution. In the profession of the 21st century, armed with a battery of genetics, neurology and nosological taxonomy, it is impossible to see what psychiatry is at its root. But in the book of Johann Christian
Heinroth, *Lehrbuch der Störungen des Seelenlebens (Textbook on the Disturbances of Mental Life)*, published in 1818, we see the fundamentals of psychiatry without the pseudoscientific smokescreen so common in our days. Following the tradition of the 17th and 18th centuries, Heinroth used the expression ‘mental illness’ and defined it as ‘selfishness’ or ‘sin’: terms he used interchangeably. Heinroth not only equated the Christian concept of sin with that of mental illness. Although he considered mental illness an ethical defect, Heinroth’s great innovation consists that he treated it with medical procedures.

How did Heinroth take this conceptual leap? Or we may ask, why should MDs reroute the flock of the straying sheep? This turn was not contemplated in the blueprints of the architects of the Great Confinement of the 17th century. Once the Inquisition was officially abolished, Heinroth himself wonders who would be the new social controller: ‘would this be the task of a doctor? or perhaps of a cleric? or of a philosopher? or an educator?’

The task fell, finally, on the physician. Presumably this was because, as the doctor deals directly with the physicality of human beings, it was easier to cover physical violence in the medical profession than in the other professions. At a time when the ideals of the French Revolution were still in the air, civil society would have suspected a cleric or a philosopher with jurisdiction over other people’s bodies, but not a doctor.

---

For people to accept the new inquisitor, they also had to literalise the central metaphor of the profession. Originally ‘mental illness’ was understood as a mere metaphor of what in previous centuries had been called ‘men of unreason’, a policy that put together the dissidents with the disturbed. When the doctor assumed the responsibility of occupying the role that used to be occupied by the officials of the houses of confinement, Heinroth assumed that the selfishness and sin that he treated were medical entities: something like saying that the ‘viruses’ that infect our hard drives are not a metaphor of subversive programs, but microorganisms. The literalisation of the metaphor ‘mental illness’ into an authentic illness would not have been possible if Heinroth and many other professionals of mental health had not counted with societal approval. The 19th century was the most bourgeois of recent centuries, and the social forces that drove the wealthy to lock up the undesirables were still expanding, even more than in the times when Heinroth himself was born.

The only way to understand Heinroth and his philosophy of the hammer is to let him speak. I have borrowed the following paragraphs from a study of Thomas Szasz. The first quoted sentence is taken from Medicina Psychica Politica (Psycho-Political Medicine): a title that perfectly illustrates how, in its origins, the psychiatrists did not speak in Newspeak but Oldspeak. Heinroth wrote: ‘It is the duty of the State to care for mentally disturbed persons whenever they are a burden to the community or present a public danger; and the accommodation, cure, and care of such individuals is the duty of the police’. But who are ‘mentally disturbed’? He answers: ‘It is those least deserving of freedom, namely the maniaci [maniacs], who love freedom best; and as long as they are left to themselves and their perverted activity, even if only in an Autenreith chamber, no recovery is thinkable’. The Autenreith chamber and the mask of the same name were torture apparatuses on which he explains his modus operandi:

Experience has shown that the patient in the sack is in danger of asphyxiation and of falling victim of convulsions… [In the confinement chair] the patient can remain bound in the chair for weeks on end without incurring the slightest bodily

\[18\] Ibid., pp. 74-75.
harm. [The pear is a] piece of hard wood, with the shape and dimensions of a medium-sized pear, has a cross-bar with straps which can be tied at the back of the neck of the patient. Since the oral cavity of the patient is more or less filled by the instrument, the patient can obviously utter no articulate sounds, but he can still utter stifled screams.19

Heinroth articulated some guidelines for the psychiatrist: ‘First, be master of the situation; second, be master of the patient’.20 Szasz comments that in these phrases psychiatry appears naked as to what it was and continues to be today: subjugation, enslavement and control of one human being by another. He also comments that contemporary psychiatrists, although they do similar things, do not speak frankly as they used to do in Heinroth’s time. However, Heinroth understood from the beginning that in his profession he had to disguise the torture chambers for social control as a hospital activity, for which he recommended: ‘all impression of a prison must be avoided’, a situation that persists today. In Spain, for example, contemporary psychiatrists have changed the bars of the windows by external blinds, some cosmetic though rigid metal sheets that serve as prison bars. The façade of psychiatric gardens of our century follows 19th-century regulations. About what happens behind the façade, according to Heinroth:

The edifice should have a special bathing section, with all kinds of baths, showers, douches, and immersion vessels. It must also have a special correction and punishment room with all the necessary equipment, including a Cox swing (or, better, rotating machine), a Reils’s fly-wheel, pulleys, punishment chair, Langermann’s cell, etc.21

Here are other words of this doctor who lived a century before Orwell wrote 1984. According to Heinroth, the psychiatrist appears to the patient as helper and saviour, as a father and benefactor, as a sympathetic friend, as a friendly teacher, but also as a judge who weighs the evidence, passes judgement,

19 Ibid., pp. 76-77.
20 Ibid., p. 77.
21 Ibid., p. 79.
and executes the sentence; at the same time seems to be the visible God to the patient... 22

Heinroth seems a hybrid between the Orwellian O’Brien and a contemporary man of his times: Sade. The fact that some psychiatrists see in Heinroth one of the founders of modern psychiatry and the precursor of Eugen Bleuler, speaks for itself and does not need further comment. Thanks to Heinroth and other apologists of medical violence, in the mid-19th century the metaphor ‘mental illness’ was recognised as an authentic disease. In England, the parliament granted the medical fraternity the exclusive right to treat the newly discovered disease. The first specialised journals in psychiatry appeared. The American Journal of Psychiatry, which was originally called the American Journal of Insanity and whose first issue appeared in 1844, published data, since its inception, that now are known to be fraudulent. 23 Throughout the 19th century countless of ‘imprudent’ women like Hersilie Rouy and Julie La Roche [cases mentioned at the beginning of my second book] were imprisoned by their parents and husbands; and the psychiatrists resisted attempts to inspect their ‘asylums’, as they were then called, because it interfered with medical autonomy. Many doctors tried to obtain important positions in the asylums.

The psychiatric profession, in its modern version, was born.

In the 20th century, the psychiatric profession consolidated its power and prestige in society. A smoke-screen terminology was developed and, for the man of the street, it became impossible to see psychiatry in its naked simplicity. Some sadists like Heinroth became ‘psychiatrists’, their tortures ‘treatments’, the social outcasts ‘patients’, the asylums ‘hospitals’ and dementia praecox ‘schizophrenia’. Before the creation of the Newspeak the asylums were properly called Poorhouses. Before drugs were designed to induce tortuous states for the mind, Emil Kraepelin and Bleuler used other methods of subjugation. In 1911 the latter experimented with a particularly disgusting medication that caused bleeding vomit, but at least Bleuler confessed with a frankness something no longer

22 Ibid., p. 78.
23 See, for example, Robert Whitaker: Mad in America: Bad Science, Bad Medicine, and the Enduring Mistreatment of the Mentally Ill (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Perseus, 2001), pp. 75ff.
seen in today’s psychiatry: ‘His behaviour improves. From the ethical point of view, I cannot recommend this method’. Similarly, in 1913 Kraepelin used to inject sodium nucleate to cause fever in his patients, who become more docile and obey the doctors’ orders.

Brain butchery

The great revolution in modern psychiatry occurred in the 1930s. Previously, with his instruments Heinroth and his colleagues had assaulted the body of citizens to control. But in the 1930s the assault on the body was abandoned by a more effective method: assaulting the brain directly. Metrazol shock, insulin shock and electroshock were introduced knowing that it killed brain cells.

Pentylenetetrazol (commercially known as Metrazol in North America and Cardiazol in Europe) causes a huge reaction in the victims. They suffered seizures so violent that they frequently broke their teeth, bones and spine. Metrazol shock was so devastating to the brain that, once its effect passed, some suffered regressive states and acted like babies; they played with their faeces, masturbated and wanted the nurses to mollycoddle them. When they recovered they prayed ‘in the name of humanity’ that they would not be injected with Metrazol again: a drug that subjugated even the hardest of the military. But by 1939 it was common to use Metrazol in most hospitals of the United States, which meant that in those times some inmates used to receive several injections.

The New York Times, Harper’s, Time and even Reader’s Digest joined the chorus of praises about a similar psychiatric treatment: insulin shock, which also produced frightening seizures. A Time writer wrote that while the patient descends in the coma ‘he shouts and bellows, gives free vent to his hidden fears and obsessions, opens his mind wide to listening psychiatrists’. The psychoanalysts interpreted the complaints of the victims in favour of their colleagues. In a meeting of the American Psychiatric Association Roy Grinker interpreted that the patient ‘experiences the treatment as a sadistic punishment attack which satisfies his unconscious...

---

25 Kraepelin, quoted in ibid.
sense of guilt’.\textsuperscript{26} Robert Whitaker, the author of a study on American psychiatry, calls this epoch, the first fifty years of the 20th century, ‘the darkest time’ in the history of psychiatry.

1935 marked the birth of lobotomy. Egas Moniz, a Portuguese psychiatrist, had started his experiments using alcohol to destroy the brain tissue of the frontal lobes, but changed the method by cutting them directly with a scalpel. His first guinea pig was a prostitute, and three months later he had lobotomised twenty people, each time daring to cut off more brain tissue from his victims. According to Moniz ‘to cure these patients we must destroy the more or less fixed arrangements of the cellular connections that exist in the brain’.\textsuperscript{27} Moniz’s work led to an explosion of lobotomies in the West, especially in the United States, but also in the United Kingdom, Italy, Romania, Brazil, Cuba and eventually in Mexico.

In 1941 the neurosurgeon Walter Freeman called this practice ‘brain-damaging therapeutics’.\textsuperscript{28} At least we must give Freeman credit that he did not express himself in Newspeak, but in the lingua franca of Heinroth: he recognised that lobotomy damages the brain. But in that decade the Swedish Academy awarded Moniz the Nobel Prize in medicine and the media was enthusiastic about the novel therapy, including the \textit{New York Times}, \textit{Time} and \textit{Newsweek}. A \textit{New York Times} editorial celebrated with these words the success on lobotomised people: ‘would-be suicides found life acceptable’.\textsuperscript{29} With such social support tens of thousands of lobotomies were practiced in the 1940s and 50s. It was believed that college students who had emotional problems, and even spoiled children, were ideal candidates for Freeman’s lobotomy. Whitaker mentions the effects of this radical operation. A lobotomised woman was described as ‘fat, silly and smiling’. Although she had been of lineage, another woman who underwent the operation defecated in a garbage dump. Lobotomised patients grabbed the food from the neighbour’s plate, or vomited in the soup and kept eating. Some of them did not get out of bed unless a family member ordered them to do so, and it was common for them to urinate there. Others just looked out the window. Those who had had jobs

\textsuperscript{26} The revelations about Metrazol appear in Whitaker’s book.
\textsuperscript{27} Egas Moniz, quoted in \textit{Mad in America}, 113.
\textsuperscript{28} Freeman, quoted in ibid, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{29} Quoted in ibid, p. 138.
before the operation were unable to make a living by themselves. It was possible to insult them and get a smile in response. Some referred to lobotomy as ‘a surgically induced childhood’, and you can already imagine the burden it represented for families to support them. But Freeman and his assistant Watts had a more positive view of things. They wrote that the lobotomised patient could be considered ‘a household pet’. The reports of the scientific journals also painted things in a favourable light for the medical profession. The language of science claims to be neutral, apolitical and non-emotional. It does not wield value judgments: the diametrically opposite to what I do in this book. In the professional literature where graphs and figures abound it is easy to write articles where the tragedy left by these semi-vegetable humans was not perceived as a crime.

Walter Freeman at the moment of cutting the healthy brain of one of his victims. Note how this was done openly with students learning from the lobotomist.

The ‘brain-damaging therapeutics’ of Moniz and Freeman lost momentum in the 1960s and 70s. It is currently difficult to know how many lobotomies are made in the world each year. According to an article in defence of lobotomy in Psychology Today (March/April 1992), at the beginning of that decade there were at least 200 to 300 ‘psychosurgeries’ openly declared every year. In fact, in the new century a few doctors still promote ‘psychosurgery’ for severe emotional problems and in some states of the United

30 Freeman, quoted in ibid, p. 124.
States special councils have been formed to review all proposals for these operations.\textsuperscript{31}

Although lobotomy fell into relative disuse, electroshock remains a standard psychiatric practice in the 21st-century profession. The electroshock was developed in 1938, inspired by a slaughterhouse in Rome where the pigs were electro-shocked to make it easier to slice their necks. A psychiatrist, Ugo Cerletti, had been experimenting with electric shocks on dogs, putting electrodes on the snout and anus of the dog. Half of the animals died of cardiac arrest. After seeing the electro-shocked pigs Cerletti decided to use it on humans. Cerletti’s first guinea pig was a homeless man who roamed the train station in Rome. Shortly after, in 1940, electroshock therapy was admitted at the other side of the Atlantic. Manfred Sakel, who introduced insulin shock in medical practice, compared his technique to the electroshock and commented on the latter: ‘the stronger the amnesia, the more severe the underlying brain cell damage must be’.\textsuperscript{32} This was another form of the ‘brain-damaging therapeutics’ of Moniz and Freeman.

Although the psychiatrists recognised all this in their specialised journals, in their public pronouncements they were more cautious. They painted ‘electroconvulsive therapy’ as a harmless therapy and said that the loss of memories was temporary. The media took the propaganda as honest science, and by 1946 half of the beds in American hospitals were occupied by psychiatric patients, some of whom had suffered the therapy. Two years later Albert Deutsch published \textit{The Shame of the States} and an article appeared in \textit{Life} magazine with shocking photographs about a reality that the American people ignored: what happened in the concentration camps called psychiatric institutions. Although the images contributed to the reform of the public facilities in the United States, the 20th century witnessed two other psychiatric revolutions. One was the consortium between psychiatrists and pharmaceutical multinationals; another, the invention of chemical lobotomies in the 1950s. Surgical lobotomy would fall into relative

\textsuperscript{31} Lobotomy, Microsoft® Encarta® Encyclopedia 2000. On the resurgence of lobotomy, see Peter Breggin: \textit{Toxic Psychiatry}, pp. 261ff and an article by Lawrence Stevens that can be read on the internet: ‘The brain-butchery called psychosurgery’.

\textsuperscript{32} Manfred Sakel, quoted in \textit{Mad in America}, p. 98.
disuse in favour of the use of neuroleptics: a more subtle form of social control.

From pesticides to antipsychotics

May 1954 is a memorable date for psychiatrists. For the first time a neuroleptic (popularly known as ‘antipsychotic’) was marketed, chlorpromazine, commercially named Thorazine in the United States and Largactil in some European countries, which revolutionised treatment in the profession. The first generation of phenothiazines from which chlorpromazine emerged had been used for pesticide purposes in agriculture. Also, experiments were known to induce catalepsy in animals.

The neuroleptic was a chemical intentionally designed as a neurotoxin, but millions of Thorazine prescriptions were prescribed in the United States. Under the effects of chlorpromazine, patients now could be ‘moved about like puppets’, and the first psychiatrist who experimented in the United States with this neuroleptic said that it ‘may prove to be a pharmacological substitute for lobotomy’.\(^{33}\) The campaign to sell Thorazine to the American society was so fierce that the same professionals called ‘Thorazine assault troops’ the propagandists of the company that manufactured them.\(^{34}\) This was the first massive incursion in the world of public relations carried out by a pharmaceutical company in a market that previously was very small: institutional psychiatry. In its first year of marketing, Smith, Klein & French obtained 75 million dollars with that drug. The rest, as they say, is history.\(^{35}\)

In 1955, *Time* magazine called the professionals who opposed chlorpromazine ‘ivory tower critics’. Gregory Zilboorg, the same psychiatrist who held the authors of the medieval *Malleus Maleficarum* in high esteem, said that the public was being deceived and that the drug only served to control the inpatient. Another doctor raised his voice and said that chlorpromazine was more

---

\(^{33}\) Heinz Lehmann, quoted in ibid., p. 144.

\(^{34}\) These words from the pharmaceutical company Smith, Kline & French appear in Loren Mosher: ‘Soteria and other alternatives to acute psychiatric hospitalisation’ in *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* (1999, 187), that I read on the internet.

\(^{35}\) Loren Mosher, Richard Gosden & Sharon Beder, ‘Las empresas farmacéuticas y la esquizofrenia’ in *Modelos de locura*, pp. 141s.
dangerous than heroin and cocaine. But the publicity muffled all internal dissidence.

By the mid-1960s more than ten thousand medical articles had been written about chlorpromazine. There were television campaigns that omitted any mention of the Parkinsonian-like effects of the drug, and the magazines were paid substantial sums if they advertised in their main articles the miraculous chemical. *Time, Fortune* and the *New York Times* were some of these prostitutes of the pharmaceutical corporations. The use of neuroleptics soon was considered cutting-edge among psychiatric treatments, triumphing over the induced commas with insulin, electroshock and lobotomy. In the 1960s the revolution of this miraculous alchemy, from pesticides to antipsychotics, was consummated and the mindset of the public had been implanted with the message that they were ‘anti-psychotic’ medicines: an idea that persists today. By 1970, nineteen million prescriptions for neuroleptics had been prescribed, and not just for people who were disturbed. Some juvenile delinquents and rebellious teenagers who were given the neuroleptic called it ‘zombie juice’, but the professionals counterattacked by introducing the euphemism ‘major tranquilizers’.

At the end of March 2001 in France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States, the prescription number of so-called ‘anti-psychotics’ was estimated in 43 million. In the case of children and adolescents, one study showed that between 1987 and 1996 the number of children who were given the drug had doubled. Between 1996 and 2000 the figure multiplied to reach the figure of one in fifty, although the most important age group was between 5 and 9 years old.\(^\text{36}\)

The propaganda through which multinational drug companies infect civil society about the ‘need’ to take these neurotoxins is performed through campaigns of ‘education’ to medical visitors and counsellors of schools and parents. Joe Sharkey, a financial journalist and author of *Bedlam: Greed, Profiteering and Fraud in a Mental Health System Gone Crazy* has reported that by the end of the 1980s, 25 percent of the earnings paid by health insurance went to the pockets of those who work in the area of

\(^{36}\)These figures appear in *Modelos de locura*, pages 124s.
mental health, largely due to the psychiatric treatment of these rebellious adolescents.\textsuperscript{37}

Furthermore, since the 1970s these professionals entered into a frank association with the drug companies. The consortium between psychiatrists and Big Pharma (pharmaceutical multinationals) is so brazen that all psychiatric conferences are financed by these corporations, and in some medical centres all laboratory research is also financed by multinationals. These companies also fund psychiatric journals. In addition, a study of eight hundred articles by some of the most prestigious scientific journals that do not specialise in psychiatry (Science, Nature, Lancet, The New England Journal of Medicine and the Proceedings of the National Academy of Medicine) found that 34 percent of the authors had financial interests with the Big Pharma. The pharmaceutical industry is the largest sponsor of psychiatric research in the United States, including research in universities and medical schools. It is estimated that in 1994 alone it spent one and a half-billion dollars in academic research.\textsuperscript{38} Some people have used the expression ‘Is academic medicine for sale?’ to describe this situation.

This is fundamental to understand why I say that psychiatrists, despite their impeccable medical credentials, enact a pseudoscience. It is clear that the sponsorship that these companies provide results in biologistic and pro-drug bias in research. The editors of specialised journals are very cautious when publishing articles by professionals who criticise biological psychiatry, especially if they question the effectiveness of psychotropic drugs or if they mention the terrible effects of drugs, such as tardive dyskinesia and dystonia produced by the so-called ‘antipsychotic’, symptoms which doctors euphemistically call ‘extrapyramidal symptoms’. Drug companies spend huge sums on advertisements that appear in specialised journals, and the publishers are not willing to offend their sponsors with articles that denounce the epidemics of drug-induced tardive dyskinesia, on the threat that the companies

\textsuperscript{37} Sharkey: Bedlam, p. 4. Sharkey’s book takes as a central theme the unjustified hospitalisations set up by psychiatrists, especially children and adolescents, to get as much money as possible from the insurance companies of their parents.

\textsuperscript{38} This information appears in Eliot Valenstein: Blaming the Brain, pp. 199 & 187.
will withdraw the advertising. The economic dependence of the journals with these companies leads not only to discretion, but many authors resort to self-censorship. As some mental health professionals say, the pharmaceutical industry owns the data obtained in the clinical tests it subsidizes and decides which studies should be published; chooses the authors, writes the articles and even the reviews to interpret the data. On the other hand, it is natural for new professionals in medical research to choose the area of the most promising future: the one that is generously financed by the drug companies. That is where the funds for their careers are found. There is a whole book on the subject, *How the Pharmaceutical Industry Bankrolled the Unholy Marriage Between Science and Business* of Linda Marsa, and this trend is much more evident in psychiatry. In a psychiatric journal there is less guarantee of scientific accuracy than in other specialised journals. In the profession it is no longer heard, as it used to be in the 1950s and 1960s, that abusive parents drive their children mad. The economic interests to hide this reality are enormous.

For example, in the mid-1990s a pharmaceutical market analyst claimed that the US $1 billion market for neuroleptics could grow to 4.5 billion a year. In May 2001, a report by the *Wall Street Journal* evaluated the neuroleptic market at 5 billion dollars a year, five hundred percent growth in five years. The total sales of neuroleptics in the United States in 2000 was 2.5 billion dollars, and international sales reached 6 billion dollars that same year. Only the neuroleptic Zyprexa gave Eli Lilly $1 billion in profits in 1998 (the incorrectly referred to as ‘antipsychotics’ are even used in veterinary!). In 1999/2000, the United States led the Western consumption of neuroleptics with 65 percent, followed by Europe with 22 percent and Latin America with 2.5 percent (I am not counting Russia, Asia or Africa). Given that many people want to control others in prisons, asylums, insane hospitals, correctional facilities for minors and even at home, the growth of market demand for these terrible drugs is comprehensible. These figures

---

39 Modelos de locura, p. 144.

are key to understanding the psychiatry of our days: a chemical Gulag.

**Big business**

Faced with a multi-billion dollar business that has subtly bought the doctors, universities and the media, the civil society can’t see what is happening. Just as in Heinroth’s time political actions were covered up in medical garb when the ideals of the Revolution were in the air, after the rebellion of the 1960s psychiatry reacted by covering itself more and more with the clothes of hard science, the paradigm of our days. In 1999 Professor Leonard Duhl of the University of California defined mental illness and poverty as did the ideologues of the Great Confinement of the 17th century: ‘the inability to command events that affect one’s life’.41 The consolidation and enlargement of psychiatric power continue in the 21st century. The tenfold increase in the use of neuroleptics in minors since the mid-1990s to the first five years of the new century, which is done with the publicity stunt that they are ‘at risk’, shows the cynicism of this marketing design.

Heinroth was a great visionary. He foresaw that drugs could be the prisons of the future. Although the neuroleptics had not been invented, Heinroth already spoke of ‘pharmaceutical means of restriction’ and ‘restrictive surgical means’, anticipating the lobotomy that Moniz would develop a century later. Since the regulations that would define the policies of the psychiatrists were enacted in the 19th century, the expansion of the chemical Gulag meant that long-term involuntary hospitalisation changed to long-term voluntary (or involuntary) drug addiction. Psychiatrists, of course, would say things differently. They say that in the treatment of mental illnesses the most outstanding event of the 20th century was the capability to synthesise these substances in laboratories. But this is one of the allegations of scientific progress that, analysed closely, is discovered fallacious.

In psychopharmacology there are no biographies of John, Peter or Mary when they are prescribed neuroleptics, neither when they are prescribed antidepressants, when stimulants are prescribed, or when tranquilizers are prescribed. There are no people in

---

41 Leonard Duhl, quoted in Szasz: *Pharmacacy*, p. 95.
biological psychiatry, or biologic psychiatry as I prefer to call it: only biochemical radicals that have to be normalised by other chemical substances. In an age that seeks easy solutions to the problems of the world, it is not necessary to delve into the past. Just calculate the dose of ‘happy pills’, be it Prozac or any other. This also happens with the abuse of illegal drugs and the only difference is that psychotropic drugs are legal. Approximately thirty million people have taken Prozac (fluoxetine), a drug that Newsweek has advertised with cover articles. The situation points more and more to the scenes of Brave New World of Aldous Huxley where, at the request of the State, every citizen consumed the drug called soma.

In the medical profession the environmental factors that prick our souls have disappeared from the map. If the ideology of the biologic psychiatrists is right, all our passions, traumas and conflicts, loves and fears, are not the result of our desires in conflict with the external world, but of the swings of small polypeptides in our bodies that are transformed into despair. In the preface to some editions of the DSM it is said that the future will completely erase the ‘unfortunate’ distinction between the popular concept of mental disorder and physical illness. On January 1, 1990, California became the first American state to accept the main dogma in psychiatry: that mental disorders are, in reality, diseases originating in brain dysfunctions. For example, it is claimed that high dopamine causes madness, and low serotonin, depression. (This reminds me that for Benjamin Rush, the father of American psychiatry, insanity was caused by low blood circulation in the head.) But in real neurological science the dopamine and serotonin claims have been debunked. Bioreductionist psychiatry is anything that sees supposed biological abnormalities in the body rather traumatic events in the family or the environment. It is like studying trauma not as a reaction to an outrageous act, say, the incestuous rape of Dora [mentioned earlier in my second book], but rather studying the temporal lobe of the raped girl, where the treatment is headed. The drugs, or the hammer of the electroshock, are the result of the medical axiom: ‘He who only knows how to use the hammer treats all things as if they were nails’.

---

42 See Valenstein, Blaming the Brain.
I am not caricaturing the profession. In November 2002 I had a long discussion with Dr. Miguel Pérez de la Mora, an experimental cell physiology physician of the Department of Biophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) and director of the Mexican Academy of Sciences. In the discussion with Pérez de la Mora I was struck by the fact that, when I mentioned the mental state of the inmates in the concentration camps, my contender immediately jumped to the subject of the amygdala and the anxiety that he studied in his laboratory: anxiety understood in a strictly biological way. In our surreal discussion, I took a long time to make the obvious point to the doctor: that the cause of the mental stress of the inmates was the brutalities in the camps. But even granted this point Pérez de la Mora added—without laboratory tests—that only those inmates in the fields who presumably had a genetic predisposition could have been the ones who became upset. For this neurologist and his colleagues, the concentration camps were a mere ‘the trigger mechanism’ for the disorder of a prisoner whose biology, presumably, was already defective! I must clarify the concept of ‘trigger mechanism’ of a supposed latent mental disorder. This is one of the main mantras of the psychiatrist, and exemplifies what I have called bioreductionism. For the bioreductionist, the human rights and psychological trauma are located in the background, and the only thing that matters is the genome project and the search for the ‘gene’ responsible for the disorder (or another strictly biological cause). The specialty of Pérez de la Mora is studying anxiety disorders in the laboratories of the UNAM, and during our discussion he confessed that the firm that manufactures the psychiatric drug Valium had financed his research. I pointed to Pérez de la Mora that a research financed by the same drug companies produces results with a clear biological bias. The eminent scientist told me that researchers rarely sell themselves to companies.

The reality is that the way that the pharmaceutical multinationals buy the scientists is infinitely subtler than direct bribery. Roche, which manufactures Valium, simply finances professionals who postulate biological hypotheses, and no other. Never Roche or the competition would give us a penny to those who investigate psychological trauma. Our line of research is a proposal that requires social engineering and changes in the nuclear family to avoid the mistreatment of children. But in our world
nobody wants to finance the researcher who puts the parents in the dock. For example, no institution funded the research to write this book. On the other hand, the medical model promotes the drugging of the abused child without changing the parental mistreatment that caused mental distress in the first place. Only in this way does the field enjoy the approval of society. If the anxiety that Perez de la Mora studies, or panic, depression, addictions, phobias, mania, obsessions and compulsions are the result of abnormal biology, the human and existential content that has caused these experiences becomes irrelevant.

The thinking of our time is being confined to a one-dimensional world as far as mental health is concerned. Bioreductionism, the ideology of the medical doctors with blinders that do not want to see the social sides, is a doctrine whose conceptual frame is quite simple: determinism and reductionism (‘Your biology is your destiny’). But as psychiatrists present this doctrine with all its scientific sophistication, the matter apparently is complicated. The following Szaszian analogy illustrates how simple, at the bottom, biopsychiatry is.

The primitive witch-doctor, who tried to understand Nature in human terms, treated objects as agents: a position known as animism. The modern witch-doctor, who tries to understand the subjectivity of man in terms of Nature, treats agents as objects: a position known as bioreductionism. Primitive man has been demystified in our scientific era. Who will demystify psychiatrists?

August 23, 2018

Postscript: I wrote this piece some time ago and I have not reviewed the latest critiques of psychiatry in scholarly books. However, as I said in ‘On depression’, I keep watching Robert Whitaker’s videos on YouTube. Nothing in recent years has moved me to change my mind about pseudoscientific psychiatry.
How awake are you?

by Mauricio

Level 1:
Nazis are evil, Democracy is good.
Jews are Holocaust survivors.
Christianity is for idiots.

Level 2:
Nazis were misled by an antisemitic demagogue.
The Holocaust may be false.
Christianity is ‘okay’.

Level 3:
Germans were fighting against Zionists.
The Holocaust is false, Zionism is evil.
Christianity is good.

Level 4:
White Nationalism is good.
Jews are evil.
Christianity is a White religion.

Level 5:
National Socialism is good.
America is evil.
Christianity has been corrupted by Jews.

Level 6:
National Socialism is the only solution.
All nations are evil.
Christianity has always been a Jewish Psy-op.
Level 7:
White segregation is the only solution.
Modernity is evil.
Anti-Christian Paganism is good.

Level 8:
There are no political solutions.
Civilisation is evil.
Blood and Soil is the only true religion.

Level 9:
Non-white exterminationism is the only solution.
Most Whites are not true Whites.
All Whites are spiritually flawed.

Level 10:
Ten percent of Whites are true humans, and must survive.
Ninety percent of Whites are defective humans, of which fifty percent must die (males).
A hundred percent of non-Whites are sub-humans, and all must die.

Personally I’m a level 9, verging on level 10. I’ve met some level 4, and only a few level 5. The leap from 5 to 6 is astronomical due to the Christian malware rejection. Feels lonely sometimes.

______ & ______
Smelling of blood

There is something that can trigger the dormant murderous spirit of the Aryan: the smell of human blood. I remember that when Bush Jr. invaded Iraq, for the first time on the internet the hits no longer were the degenerating porn sites. The sites who talked about the war got the first place.

What would happen to the Aryan psyche if my prophecy against the American dollar is fulfilled, leading to social chaos in the big cities? Yes: freedom of expression in the country of the First Amendment is constrained by law. The absolute limit seems to be the Brandenburg Law that allows the American to talk about the revolution as long as it is an academic subject; never to incite an immediate act of violence.

Under that constraint, I ask English-speaking natives to write a novel inspired by the novels of Pierce, who died at the beginning of the century, and Covington who died this year. But unlike them the novel that I have in mind would be a sort of Frequent Asked Questions on how to lead a realistic revolution in our times.

It seems obvious to me that in that work of fiction the idea would be to win the first battle: to silence the media. All anchors would be threatened by the revolutionary command: ‘A single anti-white message that comes from your lips implies the death penalty for you, or your loved ones…’

The fictional work—which I cannot write because my native language is Spanish—could begin with the story that, in the near future, there are not many revolutionaries and such a civil war cannot be born. However, with time the pro-white movement would grow exponentially while the policies of anti-white genocide in South Africa, North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand increase. In our hypothetical novel the moment would come when only the hardest core of such an expanding movement would be of the calibre of Brenton Tarrant. With two thousand
Tarrants the freedom fighters would begin to silence, through sheer terror, the mainstream media...

That would be the guiding principle of the novel that would have to be sold by a medium alien to Amazon or Lulu insofar as, although a purely fictional work does not violate the Brandenburg Law, the Silicon Valley and some corporations do violate your First Amendment rights.

_October 28, 2018_
Dark night of the soul

I’m looking forward to Richard Spencer and James Edwards running for president and vice president in 2024 to let white nationalists know that, legally, they’re not going anywhere (cf. Charlottesville). The time has come to speak about a revolution within the limits allowed by the law of the United States. Because the book *Siege* is the most popular of the radical wing of the nationalists, I must say a few words about the author, and *Siege* readers. Joseph Walsh posted this comment online: ‘I think James Mason’s current philosophy—that there’s no need for revolutionary action because NS Germany sacrificed for us all, just wait until the climax comes—is related to the fact that Mason’s had enough days of action and is now a 66-year-old Boomer in retirement phase’.

In 1980 James Nolan Mason took over writing *Siege*, a newsletter for would-be revolutionaries, and he continued publishing it until 1986. This was, of course, in times previous to the internet. In mid-2017 some young members of the so-called Atomwaffen Division contacted Mason personally after decades of their guru having lived in the dark. They wanted to have him as a veteran advisor of a small group that aspires to become revolutionary. One of them commented on *The West’s Darkest Hour* and I learned that Mason had been immersed in mystical issues and ‘Christian Identity’ all those years. The racists who believe in it promote a pseudoscientific interpretation of Christianity: that the Caucasian Aryans are the true descendants of the biblical Jacob.

What happened to the revolution that Mason used to preach? Is it possible that Christian Identity, or whatever mystical interpretation of Christianity, tamed the blond beast? There are many 66-year-old Islamists who yearn to die heroically in Jihad attacks for their holy cause. What would have happened if, instead of the Christian pond to which Mason fell after writing *Siege*, he had reached the towers that appear below?
I do not believe in the magic of the Tarot. But I do believe, as Jung said, that the figures in the pack of cards represent archetypal symbols. And from this angle I can use the symbol of La Lune (The Moon) to offer my views on James Mason and those of his epigones who, like him, continue to admire Charles Manson. Unlike the psychoanalysis of the Jew Freud, Jung’s analyses had much more Aryan overtones. So here I would like to interpret Mason’s pond from what Sallie Nichols wrote about the card La Lune.

As we see in the picture, the hero that Nichols had seen in other Tarot cards does not appear in The Moon. The intellectual ego of the hero has been submerged in a pond. He fell deeply into a depression, because unlike the hopeful card The Star no human figure appears to help him out of the darkness. He is as immersed in the aqueous unconscious as is the prehistoric crab imprisoned in the pond. This is the blackest moment in the journey of the twenty-two cards of the Major Arcana: a journey towards the knowledge of our Self (the ideal of the Oracle of Delphi).

The territory that is on the other side of the water is unknown land, a country unexplored until very recently (again, see

---

43 This article contains paraphrases of Sallie Nichols’ Jung and Tarot. Nichols (1908-1982) was a lecturer at Jungian organisations in California. A long-time student of Jung’s psychology, she had the opportunity to study at the Carl Gustav Jung Institute in Zurich while Jung was still alive.
my autobiographical trilogy). Advancing through this place full of abysmal terrors and infinite promises, the towers of distance, requires great courage: more than Mason and his epigones have shown in their later years as it involves full apostasy, not pseudo-apostasy, from the religion of our parents. As in the initiation rites that we see in Gore Vidal’s *Julian* that the apostate passed through, in the transition that the hero must now face he should go by naked and alone. He just cannot go back to the mandates of Christian ethics as most folks in the alt-right do. It takes courage and faith to act as our ancestral enemy, Abraham, did: to get away ‘from your people, from your loved ones, from your home, in search of the land to which I will lead you’ (Gen. 12: 1).

In a route that goes exactly opposite Jerusalem—to Jerusalem all ethnosuicidal whites of our century are heading—, our hero must transform himself to be reborn from the night of terror. On the card we find other accidents in the sky that are bad omens, because the multicoloured drops that appear, unlike the card The Sun, are directed from the earth to the sky. It is as if the Goddess Moon, as a devouring mother, called to herself all the creative energy from the land of the white man—pagan Rome—leaving it desolate and empty. It is the Dark Night of the Soul that some Christian saints spoke about. In psychological terms, it symbolises a triumph of Jerusalem over Rome: the devouring aspects of the serpent of *Laocoön and His Sons* that have resulted in a historical psychosis throughout the West. The Moon of the image seems to suck the energies of the alt-right hero, leaving him weakened to even think about revolutionary action.

But rebelling against Judeo-Christianity also has its perils. As we see in the card, the dogs of Hecate, also trapped under the spell of the Goddess of Night, could tear the hero apart, leaving him raging and foaming at the mouth into a perpetual night: a psychosis without recovery like the one Nietzsche suffered from 1889 to 1900, when he died. But only in the regions of greatest terror, such as the darkest hour that poor Nietzsche suffered while writing his last books, can the golden treasure be found. As Jung said, enlightenment is not achieved by imagining (as silly New Agers do) figures of light. It is achieved by making ourselves familiar with our darkest side (what I do with my disturbing autobiographical books). The hero sees the river crab trapped in the pond and feels it is ready to abandon its annoying carapace (the last Christian
vestiges) and climb the scale of evolution (as those anti-Christians who dined at the Führer’s table had done). Wet with our own dew of the *lacrimae lunae*, the tears of the moon, when we are faced with this card the towers look very attractive. One wants to move forward to discover what’s inside them. There is no possible return: the road, especially in other pictorial versions of the Tarot’s Moon, leads clearly forward. One of the towers means the knowledge that the authors of my previous compilation provide, like the history of Christianity and how Christian ethics have turned the Aryans into lunatics: a perpetual night of the soul from which not even the toughest revolutionaries have awakened.

Regular visitors to this site will remember that, last July, I interrupted my weekly publication of *Siege* on my website. Mason had written: ‘In Southern Europe, Christianity came to power slowly, via more subtle means, while in Northern Europe it was brought to power largely by the use of the sword’ (James Mason, *Siege*, Iron March publication, revision of 2015, page 130). In my website I offered my reply: Mason wrote this article in February 1981, the year of my first visit to the US. There was no internet and Mason was completely unaware that Southern Europe had suffered an hostile takeover by fanatic Christians after Constantine empowered them. Remember: the real history of early Christianity has only been revealed to the general public of our times thanks to the efforts of Karlheinz Deschner in German, Vlassis Rassias’ book *Demolish Them* in Greek, and more recently Catherine Nixey in English. At the time that Mason wrote his article only ivory-tower academics knew about the apocalypse that southern whites had suffered in the 4th and 5th centuries.

But not only ivory-tower academics knew about real history. Hitler mentioned it in his table talks and, to write *Julian*, Vidal had to read a huge amount of classical literature while living in Rome (he wrote the novel from 1959 to 1964). That knowledge was treasured in a tower waiting for wiser men than Vidal. Ever since I read the book of Nichols those towers have reminded me of the library tower of *The Name of the Rose* by Umberto Eco, located in the Middle Ages when knowledge of certain forbidden books was feared by a monk who began to poison those who dared to read them. Except for the Franciscan William, who evokes the memory of Roger Bacon, all learned monks were living in the darkest night for the Western mind. But what about today’s so-called awake
whites? Christian Identity influence on James Mason? Libertarians (Mammon worshipers) craving for an ethnostate within the US (can there be something more antipodal to Sparta than Murka)? Alt-right pundits discussing mind-rotting Hollywood films? Antisemite white nationalists who, through their Christianity, cling to the god of the Jews? All that and much more is just howling at the Moon in a dense and haunted night instead of reaching the finis Africae: the writings of those authors I’ve collected and my tragic confessions elsewhere. (In Eco’s novel the finis Africae was a hidden room in the tower that contained the forbidden works of the so-called pagans.)

The time has come to speak about a revolution, yes. But excepting the late William Pierce’s fiction (The Turner Diaries) or the elder Michael O’Meara’s non-fiction (Toward the White Republic), young revolutionaries pathetically lack a sound mind. Manson & Mason fans are like the Antifa with opposite colours on their banners. Remember that passage by Evropa Soberana?: ‘A soldier far from home, without a country, an ideal or a feminine image of reference—a model of perfection, an axis of divinity—immediately degenerates into a villain without honour. Conversely, if he can internalise an inner mystique and a feminine symbolism that balances the brutality he witnesses day after day, his spirit will be strengthened and his character enoble. Sparta had no problems in this regard; Spartan women were the perfect counterpart of a good warrior’.

Unhinged racists badly need a Beatrice that guides them through the path. I refer not to the tower of manly knowledge that the previous compilation provides but the other tower of the card that requires another compilation of a very different constellation of authors for the proverbial knowledge of our Self.

January 24, 2019
How to approach a woman in the darkest hour for the white race? Since prehistory, man-woman relationships have never been in such a psychotic state as they are today in the West. Those neophytes to the subject who have not read anything could start through an academic reading (F. Roger Devlin) or a crude reading (the so-called Incel movement). Andrew Anglin, editor-in-chief of the notorious *Daily Stormer*, supports the latter. Responding to an article on *Occidental Dissent*, Nikola Bijeliti said on *Stormfront*:

I used to like *The Daily Stormer* and would read it every day. Andrew Anglin is obviously a very intelligent man who has deep insight into a lot of things. I have to say that I have learned a lot from reading his articles, particularly his articles about women. Let me give a couple of examples. Many here will disagree, but here are a couple of insightful things that he has said. I am paraphrasing, but it captures the spirit of it:

Moral convictions are a male thing. Women don’t have moral convictions, so it is useless to try to convince them of anything. Women merely repeat the moral convictions of the men who protect them. The second is a corollary of this: It is not necessary to recruit any women into the movement; it is only necessary to recruit men, because men’s wives and
girlfriends, if properly treated, will support the principles of their men. Reading that was a revelation to me. None of the above is in any way anti-women; it is merely a recognition of the difference between male and female nature.

True, but a real Aryan would fight, as William Ventvogel proposed in ‘The Future of White Women’ (republished in The West’s Darkest Hour under the title of ‘Lycanthropy’) a racial revolution that recovers the white woman for the white man. But while the holy racial revolutions arrive, what to do?

Visitors of my blog, will be familiar with one of my guidelines for the Priest of the Fourteen Words: ‘Speak only with Aryan males’. That does not mean that it is impossible to communicate with any woman. Visitors also know that this site regularly quotes Catherine Nixey’s book about the destruction of the Greco-Roman world by Christians. Also, in the forums that defend the West there are a few women who also represent the exception that confirms the rule. A directive is only a directive, not an iron rule. But in general terms it is almost impossible to communicate the most serious issues with the bulk of the female population. Anglin is basically right: they come from Venus and we from Mars, and their PC Operating System is not exactly compatible with our Macs. That does not mean that we despise them. It means that the yin is not the Yang but its complement. I will explain it through my personal philosophy.

As some visitors know, I have written two thick autobiographical volumes (and I’m writing a the third). Day of Wrath, the English translation of selected chapters of those two volumes, is partial in one respect. The translations are texts that appeal to the left hemisphere of our brain, texts that men are capable of understanding. But the autobiographical part of my trilogy is missing in Day of Wrath because it appeals to the right hemisphere. Those are texts in which women understand me better (and this site is for Aryan males). No man among those to whom I have given them manuscripts from my first volume, Hojas Susurrantes, has understood me. But I’ve received very good feedback from a couple of women. With men I cannot communicate heart problems for the simple reason that they have not developed their soul well.
Years ago I mentioned the concept of the eternal feminine on this site but did not explain it because it is a numinous feeling rather than an intellectual concept. A male balanced in *yin* and *Yang* could decode the double helix, Mars and Venus, from my books written in the language of Cervantes. But not everyone has developed his soul (among white nationalists, Tom Goodrich is the exception). *Anima* means in Latin soul. In the analytical psychology of Jung, he alludes to the archetypal images of the eternal feminine in the unconscious of a man, which form a link between the consciousness of the ‘I’ and the collective unconscious, potentially opening a path to the Self. (To understand these concepts see the illustrations on the *anima* in *Man and his Symbols* of Jung and his female disciples.)

The reason that among men we cannot communicate in matters that most concern our feelings is simple. To communicate those issues one has to cry sometimes and the feedback of s/he who listens to the tragedy must be at the emotional level, not through the cold and intellectual reason. Women can communicate with each other for the simple fact that it is common for them to touch each other, comfort themselves, cry a little and hug each other without an iota of lesbianism. But we heterosexual men cannot do that with another man (I for one even dislike my cousins wanting to hug me in public). Men can talk about very abstract issues, but communicating with a male friend about intimate problems is not our strength.

In such parallel universes are men in matters of the heart that, when a man in deep depression tries to speak out with his best buddy over the phone, the ‘friend’ tells him such idiotic things that he is shocked when, a couple of hours later, he learns that the depressed one has just committed suicide. It’s a story I’ve heard more than once, and this also applies to those in the white nationalist movement who were seriously abused as children or teenagers and have all their biographical pain buried and dissociated from their own selves.

So the nuclear content of my two books has not appeared on this site, nor will it appear. I know from experience that a tragedy becomes a non-tragedy in the ears of Neanderthal men because they have not sufficiently developed the soul that Goodrich has talked about. In plain English, since we straight men cannot touch ourselves and cry as women do, we cannot communicate our
most serious existential problems among ourselves. That is why Schopenhauer was correct in advising us to have a woman as a confidant of such problems. The stronghold of women, Schopenhauer observed, is the compassion that, according to the philosopher, is the highest of human virtues. Therefore, since the middle 1990s I have had a female friend with whom I can communicate the *yin* content of my mind. It is not recommended to be romantically involved with this confidant because that would cloud the relationship into other venues.

Now let’s go to the opposite case. Compassionate women, in general terms, are unable to understand the cold reasons of the manly intellect. Few have a developed *animus*. *Animus* means, in Latin, mind, intellectual powers or courage. In Jung’s analytical psychology, he alludes to the archetypal images of the eternal masculine in the unconscious of a woman, which form a link between the consciousness of the ‘I’ and the collective unconscious, potentially opening a path to the Self (again, to understand the concept of the *animus* see *Man and Its Symbols*). Given that the bulk of women do not have a developed *animus*, it is useless to make them dizzy with lots of Jared Taylor-type statistics on race realism, or trying to educate them on Austrian economics. (The West will soon experience a financial and social crisis far worse than the one started in 1929, so revolutionaries will have their chance.) We have to tune into their wavelength. Bear in mind that I have been communicating with the aforementioned woman for a couple of decades, and I can say that Schopenhauer was right: I see things that she cannot see, and she sees things in life that I am unable to see.

All the intellectual content of the white nationalist webzines is useless when talking to women, especially if they come from the left (the left perverts the natural compassion of white women). The priests of Lane’s sacred words should only try to communicate something that appeals to their vanity, say: *If I am in favour of the ethnostate it’s simply because I don’t want your beauty to disappear* (through miscegenation). For these words to have a certain weight on the female in question, there may not be any romantic interest involved in the priest who pronounces them.

The italicised words above could even become a mantra, and it is the only thing that the priest of the fourteen words is advised to tell a spoiled woman. Regarding Jung’s psychology I
could philosophise a little saying that the ‘Absolute’ of Schelling and Hegel resonates with the Jungian ‘Self’ and, from the Faustian point of view, only the understanding of the eternal feminine will lead the white race to the Absolute.

*February 18, 2019*
On empowering birds feeding on corpses

‘Christian ethics was like a time bomb ticking away in Europe, a Trojan horse waiting for its season’. —William L. Pierce

‘1945 was the year of the total inversion of Aryan values into Christian values’. —Joseph Walsh

The articles of The Occidental Observer are academic. But Tobias Langdon’s article yesterday on how the left has begun to devour itself is fascinating. His article deals with the cultural war that transgender men are winning over radical feminists—including mulatto, lesbian and Jewish feminists that one would imagine are, in the inverted epoch of today, the most powerful.

Currently, trans men have begun to place themselves at the top of the pyramid thanks to Orwell’s observation: all men are equal but some are more equal than others. These men only have to declare themselves women and in several states of the US they are allowed to enter their bathrooms, changing rooms and showers. Langdon mentions a tranny, who still has a penis and a couple of testicles, who is very interested in the feminine tampons that pubertal girls leave in the baths. Of course: in our sick society he’s untouchable… Tucker Carlson and the radical feminists complain a lot that trans men are also beginning to dominate women’s sports. The most impressive phrase of the article by Langdon is that ‘Stale pale males who were at the very bottom of the victimhood hierarchy have leapt to the very top of it in a single bound, thanks to the superpower of transgenderism’. So true: the radical feminists who dare to criticise these trans men are now being deplatformed from social media with typical accusations that their complaints are ‘hate’.

A woman commented about Langdon’s article at the Observer: ‘We need no further proof that Satan rules the world…’ I would argue the opposite: at last Christ rules.
White nationalists have a rather superficial idea of the history of Christianity. Their knowledge of our parents’ religion does not go beyond historical books at the level of those Reader’s Digest books for families of pious Christians that I find in the library my father left behind. A deeper look beyond the Reader’s Digest level reveals that the reversal of the scale of values that has now maddened the West originated nothing less than in the Gospel message. Every time some Christians wanted to apply the Gospel in its purity, the medieval Church, in all its wisdom, crushed them: they knew how dangerous that would have been for the health of pre-Reformation Europe. I am not asking white nationalists to read the ten volumes of Karlheinz Deschner on the history of Christianity. If they only read the best historical novel that has been written about the period to which I have in mind, they would realise what I mean. The Name of the Rose of Umberto Eco contains a passage that throws great light on what happens today with the empowering of trans men: until recently, the most dispossessed creatures of the kingdom of God.

Adso: ‘But you were speaking of other outcasts; it isn’t lepers who form heretical movements’.

William of Baskerville: ‘The flock is like a series of concentric circles, from the broadest range of the flock to its immediate surroundings. The lepers are a sign of exclusion in general. Saint Francis understood that. He didn’t want only to help the lepers; if he had, his act would have been reduced to quite a poor and impotent act of charity. He wanted to signify something else. Have you been told about his preaching to the birds?’

Adso: ‘Oh, yes, I’ve heard that beautiful story, and I admired the saint who enjoyed the company of those tender creatures of God’, I said with great fervour.

William of Baskerville: ‘Well, what they told you was mistaken, or, rather, it’s a story the order has revised today. When Francis spoke to the people of the city and its magistrates and saw they didn’t understand him, he went out to the cemetery and began preaching to ravens and magpies, to hawks, to raptors feeding on corpses’.

Adso: ‘What a horrible thing! Then they were not good birds!’
William of Baskerville: ‘They were birds of prey, outcast birds, like the lepers. Francis was surely thinking of that verse of the Apocalypse that says: “I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven: Come and gather yourselves together at the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them…!”’

Adso: ‘So Francis wanted to incite the outcasts to revolt?’

William of Baskerville: ‘No, that was what Fra Dolcino and his followers wanted [the violent and revolutionary wing of the Fraticelli], if anybody did. Francis wanted to call the outcast, ready to revolt, to be part of the people of God. If the flock was to be gathered again, the outcasts had to be found again. Francis didn’t succeed, and I say it with great bitterness. To recover the outcasts he had to act within the church; to act within the church he had to obtain the recognition of his rule, from which an order would emerge, and this order, as it emerged, would recompose the image of a circle, at whose margin the outcasts remain’.

The dialogue between these two Franciscan monks of the 14th century hits the nail regarding the point of view of this site: the two epigraphs that appear at the top of this entry. The season of the horse of Troy of which Pierce wrote, that is to say the complete inversion of Aryan values into Gospel-inspired values, has finally arrived.
Following the resignation of Pope Benedict XVI in 2013, a papal conclave elected the Argentinean Jorge Mario Bergoglio as his successor. As Bergoglio chose Francis as his papal name in honour of St. Francis of Assisi, my father, a great fan of the saint of Assisi, expressed a few words of surprise. He wondered while watching the ceremony how it was possible that only until the 21st century did an elected pope choose the name of the most beloved saint for Catholics? Short answer: because the Catholic Church was not openly suicidal as it is today.

Since the native language of this Argentinean pope is Spanish, when I hear him speak I understand him better than those who don’t know the language. It really seems to me that, for the first time in the history of the Church, the purest message of the Gospel has reached the Vatican. I remember very well, for example, the occasion when Bergoglio, already Pope, declared that the theme of poverty (the lepers of yore) was at the very core of the Gospel. I also remember his words about homosexuals (Bergoglio is the first pope to use the Newspeak term ‘gay’: a word that wasn’t used to designate them when he and I were children) and the trans men who visited him in the Vatican.

What they say in the forums of white nationalism is false: that the Pope has betrayed his principles. On the contrary: the dream of gathering again the ravens, magpies and birds feeding on corpses has been fulfilled.

When I discovered white nationalism the term used to designate the enemy was the very generic ‘liberalism’. In his Observer article Langdon uses the term currently in vogue, ‘cultural Marxism’. Recently I suggested that the most accurate term would be ‘neochristian’. This term includes the scale of values of both Christians and liberals: the last (e.g., the tranny) shall be the first and the first shall be the last. After all, ‘Francis wanted to call the outcast, ready to revolt, to be part of the people of God. If the flock was to be gathered again, the outcasts had to be found again. Francis didn’t succeed… To recover the outcasts he had to act within the church; to act within the church he had to obtain the recognition of his rule, from which an order would emerge, and this order, as it emerged, would recompose the image of a circle, at whose margin the outcasts remain’.

March 7, 2019
On the mental health of racists

For an individual who has transvalued his values, racism is not a vice but one of the highest virtues of the white man. Once this is clarified, let’s get down to business.

The white man has lost his mind. Never in the history of the West had a zeitgeist of self-hatred seized the collective unconscious of the white man in such a dreadful way as it does today. The present is, as I have said, the worst generation of whites since prehistoric times.

That does not mean that those who haven’t fallen into the folie en mass of ethno-suicidal hatred are automatically sane. As I have also said on this site, they are only sane to the extent that they have crossed half of the psychological Rubicon (race, Jewish issue and ethnic state). But they need to cross the other half (the Christian problem and the transvaluation of values so well described in Mauricio’s rating levels). The failure to finish crossing it implies psychosis in my opinion, as the large boulder on which they are stranded in the middle of the river is not a place to reside. It is not yet firm ground, and one cannot escape from Normieland by fleeing from that side of the river without daring to cross it completely.

Among those stuck in the middle of the psychological Rubicon quite a few suffer from mental health issues. This is obvious every time a mass shooter makes a prank. Without even knowing the ethnic group of the shooter (the last time he turned out to be black) several demented people, in the comments section of racist forums, immediately jump to premature conclusions; for example, that it must be a false flag to eliminate the Second Amendment of their country. Even the most intelligent commenters sometimes have traits of psychosis. Not long ago on this site, some of the smartest I have encountered admired Charles Manson. As I’ve mentioned in a previous article, James Mason started such insane admiration among racists: admiration included
in *Siege*. Well, *Siege* readers have failed to realise that, if their manual hasn’t been able to galvanise a portion of the revolutionary population to the degree of forming a serious organisation, that could be due to this trait of the author. I not only refer to his praises of Manson but to his Christianity, incompatible with crossing the rest of the river.

But what I want to convey is something deeper than the Mason/Manson affair. Many people who defend the West on the internet have had mental health problems precisely because the System had put us, previously, into hell. This is clear in the biographies of those who suffered bullying in school and, transferrationally, identify with young shooters in schools, such as Columbine. To give a specific example, I read Andy Nowicki’s novel, *The Columbine Pilgrim* (Andy has been a featured author in Greg Johnson’s Counter-Currents Publishing). Just compare the frivolous genre Nowicki chose with my gravitas: writing about the events of my life with the real names and without altering the facts in fiction as Nowicki did. Is it not reasonable to suppose that, after writing my eleven books, the degree of my psychic integration could be greater than that of Nowicki? After all, it is not the same to write the novels that Solzhenitsyn wrote about the Red Terror than to have written *The Gulag Archipelago*. Here is another example. Hunter Wallace of *Occidental Dissent* had serious problems with his parents, who committed him to a psychiatric ward for a season. Like Nowicki, Wallace has not recreated that hell in an autobiography. Although I was never hospitalised, my parents did something similar to what they did to Wallace as an adolescent. Is it any wonder that he who has not processed his pain continues to cling to the religious dogmas of his parents? (remember, many people have their parents’ wounds heal with their relationship with ‘God’).

The list could grow, but I do not know the specific testimonies of those nationalists who have had serious mental issues because they don’t talk much about them, probably not even in intimate diaries.

I was never mentally ill in the sense of, say, classic psychiatric categories such as schizophrenia, depression, bipolar disorder or addictions. But cognitively speaking I was very ill when, after the hellish conditions at home, I joined a cult from whose dogmas I didn’t get cured until September of 1995. It is true that believing the dogmas of a sect isn’t considered psychosis by current
psychiatry, because in that case it would be possible to say that also those who believe in more traditional churches are equally psychotic. But in my view, any serious cognitive distortion of reality represents a psychotic state whether it comes from a minority church, a majority church, a cult or believing in conspiracy theories. And from this angle, even the psychiatrists themselves are psychotic with their demented ideology, as I have demonstrated in two long articles in this book and in another anti-psychiatric article in Day of Wrath.

But going back to the commenters of white nationalist forums. Right here I have been told, in the comments section, that my main flaw is a huge ego. I do not see it that way. Rather, for having written those eleven books, most of them confessing my tragic life, I can see things that the common nationalist is unable to see. Even much of the psychotic mono-causality that we see in some quarters of white nationalism (blame Jewry for everything), along with their equally psychotic Christianity (as an antisemite obeying the god of the Jews is, by definition, a schizophrenic) are due to the most elementary lack of insight or knowledge of oneself.

In the discussion thread that got the most visits from all the recent threads I cited ‘The Soul and the Barbed Wire’, already quoted in this book. He who has been severely abused at home should take a vacation to ponder on his distant past, the unconscious that lies under the tip of the iceberg, despite how horrible the surfing experience may be.

Not long ago I saw in a program a diver saying that surfing beneath an iceberg’s tip was a rather eerie experience. Although most men avoid psychic diving because it gives the creeps, it is the only way to know thyself.

March 25, 2019
WN is a club for women

We live in the darkest hour for the white race since prehistory. This means that almost one hundred percent of whites are degenerate, including those who should be the protectors of white women and children, Aryan men.

As David Lane said in his ‘Open letter to a dead race’, if there are not 30,000 warriors hiding for some reason, the white race is lost. That means that our attitude must be Revolutionary, not reactionary. White nationalism and the alt-right are reactionary. It is a movement basically of women, not of men, in the sense of feminised western males, and therefore altogether inefficient. If all WN forums we see today were actually run by women for women’s readership, I wouldn’t complain. But only males can actually defend them and their children.

That does not mean that, as men that we are, we have to recklessly charge against the enemy. It just means that we should think like Revolutionaries.

If there were those 30,000 of whom Lane spoke, The Turner Diaries would have already replaced the Bible for these 30,000 men (similar to the 300 Spartans in real history). But since the 30,000 are missing, the 3 warriors that want to take The Turner Diaries to the real world have to do some metapolitics to convince the other 29,997 to join the Revolution. And the best way to do that is to attack the alt-right as I’ve been doing in my latest articles, ‘Fuck white nationalism!’ and ‘On picketing WN meetings’.

A Revolution needs only 3 percent of Aryan males convinced of the cause. So the job is to convince them by making fun of the Club for Women. Greg Johnson’s pacifism is the pacifism of all the degenerate bourgeois of the alt-right who believe that it is possible to save the race without endangering their lives. But the trick is to tell the potential Revolutionaries that it is not yet
time for fighting in the real world, as Revolutionaries are far from reaching 3 percent of Aryans.

The work of these cultured thugs that still can’t get out of the trenches is to channel their hatred for the ethnocidal System in unmasking these feminised bourgeois so that the young may join ranks with the Revolutionary rank, far from the forums for women.

It may seem unlikely what I am going to say, but if I had a way to contact these would-be Revolutionaries, I would say the same thing that William Pierce told Bob Mathews: that his plans for immediate action are premature.

We have to wait for the dollar to tank. Austrian economists recognise that we live in an economic bubble that will soon ‘pop’. Even after the American dollar tanks we have to wait a while until we reach 3 percent of Aryan males who are willing to fight.

Meanwhile, as I said, the task is to convince young people that white nationalism is a Club for Women, as it is impossible to seize power without a fight in a West that doesn’t even allow us to speak in public. Only the United States has the First Amendment, but even that country has an extralegal system of penalties to silence the dissident, as seen in Silicon Valley, ADL, SPLC and let’s not talk about what happened on my birthday in Charlottesville.

Yes, ‘Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable’, said John F. Kennedy. But today’s warriors must hold their fire because of what happened to Mathews. However, the spirit of Mathews, not Johnson’s, is the one that will eventually save the race.

It is curious that the best author of original texts that Johnson has published, Michael O’Meara, finishes his book—the first book that Counter-Currents has published—with a call to arms. Although O’Meara has not rushed like Mathews, in a discussion forum before retiring from white nationalism he said he would prepare for Revolutionary action.

That is the correct attitude.

It is time to troll the Club for Women called white nationalism in order to recruit the real men from its ranks.

Remember: the goal is three percent among the Aryan males of a nation. Some would say that one percent is enough, insofar the other two percent are blind followers of hardcore leaders.

April 25, 2019
Terminal stage

The Course of Empire is a five-part series of paintings created by Thomas Cole in 1833-1836 (above, Destruction, the fourth painting of the series). It reflected popular American sentiments of the times when many saw pastoralism as the ideal phase of human civilisation, fearing that empire would lead to gluttony and inevitable decay.

I have said that white nationalism has developed a myopic diagnosis of white decline: the Jewish question. I have also complained that American white nationalists have not published Who We Are by Pierce and sell it as a bestseller, to expand such myopic diagnosis into a more accurate worldview. He who introduces the history of the white race encounters patterns that cannot be seen in most nationalist websites. One of the most conspicuous elements of this pattern is the history of Christianity. And I do not mean only the destruction of the classical world by Christian fanatics in the 4th and 5th centuries. I refer to the zeitgeist born in the West after such destruction.

In today’s world of florid psychosis, it seems that the fashion to empower transgender people has nothing to do with the Christian or liberal zeitgeist. But this is precisely where the nationalist perspective appears to me as myopic. A few months ago I wrote the article ‘On Empowering Birds Feeding on Corpses’, where I try to explain that some characteristics of the most psychotic aspects of today’s egalitarianism can be traced back to a 14th-century Franciscan movement that wanted to carry the
The message of Jesus, in all its purity, to medieval Italy. The Church of Rome was not tolerant with the egalitarian faction that took the gospel to the letter, and ended up chasing the Fraticelli as heretics. (For an entertaining narrative of that historical drama see *The Name of the Rose* by Umberto Eco: a novel as didactic about the 14th century as *Julian* by Gore Vidal depicts the 4th century.) Nobody could have predicted in the Middle Ages that the latent Fraticelli ideals were going to have their historical opportunity once the power of the Church was removed. But that was exactly what happened, centuries later, with the French Revolution. As the readers of this site already know, the egalitarian ideals of the Enlightenment, implemented by force through Europe during and after the French Revolution, were inspired by the gospel message. It may seem incredible to say, but even the most anti-clerical Jacobins subscribed the commandments preached by the fictional character called ‘Jesus’, created by the Semitic and Judaised gentiles that had penned the New Testament.

If we compare what the West is currently suffering with cancer, we can say that the first cancer cells arose since, in the 2nd century, a faction of Judaism, which Julian would call ‘the Galileans’, began to infiltrate the Gentile world in the outer provinces of the Roman Empire. The infection came to power with Constantine and the Roman emperors who followed him, despite Julian’s best efforts in his brief reign after the apocalypse for whites described in ‘Rome against Judea; Judea against Rome’. The noble spirit of the Aryan managed to tame, in the Middle Ages, the most ethno-suicidal aspects of this Levantine cult that was even imposed on the northern barbarians by force. But it was not until the Reformation and Counter-Reformation when they murdered, again, the revived pagan spirit of the Renaissance when the holy book of the Jews began to be taken seriously, especially in the Protestant world.

Nothing could have been more suicidal than worshiping the sacred book of the Jews, insofar as both the Old Testament and the Talmud are sworn enemies of the Gentiles, especially the white man because He represents the best of the Gentile world. But worst of all happened when this virus mutated from its religious phase to its secular phase, as we have seen in the essay of a conservative Swede.

The Western world of today is nothing but an ideological heir to the ideals of the Enlightenment. The so-called enlightened
philosophers did not greet Reason, to use the language of the time, and much less the French revolutionaries. Those who truly began to greet Reason since the twilight of the Greco-Roman world were the eugenicists. Only they broke away from the Christian dogma that ‘All men are equal before the eyes of God’, or the neochristian or secular version of the gospel, that ‘All men are equal before the law’. The crux is that ‘All men are equal before the law’ has mutated, since the 1960s, as all men and women are ontologically equal: the final or end-stage cancer that currently kills the West. As the Cassandra named Alexis de Tocqueville foresaw, the virus of equality always demands more equality. It is like a gene or meme that multiplies itself to the absurd. And the absurd has come today not only with the demand that we must consider transgender people our equals, but trans children as well. But per Tocqueville’s observation this last metastasis won’t end with trans children. There are already Western countries that have legalised zoophilia and, in some of them, there are proposals to legalise paedophilia and even necrophilia…

Through this final metastasis, this runaway egalitarianism, the West is doomed. There’s no question about it. Or to say it more precisely Western Christian Civilisation, which is in its terminal stage, will die in this century as the Swede predicted.

But the point is that everything had its origin in the radical message of Jesus: a message that seemed sublime to me at sixteen but that, at sixty, I see it as Semitic poison for the white man. It must me stated again: the season of the horse of Troy of which Pierce wrote, that is to say the complete inversion of Aryan values into Gospel-inspired values, has finally arrived.

*August 10, 2019*
The resurrected Jew

With the characteristic symmetry of the Renaissance, Andrea Mantegna composed this Resurrection in which the resurrected Jew is the luminous axis of the scene, surrounded by the heads of red angels on his right and white angels on his left. Judea’s resurrection over Rome after the catastrophic Jewish-Roman wars is visible today even among the racially conscious who mistakenly fancy themselves as antisemites, as we will see in this post.

In The Fair Race I mentioned the work of Richard Carrier. ‘All of the evidence we have’, said Carrier in a public debate with an American Christian, ‘strongly supports the conclusion that there were actually literal rabbis that originated the sect’ (Christianity). They simply used the story of the founding hero-God of the Romans: Romulus. The idea of those who wrote the New Testament was simply to use the mythological biography of the white God to convince the Romans to better worship the god of the Jews. The parallels between the old Romulus and the new Jesus presumably invented by the rabbis are so obvious that some of them are worth mentioning.
Both are sons of God; their deaths are accompanied by prodigies and the land is covered in darkness; both corpses go missing; both receive a new immortal body superior to the one they had; their resurrected bodies had on occasion a bright and shining appearance; after their resurrection they meet with a follower on a road from the city; a speech is given from a high place prior to the ‘translation to heaven’; there is a ‘great commission’ or instruction to future followers; they physically ascend to heaven and, finally, they are taken up into a cloud.

Every single westerner has heard the story that the authors of the New Testament concocted about Jesus. But who knows the original legend, that of the white hero-God Romulus? It really looks like the Gospel writers plagiarised the foundational myth of Rome to sell us another foundation myth. The new Christian myth did not only involve replacing the Aryan Romulus for the Jewish Jesus. It did something infinitely more subversive, as we shall see in the article about Carrier’s book.

*September 8 2019*
Hitler in your living room

When I read *Hitler’s Table Talk*, what impressed me most was to discover that uncle Adolf was a very cultured man who talked about ancient history (including Julian the Apostate), architecture, painting, music and even criticised Christianity more than Jewry. He also predicted that the future of the Reich would be vegetarian. Alas, in the pro-white forums neonazi Christians cannot believe that Hitler’s after-dinner conversations are genuine. For this reason, I would like to quote a commenter who used to sign under the pseudonym of Jack Frost in the webzine of Kevin MacDonald. This is what Frost said in a discussion thread of *The Occidental Observer* on August 4, 2015:

David Irving has considerable expertise in this matter, and he says they’re genuine. Likewise Albert Speer, who was present at some of these dinner talks, attests to them in his memoirs. But also, perhaps even more convincing, the talks are the blindingly original insights of a true master.

These views [critical] of Christianity are not derivative of anyone else’s opinions, certainly not Schopenhauer’s, and while at odds with certain of his public statements, are quite consistent with other things known about Hitler, particularly his anti-Semitism. Surely a forger wouldn’t have gone this route. In the first place, he would have had to do original thinking that is quite uncharacteristic of forgers, and in the second place an ordinary forger would have been careful not to make any statements that were inconsistent with other things known to have been said or written by Hitler. Their very originality speaks to their veracity. Of course, this can be turned around. People who want to believe Hitler was actually a Christian disingenuously ask why, if this was his real opinion, didn’t he put it in *Mein Kampf* or mention it in any of his public speeches?
But the answer is obvious. Hitler was a politician, and had to be all things to all people. No politician with such views could have been open about them in a Christian nation. Accordingly, to Christians of his day, he appeared to be a Christian. Such hypocrisy was more or less built into the task he had set for himself.

David Irving, with whom I came to exchange some correspondence, has been the foremost historian about Hitler and the Third Reich. Unlike the politically-correct historians about the Second World War, Irving can see the ‘historical Hitler’ in contrast to the fictional ‘Hitler of dogma’ that the System advertises. Below I quote his opinion on the book in question. It appeared in David Irving’s website, posted on January 1, 2004:

*Hitler’s Table Talk* is the product of his lunch- and supper-time conversations in his private circle from 1941 to 1944. The transcripts are genuine. (Ignore the 1945 ‘transcripts’ published by Trevor-Roper in the 1950s as Hitler’s Last Testament—they are fake.) The table talk notes were originally taken by Heinrich Heim, the adjutant of Martin Bormann, who attended these meals at an adjacent table and took notes. (Later Henry Picker took over the job.) Afterwards Heim immediately typed up these records, which Bormann signed as accurate.

François Genoud purchased the files of transcripts from Bormann’s widow just after the war, along with the handwritten letters which she and the Reichsleiter had exchanged. For forty thousand pounds—paid half to Genoud and half to Hitler’s sister Paula—George Weidenfeld, an Austrian Jewish publisher who had emigrated to London, bought the rights and issued an English translation in about 1949.

For forty years or more no German original was published, as Genoud told me that he feared losing the copyright control that he exercised on them. I have seen the original pages, and they are signed by Bormann. They were expertly, and literately, translated by Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens, though with a few (a very few) odd interpolations of short sentences which don’t exist in the original—the translator evidently felt justified in such insertions, to make the context plain... Weidenfeld’s translator
also took liberties with translating words like *Schrecken*, which he translated as ‘rumour’ in the sense of ‘scare-story’.

The *Table Talks’* content is more important in my view than Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, and possibly even more than his *Zweites Buch* (1928). It is unadulterated Hitler. He expatiates on virtually every subject under the sun, while his generals and private staff sit patiently and listen, or pretend to listen, to the monologues.

*Hitler’s Table Talk* is better than *Mein Kampf* as, according to Irving, with the consent of Hitler some editors added to *Mein Kampf* several chapters that the Führer never wrote. While *Mein Kampf* was a bestseller for the German people, the unadulterated Hitler will not be discovered in it.

George Lincoln Rockwell was a man of a generation infinitely less sick than ours. When he was killed I had just turned nine. Three decades later, when a new term, ‘white nationalism’ began to be heard on the internet, the typical American racist had already deviated from the path of Commander Rockwell to a more politically correct one.

Remember, the history of the white man carries enormous inertia. In addition to the MacDonald webzine, there is another that is considered one of the pillars of alt-right publishing, Greg Johnson’s *Counter-Currents*. Although Johnson promotes the creation of an ethnostate his webzine exemplifies what we say about the historical inertia that, once Rockwell and William Pierce died, reversed back white conscience to neochristian paths. Johnson, who in 2010 still taught homilies in a church in San Francisco, rejects Nordicism and has come to say: ‘I am interested in European preservationism, and “white” to me just means “European”, which includes a whole range of skin tones, from the whitest white to brown’ (posted as a comment in his webzine on the thread about ‘Racial Purity, Ethnic Genetic Interests, and the Cobb Case’ on November 18, 2013 at 4:14 pm). As we have seen, this is exactly the sort of worldview that moves me to say that white nationalists are committing ethnosuicide. The following is what Guillaume Durocher, one of the writers who contribute to *Counter-Currents*, wrote in ‘Understanding Hitler and the Third Reich’ published on April 20, 2016:

*Hitler’s Table Talk*. This big book, as far as I am concerned, is the ultimate Hitler book. Of course, we have the
usual caveats: We have no guarantee that these recordings of Hitler’s private conversations, primarily taken between the invasion of Russia and the end of 1942, are completely accurate. The translation edited by Hugh-Trevor Roper is uncertain: David Irving claims it is good, mainstream historians have said it is actually artlessly translated from a previous French translation (!), which is actually an impression I distinctly had reading the book. Nonetheless, themes of these private conversations recur enough that the gist is clear and accepted by both mainstream and revisionist historians.

I cannot summarize such a book here, but suffice to say that Hitler had an awesome scientific and elitist vision, a truly epic conception of history and politics in which he was a leading character, and a grandiose and terrible project against decadence and for excellence (as he saw it). All this merits real engagement rather than crude caricature. Hitler’s ruthless utilitarianism (his relations with other peoples can be summed up as following: Either fighting-comrades or expendable subjects) and his absurd exclusion of Slavdom from ‘Europe’ in effect make him politically untouchable, above and beyond Allied or Hollywoodian propaganda.

With this book, everyone can reach in to find the Hitler behind the myth. For added effect, imagine Hitler speaking as he does in our only known recording of his private conversations, with Marshal of Finland Carl Gustav Mannerheim. And now you’ve Hitler in your living room…

This quote by Durocher portrays not only the importance of the book of shorthand transcripts of Hitler’s monologues: it also portrays the typical intellectual of white nationalism. They are de facto conservatives with racialised tones: fellows that bear no resemblance to the men we saw in my previous compilation. Like MacDonald’s The Occidental Observer, Counter-Currents exemplifies the feminisation of racialism since the times when Rockwell tried to transplant the National Socialist model to America.

Hitler’s ‘absurd exclusion of Slavdom from Europe’? As we saw in the history of the white race of Pierce, originally, Celt, German, Balt, and Slav were indistinguishably Nordic. But the Slavs became mongrelised after the genocidal Asian invasions: one of the darkest hours for the fair race. We must also remember what the SS pamphlet advertised in my site pointed out: the differences between
a Russian village in fertile Ukraine compared to a German farm on
land wrested from the sea. Neither Durocher nor his editor or the
alt-right folk would ever make such distinctions! A fanatic form of
egalitarianism reigns among them as to Caucasian peoples. Nor
would they say that a country that succumbs to Jewish Bolshevism
deserves to be conquered by a nation, in every sense of the word,
more Aryan: a nation where the archetype of the eternal masculine
was still active!

I invite the reader to acquire a copy of *Hitler's Table Talk* to
know the real Hitler. It is also an invitation to see how Aryan men
who resurrect the archetype of the eternal masculine in our age
should think.

*September 19, 2019*
In recent years I don’t usually go to the movies. If there is something I say to my nephews when I see them it is that, in the media and the cinema, all the messages are bad. But yesterday I broke my habit after watching Stefan Molyneux’s video about the Joker movie.

I am glad that, as Molyneux confessed in one of his latest videos, eighty percent of his audience dropped last year. Is it because of his dishonesty about the Jewish question? Whatever caused the drop, from alt-lite to neonazism, passing through white nationalism, Molyneux is the only notable personality in our underworld who has consistently talked about child abuse.

As the visitors of this blogsite know, I spent more decades investigating child abuse than the single decade I’ve dedicated to investigating the darkest hour in the West: whose report, The Fair Race, now appears as a free PDF. Since my oldest specialty is the subject of child abuse I must say that what Molyneux tells us in his one-hour video is, in general terms, correct.

The video revolves around the character Arthur Fleck in Joker, a mentally-ill man who dreams to become a stand-up comedian but so disregarded by a hellish and diverse Gotham City that decides to become a criminal. Curiously, the actor Joaquin Phoenix did not look to previous Joker actors for inspiration: he simply read some reports about political assassinations.

Hollywood movies usually lack psychological realism. For example, in the 1989 Jack Nicholson movie the Joker origin story simply falls into a vat of acid. The 2019 movie, on the other hand, gives its central character a plausible origin. So plausible that the film has been described as reminiscent of mass shootings in the US, and the incel community loved it. What’s more, some people from the establishment have expressed concern that Joker could inspire real-world violence.
In a moment of the first minutes of his video, Molyneux confesses that he has received horrific verbal abuse just for mentioning the naked facts of his own childhood, and that hostility toward those who were abused as children or teenagers is not uncommon if the adult victim dares to open his mouth (this happened to me, as we can read in the third book of my autobiography). At this point I would like to distinguish between dysfunctional parents and schizogenic parents, that is, parents who literally murder their children’s souls. While almost everyone I know comes from family dysfunction in one way or another, the category of schizogenic parents simply does not exist in our society. Since the 1950s the Big Pharma has ensured that civil society does not find out that there is a trauma model to understand the mental disorder that competes with its profitable medical model.

But what does all this have to do with the recent film Joker? As can be deduced from Molyneux’s video, and regardless of the sinister motivation of its Jewish creators, the film could be used to present the trauma model to the public. I was the one who started the Wikipedia article on the trauma model on mental disorders, an academic text that appeals to the left hemisphere of our brains. He who wants to delve deeper into this research line, and in a more literary way, can read my book Day of Wrath. On the other hand, he who prefers a personal testimony that presents the trauma model appealing to our right hemisphere could read John Modrow’s touching autobiography, How to Become a Schizophrenic that I’ve already mentioned. Furthermore, he who is unwilling even to read any the above literature, but willing to educate himself on the subject having some fun, could see the films Shine (1996), The Piano Teacher (2001), Monster (2003) and even Artificial Intelligence by Spielberg, which can be used to grasp what proponents of the trauma model call ‘the problem of attachment to the perpetrator’.

Although it may seem incredible, sometimes fairy tales portray the destructive interaction of parents with their children. In almost all fairy tales, including contemporary fairy tales like Kubrick/Spielberg’s Artificial Intelligence or Harry Potter, the parental figure is substituted so as not to touch it directly. In the case of the Potter series the abusers are Harry’s uncle and aunt. As to David, the child robot in A.I., obviously had he no biological parents but Monica functions like a substitute mother. But sometimes the storyteller sneaks parents directly into the story as the villains who
abandon their children (for example in *Tom Thumb*). But there are more serious forms of abuse than abandoning your child in the woods, which also happened to David. What Molyneux says about not forgiving schizogenic parents is true. I would go as far as to claim that to forgive such parents is the most toxic thing for the mental health of the victim. Mine is an opposed claim to what the establishment wants us to believe.

Why is the forgiveness that religionists and therapists preach so toxic? Because it is the abusive parents and society the ones who are currently murdering young souls. As the Armenian lawyer said in *Spotlight*, which won the Academy Award for Best Picture in 2015: ‘This city, these people [Boston people] are making the rest of us feel like we don’t belong. But they’re no better than us. Look at how they treat their children. Mark my words, Mr. Rezendes [another Armenian]: If it takes a village to raise a child, it takes a village to abuse one’ (emphasis added). For the victim, unilaterally forgiving the perpetrator or a society that never accepts its soul-murdering sins is simply a betrayal of oneself and the other adult victims, now suffering from mental stress and even disorders.

In addition to the first minutes of his video, Molyneux uses as a paradigm how Penny, Arthur Fleck’s mother, allowed one of his lovers to beat him as a small child to the degree of causing neurological damage in the chained child. Molyneux then advances ideas analogous to what I have known for a long time. Watch also the segments after minute thirty-five of his video: how female evil is still taboo in the film industry (Penny allowing the child to be tortured wasn’t shown in the film, only implied).  

It is curious to note the chasm between those who, like Molyneux and I, have investigated child abuse due to our past, and those who did not have such destructive parenting. Greg Johnson for example is a Batfan. In his recent review of *Joker*, which he writes under the penname of Trevor Lynch, Johnson prefers Heath Ledger’s Joker in the 2008 *The Dark Knight* than the Joker of the movie released this month. Johnson expresses very derogatorily about this latest Joker: ‘You’d want to squash him like a bug’. ‘Ledger’s Joker launched a million memes, both because of his

---

44 Note of 2020: Molyneux’s channel has now been taken down by YouTube.
character and his lines. Phoenix’s Joker will have no such influence. He’s a pathetic nobody with nothing to say’. ‘Arthur [the Joker] is entirely absorbed in self-pity’. ‘Joker’ is a boring movie about a disgusting loser’. Well, it didn’t look boring to me… But the commenters on Counter-Currents who opined about Johnson’s review said very similar things: ‘People like him deserve to get left behind by society, and the true tragedy of this movie is that successful, well-adjusted men like Thomas Wayne insist on trying to love the Arthur Flecks of the world and take care of them’. Love, take care of them? The conservative commenter also said: ‘The defects like Arthur would be put in mental asylums and [eugenically] sterilized’. Such commenters remind me that, in the movie, Thomas Wayne, the billionaire father of the future Batman, labels those Gotham residents envious of the wealthy as ‘clowns’, not only Arthur Fleck. I don’t know how many viewers enjoyed the moment when, by the end of the movie, a rioter corners the Wayne family in an alley and murders Thomas and his wife sparing the child Bruce. Another commenter said: ‘One of the great things about Heath Ledger’s Joker in Christopher Nolan’s The Dark Knight is that he does not have an origin story’.

I dare not opine about the Marvel universe as I feel deeply revolted by it. But in the real world isn’t it good to know, say, the psychopathological motivations of those women in the Charles Manson family? The commenters’ lack of elemental compassion is even noticeable in the previous Joker represented by Heath Ledger, an actor that incidentally has already passed away. In one of the dialogues the now-dead Joker explains his scars. He said that his father ‘comes at me with a knife. “Why so serious?” He sticks a blade in my mouth. “Let’s put a smile on that face”’. This father strikes me as ‘soul murderer’. Note this other phrase from the Counter-Currents commenter: ‘Arthur [the Joker who’s alive] is far too damaged for any regular person to identify with him’. How will

45 In the comments section of his Joker article Johnson shows how ignorant he is about psychiatry: ‘If Arthur is adopted then his mental illness cannot be inherited from this mother’. He has swallowed the pseudoscientific propaganda that mental illness is genetic. Apparently, Johnson forgot what I said in one of my articles in which he himself corrected my syntax! (see my piece about unfalsifiable psychiatry in Day of Wrath).
a normie commenter identify with him if only one percent (or less) of westerners have endured schizogenic parents?

Incidentally, last night, as I watched the psychological thriller, there were times when I laughed when the audience was serious and nobody laughed (as the character does in the film). That happened to me, yesterday, in the climax of the film when the Joker kills the establishment character that Robert de Niro represented. As I said, I usually don’t go to the movies now. But decades ago the same phenomenon occurred to me with some films by Luis Buñuel, whom I met personally, in which nobody laughed. It also happened to me when I watched Dr. Strangelove by Kubrick on the big screen. I laughed at the black humour in which the nuclear extermination of humanity was at stake while the hundreds of people watching the movie with me were quiet in the theatre. Only when I read a Kubrick biography by Vincent Lobrutto did I find out that Kubrick had a very black sense of humour. Then did I understand me and the non-laugher spectators of Dr. Strangelove!

Joker ends when Arthur laughs and tells a psychiatrist that she would not understand the joke.

October 7, 2019
In ‘Dark Night of the Soul’ I said that all white people are heading to Jerusalem, a metaphor that must be understood in the context of my essay ‘Ethno-suicidal Nationalists’ (also in this book). How Christianity managed to invert the moral compass of the Aryans, from pointing at Rome to pointing at Jerusalem, is discovered by researching the motivations of those who wrote the Gospels. Remember: according to Richard Carrier in his magnum opus On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt, published in 2014, there’s no historical Jesus, only gospel authors.

Keep in mind what we have been saying on this site about the inversion of values that happened in the West when whites, including atheists, took the axiological message of the gospels very seriously. Based on this and the crucial part of Evropa Soberana’s
essay on Jerusalem and Rome in *The Fair Race*, let’s see what Carrier says at the beginning of chapter 4 of *On the Historicity of Jesus*.

In Plutarch’s book about Romulus, the founder of Rome, we are told that Romulus was the son of God, born of a Virgin, and that there were attempts to kill Him as a baby. As an adult the elites finally killed Him and the sun darkened, but Romulus’ body disappeared. Then He rises from the dead. Some people doubted and, on the road, Romulus appears to a friend to transmit the Good News to His people (see image above). It is revealed that, despite His human appearance, Romulus had always been a God and was incarnated to establish a great kingdom on earth (keep these italicised words in mind in the context of the quotation below). Then Romulus ascends to the heavens to reign from there. Before Christianity, the Romans celebrated the day when Romulus ascended into heaven. Plutarch tells us that the annual ceremony of the Ascension involved the recitation of the names of those who were afraid for having witnessed the feat, something that reminds me of the true end of the Gospel of Mark (Mk 16.8) before the Christians added more verses.

Carrier comments that it seems as if Mark was adding a Semitic garment onto Romulus’ original story: a Roman story that seems to be the skeleton on which the evangelist would add the flesh of his literary fiction. The phrase of Carrier that I put in bold letters convinced me that *On the Historicity of Jesus* deserves attention.

There are many differences in the two stories [the fictional stories about Romulus and Jesus], surely. But the similarities are too numerous to be a coincidence—and the differences are likely deliberate. For instance, Romulus’ material kingdom favoring the mighty is transformed into a spiritual one favoring the humble. It certainly looks like the Christian passion narrative is an intentional transvaluation of the Roman Empire’s ceremony of their own founding savior’s incarnation, death and resurrection [page 58].

The implications are enormous. Such passages substantiate the central essay of my internet site: ‘Rome against Judea; Judea against Rome’. It really looks like the authors of the Gospels, presumably Semites, thoroughly plagiarised the foundational myth of Rome in order to sell us another myth. This new myth did not only involve replacing an Aryan hero (Romulus) for a Jewish hero
(Jesus). It did something infinitely more subversive, what Nietzsche called the inversion of values.

It is increasingly clear: Not only Jesus of Nazareth did not exist. Mark the Evangelist stole the myth of the Aryan god Romulus for incredibly subversive purposes (see my bold type above). That is why they tried to erase any hint of the Romulus festivals when they destroyed almost all the books in Latin, from the fourth to the sixth century. In addition to Carrier’s thick academic volume, see a more readable book by Catherine Nixey: *The Darkening Age: The Christian Destruction of the Classical World*.

*October 22, 2019*
Whose arc is it that will move?

I have always complained about the ‘Empire of the yin’, in the sense that today’s Aryans behave like the Eloi blonds with Weena when she was drowning in a scene of *The Time Machine*, a 1960 film. What I had not understood is that the extreme feminisation of men today is due to environmental causes. See the section ‘The biological origins of patriarchy and feminism’ in one of my blog entries where the chimpanzee society, in which patriarchy reigns, is contrasted with the bonobo society in which matriarchy reigns. The Eloi had everything: food, easy sex and a fair climate. We have seen that French revolutionaries rebelled because they were starving, but that human beings in general give a damn about politics.

I have always suspected that the westerners of today are not worse than those of before but that, having perennial bread and circus, behave like the Eloi—in the real world, like the bonobo. Remember that the bonobos were originally chimpanzees, but were stranded in a privileged and isolated region of Congo where they didn’t have to compete with gorillas. Through the millennia they changed genetically from a dimorphic species to a species where the male is physically similar to the female.

The fundamental difference between the bonobo and the human society is that the earthly paradise of the bonobo can last millennia, while the human matriarchy of today will only last a few more years. The reason for this is that in our species matriarchy goes against nature, as *Homo sapiens* is a dimorphic species. Remember, ‘To understand the West’s darkest hour we must keep in mind that to reach a feminist society two things are required: an abundance of resources and absence of external threats’. I believe that both will be inverted in the aftermaths of a hyper-inflated dollar and the subsequent misbehaviour of blacks in America’s big cities. The flaw of the anti-white system is that the welfare state has produced a milieu of false abundance.
Of the four modes of which I have spoken elsewhere (happy mode, angry mode, combat mode and killing mode), I already find myself in the latter while the vast majority of westerners are in the former. That is the reason why this site receives few visits compared to other racialist sites. I am a creature of pure hatred while most white nationalists do not think in revolutionary terms, not even as a purely academic exercise.

That has to do with the environment of course. My biographical past in Mexico was as brutal as the chimpanzee society in Africa. The gringos north of the Río Grande live in a privileged zone. But soon our barbarism will reach the whole West whose blonds, after World War II, live in an Elysian island equivalent to the bonobo paradise. In other words we belong to very different psychoclasses. And in the next few years it will not be me who speaks more civilly and demurely, approaching the chivalry of a Jared Taylor. During the convergence of catastrophes it will be you who will gradually move from happy mode to combat mode. It will not be the arc of *The West's Darkest Hour* what will move toward your side. It will be the white nationalist whose arc will be moving towards us and the characters in the novels of Pierce and Covington.

Winter is coming, and you don’t stand a chance unless the Eloi become killing machines again and your Weenas birthing machines…

*November 25, 2019*
In the early hours of the day after midnight I began to watch once again the 2005 film *Pride and Prejudice*, based on Jane Austen’s novel. I felt really tired and had to suspend the function, already after two in the morning. I left when, advised by Mr. Darcy, Mr. Bingley struggles with himself to propose to Jane Bennet. Tonight I will see the rest.

Over the years I have talked about that movie, even since the old incarnation of this site. While what I said last week is true, that even seemingly benign films contain subversive messages, in this *P&P* adaptation there is no bad message. It is a movie that may well have been filmed in a parallel world in which Hitler had won the war.

There are several readings we could make of the film. Personally, the actress who plays the blonde Jane represents, in flesh and blood, the ethereal nymphs that I place on my site’s sidebar: the inspiration of David Lane. If there is something that I fail to understand in the white nationalist movement, it is this lack of praise for the most beautiful specimens of the Aryan race. I just do not get it. Eros’ force about women like Jane should, on its own, move millions of whites to Lane’s words. And I don’t mean only ‘That the beauty of the white Aryan women shall not perish from the earth’, but the consequence of Eros: ‘We must secure the existence of our people and a future for white children’.
The other issue is marriage. If ours is the darkest of all times, it is because they inverted values in everything related to sexuality and the reproduction of the Aryan race. Needless to say, salvation consists of transvaluing values as they were before, in the world of Austen. But with the exception of F. Roger Devlin who, among the white nationalists, insists so much on the subject? This is one of the many reasons I don’t take the movement seriously. In Hitler’s Germany, on the other hand, the sacredness of marriage and Aryan reproduction was primordial.

As I said, tonight I will finish watching the movie where I left after midnight. Those who want to capture the spirit of this site, what moves me to write, will have to buy the DVD of *P&P* and watch it from time to time. The music of Dario Marianelli, the landscapes of bucolic England, and even the buildings—for example when Mr. Darcy proposes to Elizabeth for the first time—should move the deepest fibre of the white man.

If you visit my Twitter page you will find a painting of Claude le Lorrain at the top. It is known that the wealthy 19th-century English tried to bring the beautiful architecture of some paintings of le Lorrain (paintings that I contemplated during my last visit to London’s museums) to the countryside of the island. The building that served as a refuge from the copious rain for the future couple, when Mr. Darcy proposes to Elizabeth, is the perfect framework for the fourteen words (or twenty-eight, if we are to count the two meanings of the Lane words).

Art, architecture, Aryan beauty, Puritan sexual customs, the 14 words, good music (the very antithesis of what whites listen today), bucolic landscapes—it is all the same. Hitler, who sometime in his life wanted to be an artist, saw it clearly. When will white nationalists see something so obvious?

*January 23, 2020*
Very important subject

Virtually all people in white nationalism, the alt-right or even the alt-lite are unaware of the psychic havoc caused by abusive parents. The exception, as I have said more than once, is Stefan Molyneux as we saw in his videos about Charles Manson and *Joker*. What bothers me is that Molyneux’s mother is Jewish, and one would expect that a non-Jew of the alt-lite or white nationalism to venture into a subject that I consider fundamental: the actual aetiology of mental illness, as opposed to the psychiatric lies that we hear in the universities. If the Aryan world shakes off all Jewish influence, beginning of course with the rejection of Christianity and its secular offshoots, over time it will ‘translate’, into Aryan language, the most relevant findings of Jews on the trauma model of mental disorders. In an introductory article to my work for a racist audience I recently wrote in this site:

For now, suffice it to say that Alice Miller continued to mention Hitler under the influence of the official narrative in almost all of her texts, so I currently do not recommend any of her books. It is not that I have repudiated Miller’s findings: a Jewess who, although she suffered as a child in the Warsaw Ghetto, after changing her Jewish surname she never wanted to return to the shelter of her mother’s religion. But I must say that Miller’s psycho-biographical analysis of Hitler is based on the great lie of our times. The Swiss psychologist never considered such elemental issues as the fact that the Holocaust of millions of Ukrainians, largely perpetrated by Bolshevik Jews, caused the legitimate fear, and eventual reaction, of the German state. But that is a separate matter. The issue that concerns us is very different: the Dantesque hell that some parents put their children in: something that Miller got right.

The issue of abusive parents is not only taboo in all societies, as almost no one connects the dots between mental
disorders and poor childrearing. Like the racial issue, as to mental health the values have been completely reversed. For example, two years ago a commenter told me: ‘I have since forgiven my father and every other person of note in my life needing forgiveness’. But forgiveness is a Christian doctrine, although many secular psychotherapists also subscribe to such an unhealthy way of treating their patients. I answered: ‘I cannot speak for you because I ignore the full story’ but added that for an adult child to forgive a parent who never recognised his fault is psychological suicide. Any adult child can very easily and naturally forgive his parents if they are prepared to ask for forgiveness. But the demand for unilateral forgiveness that we often encounter in so-called therapy can pose a danger for true healing. These are some quotable quotes of Alice Miller:

- It is the resentment of the past, we are told, that is making us ill. In those by now familiar groups in which addicts and their relations go into therapy together, the following belief is invariably expressed. Only when you have forgiven your parents for everything they did to you can you get well. Even if both your parents were alcoholic, even if they mistreated, confused, exploited, beat, and totally overloaded you, you must forgive.

- The majority of therapists work under the influence of destructive interpretations culled from both Western and Oriental religions, which preach forgiveness to the once-mistreated child. Thereby, they create a new vicious circle for people who, from their earliest years, have been caught in the vicious circle of pedagogy. For forgiveness does not resolve latent hatred and self-hatred but rather covers them up in a very dangerous way.

- In my own therapy it was my experience that it was precisely the opposite of forgiveness—namely, rebellion against mistreatment suffered, the recognition and condemnation of my parents’ destructive opinions and actions, and the articulation of my own needs—that ultimately freed me from the past.

- By refusing to forgive, I give up all illusions. Why should I forgive, when no one is asking me to? I mean, my parents refuse to understand and to know what they did to me. So why should I go on trying to understand and forgive my
parents and whatever happened in their childhood, with things like psychoanalysis and transactional analysis? What’s the use? Whom does it help? It doesn’t help my parents to see the truth. But it does prevent me from experiencing my feelings, the feelings that would give me access to the truth. But under the bell-jar of forgiveness, feelings cannot and may not blossom freely.

- I cannot conceive of a society in which children are not mistreated, but respected and lovingly cared for, that would develop an ideology of forgiveness for incomprehensible cruelties. This ideology is indivisible with the command ‘Thou shalt not be aware’ [of the cruelty your parents inflicted to you] and with the repetition of that cruelty on the next generation.

I’ve added italics in the above quotes.

Again, I am not asking my audience to read Miller. But my eleven books translate, and expand considerably, her findings for an Aryan audience (the first one, Letter to mom Medusa, is already in English). It is a very important subject for the simple reason that mental health matters, and racialists who have had mental issues are generally clueless about what caused them.

March 28, 2020
From Jesus to Hitler

(my eleven books)

Whispering leaves

1. Letter to mom Medusa
2. How to murder your child’s soul
3. My childhood
4. The return of Quetzalcoatl
5. Whispering leaves

Will you help me?

6. Father
7. Corina
8. Mother
9. Leonora
10. Will you help me?

11. The Grail

February 16, 2020
Mental health matters

Before the Christians destroyed the culture that I love the most, the ancient Greek aphorism ‘Know thyself’ was one of the Delphic maxims. It was inscribed in the forecourt of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. On my statistics page I have been seeing that my recent post ‘Very important subject’ has been popular with visitors, a post that ends by saying that mental health matters.

By the poor mental health of our time I not only mean classic disorders such as alcoholism, drug addiction, depression, delusions of persecution or greatness, but all ideological deviancies. As I see the West, most have been in a state of psychosis since Constantine, either honouring the god of the Jews, which is also Jesus and the divine dove (a psychosis that many American antisemites share) or, more recently, the psychosis of believing the dogma of equality in issues of race, gender and sexual orientation: the new Holy Trinity of the white race. The vast majority of whites suffer, or at least don’t openly rebel, against one of these two psychoses. But there are many other ideologies as psychotic as these two major psychoses that many minority groups share.

I mean beliefs like UFOs, conspiracy theories, magical thinking, all sorts of beliefs in the paranormal and the many cults. When I lived in California I found out that there was a myriad of cults in that state, and it bothered me greatly that all that mind-rotting beliefs were considered ‘spiritual’ by Americans. The common white only hears of the largest new religions such as Scientology but there are many more cults as harmful as Dianetics, which are hardly spoken of because they have few followers. I myself fell into an obscure cult in my twenties, as we have seen here.

Decades ago, I was unaware that it had been my Catholic father’s abusive behaviour that led me to the mental catastrophe of entering the world of Eschatology, something that I explain in the
fifth book of my autobiographical series. But the problem with the vast majority of westerners is that they do not have the faintest idea that similar catastrophes, such as falling into other sects or ‘spiritual’ systems, may have the same causes. In the comment section of this site, for example, various types of Christians have wanted to argue with me completely clueless that their faith in the Bible is simply a parental introject. That is why I have told them more than once that they don’t know how to distinguish between the empirical world and the structure of their inner selves.

Europeans are not far behind. This day I received an email from a German who wants to promote his recently translated books into English. If Europeans in general were not crazy like goats what they would write would be, above all, historical reviews of what happened not only since Constantine, but the Second World War, as it is these two lies that are destroying their race. The German who wrote to me today, on the other hand, in his books talks about the Illuminati, the attacks of 9/11 and even the aliens who control us… The German system allows this type of controlled opposition because it does not represent any danger to the System. But what I’m after is something deeper.

What cured me of the mental virus of Eschatology was putting my spiritual odyssey on paper. Without it the cure would not have been profound, as only when I realised that the parental introjects were at the core of my being I understood that everything I believed about Jesus wasn’t data from the empirical world, but malware installed in my inner self. The subject is huge, and that’s why I decided to write so many pages about it in my native language. But what hurts me is that many people who want to do something for the white race cannot do it because they continue to be slaves of their introjects, and will continue to be slaves until they follow the mandate of the oracle of Delphi.

March 31, 2020
Slaves of parental introjects

Yesterday I wrote that many people who want to do something for the white race cannot do it because they continue to be slaves of their parental introjects. But not only yesterday. On this site I have used the term ‘parental introject’ many times. And on my stats page I’ve noticed that several visitors try to understand its meaning when I link the word to Wikipedia’s ‘Introjection’ article. But the best way to explain it is simply by anecdote. Professor of psychology Nicholas Humphrey does not usually use the term introject. But by 1997, when I had already abandoned my belief in parapsychology, I was still reading on the sceptics of the paranormal. At Barnes & Noble in Houston I sat down to read some passages of Humphrey’s *Leaps of Faith*, and on page 147 I had a eureka moment. On that page we can read:

Imagine that in childhood, before you thought of questioning it, you were told as a fact that Jesus performed miracles and therefore was the son of God, and not till later in life did it occur to you that the miracles might not be genuine. By that time, you might well find that your critical faculties had already been hijacked. For how could you
possibly entertain such doubts about the works of a man whose works had already proved he was never to be doubted! The importance of the first step taken in childhood was not lost on the Jesuits: ‘If I have the teaching of children up to seven years of age or thereabouts, I care not who has them afterwards, they are mine for life’.

In the previous page we can see Humphrey as a boy. It was after that passage, on that same page, that the author added a phrase that caused my eureka moment. Keep in mind that his book is a critique of parapsychology. Humphrey said that even when an alleged psychic is shown to resort to fraud, because of the image implanted on us about Jesus, the damage had already been done in the believer’s mind. When I read those words my mind immediately flew to the introject that my father had put in me as a child about Jesus’ miracles, an introject secularised by parapsychologists with their beliefs in extrasensory perception and psychokinesis among humans. So to understand the word introject we just have to think about Humphrey’s quote from the Jesuits above: ‘…they are mine for life’.

That’s it! Once you have a specific malware programmed in your mind at a tender age it is incredibly difficult to remove it.

*Leaps of Faith* can be read online, but I suggest obtaining a copy because it is one of those books that should be in our bookshelves. It explains why so many people still cling, like children seeking reassurance, in supernatural phenomena like an immortal soul and life after death. It is also a devastating critique of the existing evidence for paranormal phenomena, ranging from miracles to the laboratory experiments for extrasensory perception.

No matter what the evidence, those who have not fulfilled Delphi’s commandment will continue to believe that ‘there must be something there’. They’re slaves of parental introjects.

*April 1, 2020*
The subtitle of my site

In these times of pandemic it is easy to forget the basic premise of this site: Christianity, and the set of values that Christianity generated, are the cause of ethnosuicide by whites throughout the West. Even at the origins of the pandemic in Italy, it can be seen how the axiological system that spawned Christianity is responsible for all the ills that afflict us. We can already imagine the ancient Romans embracing the Chinese on the streets with loving hugs, as was done in Italy right at the start of the pandemic.

Love of neighbour, or rather: universal love for all humans imposed by the state and civil society, is the cause of white suicide. Now it comes to my mind the words of Octavio Paz who mocked the neochristians who, during the French Revolution, tried to decree mandatory fraternity as if that were possible by law. The Jacobins never gave up the whole of Christianity, only the dogmatic part of it.

Something that I have observed in virtually all intellectuals and commenters of the dissident right, including the racialists, is that they don’t try to reinvent the history of the white race as the Nazis tried and, as far as English speakers are concerned, as Pierce and Kemp tried. They do the opposite: They rely on Christian authors or neochristian secularists, the heirs to the ideals of the French Revolution. They don’t seem to realise that, to understand what is happening, it is necessary to make a tabula rasa of everything that is taught in the universities about the humanities, and to start rewriting history from the beginning. That is why I chose the symbol of the three-eyed crow’s weirwood tree as the subtitle of this site. Such an odd symbol reflects that what we should focus on is the historical past of the white race—the true

---

46 I posted this entry when the subtitle of *The West’s Darkest Hour* was ‘The site of a man fused to a weirwood tree’.
past I mean (cf. *The Fair Race*), not what is said even in slightly racialised forums for the dissident right.

The difference between my point of view and that of the racialists is that we start from completely different ways of seeing history. Except for the Third Reich, all the nations that emerged after Constantine are not to be taken seriously. George Orwell said: ‘All tyrannies rule through fraud and force, but once the fraud is exposed they must rely exclusively on force’. The entire Christendom has been ruled through fraud and force, but only until recently has the veil been lifted over the nonexistence of Jesus and the super-barbaric way in which the Christians eliminated the Aryan culture from the ancient world. To the extent that Christianity is being exposed, they are relying exclusively on force. The Jews are secondary from this point of view, as it is Christian and neochristian whites who have been empowering them. Even the Russian revolution that empowered the genocidal Jews would have been impossible without the help of the Russians themselves.

Unlike the Middle Ages and pre-revolutionary times, modern Western society allows the white man to disbelieve the dogmatic part of Judeo-Christianity, the ‘fraud’ to use Orwell’s quote. But under no circumstances does it allow the white man to abandon the axiological part of the religion of our parents. Hitler attempted complete apostasy, including axiological apostasy, and we see how they genocided their people and blamed the Germans for the holocausts that the Allies themselves had committed. We must never forget that both the American and the Soviet experiments of the last century were branches of the same trunk that emerged from the egalitarian ideals of the French Revolution. Real dissent had not occurred since Julian the Apostate tried to transvalue the values that Constantine, Constantius and their powerful bishops had inverted.

It has to be said once again: as long as white nationalists don’t want to see Christian ideals at the core of their disgrace, their movement will remain in the cradle. Fortunately, the looming monetary apocalypse has the potential to awaken, at least, the children of those nationalists who refuse to finally wake up.

*April 11, 2020*
The racialist movement is quackery

*(Posted the day the Führer was born)*

I had thought to leave the previous post, with an enlarged portrait of Uncle Adolf, at the top of this page throughout the day out of respect for his memory. But a comment in that entry motivated me to say something very obvious.

The last time I checked Goebbels Hub, the best ‘news aggregator’ site that links almost all the sites of white advocates *(Note of September 2020: it no longer exists)*, I discovered that except for a mere post in Stormfront (not an article) no articles appear, this April 20th, that honour the best man in the history of the West.

How is that possible?

I have said it many times: the racialist movement is fraudulent. These valiant antisemites were able to say ‘Happy Easter’ a week ago in their forums, thus celebrating the god of the Jews (a Jesus who didn’t even exist by the way). But to celebrate an Aryan man who did exist, and who fought against Jewry in the century when most of us were born? God forbid!

The movement with the deceiving title of white nationalism was quackery from its origins in the Judeo-Christian US, it remains quackery today, and it will be quackery.

Our only hope is that a wiser generation arises that finally transvalues Semitic values to Aryan values. Will it happen, or will the so-called antisemites cling to their Semitism?

*April 20, 2020*
Colour, pranks and psychoclasses

Yesterday I discovered some YouTube videos that make us laugh out loud, especially those involving children. The one that almost killed me of laughter was ‘Scary Monster Kid Prank’ and another prank of a girl apparently pregnant by her child husband! I compared the volume of visits of those dying LOL videos with this site, and concluded that I have been wrong about something fundamental.

If we think about the sites of white advocates, Andrew Anglin’s has been the most popular—the closest, within racialism, to those prank videos: some of which already have more than a hundred million views. What I have been wrong about is not realising that the psychoclass to which I belong is not only sidereally different from the psychoclass of those to whom I would like my message to reach. I come from a tragic family that destroyed three persons, of whom two died and I am the only survivor to tell their story. This experience has developed in me a gravitas character in the sense of serene sadness before life. Those who give literally hundreds of millions of clicks to those videos are not only different: they are my antipodes. Not because laughing is wrong (laughing is very healthy even under the laws of Lycurgus); but because in dark times the most relevant is the gravitas of the ancient Romans. My mistake has been treating people, even some visitors to this site, as if they are psychologically structured in a similar way to mine when their happy mode cannot contrast more with the hard Roman ethos. Perhaps the best way to understand it is through analogy.

A couple of days ago I discovered the videos of colour-blind people who see colours as they actually are for the first time in their lives thanks to a new invention: enchroma glasses. In one of them for example, a dad sees the red hair of his children for the first time. It’s like an emotional atomic bomb to see colours as they are for the first time in life! You can see many of such videos, like
one of a boy crying when seeing the world in full colour, or another one when an adult cried when seeing the beautiful flowers as they are for the first time, or another adult man crying when he saw the colour orange for the first time and was amazed at the skin colour of his white mother; others had not seen the purple.

Exactly the same happens with existential pain. It produces abysmally different minds, let’s say, the life of someone who had a mother like the one of the film Joker compared to the happy mode in which a good portion of white Americans currently live. Like colour-blind people, there is no way to make anyone who has not gone through it big time to see the full range of the colours of existential suffering. In other words, trying to sell the idea of ‘eliminating all unnecessary suffering’, my philosophy of the four words, is more than a hard sell: it is a fool’s errand if my audience is the common American. You have to wait for the catastrophes that people like Guillaume Faye have been predicting to converge.

Only after the United States is destroyed will white survivors begin to see the colours that, south of the Rio Grande, I have been seeing for the past few decades. Yes, a subtitle for this article might say: The ancient Greeks knew tragedy, drama, and comedy; today’s colour-blind Americans only drama and comedy.

May 11, 2020
Let us remember what Evropa Soberana tells us in the essay that I have promoted the most on this site:

In 38, Caligula [bust above], the successor of Tiberius, sends his friend Herod Agrippa to the troubled city of Alexandria, to watch over Aulus Avilius Flaccus, the prefect of Egypt, who did not enjoy precisely the confidence of the emperor and who—according to the Jew Philo of Alexandria—was an authentic villain. The arrival of Agrippa to Alexandria was greeted with great protests by the Greek community, as they thought he was coming to proclaim himself king of the Jews. Agrippa was insulted by a crowd, and Flaccus did nothing to punish the offenders, despite the fact that the victim was an envoy of the emperor. This encouraged the Greeks to demand that statues of Caligula be placed in the synagogues, as a provocation to Jewry.

This simple act seemed to be the sign of an uprising: the Greeks and Egyptians attacked the synagogues and set them on fire. The Jews were expelled from their homes, which were looted, and thereafter segregated in a ghetto from which
they could not leave. They were stoned, beaten or burned alive, while others ended up in the sand to serve as food to the beasts in those macabre circus shows so common in the Roman world. According to Philo, Flaccus did nothing to prevent these riots and murders, and even supported them, as did the Egyptian Apion, whom we have seen criticising the Jewish quarter in the section devoted to Hellenistic anti-Semitism.

To celebrate the emperor’s birthday (August 31, a Shabbat), members of the Jewish council were arrested and flogged in the theatre; others were crucified. When the Jewish community reacted, the Roman soldiers retaliated by looting and burning down thousands of Jewish houses, desecrating the synagogues and killing 50,000 Jews. When they were ordered to cease the killing, the local Greek population, inflamed by Apion (not surprisingly, Josephus has a work called Contra Apion) continued the riots. Desperate, the Jews sent Philo to reason with the Roman authorities. The Jewish philosopher wrote a text entitled Contra Flaccus and, along with the surely negative report that Agrippa had given to Caligula, the governor was executed.

After these events, things calmed down and the Jews did not suffer violence as long as they stayed within the confines of their ghetto. However, although Flaccus’ successor allowed the Alexandrian Jewry to give their version of the events, in the year 40 there were again riots among the Jews (who were outraged by the construction of an altar) and among the Greeks, who accused the Jews of refusing to worship the emperor. The religious Jews ordered to destroy the altar and, in retaliation, Caligula made a decision that really showed how little he knew the Jewish quarter: he ordered to place a statue of himself at the Temple of Jerusalem. According to Philo, Caligula ‘considered the majority of Jews suspects, as if they were the only people who wished to oppose him’ (On the Embassy to Gaius and Flaccus). Publius Petronius, governor of Syria, who knew the Jews well and feared the possibility of a civil war, tried to delay as long as possible the placement of the statue until Agrippa convinced Caligula that it was a poor decision.

In 41, Caligula, who already promised to be an anti-Jewish emperor, was assassinated in Rome, which unleashed
the violence of his German bodyguards who had not been able to prevent his death and who, because of their peculiar sense of fidelity, tried to avenge him by killing many conspirators, senators and even innocent bystanders who had the misfortune to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. Claudius, the uncle of Caligula, would become the master of the situation and, after being appointed emperor by the Praetorian Guard, ordered the execution of the assassins of his nephew, many of whom were political magistrates who wanted to reinstate the Republic.

This is the probable cause of the unprecedented historical defamation of this emperor: the texts of Roman history would eventually fall into the hands of the Christians, who were mostly of Jewish origin and viscerally detested the emperors [emphasis added]. Since, according to Orwell, ‘he who controls the past controls the present’ the Christians adulterated Roman historiography, turning the emperors who had opposed them and their Jewish ancestors into disturbed monsters. Thus, we do not have a single Roman emperor who has participated in harsh Jewish reprisals who has not been defamed by accusations of homosexuality, cruelty or perversion. The Spanish historian José Manuel Roldán Hervás has dismantled many of the false accusations against the historical figure of Caligula.

I have said several times that to save the white race from extinction it is necessary to rewrite the history of the West, so I use the symbol of the three-eyed raven that, unlike the normies, can see the past. Following the crow’s lead, it is not only necessary to reclaim the pagan emperors such as Caligula and Nero within a new narrative. Concurrently we must takedown from the pedestal those figures that Christianity placed on top, something that I would like to illustrate with Charlemagne.

The only living historian for whom I have respect told me that he would rate Charlemagne well up in the top five most evil characters of European history. I recently acquired Thomas Hodgkin’s *The Life of Charlemagne*, which I recommend to those who have swallowed the Christian propaganda of this evil man. If we keep in mind the message of the historical sections in *The Fair Race*, we will see that even after the Aryan apocalypse of the 4th and 5th centuries, there were still many Germanic tribes in the 6th and 7th centuries who refused to worship the god of the Jews.
Charlemagne forced these uncontaminated Aryans to worship the enemy god: a historical milestone that has to do directly with the philosemitic state that the entire West is currently suffering. We could imagine a parallel world in which at least part of the Aryan populations had not been worshiping, for more than a millennium, the volcanic demon that appeared to Moses in a desert.

May 24, 2020
Negrolatry is Christian morality

A week before the *Game of Thrones* finale I added an entry that I now recycle and rephrase interpolating the new term, ‘negrolatry’. 2020 is the year of the total inversion of Aryan values into Christian values. Our historical season or climax of Christian values is similar to *Game of Thrones*’s ‘Sparrows’, the Faith Militant fanatics who believed in equality for all men (‘We’re all equal in the eyes of the Seven’, a rephrasing of the Christian ‘Every man is equal in God’s eyes’). George R.R. Martin obtained his inspiration from real events of Western history. In the Middle Ages, the Dulcinians were like the Sparrows. Inspired by pious Franciscan ideals, like today’s Antifa that occupy six blocks in Seattle, in real history the Dulcinians became thugs.

The ideals of the medieval Dulcinians were: (1) The fall of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, (2) The fall of the feudal system, and (3) The creation of a new egalitarian society based on mutual aid, holding property in common and respecting gender equality. Fra Dolcino (1250-1307) viewed the history of mankind as four epochs, culminating in the period of the Apostolics led by Dolcino. Like the ‘Sparrows’ in *Game of Thrones* this is a period characterised by the absence of government action (or police).

In Martin’s novels, after a couple of centuries of disbanding the Faith Militant, Cersei restores the military arm of the Faith of the Seven, just as today the elites are restoring a secular form of
Stormtroopers with the empowered Antifa with the noble goal of immanentizing the eschaton. Just as today’s white negrolatres see Jesus in blacks, the white man must be degraded to equalise him with the Negro. In *Game of Thrones* the Sparrows attacked the noblest houses of Westeros: House Tyrell and then Cersei herself. Since in real life the Negro cannot be equalised by decree, the only way to equalise him before the white male is simply by degrading the latter’s status throughout the West: precisely what is happening. Westerners ignore that, after seven hundred years, our secular governments are implementing the core of the ideals of Fra Dolcino.

The Roman Catholic Church destroyed Fra Dolcino and the Dulcinians in the 14th century when the Church felt threatened by them, just as Queen Cersei destroyed the Sparrows in Season 6 of *Game of Thrones*. Alas, there’s no Cersei on the horizon. In today’s West the ‘Sparrows’ who became negrolatres in the Great Neochristian Awakening of 2020 hold power in each Western government, media outlet and university. The only way to destroy them would be through a revaluation of all values. But very few white nationalists are willing to endorse it. The following comment by Mauricio motivated me to recycle what I said a year ago:

There is a convergence taking place. It’s happening in many dissident blogs and channels—the Christian Question. It’s been lurking around for years, mostly disregarded as trivial topic of debate. But this rising nigger terrorism is making the internet’s Occam razor cut deeper and deeper.

White Nationalists will have to choose. Christian Question: Yes or No. If you choose Yes, you’re out. You’re not part of the White Revolution. If you choose No, welcome to Level 6. Now start concocting ways to solve the Christian Problem. You’ll find that transvaluing moral values isn’t so trivial after all.

There are those who come up with a third option, ‘it doesn’t matter’, like that Devon Stack from Black Pilled. They want to continue to ignore the Christian Question, and want to continue fighting the system without any regard to the morality of their movement. ‘We’re all brothers’, he said. ‘We’re united by reason’. I laughed when I heard that.

I’m reminded of *The Turner Diaries* when, after the secession of the western states from the US, there was one
rebel General in charge of a movement that was less radical than Earl Turner. They completely fell apart from infiltration and in-fighting and got crushed by the system.

That’s what these purple-pilled, Christian Question-ignorers don’t understand: accepting Christians in your movement is the same as accepting Jews.

The time will come when the ship will sink, and you need to sever the hands that cling to the lifeboat. Christians can’t do that. Quite the contrary, they will pull up even more people into the lifeboat.

So start cleaning your mental room of filthy moral garbage, because you’ll need a clear head with a clear morality and a lot of hate to fight the war that’s coming. The Christian Question is old news for those who have been preparing. Get Updated or get Outdated.

‘Welcome to level 6’. Mauricio refers to his article published in this book.

June 12, 2020
Whites have gone bananas

The *folie en masse* that the West is currently suffering, triggered by the recent events of the black man who died on the asphalt in the United States, has its historical precedents.

The first devilish psychotic breakdown suffered by the white man, as old readers of this site know, was the *folie en masse* when the Roman Empire empowered a cult to destroy all the temples, the libraries and the sculptures that showed the magnificence of the Aryan beauty. What is tragic about this destruction of the classical world by a Semitic ideology is that many whites participated in the destruction of the white world, as can be seen in books whose PDFs are available on this site.

The white race is similar to the Targaryens of *A Song of Ice and Fire*. Of inconceivable beauty in the prose of George R.R. Martin, these great conquerors suffered psychotic outbursts from time to time. One of those happened in the penultimate episode of *Game of Thrones*, when Daenerys Targaryen burned the capital of the seven kingdoms.

In real history, whites have done similar things. Not only did they burn, or tolerate non-white people burning, almost the entire legacy of classical knowledge, but centuries later they let being hypnotised by a pope to the extent of organising a children’s crusade, with the quixotic aim of recapturing Jerusalem. We can imagine what happened to those poor white children when they fell into the hands of the Muslims. These recurring massive psychotic breakdowns of the white race occur, as in the Targaryen family, after a few centuries. We are currently witnessing the last of these *folies en masse*. There cannot be another breakdown after the present one as the stakes are that whites must become extinct.

The pro-black protests on both sides of the Atlantic wouldn’t worry me if they weren’t packed with whites. What blacks, media Jews, and white women say is of no concern to me (women
always follow the alpha male who provides them). What concerns me is what the Aryan men are saying, as it is up to them to reclaim their civilisation during this anti-white war. I insist that to understand what is happening one must become familiar with the real history of the white race: something impossible to find in the forums of the alt-right or white nationalism as they ignore that Christianity apparently, and irreversibly, damaged the Aryan psyche.

That we are experiencing the last mass psychotic breakdown of the white race, which we could call Genuflect to the New Church of Antiracism, is guessed in the following tweets and texts by racially conscious whites that could be multiplied by hundreds, but that below I collect only a few:

• Not even sure what to say anymore. It’s like 90 percent of the population have joined a cult without telling the rest of us and now we’re watching bewildered.

• Racial hierarchy hasn’t gone anywhere. It has been inverted. Blackness is celebrated now. Whiteness is demonised and deconstructed.

• Today, The New York Times ran an op-ed telling people to withhold affection from their relatives unless they protest or give money to anti-racist organizations: ‘Text to your relatives and loved ones telling them you will not be visiting them or answering phone calls until they take significant action in supporting black lives either through protest or financial contributions’.

• So I may have to revise my model of a Cold Civil War. Right now, we look more like an occupied nation, dominated by this bizarre cult of anti-white totalitarianism, dissenters from which have no organization, no leadership, and almost no public voice.

• In the 1940s, this county began fighting ‘racism’. By 2020, this obsession has completely and utterly destroyed this country. It has absolutely consumed it.

The trumpet of the Apocalypse heralding the end of the Christian Era was covid-19, but the first droplets from the goblets of wrath began to spill this month. If my understanding of the world economy is adequate, I predict that the liquid residue from the cups will be poured over the mad West once the US dollar collapses.

Today’s American blacks still have bread and TV circuses. After the collapse, you can imagine a chimpout with hunger and the
government, the media and the mad whites who are protesting supporting them.

It is high time to listen to William Pierce’s voice as he reads his Turner Diaries…

June 27, 2020
In my previous post I quoted a commenter who explained why the bulk of white nationalists in America don’t admire Hitler. The sad answer is that these nationalists sold their souls to Judeo-Christianity, even those secular nationalists who refuse to criticise it. As Emil Cioran said, ‘Everybody has forgiven Christianity’. It’s worth quoting and rephrasing what a Wikipedia article, ‘Religious aspects of Nazism’, says, purging from it all anti-white crap that that damned online encyclopaedia promulgates, and adding some observations of my own:

After National Socialist Germany had surrendered in World War II, the US Office of Strategic Services published a report on the National Socialist plan for the persecution of the churches. Historians and theologians generally agree about the National Socialist policy towards religion, that the objective was to remove explicitly Jewish content from the Bible (i.e., the Old Testament, the
Gospel of Matthew, and the Pauline Epistles), transforming the Christian faith into a new religion, completely cleansed from any Jewish element and conciliate it with National Socialism, Völkisch ideology and Führerprinzip: a religion called ‘Positive Christianity’. This, of course, was tried before, back in… 144 c.e.! Marcionism depicted the God of the Old Testament as a tyrant or demiurge. Marcion’s canon, the first Christian canon ever compiled, consisted of eleven books: a gospel, which was a form of the Gospel of Luke; and ten Pauline epistles. Marcion’s canon rejected the entire Old Testament, along with all other epistles and gospels. In my opinion, NS Positive Christians was a failure. It was a good try but ultimately it is impossible to combine water with oil. It was a very explainable mistake in the recent nation that had just awakened to the most elemental racialism. Alfred Rosenberg was influential in the development of Positive Christianity. In *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* he wrote that:

- Saint Paul was responsible for the destruction of the racial values from Greek and Roman culture;
- the dogma of hell advanced in the Middle Ages destroyed the free Nordic spirit;

This is pivotal to understand white demoralisation today (and it is a pity that my site is the only racialist site which has accused this doctrine of the havoc it caused among us).

- original sin and grace are Oriental ideas that corrupt the purity and strength of Nordic blood;
- the Old Testament and the Jewish race are not an exception and one should return to the Nordic peoples’ fables and legends;
- Jesus was not Jewish, but had Nordic blood from his Amorite ancestors.

The latter point was another mistake. Neither Rosenberg nor Hitler nor anyone at the top of the elites knew that Jesus didn’t even exist. Only very recent scholarship has demonstrated that Evangelist Mark invented his story (and that the other evangelists simply edited Mark’s Gospel).

The National Socialist Party program of 1920 included a statement on religion as point 24. In this statement, the National Socialist party demanded freedom of religion for all religious denominations that are not opposed to the customs and moral
sentiments of the Germanic race. Also, the paragraph proclaims the party’s endorsement of Positive Christianity. Historians have described this statement as ‘a tactical measure, cleverly left undefined to accommodate a broad range of meanings’.

*Adolf Hitler’s religious views*

Adolf Hitler’s religious beliefs have been a matter of debate; the wide consensus of historians consider him to have been irreligious, anti-Christian and anti-clerical. In light of evidence such as his fierce criticism and vocal rejection of the tenets of Christianity, numerous private statements to confidants denouncing Christianity as a harmful superstition, and his strenuous efforts to reduce the influence and independence of Christianity in Germany after he came to power, Hitler’s major academic biographers conclude that he was irreligious and an opponent of Christianity.

Historian Laurence Rees found no evidence that ‘Hitler, in his personal life, ever expressed belief in the basic tenets of the Christian church’. Ernst Hanfstaengl, a friend from his early days in politics, says Hitler ‘was to all intents and purposes an atheist by the time I got to know him’. However, historians such as Richard Weikart and Alan Bullock doubt the assessment that he was a true atheist, suggesting that despite his dislike of Christianity he still clung to a form of spiritual belief.

Hitler was born to a practising Catholic mother, and was baptised into the Roman Catholic Church. From a young age, he expressed disbelief and hostility toward Christianity. But in 1904, acquiescing to his mother’s wish, he was confirmed at the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Linz, Austria, where the family lived. According to John Willard Toland, witnesses indicate that Hitler’s confirmation sponsor had to ‘drag the words out of him almost as though the whole confirmation was repugnant to him’. Rissmann notes that, according to several witnesses who lived with Hitler in a men’s home in Vienna, Hitler never again attended Mass or received the sacraments after leaving home. Several eyewitnesses who lived with Hitler while he was in his late teens and early-to-mid 20s in Vienna state that he never attended church after leaving home at eighteen.

Nonetheless, in Hitler’s early political statements he attempted to express himself to the German public as a Christian.
In his book *Mein Kampf* and in public speeches prior to and in the early years of his rule, he described himself as a Christian. Precisely because of things like this, David Irving, the great biographer of Hitler, never read *Mein Kampf*: a public-relations book that some writers stuck their fingers in the text, so Irving never had it as a reliable source that expressed the thought of the Führer in its purity.

As we have seen, the National Socialist party promoted Positive Christianity, a movement that rejected most traditional Christian doctrines such as the divinity of Jesus, as well as Jewish elements such as the Old Testament. From this angle, contemporary Christian nationalists in the US are a century behind compared to Positive Christianity. Consider, for example, how the administrators of *Occidental Dissent* and *The Daily Stormer* still subscribe to traditional Christianity, not even to a sort of Positive Christianity.

In one widely quoted remark, Hitler described Jesus as an ‘Aryan fighter’ who struggled against ‘the power and pretensions of the corrupt Pharisees’ and Jewish materialism. While a small minority of historians accept these publicly stated views as genuine expressions of his spirituality, the vast majority believe that Hitler was sceptical of religion and anti-Christian, but recognised that he could only be elected and preserve his political power if he feigned a commitment to and belief in Christianity, which the overwhelming majority of Germans believed in. But privately Hitler repeatedly deprecated Christianity, and told confidants that his reluctance to make public attacks on the Church was not a matter of principle, but a pragmatic political move. In his private diaries, Goebbels wrote in April 1941 that though Hitler was ‘a fierce opponent’ of the Vatican and Christianity, ‘he forbids me to leave the church for tactical reasons’. Hitler’s remarks to confidants, as described in the Goebbels Diaries, the memoirs of Albert Speer, and transcripts of Hitler’s private conversations recorded by Martin Bormann in *Hitler’s Table Talk*, are further evidence of his irreligious and anti-Christian beliefs. These sources record several private remarks in which Hitler ridicules Christian doctrine as absurd, contrary to scientific advancement, and socially destructive.

Once in office, Hitler and his regime sought to reduce the influence of Christianity on society. From the mid-1930s, his government was increasingly dominated by militant anti-church
proponents like Goebbels, Martin Bormann (see pic at the beginning of this article), Himmler, Rosenberg and Heydrich whom Hitler appointed to key posts. These anti-church radicals were generally permitted or encouraged to perpetrate the National Socialist persecutions of the churches. Jehovah’s Witnesses were ruthlessly persecuted for refusing both military service and allegiance to Hitler’s movement. Hitler said he anticipated a coming collapse of Christianity in the wake of scientific advances, and that National Socialism and religion could not co-exist long term. Although he was prepared to delay conflicts for political reasons, historians conclude that he ultimately intended the destruction of Christianity in Germany, or at least its distortion or subjugation to a National Socialist outlook.

Heinrich Himmler

Reichsführer-SS Heinrich Himmler said: ‘We believe in a God Almighty who stands above us; he has created the earth, the Fatherland, and the Volk, and he has sent us the Führer. Any human being who does not believe in God should be considered arrogant, megalomaniacal, and stupid and thus not suited for the SS’. This of course was Himmler’s blunder, as theistic visions of the providence stem from monotheistic Judaism. Also, from my point of view, a personal god—i.e., the mythical Judeo-Christian god—should be written thus: (((God))).

On the other hand, credited retrospectively with being the founder of ‘Esoteric Hitlerism’, and certainly a figure of major importance for the officially sanctioned research and practice of mysticism by a National Socialist elite, Heinrich Himmler, more than any other high official in the Third Reich (including Hitler) was fascinated by pan-Aryan (i.e., broader than Germanic) racialism. Himmler’s capacity for rational planning was accompanied by an enthusiasm for the utopian, the romantic and even the occult. Although Himmler did not have any contact with the Thule Society, he possessed more occult tendencies than any other National Socialist leader. The German journalist and historian Heinz Höhne, an authority on the SS, explicitly describes Himmler’s views about reincarnation as occultism. The historic example which Himmler used in practice as the model for the SS was the Society of Jesus, since Himmler found in the Jesuits what he perceived to be the core
element of any order, the doctrine of obedience and the cult of the organisation. The evidence for this largely rests on a statement from Walter Schellenberg in his memoirs (Cologne, 1956, p. 39), but Hitler is also said to have called Himmler ‘my Ignatius of Loyola’. As an order, the SS needed a coherent doctrine that would set it apart. Himmler attempted to construct such an ideology, and to this purpose he deduced a Germanic tradition from history.

In a 1936 memorandum, Himmler set forth a list of approved holidays based on pagan and political precedents and meant to wean SS members from their reliance on Christian festivities. The Winter Solstice, or Yuletide, was the climax of the year. It brought SS folk together at candlelit banquet tables and around raging bonfires that harked back to German tribal rites. The *Allach Julleuchter* (Yule light) was made as a presentation piece for SS officers to celebrate the winter solstice. It was later given to all SS members on the same occasion, December 21. Made of unglazed stoneware, the Julleuchter was decorated with early pagan Germanic symbols. Himmler said, ‘I would have every family of a married SS man to be in possession of a Julleuchter. Even the wife will, when she has left the myths of the church find something else which her heart and mind can embrace’.

In 1935 Himmler, along with Richard Walther Darré, established the Ahnenerbe. At first independent, it became the ancestral heritage branch of the SS. Headed by Dr. Hermann Wirth, it was dedicated primarily to archaeological research, but it was also involved in proving the superiority of the Aryan race. A great deal of time and resources were spent on researching or creating a popularly accepted historical, cultural and scientific background so the ideas about a superior Aryan race could be publicly accepted. For example, an expedition to Tibet was organised to search for the origins of the Aryan race. To this end, the expedition leader, Ernst Schäfer, had his anthropologist Bruno Beger make face masks and skull and nose measurements. Another expedition was sent to the Andes. When I lived in Gran Canaria a Spanish woman told me that Himmler’s researchers had had much interest in researching the Nordic aboriginals of the Canary islands: blonder and lighter than the Spaniards themselves.

*June 27, 2020*
The fourth part of my eleventh autobiographical book, *El Grial*, begins with a dream that I now translate into English:

I was walking on a street by day next to Dad, who pointed out to me, enthusiastic and joyful as his character, the great church—or wall of a great church, rather like a Gothic cathedral—while I felt real horror for the (not glimpsed, only felt) kind of gargoyles, low relief sculptures or external figures of a very dark-stone cathedral. The contrast between the spirited Dad in pointing out to me that Christian bastion as something so positive that he even smiled at me and the horrified son—although I corresponded to Dad’s smile from my height as a child with another smile to be nice with him—couldn’t be greater.

Then I commented that over the years I had several dreams with that theme. I interpreted that my father lacked enough empathy to realise that traditional Catholic doctrine, which seemed so positive to him, horrified his little firstborn.

I recently said that the music of *Parsifal* has been one of my favourites, despite the fact that the opera characters are quasi-Christian knights that Wagner devised. Wagner’s last opus is not a hundred percent Christian insofar the script never names Christ or Christianity. Rather, it resembles the spirit of the Germanic sagas in
times of Christian conversion, when something of the ancient pagan spirit was still breathed. I must confess that, unlike *Parsifal*, traditional Christian music has horrified me as much as that series of dreams with which I opened this post.

Iconoclasm, even in music, is a thorny topic. If we proclaim the transvaluation of all values, the question immediately arises: What to do with the so-called sacred music after the truly anti-Christian revolution conquers the West? Nietzsche loved *Parsifal*’s music but abhorred its message, especially the chastity of the quasi-Christian knights. In my opinion, Wagner, Hitler’s favourite composer, is salvageable but how should we treat sacred music from his predecessors?

Unlike Richard Wagner (1813-1883) who flourished a century after the death of Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750) Bach had no passion for the Germanic sagas of the pagan past. On the contrary: he composed his music for the main Lutheran churches in Leipzig, and adopted Lutheran hymns in his vocal works. The hundreds of sacred works that Bach created are generally seen as a manifestation not only of his craft, but of his great devotion to the god of Christians: that is, the god of the Jews. Bach even taught Luther’s catechism as Thomaskantor in Leipzig, and some of his pieces represent it. For example, his very famous *St Matthew Passion*, like other works of this type, illustrates the Passion of (((Christ))) directly with biblical texts. (Triple parentheses are an antisemitic symbol that has been used to highlight the names of individuals of a Jewish background, or organisations owned by Jews. My innovation has been to add those parentheses to the god of the Jews, or to the characters of the New Testament: something that white nationalists don’t dare to do.)

Compare all this with Wagner’s relatively paganised work who didn’t quote the gospel: a musician who, by introducing pre-Christian elements in his operas, was already starting to shake off the Judeo-Christian monkey from his back. But before continuing my writing about Bach I would like to quote, once again, the words of Nietzsche that appear in *The Fair Race*:

Here it becomes necessary to call up a memory that must be a hundred times more painful to Germans. The Germans have destroyed for Europe the last great harvest of civilisation that Europe was ever to reap—the Renaissance. Is it
understood at last, will it ever be understood what the Renaissance was?

*The transvaluation of Christian values:* an attempt with all available means, all instincts and all the resources of genius to bring about a triumph of the *opposite* values, the more noble values... To attack at the critical place, at the very seat of Christianity, and there enthrone the more *noble* values—that is to say, to *insinuate* them into the instincts, into the most fundamental needs and appetites of those sitting there...

I see before me the *possibility* of a heavenly enchantment and spectacle: it seems to me to scintillate with all the vibrations of a fine and delicate beauty, and within it there is an art so divine, so infernally divine, that one might search in vain for thousands of years for another such possibility; I see a spectacle so rich in significance and at the same time so wonderfully full of paradox that it should arouse all the gods on Olympus to immortal laughter: *Cæsar Borgia as pope!*... Am I understood? Well then, *that* would have been the sort of triumph that *I* alone am longing for today: by it Christianity would have been swept away!

What happened? A German monk, Luther, came to Rome. This monk, with all the vengeful instincts of an unsuccessful priest in him, raised a rebellion against the Renaissance in Rome...

Instead of grasping, with profound thanksgiving, the miracle that had taken place: the conquest of Christianity at its *capital*—instead of this, his hatred was stimulated by the spectacle. A religious man thinks only of himself. Luther saw only the *depravity* of the papacy at the very moment when the opposite was becoming apparent: the old corruption, the *peccatum originale*, Christianity itself, no longer occupied the papal chair! Instead there was life! Instead there was the triumph of life! Instead there was a great yea to all lofty, beautiful and daring things!

And Luther *restored the church*.

I invite visitors who like classical music to watch an hour-and-a-half documentary: *Bach: A Passionate Life*. The host of the documentary informs us that, when Luther took refuge in a castle, he believed that the devil was stalking him from the ceiling. Compare such dark paranoia with the return to the artistic spirit that then reigned in Renaissance Rome! In that room the dark
monk, Luther, translated the New Testament using many German dialects, thus creating a unified language for that nation. In one of my previous posts I said that all western nations since Constantine, except for the brief reigns of Julian the Apostate and Hitler, should be considered quackery from the new point of view. The reason why the Germans allowed themselves to be brainwashed so easily since the US-imposed Diktat is explained if we see that the inertia of their culture was infinitely more Christian than the occult paganism of the Third Reich, so iconic at Himmler’s SS-Castle in Wewelsburg. In other words, what succeeded again after the Second World War was, as happened after the assassination of Julian, the grip that the Jesus archetype holds over the white man’s psyche.

Compare my point of view with what even a racist revolutionary, a non-Christian, wrote in one of his novels. Harold Covington envisioned a dispute between Christians and pagans, both freedom fighters for the fourteen words, during the racial revolution: a dispute that was only resolved when the pagans allowed that the hymn of the new Aryan republic was none other than a hymn that Luther had composed. Naturally, neither the late Covington nor his secular followers that can still be heard once a month on Radio Free Northwest knew that Christianity and the Jewish question are one and the same.

These Luther hymns went perfectly in line with the central goal of Bach’s life, as we are informed after minute 29 of the documentary mentioned above: ‘A well-regulated church music to the glory of (((God))))’. Those were Johann Sebastian Bach’s words: the words of the grandfather of all the composers! But without putting triple parentheses now, after the 45th minute of the documentary a man confesses to us, when we hear Partita for Violin No. 2 in the background, that this sort of musical soliloquy ‘would convince me that there is a God’.

This is most interesting because that Partita is the music solo I have heard the most from Bach, and although it is secular (i.e., non-sacred music) it perfectly portrays the feeling of the child of my dream: that what for my father (or Christians) seemed sublime to me it seems hellish—infernal not in the sense of today’s degenerate music, but in another sense. Just as Gothic cathedrals represent magnificent art, much of Bach’s music (and even Beethoven’s quartets) transports me to that gargoyle-filled nightmare world of which I want nothing more than a return to a musically enlightened
world. Please understand me well. Unlike those Neanderthals who
don’t understand the music of Bach, Beethoven or Wagner, since
my parents were musicians of classical music by profession, I did
understand them. But it is the dark zeitgeist that, as in my dark
cathedrals series of dreams, bothers me even though I recognise
that the *Partita* is a masterpiece. Curiously, when after getting used
to listening to it on the violin I once heard the same *Partita* by Bach,
but this time versioned for classical guitar, the gargoyles
disappeared and I was finally able to enjoy it. Something similar
happens to me with the church organ and the harpsichord: I cannot
hear them except when the pieces are versioned for other more
modern classical instruments. It is the Christian Era zeitgeist that
irritates me.

In the aforementioned documentary, after minute forty-six
the narrator talks again about Bach’s ‘life ambition’: writing music
for the church. It is very interesting to observe how Bach worked
frantically in Leipzig to compose, in a relatively short time, his two
Passions. Leipzig was ‘the city of churches’ and out of a population
of thirty thousand, nine thousand of them gathered together in two
churches, making Bach the centre of an audience ten to twelve
times larger than an opera house.

Wagner would have envied him!

It was there that Bach premiered a Passion: a central gem in
a series of cantatas and oratorios that told the story of a rabbi’s
arrest, trial, and crucifixion. This was the fictional rabbi that the
treasonous Aryans still adore, including a good many of the
misnamed white nationalists. *St John Passion* is an amalgam of
‘storytelling, meditation and drama’ and let us remember that the
Gospel of John was Luther’s favourite gospel. If one takes a look
after minute fifty-six in the referred documentary we see the
narrator directing a group of musicians that includes a woman of
dark skin: the perfect corollary of an ethic that commands the
German to love every anthropomorphic creature. The narrator
comments on playing *St John Passion*: ‘It’s like nails being driven into
bare flesh’ and that’s exactly the feeling that that music causes me.
But not in the sense that the narrator imagines: but in the sense of
my dreams of terrifying cathedrals and my dislike for dad’s
Christianity. I especially feel that when the choir sings together.

In a non-nightmarish world Aryan Germany would have
continued without Levantine contamination. How would that
Teutonic music have sounded in an 18th-century parallel world in which Julian had not been murdered? Maybe when Christianity finishes dying Bach’s music will die but even in secular Germany Christianity is alive. Just listen to the lyrics of St John Passion sung by the German choir after the fifty-eighth minute!

(((Lord)), our ruler
whose fame in every land is glorious!

Axiologically, the Hebrew god still rules the secular West (‘ethnocentrism for me’—the chosen people—‘but universalism for thee’—you gentiles). In a ‘wonderful presentation of story-telling’ the Passion composed by Bach tried to transmit, in ‘an extraordinary amalgam between theology and music’, the drama of the rabbi’s crucifixion whom mad people ordered to be killed. It hurts to see these Aryans sing to the god of the Jews seven decades after a German Reich tried to get them on the right track. St John Passion, the narrator informs us, is a masterpiece even though the authorities at the time disliked it so much that they forced Bach to make changes to it.

Bach did not compose any opera at a time when the genre was very much in vogue. In this, he cannot contrast more with Wagner, mainly known for his operas (or, as some of his mature works later became known, ‘musical dramas’). Unlike Bach who used the Gospel text in his most ambitious works, Wagner wrote both the libretto and the music for each of his works. My father, a composer of classical music, used to say that Wagner’s art predicted cinema. However, in the aforementioned documentary the narrator tells us that St Matthew Passion has operatic elements. It was music that inspired ‘contrition and remorse’, and it is striking how the pundits of white nationalism don’t want to see the elephant in the room when they agonise to explain how the guilt that currently kills the white man originated. St Matthew Passion lasts an hour and a half, and has twice the choir and orchestra than St John Passion.

Who has hit you
my Savior, and with torments
so harshly abused you?

The narrator tells us: ‘And it’s in that moment that I feel Bach is saying, This suffering is unbearable. We have to stop it. We have to show our sense of moral outrage’.
You know nothing of our sins…
Have mercy my God
for the sake of my tears.

After explaining *St Matthew Passion* the narrator made the mistake of passing the microphone to a psychologist to ‘psychoanalyse’ Bach. Readers of this site know that I think clinical psychology is pseudoscientific, and it’s not worth adding much here except to say that Freud and his disciples loved to ‘psychoanalyse’ geniuses to feel superior to them (see what I say about the Vienna quack in my second autobiographical book). After this mistake, the narrator tells us that Bach’s obsession with composing religious music was such that, despite his Lutheran background, he composed a large-scale Latin Mass for a Catholic court. As the lyrics of one of his last compositions say shortly before Bach died: ‘Before (((your))) throne now I appear…’

*July 4, 2020*
I’m still alone

One of the things that strike me when I say that I am speaking to myself is that some respond that they are listening to me, or that they have learned about anti-Christian matters thanks to this site. The reality is that that would be only one aspect of being accompanied. A few days ago I quoted once again what Nietzsche said of Luther. This monk, instead of kneeling in Rome grateful for the transvaluation of visual values that had started at the very headquarters of Christendom, none of that impacted him but returned to his dark Germany to write dark religious texts.

White nationalism is basically an American phenomenon. All major websites are American, not European. Europe died after the Second World War when two Judaised nations to the core annihilated it. But we should not blame Roosevelt’s US and Stalin’s SU one hundred percent, as both socio-political experiments were two branches that emerged from the same egalitarian baobab that began to engulf the West right after the French Revolution.

White nationalism being an American phenomenon, a descendant of the Calvinist Puritanism of the first colonists, is blind to the values that the Renaissance advocated: the plastic and visual arts. If we remember the texts of Evropa Soberana, a European from the westernmost part of Europe, for the Greeks and the Romans the beauty of the statuary and the temples, more than the texts—not all of them could read—was central. Remember what Greg Johnson said in the comments section of The Occidental Observer in 2012: ‘We need a regime that bans pornography and erects statues of gorgeous naked nymphs and athletes in every public square and crossroads’.

The texts of white nationalism, including the ones Johnson posts on his webzine, bore me (worst of all is the very verbose The Unz Review whose admin is Jewish). They are a direct result of those who conquered the American continent, alienated in the Old
Testament ethos and consequently inspired by Judaic legalisms and moralising rather than by the visual arts. Unlike these Judaised whites, what interests me is the beauty of nymphs, sylphs, and dryads (and it doesn’t bother me in the least that some pederasts include androgynous ephebes in the list). Instead, the pundits of white nationalism, even those who have read Nietzsche, as little and prudish Luthers are blind not only to the beauty of the Aryan body, insofar their webzines don’t dream about it in every crossroad, but blind also about the squares that should inspire them to create the ethnostate. Remember the video ‘What Did Ancient Rome Look Like?’ that I embedded not long ago!

If I am alone it is because I have not been understood when I speak of the transvaluation. Perhaps many believe that I am still referring to texts or cold reason, when what I want is an ethnostate whose architecture resembles the Rome that appears in the aforementioned video. The anti-white climate of our time is exactly the reverse of the dream of putting gorgeous naked nymphs and ephebes in every public square and crossroads. If contemporary racialists had already transvalued their values, instead of verbose texts that few read they would show in their webzines that beauty (as I do with the nymphs in my blogsite’s sidebar).

This is one of the reasons why I am not in the least concerned that the insane American negrolatres, and the blacks themselves, are smashing white male statues in America. All the statues knocked down by BLM and the Antifa have been statues of clothed Christians: statues that had to be thrown away anyway after the Nietzschean revolution. What we need throughout the reconquered West are thousands of completely naked pagan statues showing Aryan beauty in their full frontal glory.

July 6, 2020
The transvaluation explained

Stefan Molyneux was recently expelled from YouTube and his thousands of videos, deleted. Yesterday, they also kicked him out of Twitter. For one thing that’s fine, as Moly always was a gatekeeper on the Jewish question. And it is impossible to understand what happens to the West unless someone expands the Jewish question into what we have been calling the Christian question. However, the day before yesterday, before being expelled from Twitter, Moly was interviewed by a Christian who still has his YouTube channel. Moly said something in the context of parent-child abuse, a topic that I consider my forte: that people used to have their fathers’ wounds heal with their relationship with God. Very true! And what is happening now in the Aryan collective unconscious is that, since they took away their (((god))), now they have no choice but to imitate, albeit secularly, Jesus through their own self-immolation as in the recent negrolatric events.

 Speaking of Twitter, Will Westcott has been a white advocate who uses that platform and says sharp things. Yesterday for example he said: ‘Liberalism is a state backed religion. Dissent and freedom of speech is not allowed. Heretics will be dox’d, fired from their job, arrested, and charged with a hate crime’. I don’t mind the word liberalism, but I would have said it this way: Neochristianity, or following Jesus through secular self-immolation, is a state-backed religion. Dissent and freedom of speech are not allowed. Apostates of neochristianity will be doxed, fired from their job, arrested, and charged with a hate crime. Westcott recently also tweeted, putting up an image of the Constantine statue: ‘Constantine at York statue is incredibly powerful. The authority, the glamour, the supremacy of the Imperator is so far beyond any leader of our current age who would be worthy of such representation’. I strongly called Westcott’s attention, leaving him a link to the PDF of The Fair Race and suggesting that he read the Judea and Rome part of the book, which is about how Constantine
should be considered the greatest imaginable villain in the history of the ancient world. Unlike Westcott, Robert Morgan does have a clear notion of the damage that Christianity did to the white race. In his most recent comment he wrote:

The fish doesn’t perceive the water he swims in; or as Ellul put it, when a propaganda has triumphed completely, it disappears from view as propaganda. Then it becomes the normal, replacing whatever existed before with itself. Christianity conquered the West so completely and uprooted paganism so thoroughly that nothing remains in the culture that opposes it. There are only various Christian heresies, some of which, like Marxism, accept the Christian moral outlook on the so-called ‘brotherhood of man’, but relegate belief in Jesus to an optional accessory, or even oppose it. Gone with paganism is the white man’s primeval joyousness, his celebration of himself as depicted in the sculptures of ancient Rome and Greece. Gone is his sensuality and love of life; gone his love of victory; gone his pride. He learned from Christianity to despise himself, be ashamed of sex, and look forward to death.

And in another comment he added:

A prominent feature of today’s totalitarianism is a 1984-style Anti-Sex League. This operates synergistically with the Puritanical view of sex fostered by Christianity, and now persists as Christianity’s cultural residue even among those who aren’t religious, or even consider themselves anti-Christian.

This is very true and we must analyse it.

Almost without exception all white advocates ignore, like Westcott, that the anti-white zeitgeist in the collective unconscious of the white man was born in the times of Constantine. That is why it is so important to read Evropa Soberana’s essay in the book that I compiled. However, reading it is only the beginning to amend our ways. An individual who truly transvalues all values detects reminiscences of the Christian ethos even in the harshest novel a white advocate has written. I have already talked about this but it is worth repeating. The Turner Diaries contains a passage in which it is said that the Order would take a freedom fighter to the firing squad if he rapes a woman who also belongs to that liberation movement.
The first thing to consider here is that Pierce wrote his novel before the movement of frustrated men emerged on the internet analysing women’s psychology to the point of understanding it. In short, women only become bad if they don’t have many children, just as men become bad if we fail to kill the enemy. In the context of war, the life of a man is worth infinitely more than the life of a woman, and this is where Pierce erred. One of the toughest episodes during Julius Caesar’s war in Gaul happened when those on Vercingetorix’s side had to expel Gallic women and children from a besieged fortress, as the food was scarce, and it was understood that without the precious life of the male warriors the war would be lost.

Unlike the above anecdote, which shows how precious the male life is during wartime, in the reader’s mind that passage from Pierce’s novel, which is very brief, only demoralises the would-be soldier. In total war what counts is to kill, genocide, exterminate, and not leave stone upon stone of the enemy culture as the Romans did in Carthage. Occasionally, this Blond Beast is allowed to rape even the women in his tribe. Although the *Vikings* TV series is as flawed as *Game of Thrones* to describe the spirit of yesteryear, I remember in one of the episodes of the first season that Rollo raped a woman from his village simply because he fancied her. For the white advocate who wants to do something for his race, and even for the Pierce who wrote that passage, it would be absolutely inconceivable if you carried that barbarism into the world today. True, once there is a social contract in a pure white society (think of the Jane Austen or *Downton Abbey* worlds), rape should not be allowed. But in those societies the institution of marriage was rock solid.

The point is that we do not live in times of early or late Victorianism. We live in the time when Christianity has been axiologically transformed into a neochristianity whose goal is that whites immolate themselves as Jesus did. In these times the only thing that matters is to disabuse the Aryan man from the lie of millennia, as Nietzsche would say (hence the priest of the 14 words’ first guideline: ‘Speak only to Aryan males’). What Morgan says in his second quote could be illustrated not only with the case of the Viking Rollo raping a woman from his village, but with the siege of the Vercingetorix warriors, although now seen from the Roman side.
Homer describes Ganymede as the most beautiful of mortals, and in one version of the myth Zeus falls in love with his beauty and abducts him to serve as cup-bearer in Olympus. Although Zeus was basically hetero and always had countless affairs with goddesses and human women, he wanted to know what the cute brat tasted like. Imagine that one of Julius Caesar’s centurions, a married man with children in a distant village, as most soldiers was sexually starved in the camp. Following the example of Zeus-Jupiter he fancied a teenager as androgynous as Giton, and adopted him as the cup-bearer of his tent. Who in the Roman world would care, in times of war, that this centurion felt that infatuation for the ephebe? Who the hell would tear their clothes like even racist ‘anti-Christians’ would do today, so loaded on their backs with the ogre of the Christian superego?

These two examples illustrate what Morgan says in the quote above. Just as Westcott had no inkling of the role Constantine played in the destruction of the ancient world, contemporary racists, even so-called anti-Christians, remain slaves to the moralism dictated by Moses rather than the morality of Homer. Many people, even those who have congratulated me on this site for the texts I have translated unmasking Christianity, have no idea what the phrase ‘transvaluation of all values’ means.

It means: Be humble!

Be humble enough to recognise that we committed a blunder seventeen hundred years ago. Constantine’s mistake, that may cost the race its very existence, meant exchanging the beautiful Aryan Gods and the mores accompanying them for the nefarious god of the Jews. If the white race is heading towards extinction it is due to the pride of refusing to see something so obvious.

July 9, 2020
Puritanical degeneracy

The first action Hitler took to heal degenerate Weimar Germany was to ban pornography and out-the-closet homosexuality. Which editor of the main webzines of white nationalism is currently proposing to emulate the Führer with such salubrious measures, repressing everything related to LGBT?

I have often said, even personally with some relatives, that the colourful LGBT flag lacks precisely the colour that was relatively accepted in the Greco-Roman world. Since in that world neither the Greeks nor the Romans had been miscegenated to the point of becoming the creatures we see today in Greece and Italy, Federico Fellini was right to choose two English actors for the roles of Encolpius and Giton in his surreal adaptation of Petronius’ *Satyricon* (the Roman author of that novel lived in 27-66 of the Common Era). As we can see in a *Satyricon* clip in my YouTube channel, it’s about a man in his twenties and an androgynous teenager. Such sort of ‘pederasty’ was the only accepted form of homosexuality in the Greco-Roman world, and seeing the clip doesn’t cause revulsion in the straight viewer as the adolescent Giton, before becoming a fully-developed man, really looks like a girl. The LGBT Sodom movement will be able to add more colours to its flag now that the genres are surrealistically multiplying. But it will never add to it the only colour accepted in the time of Pericles, or Nero when Petronius flourished (remember that in a revised reading of history, which removes Christian propaganda, Nero was not a villain).

Why do I say that those of the LGBT, who must be swept away as the first cleansing action of the Fourth Reich, will not okay the only homo colour accepted in the ancient Aryan world? A single anecdote will illustrate my point. Thomas Hubbard’s *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* was published in 2003. The following editorial review appears online:

*The most important primary texts on homosexuality in ancient Greece and Rome are translated into modern, explicit*
English and collected together for the first time in this comprehensive sourcebook. Covering an extensive period—a from the earliest Greek texts in the late seventh century b.c.e. to Greco-Roman texts of the third and fourth centuries c.e. — the volume includes well-known writings by Plato, Sappho, Aeschines, Catullus, and Juvenal, as well as less well known but highly relevant and intriguing texts such as graffiti, comic fragments, magical papyri, medical treatises, and selected artistic evidence. These fluently translated texts, together with Thomas K. Hubbard’s valuable introductions, clearly show that there was in fact no more consensus about homosexuality in ancient Greece and Rome than there is today… This unique anthology gives an essential perspective on homosexuality in classical antiquity.

Scandalised by this professor’s academic work on pederasty, half a year ago Antifa vandalised his house, as can be read in an online article. (You have to be very careful with this journalistic note. It was written by a Latina, and those who protested and vandalised the professor’s house were predominantly feminist women.)

I don’t think the Fourth Reich should promote pederasty, but it should promote what I quoted recently: ‘We need a regime that bans pornography and erects statues of gorgeous naked nymphs and ephebes in every public square and crossroads’. It is very clear to me that this, and the filth that Hitler prohibited as soon as he came to power, are two kinds of animals not only different but opposed from an aesthetic point of view. But regarding same-sex unions Americans are unable to distinguish between the sublime and the grotesque. The US was once brilliantly described by Richard Spencer saying that it was a mix of Christian Puritanism and sexual degeneracy—both side by side and at the same time! Too bad they recently took down Spencer’s YouTube channel and I can’t link to it, but if I remember correctly, that video dates back to the times of the Kavanaugh hearing.

No wonder that a nation suffering from such schizophrenia is incapable of recreating visually the Greco-Roman world as it really was. Hollywood Rome is not Rome, and although the Jews and the decadent Americans are very good at recreating degeneracy, they’re unable to recreate the healthy pederasty of ancient times. They couldn’t even bring a movie like Death in Venice to the screen.
Only an Italian was able to do it with the proper aesthetics, and without any sexual contact in the film (a truly platonic love). What I said in my entry ‘The transvaluation explained’ can be exemplified by that American chimera between gross sexual degeneration and Puritanism. As long as the Americans don’t dare to see Hitler as the best man in history, and Constantine the worst, they will be unable to bring to the screen the ethos of Greco-Roman antiquity, the truly Aryan world. As to the visual arts on the television and cinema, they will continue to be neochristian in sexual matters.

Our roots are Greece and Rome—not Jerusalem.

July 12, 2020
The aetiology of psychosis

The state of collapse of the most elemental manhood among whites is evident even in the forums of white nationalism. In these times when anti-white psychosis is accelerating, who among the admins of the main forums has begun to speak of a revolution like the one Pierce imagined in *The Turner Diaries*? What we have is the diametrically opposite to the *Diaries*: a negrolatric revolution that surprised everyone less those who see recent history as the explosion of the Christian sun in its secular, incendiary form: a red giant that we have called neochristianity, although it is more precise to see it as neofranciscanism.

Today, whites are literally in a state of mind that psychiatrists call flowery psychosis: a red giant that burns their entire culture and even their genes.

Since my family’s psychosis started when I was about fifteen or sixteen years old and I have studied that family tragedy, I’d like to be translated already (I have only published most of my fourth book and a censored version of the second in *The West’s Darkest Hour*). The objective would be to show how a normal family can go crazy after one of the parents (in my case, my mother) began to infect other members of the family with her mental viruses. The first to become infected was my father, then some of my siblings (*folie en famille*) and even so-called mental health professionals subscribed to that destructive psychosis that had originally arisen from my mother’s mind. Talking about this topic is taboo in every part of the world. Of the alluded admins, he who perhaps could do it would is Brad Griffin, who apparently had a past similar to the one I describe above, but due to the taboo he won’t write on the subject. I can say the same of a pessimistic commenter that I’m not going to name. If he wrote his heart-breaking autobiography in several volumes, as I did, he would know that what happens to the white man and the tragedy of his teenage life are two sides of the same coin.
A mistake some fans of this site make is to see what I write here as the main thing, and to ignore my work in my mother tongue. The reality is the opposite: precisely because of having analysed the family tragedy I was able to see the western tragedy from my privileged perspective of a three-eyed crow: a fictional entity who has spent his life looking at the past retrocognitively to understand it. But unlike television movies this raven does not have a single pupil. And how can I have it if only my first book and part of the fourth are available in printed form in English?

Since *From Jesus to Hitler* is my *magnum opus*, today I will begin a new reading of the fifth to the eleventh books, as some passages still contain errors of syntax and need harmonisation with respect to the other books. Let’s not forget that I started writing them at the beginning of 1988 and that I barely finished this year. Harmonizing them so that they may eventually appear under a single cover is a laborious and time-consuming undertaking.

If there is anything in which *From Jesus to Hitler* can serve the white cause it is my overriding conclusion of such a spiritual odyssey: There is such a thing as voluntary surrender to evil and the current version of human beings, especially ethno-suicidal whites, are basically evil. In my life, my late father exemplified such evil by believing the slander my mother uttered against the teenager I was. But today all whites who follow the ethical precepts of Jesus, be it in its religious or secular version—christian, neochristian or negrolatric neofranciscan—exemplify evil. If one is unable to understand one’s family, one will be unable to understand why his race commits suicide.

*Elemental psychology*

This is a postscript to my entry yesterday, ‘The Aetiology of Psychosis’. A recent thread of discussion on this same site shows an elemental ignorance about how Christianity seized the soul of whites.

First of all, it is necessary to understand that, as Schopenhauer says, ‘people learn religions as they learn languages’: what some psychologists call parental introjects. The wrongdoing comes from our parents, as ‘introject’ here means a kind of malware in our mentalities without realising that we were programmed to believe in the false god of equality and out-group love since our
childhood. If it were possible to abduct from all Christian and atheist (i.e., neochristian) families their children and educate them under a Fourth Reich, in two or three generations (grandparents are also capable of programming their grandchildren) the spell of Christianity and ethnosophisticated neofrancisanism among whites would be broken. It’s as simple as that. And there would be no need to destroy the few remaining Bibles that would still be in some libraries because there would never again be infatuation for the Abrahamic religions—unless the cycle of allowing Jewry to take over education in this new Aryan Empire was repeated to the degree of destroying the Neopagan temples, and that the stupid white parents start reprogramming the minds of their children with Abrahamic poison.

The ignorance of racialists about basic psychology results in some of them blaming the Aryan genes (hardware) for something that is solely and exclusively a pandemic of mental viruses (software): the Judeo-Christian/liberal memeplex. Remember the parable of the mustard seed: the humblest of the seeds in the 1st century of the common era ended up becoming a huge plant in the 21st century. So what’s a poisonous introject? As Catherine Nixey said after mentioning a famous Gibbon phrase about the ruins of the Capitol in Rome, it was not enough to destroy all statues, libraries and temples:

But, according to some of the most famous preachers of the time, even this was not enough to satisfy the Christian God… He wanted—He demanded—the hearts and minds of every single person within the empire.

And, these clerics threatened, He would know if He didn’t get them. As preachers in the fourth century started to warn their congregations, God’s all-seeing gaze followed you everywhere. He didn’t only see you in church; you were also watched by Him as you went out through the church doors; as you went out into the streets and as you walked around the marketplace or sat in the hippodrome or the theatre. His gaze also followed you into your home and even into your bedroom—and you should be in no doubt that He watched what you did there, too.

That was not the least of it. This new god saw into your very soul. ‘Man looketh on the face, but God on the heart’, thundered Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage. ‘Nothing
that is done is hidden from God’. There was, congregations across the empire were warned, no escape: ‘Nothing, whether actually done or only intended, can escape the knowledge of God’—or His ‘everlasting punishment of fire’.

As I have already said elsewhere, ‘God’ is nothing other than the shadow of our introjected parents. We must begin to see our parents, or rather a facet of our parents, as the villains of our history: even non-Christian white parents for subscribing to Christian ethics. In this way we will free ourselves from the common slander in some quarters of white nationalism of blaming white genes for what are actually the parental memes that have infected us.

*Trauma model of mental disorders*

The following is my response to what Joseph Walsh just told me on this site.

But I sense you seem to think that because you had a troubled relationship with your parents which caused you much mental anguish, that all illnesses of the mind are due to the behaviour of one’s parents?

Have you read my *Day of Wrath*, or at least the Wikipedia article ‘Trauma model of mental disorders’ that I started the previous decade (or even my article ‘On depression’ in this book)? *Day of Wrath*, by the way, is not autobiographical.

I could be mistaken but if that is the case that seems like a massive case of projection. Not only do you seem to think all mental illness is due to parental abuse but you’ve extrapolated that the near-extinction the white race is facing is due to erroneous white parents-white child relationships.

Please note the Schopenhauer quote in my previous post today, that people learn religions like they learn languages. That is, we have been *programmed*. You cannot think in Spanish or Greek however hard you try, and the same is true with religion. You can only learn Buddhism as you can learn a second language, but the whole matter is artificial and you end up thinking in your native language. Perhaps the best analogy is diseases that are transmitted through human contact, such as viruses. The thing is, for almost two millennia, many white parents have been forcing their white children to worship the god of the Jews. I call that child abuse. And
it is easy to see it as child abuse if we compare the religion of eternal torture even of unbaptised babies (a doctrine that Luther believed!) with the incredible beauty, majesty and nobility of classical religion.

If you know the book by Catherine Nixey that I quoted, a woman who is your fellow citizen, you will see that what happened in ancient Rome was an astronomical trauma for converted whites: a trauma that the race has yet to heal to this day. In fact, all Christendom has been nothing other than suffering from a mental illness, analogous to how those diagnosed with schizophrenia suffer symptoms that can be traced to a very specific form of parental abuse that crashes the spirits of their children. But going back to Christianity and neochristianity. They are transmitted via parents. Without the malware within the operating system that abusive parents implant—that is, parents who install the Jesus archetype as a paradigm to follow (and add to it the secular programs that such operating system facilitates in schools and the media)—there is no ethno-suicidal drive.

Mixing metaphors, in this secular phase of the red giant of Christianity whites are burning in earthly purgatory for having committed, after Constantine, the mortal sin of abandoning their Aryan gods to honour the Semitic god. And everything has to do with introjects as the infection has passed from parents to children for so many centuries... Trying to break the chain of parental introjects is the job of the priest of the 14 words, even assuming that whites don’t want to listen to him and avoid his counsel that could heal them of this age-old psychosis.

*July 21, 2020*
‘Introjection’

On this site I have used the word ‘introject’ and would like to explain it using a little isolated piece of my biography, as when writing a profound autobiography I had to come across this word.

In common dictionaries introjection is ‘the unconscious adaptation of the ideas or attitudes of others’. But I emphasise the adoption of the ideas that our parents instilled in us, as it was they who had the greatest influence on our tender egos.

Several commenters, both here and outside this site, have scoffed at my past ideological deviations like Eschatology and parapsychology: completely ignorant of what I intended to tell them about. I have confessed that to illustrate how we are slaves to parental introjects; for example, why in the past I displaced belief in Jesus’ miracles to belief in paranormality or why some antisemites continue to kneel before the Jewish deity.

Although decontextualised, the following passage from my eleventh book, The Grail, illustrates how it was that I introjected some religious things that my father told me. It was like a tremendous malware that I couldn’t erase until after a long time. The following passage is just a loose piece of the puzzle that my autobiographical books put together, but it helps to understand the word introjection. On pages 231-235 of The Grail I wrote the following (my Spanish-English translation, with some explanatory brackets):

The Shroud of Turin

Imagine my surprise when, flipping through a book on the so-called Shroud during a subsequent stay in the neighbouring country (this time in Houston, Texas), I found some pages where the authors spoke of a writing of mine whose theories I had already abandoned!

Some see the origin of the image on the Shroud as paranormal, rather than miraculous. They suggest that
supernatural, rather than Divine, forces may be at work. Mexican parapsychologist Cesar Tort has raised the possibility that the image is a ‘thoughtograph’. There is evidence—controversial, but not easily dismissed—that some psychics can create recognizable images on film by the power of thought alone. The most famous case is that of Ted Serios, an alcoholic Chicago bellhop, whose abilities were studied intensively in the mid-1960s by the eminent researcher Jule Eisenbud. If it exists, the ability of the mind to affect the highly sensitive chemicals of photographic film would seem to be a natural variant of psychokinesis (PK)—the alteration of the state of a physical object by mental influence alone—as exhibited most famously by Uri Geller.

Tort\(^{47}\) points to a similar phenomenon, that of images appearing spontaneously on the walls and floors of buildings. He cites a well-documented case from the 1920s, when the image of the late Dean John Liddell appeared on a wall of Oxford Cathedral. Such pictures are usually of people of special sanctity, but not always. In one case in Bélmez de la Moraleda in Spain, which was investigated by the veteran parapsychologist Professor Hans Bender one-time mentor of Elmar Gruber, co-author of *The Jesus Conspiracy*, leering, demonic faces have appeared regularly on the walls and floors of a house for more than twenty years.\(^{48}\)

Cesar Tort’s starting point was the paradox between the historical and scientific evidence that we had already noted: the image on the Shroud is more consistent with actual crucifixion (and so, to most people, with the first century), than with a medieval artistic forgery, but the carbon dating and


\(^{48}\) The previous footnote appears in the book by the English authors. I investigated this case on my visit to Bélmez in Andalusia, Spain, in 1992. After another credulous article of mine in the journal of the previous note, I became convinced of the fraud. See my short 1995 article, ‘Bélmez Faces turned out to be suspiciously picture-like images’ in *Skeptical Inquirer*, 19 (2) (Mar/Apr), page 4. I personally submitted the manuscript of this article to the editor of the magazine, Kendrick Frazier, during the CSICOP conference in Seattle in 1994.
the documented history show it to be medieval. How, asked Tort, could a fourteenth-century cloth show a first-century image? So he speculated that it was a thoughtograph, projected onto the cloth by the collective minds of the pilgrims who came to meditate on a (then plain) cloth that they believed had wrapped their risen Lord. Tort admitted the main objection to this scenario: even suspending disbelief about the reality of thoughtography, we would expect the image to conform to the beliefs and expectations of those who unconsciously created it. To a medieval mind, there should be nails in the palms (not the wrists), Jesus should look younger, and he would certainly not be naked as here. To explain this, Tort has to invoke another paranormal phenomenon—retrocognition—where the past can be psychically perceived.

The pros and cons of these phenomena are outside the scope of this book, but in the case of Tort’s hypothesis it is enough to say that neither effect has ever been reported as working on the scale needed to make the Shroud image, and that the use of two such unknowns—thoughtography and retrocognition—is simply stretching credulity far too far. Neither does it explain why a negative image was projected, or why the bloodstains should be so different from the rest of the image. It is a bold and open-minded attempt to reconcile the contradictory elements of the Shroud, but in the end it creates more questions than answers.

The passage appears on pages 45-46 of *Turin Shroud: In Whose Image?* by Lynn Picknett and Clive Prince. The authors mention my name again on pages 48 and 57-58. Despite having cited an enormous number of bibliographic references, I never imagined that what I had written in the *JSPR* could appear in a hardcover book whose first edition was sold in the United States.

In an Octavio Paz book I read that what is written for money has no artistic value. If I had become a commercial writer, I would have written, in addition to *My Agony in California*, books such as *In Search of the Soulmate* and *My Quixotic Misadventures in a Cult*. Eventually my editor, avid for bestsellers out of the pens of tormented souls, would have asked me to write *My Misadventures with the Shroud*. But those books would no longer be the cream of the cream as my published ones are. However, although I could fill a
book on my misadventures with the Shroud, which I will not write, I cannot completely overlook that stage of my life.

It all started in 1986, on a gloomy night in the Loch Lomond harbour for private boats in San Rafael, California, times when I wrote desperate letters to Octavio [my cousin]. In wanting to save me [from the introjected fear of hell], I had to demonstrate that the mysterious image of the shroud had been a mere paranormal phenomenon (did others also leave imprints on mortuary sheets?), not the resurrection as Christians understand it. In my Whispering Leaves I mentioned that that year John Heaney answered a letter I had mailed to him. But I omitted that the theologian referred to a Scott Rogo book on miracles, stressing that this parapsychologist had speculated analogously to what I had asked Heaney. I had also commented to the theologian, in a sentence that I wrote to him that verbatim still reaches me today: ‘Because of the fear of eternal damnation, I have been in spiritual agony’.

Opening Scott Rogo’s book in the blackness of Loch Lomond [I had a night shift] I was greatly surprised by a hypothesis that had not crossed my mind. That book, Miracles, was the starting point that resulted in an obsession in which I gradually acquired several books and scientific documents on the shroud.

Back in Mexico, I spent two years, full-time work, on the subject and I got to publish my theories in the journal that Picknett and Prince read in the quote above. In 1991 I would even visit John Beloff in Edinburgh, the editor of that journal for psychical researchers. By the way, the previous year I had rushed into publishing my article, which Picknett and Prince summarised so well above. It was plagued by typographer’s misprints for having asked Karen Deters, my syntax editor, to speak to Beloff for publication in January of 1990, rather than the editor’s wise advice to leave it for April. Deters tried to contact Beloff [there was no internet] but Beloff was not in his cubicle when she called Scotland on the phone. The director of the Department of Psychology at the University of Edinburgh answered the call, who conveyed my hasty wish to Beloff. So I was responsible for the horrible misprints.

More than three decades have passed since my misadventures began with the most sacred relic of the Catholic Church. I currently have a web page on the shroud that reproduces a few texts (The medieval Turin Shroud: A non-paranormal approach to the puzzling image). To write one of the entries on that site I had to find,
from my archived files, an old half-blurred photocopy of Walter McCrone’s article in Scientific American. The brief article referred to the turning point of October 1988: the month in which the results of the radiocarbon tests dated the relic from 1260 to 1380 C.E. Capturing McCrone’s text for my shroud website came as a revelation. But before I confess it I must say that, at the time when I was writing for Beloff’s journal, I paid no much attention to what the Skeptical Inquirer had published in the spring issue of 1982, which contained an article by Marvin Mueller. I had requested that number and Joe Nickell’s sceptical book on the shroud, but still believed that the image was paranormal.

When I quoted McCrone’s words in 2018, the question came to me how it was that, with such good information, thirty years before I had not woken up. I concluded, in one of my diaries, that it had all been a tremendous introject from my father. Years before my internal struggles in Loch Lomond, it had been my father who had captivated me with his tales about the Shroud! He had taken that information out of books he bought, although they have been lost and are no longer in the family library after he passed away. ‘And that was more important than everything posted on my new blog about the shroud’, says my diary. ‘You can imagine’, I said to myself, ‘the toll that the shroud of Turin would have caused in my mind if my father had been an agnostic regarding religion, like his brother Alejandro who still lives’. In the 1990s uncle Alejandro had told me, in front of dad and alluding to McCrone, that the image on the sheet was iron oxide—as if making fun of my JSPR article, which he had read.

On my shroud site I confess that I am indebted to the late nuclear physicist Marvin Mueller for having had the patience to answer my letters. Mueller’s long missives, which would gradually disabuse me about the claim that the image was mysterious, can be seen on my mentioned shroud website.

July 25, 2020
Blaming mankind

On this site I have quoted Robert Morgan. Although he’s right about Christianity, Morgan seems to be saying that technology was something like the apple of knowledge that men ate and were expelled from paradise. That vision of man presupposes the Golden Age of humanity: a myth.

Morgan’s mistake, blaming technology for everything, is due to his lack of knowledge of my appropriation of psychohistory, as massive child sacrifice in pre-technological civilisation speaks horrors of humanity. (In our time there is almost no ritual sacrifice of children, but society allows parents to mistreat their children’s egos to the extent of schizophrenizing them.) Morgan’s position reminds me of Marxists who blame capitalism, as if before capitalism there had been no horrors in the world (see for example what I say about schizophrenia and pre-Columbian Amerinds in Day of Wrath). The only thing technology does is empower even more a modified ape that does very bad things for the reasons outlined in my book: the ‘long childhood’ that lends itself to all kinds of parental abuse, traumas and a pandemonium of cruelty and severe mental disorders.

The trick is not only to blame capitalism, Jewry, technological civilisation or even Christianity but man himself or rather what I call ‘exterminable Neanderthals’. And only the Aryan race has the potential to leave human Neanderthalism behind.

When Morgan commented here, to rebut his technological reductionism (‘Eve’s apple’) I pointed out to psychohistory. He said something to the effect that I had focused on Amerindians. But pure whites also did similar things. Among Scandinavians, the practices of throwing living offerings in holy waters began in the Stone Age and continued during the Bronze and Iron ages. There was never a Golden Age, as shown in the remains of sacrificed children even in the days of our pre-human ancestors.
By the 3rd century BCE whites were already offering human lives in Scandinavia: hundreds of men, women and children have been found in sacred lakes. In 1839, a Danish newspaper published an article about the exhumation of a body from a peat bog in Jutland, and to date several hundred mummified bodies of Scandinavians who had been dumped in the bogs, slaughtered 2,400 years ago, have been exhumed. The 1974 book *The Northmen* by Thomas Froncek and the team of Time-Life shows several photographs of those victims, including the mummified body of a young blonde woman who, preserved by the peat bog, shows that she was a beautiful. Alas, she was attached to a large stone to drown her. Her entire body was found in 1952 at the bottom of a Schleswig-Holstein bog.

Why did even the beautiful Nordics do these things with their crown of the evolution they themselves had created through sexual selection? Recently a commenter sent me a very good edition of James George Frazer’s *The Golden Bough*. But Frazer lacked the tool of psychohistory because it did not exist when he lived (1854-1941). In his truly encyclopaedic work Frazer was unable to explain why on earth can people sacrifice their own children or their women, a practice that sometimes included torture.

As psychohistory explains, everything has to do with the traumas caused by ‘the long childhood’ in our species: traumas that demand not only repetition, but also sublimation of the parents onto figures of-demanding gods. Lloyd deMause, who died this year, figured out much of the why such horrible rituals cropped up in all human races since prehistory. But who among the commenters is interested in my work? DeMause was such a deranged liberal that I had to take over his psychohistory, turn it, and use it as a tool for the priest of the four and fourteen words.

*July 27, 2020*
One more movie

Regarding what I said in my previous posts, that the treatment of children was so atrocious in the past that it caused psychosis in ancient societies, perhaps some visitors have already read a quote in one of the chapters of *Day of Wrath*:

In my view, the psychohistory of Lloyd deMause is indeed a notable approach to history, in the sense in which Wikipedia uses the term ‘notability’. I am not personally involved in psychohistory—I am a mathematical sociologist—but here are some thoughts for your consideration.

Psychohistory as put forth by deMause and his many followers attempts to explain the pattern of changes in the incidence of child abuse in history. This is a perfectly respectable and non-fringe domain of scientific research. They argue that the incidence was much higher in the past, and that there has been an irregular history of improvement. This is a hypothesis that could just as easily have been framed by an epidemiologist as a psychologist. DeMause proposes a theory that society has gone through a series of stages in its treatment and discipline of children.

Again, this is well within the bounds of social science. None of these questions are pseudoscientific. Even the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, a bastion of scientific epidemiology, is interested in these kinds of hypotheses.

Except for some Amazonian tribes, in our time parents are no longer allowed to bury their kids alive. Ours is an infinitely more advanced psychoclass compared to the prehistoric psychoclass and even the psychoclasses of many historical societies (think for example of what I said yesterday about the Aztecs). But even in our western society it is taboo to talk about the abuse that some of our parents inflicted upon us as children. Except for what Stefan Molyneux said about his abusive Jewish mother, who among the racialists has raised the issue?
Not long ago I published a list of fifty-one movies that could be seen in these days of the pandemic. I forgot to mention *Stand by Me*, which contains a scene worth remembering which appears near the end of the film when Gordie, crying, confesses to his friend Chris ‘My father hates me!’ Interestingly, yesterday I saw a clip of the extended edition of the *Lord of the Rings* films. Faramir goes through a flashback in Minas Tirith which shows him with his beloved brother Boromir and his father Denethor, Steward of Gondor, who in this extended version scene doesn’t love Faramir at all. But even in the non-extended version that we all saw on the big screen Gandalf tells Faramir a lie: ‘Your father loves you’. Similarly, in *Stand by Me* Chris told Gordie a well-intentioned lie: that it was false that his father hated him.

While there is a chasm between the sacrificial practices of ancient times with the way some parents treat their children today, it is very rare to hear someone confess his pain as directly and emotionally as the boy Gordie did in the movie. I try to break the taboo in my books.

*July 29, 2020*
Creatures of Dad’s introject

The superiority of Hitler and his closest group compared to the racialist Americans of today is extremely evident in his intimate talks not only at dinner time, but in what remained in the memories of the Germans who knew the Führer in private. For Hitler, the greatest calamity in our history was the advent of Christianity. White nationalists, on the other hand, are stupefied and paralysed in the middle of the psychological Rubicon because they don’t have the balls to face the programming of their parents (at least not the balls I have when exposing my parents in my books). They are ‘creatures of Dad’s introject’ as I say to myself in my soliloquies. Even in the forum of the most respected white nationalist in the US this childishness of not wanting to break away from Dad’s introjects is evident. The title of the most recent article on The Occidental Observer begins with the words ‘Hail the Catholic Church for…’ There, Ricardo Duchesne tells us:

Many on the dissident right today blame Christianity for promoting universal values and the equality of human souls across the earth in the eyes of God. MacDonald does not blame Christianity. He does not argue that the Catholic Church created the conditions for the subsequent rise of multicultural collective norms.

Pace MacDonald, let us remember that famous Budapest meeting on October 4, 2014. In a restaurant with an international community of racialists (including Richard Spencer and Jared Taylor) Tom Sunic said: ‘We have to address the causes, the root causes of immigration...’ Then Sunic blamed capitalism to a large extent and mentioned that according to Adam Smith ‘merchants know no borders’. Capitalists are interested ‘in cheap labour’ at the expense of all ethnic loyalty. Sunic failed to say that the non-Christian Chinese, Japanese and other prosperous Asians have also embraced capitalism but are not committing ethno-suicide by importing millions of third-worlders into their nations. However,
Sunic added that in the West cardinals and the pope himself are fond that such immigrants come because ‘they are all our brothers in the face of Jesus Christ’.

Sunic delivered his speech in Europe. Back to the New World, you can imagine what a society based on both capitalism and a puritanical version of Christianity would become: the double helix of the United States. After all, the business of America is business, right? One might think that not all white nationalists or alt-right folk are blind regarding Christianity. Before they nuked his YouTube channel, I used to watch some videos that Richard Spencer uploaded on his McSpencer Group. What is striking is that a member of Spencer’s group, young Keith Woods, has deserted in the sense that he has abandoned the main principle of the alt-right: *Gens alba conservada est*, the white race must be preserved. And if Woods sticks to that position, it seems that he’s doing it because the religious introjects that he suffers ordered him not only to stay paralysed in the middle of the Rubicon, but to take a few steps back: the inertia of his parents’ Catholicism.

I don’t know if the white race is going to survive. But if there is something I feel morally obliged to say—although as someone on Twitter told me I am like a voice crying out in the wilderness of white nationalism—, it is that Judeo-Christianity fried the brains of whites. If they go extinct, at least posterity must have an exact diagnosis of what killed them.

*July 31, 2020* 49

---

49 This article also contains some paragraphs of a January post of the same year, ‘The double helix’.
Andúril: the broken sword

At midnight I was talking about the feeling of unreality that I felt when I saw a video of Jared Taylor. Finding ourselves on the brink of a civil war or rather an anti-white, exterminationist war that gets closer and closer to Ward Kendall’s novel *Hold Back This Day*, Taylor gives counsel like getting married, having a good job, and trying to do politics without overtly revealing our true colours…

Another notable racialist webzine, Kevin MacDonald’s, recently published a terrifying article of things I had already seen in London the last time I visited the city. The island has truly become the ultimate example of what I call ‘the sin against the holy spirit of life’, an unforgivable sin: they do mass propaganda for English roses to have kids with blacks! But the most serious issue about that article is that there is not an iota of hatred among the commenters, or even in the writer. And without hatred there can be no war of recovery of their women.

What can save the white race at this point? Only that a million white men on each side of the Atlantic develop the infinite hatred that I feel. But how likely are they to become like me? Probabilities seem null. However, there is a possibility of salvation: a *Deus ex Machina* in the real world, the convergence of catastrophes predicted by Faye.

What will happen if a coloured vice president becomes president and transitions from soft totalitarianism to hard totalitarianism? Several times I have said on this site that the first president of Paraguay forced whites to marry Indians, blacks or mulattas: an even ‘harder’ step to exterminate the white race than the ‘soft’ steps taken in the UK.

What happened these days on the Taylor and MacDonald webzines confirms what I have been saying: white nationalism only represents a couple of baby steps for the normie to start going to the other side of the Rubicon. It should be more than obvious that on the other side we already can see warriors ready to fight for the
recovery not only of their lands but of their debauched women. Will catastrophes converge in time to make the white male react?

Most white advocates don’t even believe that the dollar is going to tank. Lack of warrior hatred in the movement, lack of the most elementary knowledge of the economy, make the white nationalist movement of today a sort of child throwing a tantrum in the middle of the river, unwilling to walk past his first baby steps.

But after the economic crash a window of opportunity will open for white males to start waking up in enough quantity to make a difference. An opportunity is only an opportunity. In no way is it assured that, even if catastrophes converge with a coloured female president, whites will want to wake up.

‘Men will fight to the death for only the most basic of motives’, said George Lincoln Rockwell. If I understand human psychology well, in the convergence that will unfold in the following years or decades at least thirty percent of whites will have to die horribly before the survivors finally begin to wake up and wield the (presently broken) sword.

August 2, 2020
The Lord of the Rings

In a one-volume edition celebrating the 50th anniversary of Tolkien’s book, I read *The Lord of the Rings* from March 2011 to February 2012, while listening to the audio of *LOTR* voiced by Rob Inglis.

I must say that since I wanted to be a film director, I think that only the first film of Peter Jackson’s adaptation was good. The other two suffer from the typical stridency of Hollywood in recent decades, especially the extended battle scenes. Tolkien’s novel has no stridency. On the contrary: it has a very slow development. And what is most striking are his descriptions of the countryside: something that those of us who live in large cities have completely lost and must recover if, after destroying the One Ring (capitalism), return to the Shire.

But that doesn’t mean that I loved *LOTR*. I think it’s a children’s tale, not even a tale for teenagers, which is noted in a passage where King Théoden, once Gandalf broke his spell, spares Wormtongue’s life instead of killing him. (For having spared his life Wormtongue later conspired with Saruman to exterminate the blond people of Rohan.)

I confess that this passage irritated me a lot, both in the film and in the novel; and we can only forgive it if we read *LOTR* to our little children, night after night, until the book is finished. But the problem I see with contemporary Aryan man is his long childhood. A Viking teenager wouldn’t have even understood why the king should spare the life of a Jew-like character who would only bring enormous evil to the kingdom.

When I finished reading *LOTR* I wrote: ‘What I say in *The Return of Quetzalcoatl* about Don Quixote by Cervantes compared to Bernal Díaz del Castillo’s book applies here: It talks ill of westerners and Englishmen who have this work (fiction) at the top and know nothing about the Führer’s actual words (non-fiction). An edition of such luxury [that of *LOTR*] for his table talks should incorporate a very long prologue by David Irving’. In that soliloquy, I wanted to
tell myself that just as it bothered me that Spanish speakers preferred to read Cervantes’ fiction rather than Díaz’s non-fiction about the conquest of Mexico, it also bothered me that English-speakers preferred Tolkien’s fiction to Irving’s non-fiction. Having said this, the words of _LOTR_ in which I projected myself were:

‘I wish it need not have happened in my time’, said Frodo.

‘So do I’, said Gandalf, ‘and so do all who live to see such times. But that is not for them to decide. All we have to decide is what to do with the time that is given us’.

I also liked: ‘It was an evil fate. But he [Frodo] had taken it on himself’ (page 644). I projected myself even more in some words that in Jackson’s version appear at the end, when Frodo writes _LOTR_ and says in a soliloquy that there are such wounds that it is no longer possible to bear them.

All in all, I wouldn’t recommend _LOTR_ to young people as what we need are real-life stories that inspire them, like the lives of Leonidas and Hermann. Movies and TV series about them and Hitler are missing from the point of view of the fourteen words.

When in the past century I lived in Manchester a native English man invited me on a peripatetic outing to the countryside with others and I am ashamed to say that I declined the invitation. Yes, I would recommend _LOTR_ to those who want to get out of the monstrosity that Saruman did with his arboreal destruction, iron industry and multiplication of Orcs—a symbol of the soulless London—and want to reconnect with bucolic England. If I were a film director and wanted to make a children’s movie, I would bring _LOTR_ to the screen by retrieving all those detailed descriptions of the field in Tolkien’s prose.

_August 5, 2020_
Misguided sons of Bentham

I hadn’t listened to Mark Weber in years. I like him because, unlike many in the pro-white movement, like David Irving Weber is willing to change his opinion about what our enemies call the ‘holocaust’ if the historical evidence points in that direction. In his recent radio interview with Greg Johnson and another fellow Weber said interesting things. But like his interlocutors, the operating system of his mind, so to speak, remains neochristian.

I recently talked about Michael O’Meara and linked a couple of his articles. Although Michael never broke as openly with Christianity as we do on this site, he knew much better how the collective unconscious of the white race works than the authors of today. He knew that what we need is a story or myth that galvanises the Aryans to the point of producing a new religion. Unlike Savitri Devi, Michael failed to realise that this new myth, this new religion, had already been born in Germany and that Hitler had been its prophet. But at least Michael had a much better notion of what moves our collective imagination than today’s racialists.

The case of Weber and his interlocutors exemplifies this. After 1:41 Weber warned us not to view history as good guys versus bad guys (what a mistake, as we are about to see). At the end of the Johnson-led show, Weber pointed to two places where we can buy important racialist books. But Weber’s failure is precisely not to see things in a mythical way, as the Jews do. Although Jews have been repeating their myths for thousands of years, even white racists are reluctant to recover their history. If I use the metaphor of the three-eyed crow it is because this site, unlike the others, provides just the historical myth that the white man needs (summarised in The Fair Race).

---

Go to YouTube and take a look at Tyrion’s speech in the grand finale of *Game of Thrones* to understand what I mean. According to the plot of Season 8, the night king planned to bring about an eternal night, wiping out mankind altogether, and to accomplish that he needs to kill Bran, who inherited the title of the three-eyed raven from a very old man, the previous ‘crow’. As Sam points out, true death is only achieved when people are completely forgotten by the living, and the three-eyed raven has access to all of human history, making him a crucial target for the night king. In real life, this almost happened when Judeo-Christians destroyed all temples, libraries and even the human lives of the carriers of the white man’s culture. Following this analogy, white nationalists have failed to grasp the ravens’ messages to retrieve such history after the night king (Christianity) destroyed the most germane knowledge for white survival. I refer specifically to the stories of the white race by Pierce and Kemp that ‘nationalists’ still refuse to read, and apparently will continue to refuse to read until the eternal night finally reaches Westeros.

The great mistake of Weber and other racialist scholars is that they read Christian or neochristian historians. If there is something in which I distinguish myself from all of them, it is in my claim that we must rewrite the history of the white man to save him: hence the metaphor of the weirwood tree, the tree of historical wisdom. The first attempt to rewrite history from the point of view of the new myth occurred in National Socialist Germany. On this side of the Atlantic, only William Pierce that I know of began to rewrite the story of the white man: a book that doesn’t appear in the racialist bookstores mentioned by Weber. It is true that Pierce’s book is merely a ‘story’, in the sense of a preliminary readable essay on the more erudite histories to be written about the race. But that’s how the rewriting begins: with a simple, inspiring and captivating story, not with huge volumes that few will read.

*Who We Are* is the myth that would emerge in a movement that leaves behind the failed methods that Michael O’Meara warned us about a decade ago. The only thing that will return the soul to the European-descended peoples will be to tell the real history of the race, what actually happened. And that begins with what Tyrion Lannister said before the coronation of Bran the Broken:
What unites people?
Armies? Gold? Flags…? [pause]
Stories.

There’s nothing in the world more powerful than a good story. Nothing can stop it. No enemy can defeat it.

Is this so hard to see? Apparently yes. Like Jared Taylor, Weber appeals to the intellect, not to the numinous aspect of the human soul, for example what he said about friend and foe. I remember that some years ago Weber wrote texts for the left-hemisphere side of the brain and then read them on his radio podcasts. The more right-hemisphere Carolyn Yeager, who had her own podcast, warned him that such practice could result in burnout. But neither Weber nor those who read Johnson’s webzine can see something so obvious.

What the Nazis did was to appeal to the numinous side of the Aryan race, with all those quasi-religious rituals they did on the streets and, even more numinously, at Himmler’s castle in Nuremberg. The error of practically all the experts of American racialism reminds me of an anecdote in which Octavio Paz participated that appears in the ninth volume of Paz’s complete works (pages 257-258). In a private discussion in a home in Cambridge, Massachusetts between American writers and the dissident Russian poet Joseph Brodsky, Paz realised that ‘these sons of Jeremy Bentham’ came from a completely different background and that water and oil don’t mix.

Many of the pundits of white nationalism today resemble these sons of Bentham, ignoring what Michael tried to tell us: It is the poet who creates nations, not the scientist.

August 6, 2020

51 This article incorporates some paragraphs of my May 22, 2019 post ‘Tyrion’s speech’.
There is something that I must add to what I said yesterday in the context of the current approach among race realists, which can be summed up in the already quoted words of Michael O’Meara: ‘The historical course offered by myth, in contrast to the inherently passive determinism of scientific rationalism, is a choice for heroes, not bookworms or computer hobbyists’. But first of all I must say that the great failure of O’Meara was not seeing in Hitler the hero who created the new myth, the story that supplants the Christian one.

Among Americans only George Lincoln Rockwell, after he finished reading Mein Kampf, saw that Hitlerism was a new religion. William Pierce got off to a good start, calling Hitler ‘our leader’ in National Socialist World in 1968. But then he got carried away by the American way and, instead of using the swastika for the new religion he wanted to create after Rockwell’s assassination, he devised another symbol (which nobody uses anymore). The mistake I see here is that the American population cannot make contact with a higher archetype, as the Germans of the last century did. Americans are not the chosen people to create the new religion because their materialistic culture is completely uprooted from the history of their race, so well described by Pierce himself.

Yesterday I said that what is called history must be rewritten since, if it came from the pen of Christians or neochrists, the only value that history books can provide is raw material that must be relocated in the numinous context of the fourteen words. To give just one example. Remember what I’m doing with the work of Karlheinz Deschner, his criminal history of Christianity. Although the late Deschner was antichristian his scale of values was clearly liberal, that is, neochristian: a pseudo-apostate to use my neologism. Deschner’s encyclopaedic knowledge had to be appropriated to turn his legacy around our point of view: the viewpoint of the
transvalued man. And the same must be done with the rest of the other historians.

Yesterday I also said that what galvanised men in National Socialism were its marches and events in the streets. From this angle, the only thing that imitated them well, other than Rockwell when I was a kid, was the Charlottesville event three years ago. However, regardless of the fact that the government ambushed those who demonstrated, the demonstration was schizophrenic because of the American flags they carried. It is as if the Nazis of yore had carried the symbols of the degenerate Weimar Republic on their marches instead of coming up with a new flag.

That the racialist movement that raises the American flag is schizophrenic is seen in its inability to realise that, with its three anti-white wars—the 1860s, the 1940s, and today’s cold war that is already turning hot—the United States has become Mordor, and that using its symbols is mind splitting. As far as I know, the only contemporary racialist who has understood that you have to hate the US to save the Anglo-German DNA is the Canadian Sebastian Ernst Ronin. Even at that Rockwell failed when trying to mix the swastika with the stars and stripes flag. Don’t be fooled, white nationalists: Since the United States was founded as a worshiping entity of Mammon and the god of the Jews, it is unreformable. The United States can only be repudiated as an alien body-snatcher and place an entirely different political animal in its place.

If the American racialist movement were not charlatanic, its proponents would not only begin to rewrite history as Pierce did,
but reject both materialistic comfort and Yahweh. They would also begin to learn Germanic languages and would even try to change their American accent to how it sounded in England before the recent mass migrations. Furthermore, after the Revolution bonfires would burn the books of accepted wisdom, including Bibles, degenerate music and Hollywood movies; in addition to the destruction of churches and the public lynching of those who oppose it.

Mount Rushmore will be nuked and another American mountain will boast colossal granite sculptures representing Leonidas, Hermann, Hitler and that of the new American messiah who led the racial revolution (a man whose name we still ignore).

For the transvaluation of all Christian values to Greco-Roman values to be complete, public opinion won’t give a damn if, instead of nymphs, one or two generals of the ethnostate have had ephebes as cute as Björn Andréson or Max Born when they were teenagers (see pics in ‘Giton’s magic’). On the other hand, having sex between same-sex adults will be frowned upon as it was frowned upon in Greece and Rome.

Since that’s impossible given the level of the inflated ego in today’s American nationalist, only a convergence of catastrophes that kills vast numbers of whites around the world will straighten the ways of survivors.

Now that I saw the title of the latest article of *The Occidental Observer* I couldn’t contain the feeling of what O’Meara said about bookworms and computer hobbyists compared to the heroes we need, including the new messiah whose name we ignore. Without soldiers and transvalued heroes the academy is useless. In other words, the first rightful steps were made in Charlottesville, not in the pieces that Kevin MacDonald publishes. Now we would have to do the same but without the enemy flag, devising a swastika flag for American consumption.

But demonstrating in the streets will be impossible as long as Uncle Sam lives. If the US government didn’t exist, whites would easily win a war against Black Lives Matter and the Jews who finance it. But killing Sam will be impossible as long as Christians and neochristians dominate both conservatism and white nationalism itself. Without infinite hatred there is no revolution. And with the psychic toll that Christianity bequeathed to us, there will be no place for infinite hatred.
Curiously, American racialists have already heard about the keys to save the race in both Pierce’s story (transvalued academy as opposed to Kevin MacDonald’s neochristian academy) and *The Turner Diaries* (bloodthirsty soldiers). But they follow a different path because they insist on being slaves of parental and societal introjects, including the enemy flag.

Although white advocates acknowledge that Jews hate, they are unable to link the info between two elemental neurons and imitate them. Being children of the Christian and liberal ethos they really believe, even many secularised racists, that we should solve our problems without violating the command to love our neighbour. Otherwise they would have already amalgamated their selves with the spirit of the *Diaries*.

Mine is constructive criticism of white nationalism insofar, unlike destructive criticism, I point out the way that could potentially save them.

*August 7, 2020*
White nationalism

I’m not done with what I said in ‘Charlottesville without stars or stripes’. What is known in the United States as white nationalism is not white nationalism. If it were, the Americans who promote it would say that Leonidas, Hermann and Hitler are the heroes who would replace the faces carved at Mount Rushmore. This American provincialism is the great failure not only of ordinary white nationalists but of one of their best minds, the retired Michael O’Meara, who in one of his articles that I have been mentioning wrote:

If you want, then, to engage in discussions about race and racial differences, you bring in the geneticists and Darwinists. But if you want to build a nationalist movement to ensure the continuity of white America, you appeal to Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson, to the Battle of the Alamo and Kearney’s Workingmen, to the Stars and Bars and the sustaining voices of those quintessential representatives of America’s white culture, the Carter family.

Stars and Bars? As Robert Morgan explained to us, the carved personalities at Mount Rushmore, including the Jefferson that O’Meara wanted to put on us as an inspiring figure, represent ideals that would eventually lead to white decline:

The Old America is dead? I don’t think so. Symbolic of the Old America, and chiseled into Mt. Rushmore, are four American ‘heroes’, whose exploits demonstrate the white man’s biggest problem, himself. First we have George Washington, who magnanimously freed his slaves, but only after his death, after which he had no further use for them. But how many white Americans have been robbed, murdered, or raped by the descendants of those slaves? Quite a few, no doubt. Thanks George!

Then comes Lincoln, who authorized the murders of hundreds of thousands of whites on his way to freeing the
slaves and then turning them loose on his countrymen. His admirers say that, like Martin Luther King, he had a dream. But Abe’s dream was that all of the negroes would volunteer to leave these shores. How racist! Amazingly, and no doubt a big surprise to Abe, few wanted to do so. Thanks a lot, ‘honest’ Abe!

Then we have Thomas Jefferson, a randy old fellow who was probably nailing his quadroon slave Sally Hemings, and likely had a child by her. His was the colonial prototype for the long American tradition of race mixing (aka white racial suicide). Thanks Tom! You set a fine example.

Last is Teddy Roosevelt, the original progressive. He was an advocate for women’s suffrage, yet another step in the direction of the hallowed American cause of ‘equality’, and it’s painfully obvious how that turned out. Also, he favored a powerful federal government, just as do progressives today. To fund such a government he favored the income tax, a noose into which the American public eagerly thrust its neck.

The current unrest is only more of the same white racial self-destruction. So the Old America isn’t dead. Its spirit is just flying new flags, reorganized under the banners of BLM and antifa. Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.

Let us now compare what O’Meara wrote with what Mauricio recently told us responding to an objection about carving out the images of Leonidas and Hermann (“We are unsure as to how they looked”):

We don’t need photos of them. The Christians didn’t need photos for Jesus, neither do we for our demigods’ iconography.

Leonidas looks like a veteran of a hundred battles. He is the wise old man of sixty years, husband, father, king. Long grizzled hair tied in braids. Cleft chin, scars across his cheeks and brow. His deep, sullen blue eyes observe the horizon fiercely, as the subhuman hordes approach. He grips his spear with his right hand and his Corinthian helmet under his left. Long red cape, shining bronze armour. Behind him, a wall of shields with the Lambda symbol. He is hopelessly outnumbered, and yet he knows no fear.

Hermann is a virile young man full of wit and brash confidence. Golden-blond, bright blue eyes, very tall. He is the clever two-faced warrior. In one face, he is a gallant
Roman commander, with steel armour, silvery helmet and blue cape, on horseback leading his cohort across the Rhine. He is the Eagle. In the other face, he is a muscular, bare-chested German warrior, with blue war-paint markings, leading a ferocious charge against the Roman shield-wall, roaring from top of his lungs: ‘TYR!’ He is the Wolf.

There is no image we cannot carve.

In short, what people on the internet call white nationalism, O’Meara included, is actually American nationalism. That should be obvious: as a legitimate white nationalism would imply a story that inspires all white Nordic types, not just those from a single country.

Tomorrow will mark three years of the event in Charlottesville. Just compare how the American government reacted to that event with its reaction to BLM. The reversal of classical values is now complete. The government of the United States is really Sauron. That non-revolutionary, law-abiding civilian white nationalists fail to propose the destruction of at least all of Lincoln’s symbols is so delusional that there is no point trying to argue with them. America’s near future will disabuse them.

August 11, 2020
MacDonald’s Preface to Giles Corey’s *The Sword of Christ* was not only published on *The Occidental Observer*, but on *Counter-Currents* and *The Unz Review*. As we can see in the comments section of the largely secular *Counter-Currents*, several commenters are either Christians or sympathetic to Judeo-Christianity, so they liked MacDonald’s essay-review and some of them even have ordered a copy of Corey’s book. One exception was commenter Asdk:

If we were to apply Kevin Macdonald’s perspective on the culture of critique to modern ideologies, Christianity would be very easily understood. Christianity is an ideology created by Jews to benefit the Jewish people, to break the feeling of tribal union of the peoples who are rivals to Jewish hegemony.

We can already imagine how different white nationalism would be if the webzine admins of the main white nationalist webzines were like Asdk. Regarding Giovanni Gasparro’s painting above, *The Martyrdom of St. Simon of Trento*, which appears in MacDonald’s preface, it was painted this very year in old baroque style. The idea to create such painting reminds me of one of my
favourite paintings by Hieronymus Bosch, *Christ Carrying the Cross* (1516). The idea is the same: the bad guys—Jews—surround the child to be sacrificed or the divine rabbi to be crucified. Gasparro’s 2020 painting measures seven by five feet, and references a blood libel that led to the execution of several Jews in 1475. The scandal (some would call it moral panic) started around the disappearance and death of a Christian boy in Trento named Simonino. He was later made a saint and the day of his death, March 24, was included in the Roman martyrology—hence the cherubs in Gasparro’s painting—until its removal in 1965.

In his article MacDonald tells us ‘This [blood libel] is a topic that I have never written about… However, we should not be surprised to find that such practices occurred’. I am not going to take issue with him because what I want is to answer his Christian apologetics, not this new approach to the Jewish question. I will limit myself to point out that on the subject of blood libel I had already written in 2013 an article, ‘Isabel’ (Isabella I of Castile): times when MacDonald was apparently more sceptical about libel claims. MacDonald starts his review with these words:

Giles Corey has written a book that should be read by all Christians as well as white advocates of all theoretical perspectives including especially those who are seeking a spiritual foundation that is deeply embedded in the history and culture of Europeans.

White advocates of all theoretical perspectives? What would Revilo Oliver and William Pierce, geniuses so critical of Christianity, have opined about Corey’s book? What would Alex Linder opine today? Spiritual foundation embedded in European culture? MacDonald ignores the difference between Western Christian civilisation and European civilisation, as explained in ‘The Red Giant’ in this book. MacDonald also says about Corey’s book: ‘This is excellent scholarship’. If the scholarship is excellent, blood libel had to be historical. But as I said, I don’t want to discuss the Jewish question but the Christian question. MacDonald wrote: ‘Corey is well aware that contemporary Christianity has been massively corrupted’.

Completely false. Christianity today is as legitimate a form of Christianity as the others. Previous Christianisms were based on St. Augustine, and in the case of the Catholic Church, also on St.
Thomas Aquinas. The Christianity of Pope Francis today, like the Christianity of the medieval St. Francis of Assisi, is based more on the direct message of the gospel. There is no true Christianity and an heretic Christianity: only Christians use anathemas and excommunicate each other, always claiming that their faction is the true Christianity. For non-Christians like us, St. Francis (and therefore the policies of Pope Francis) was as authentic Christian as St. Augustine, however different they were in their politics. On the Counter-Currents thread, commenter Asdk added the following:

It sounds ridiculous, but in the middle of the Christian era, the Pope did it with the pre-Columbian natives; today the descendants of such an aberration populate most of Latin America and soon they will be the new majority of North America.

What happened in Latin America is relevant: something that I have said so many times in the racialist forums that I gave up because nobody was listening. And they don’t listen for the simple reason that the miscegenation on a colossal scale in this American continent, perpetrated by the Spanish and Portuguese since the 16th century, just when they persecuted the Jews and the crypto-Jews, is such a demonstration that there is a Christian problem that it doesn’t even have to be argued: only to point out the events that occurred in the Spanish and Portuguese-speaking parts of the continent.

Remember the old painting that last month I reproduced of a Spaniard marrying an Indian with the approval of the Church. MacDonald says the corruption is recent. How does he explain the greatest genetic catastrophe that occurred in his continent? The trick MacDonald and white nationalists do has been to ignore history south of the Rio Grande—and history north of the Rio Grande I should add insofar New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, California and Texas, before the 1840s war, belonged to Mexico and previously to New Spain! For MacDonald to say that Christianity has been ‘massively corrupted’ he must be ignoring, of necessity, the history of those states that now belong to his country, since the New Spaniards never forbade interbreeding. Why doesn’t MacDonald see that more than half a billion mestizos in Latin America are the direct result of marriages between Iberian whites,
Indians and blacks—marriages that both the Spanish crown and the Church approved?

The answer is clear: if he dared to see the history of New Spain his paradigm would collapse immediately, since it would be obvious that alongside a Jewish problem there has existed a huge Christian problem. In the 1530s a Pope bull allowed the bachelor Iberians in the continent to marry Amerind women. This happened only a decade after the conquest of the Aztec Empire. As Asdk says, Christianity is blind to racial matters. And the Church did not give a damn about the biological havoc that such bull would cause. Incidentally, the Catholic Church was so powerful in New Spain that by the end of the 17th century it owned more than half of its territories. Like today’s elites, it was in the Church’s interest to rule over low-breed mestizos rather than high-IQ Iberian whites. *Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.* This epigram by Jean-Baptiste Alphonse Karr in 1849 means ‘The more it changes, the more it’s the same thing’. Yes, there is no such a thing as ‘contemporary Christianity has been massively corrupted’ as MacDonald wrote. Only an ignorant of history in the American continent can say such a thing.

MacDonald wrote:

Until the twentieth century, Christianity served the West well. One need only think of the long history of Christians battling to prevent Muslims from establishing a caliphate throughout the West—Charles Martel at the Battle of Tours, the Spanish Reconquista, the defeat of the Turks at the gates of Vienna. The era of Western expansion was accomplished by Christian explorers and colonists. Until quite recently, the flourishing of science, technology, and art occurred entirely within a Christian context.

In recent posts I have been talking about the need to rewrite history. This paragraph was only made possible by centuries of misinformation when it comes to historical facts. I have read the only two stories that in English have been written from the point of view of racial preservation, that of William Pierce and that of Arthur Kemp. Since Pierce died before I woke up, I was only able to visit Kemp when he lived in a beautiful little town in England. The only two stories that have been written from the point of view of white advocacy run under one premise: white civilisations have
fallen due to the imperial phase that inevitably leads to miscegenation. (Of the two stories, only Pierce recommends extermination or expulsion of non-whites after having learned the tough lessons of history.)

One of my huge surprises when reading those two stories, *Who We Are* and *March of the Titans*, is that starting with a pro-white viewpoint inverts many values that we had taken for granted in the more academic and conventional stories. For example, it is striking to learn that the Greeks of the Dorian period were pure Nordids who came to the peninsula from the North. And something similar could be said of the first tribes that created the Roman Republic in the other European peninsula: they also were unmiscegenated Nordids. (He who wants to learn about the Nordic component of the founders of Greece and Rome must read *The Fair Race's Darkest Hour*.) All of this had been kept from me by conventional historians simply because most of them have been Christians.

And concerning more recent secular historians, they live under the sky of the ideas that led to the French Revolution regarding the equality of men: a doctrine breathed even in the American Declaration of Independence: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator…’ Only when the reader of history repudiates this egalitarian premise is ready to understand history. Otherwise he might be a scholar but his historical knowledge will be contaminated with such a false worldview that distortion is unavoidable. And conventional books of history are so replete of distortions that after the Nazi period and the two preliminary stories referred to above we must, like them, start from scratch. I don’t think MacDonald has read the Pierce or Kemp books. If he had read any of them, he would have realised that what he says in the paragraph above cannot be sustained from this scratching point of view. The following is what MacDonald seems to ignore:

The Christian era began with a hostile takeover of classical culture—that is, white culture—by a sect of Levantine origin. In the 4th and 5th centuries of the common era, in a destructive outburst the temples of the white gods and sculptures displaying Aryan beauty, were destroyed by Judeo-Christian fanatics along with entire libraries of ancient wisdom. Karlheinz Deschner devoted his entire
life to studying the true history of Judeo-Christianity and we translated several passages from his *Christianity’s Criminal History.*

I must say something about Charles Martel mentioned by MacDonald and the Spanish Reconquista. Given my Hispanic origins, the history of Spain as told by Pierce and Kemp caught my attention several years ago, when I read their books. Both mention something that left me cold: the Iberian Visigoths—pure whites of the Nordid type—were deceived by Christians to commit miscegenation: a little piece of information that won’t be easy to find in conventional histories. Remember that the Goths were a Germanic people who played a major role in the fall of the Western Roman Empire. In the first centuries of our era the Iberian Goths burned at the stake their fellow whites that dared to mix their precious blood with mudbloods. But the king of Hispania Recceswinth committed the greatest blunder in Iberian history: a blunder still unrecognised by normie intellectuals and normie historians as a blunder: but a gigantic blunder nonetheless. By converting to Christianity Recceswinth abolished the long ban on miscegenation (which reminds me of the rigorous Spartan ban against miscegenation), which resulted in the immediate mongrelisation of the Visigoths. The king of Hispania’s decision allowed any person of any racial origin, as long as he professed Christianity, to intermarry with the Germanic Goths. Such rupture of the ancestral prohibition against miscegenation and worship of the enemy god (the god of the Jews) occurred just a few decades before their territories… were invaded by the Moors!

*If you worship thine enemy’s god, thou art defeated;*  
*Adopt the religion of his fathers, thou wilt be enslaved;*  
*And if thou propagate with his daughters, thou art destroyed*

This crucial page in the history of Spain would have to be studied in far greater depth than the preliminary ‘stories’ of Pierce and Kemp. But I suspect that the Visigoths would have been invincible if, with the benefit of hindsight, they had expelled or exterminated the mudbloods, mainly peoples of Hispania of Semitic

---

52 The 2020 edition of this English translation is available through Lulu, Inc. But for the thousands of scholarly endnotes with the accompanying bibliographical references, you need to obtain the original German edition of the first volumes of Deschner’s ten-volume work.
origin (non-Jewish Semites had begun to invade the Iberian peninsula since the times of the Carthaginians). Hispania aside, if the Roman Empire had not decayed, and let us remember that Gibbon blames the Christians for it, Islam wouldn’t even have had a chance of its spectacular conquests that only the gates of Vienna stopped, that MacDonald mentions. By subscribing to the official story MacDonald is viewing Christianity as our saviour before Islam, not as the cause of the power gap that occurred after the Christians destroyed the classical world (or tricked the Visigoths), leaving the remaining whites at the mercy of a primitive Arabic tribe.

On the Western achievements that MacDonald mentions in the quote above, he is framing them as achievements of the Christian spirit. Nothing farther from the truth. The white man had to fight for centuries against Church prohibitions (see e.g., *Christianity’s Criminal History*, pages 291-293) to regain his right to scientific research, technology, and art uncontaminated with biblical passages or the lives of the saints. Now my history teacher comes to mind, whose brothers were blond, at Colegio Madrid. She told us that in New Spain they used the trick of putting covers of lives of saints on secular books imported from Europe so they could pass through customs. And this happened until the beginning of the 19th century! Again, MacDonald is ignorant about history down the south of Rio Grande. He wrote:

Such individualism was not disastrously self-destructive. As Corey notes, ‘Christian universalism historically posed little to no danger to white survival because it was preached by whites living in a world ruled by whites; it was only in the multicultural Egalitarian Regime inseminated in the mid-twentieth century that Christian sacrifice was transformed into a call for racial suicide’.

Precisely because MacDonald, like most white nationalists who do not follow Pierce and Kemp, knows little of true history, he is unable to see that healthy religions promote the good of a tribe, and unhealthy religions—a phenomenon that appears in the imperial phase of a civilisation—forget what’s good for the tribe and start to speak solely and exclusively in individualistic terms, of ‘individual salvation’. Richard Carrier has studied this phenomenon in several Mediterranean religions at the time of the decline of the
Roman Empire, and MacDonald and those who believe that any form of universalism was not ‘disastrously self-destructive’ should become familiar with his work. That religious individualism was toxic from the beginning is evident in the fact that in shifting from the good of the group to individualism (the Christian must think above all in the salvation of his soul), the foundations for miscegenation were laid. Once Constantine changed the name of the old Byzantium to Constantinople, the new capital of the Empire became a melting pot for all the races of the Mediterranean, in which the pure Nordid blood of the patrician Romans was forever lost.

MacDonald wrote:

Instead, Corey advocates a revitalization of Medieval Germanic Christianity based on, in the words of Samuel Francis, ‘social hierarchy, loyalty to tribe and place (blood and soil), world-acceptance rather than world-rejection, and an ethic that values heroism and military sacrifice’. This medieval Christianity preserved the aristocratic, fundamentally Indo-European culture of the Germanic tribes. This was an adaptive Christianity...

Adaptive medieval Christianity? See what I say in this book about Caligula and Charlemagne: the latter forced uncontaminated Nordids to worship the enemy god: a historical milestone related to that tardive metastasis, the philosemitic stage that the US is currently suffering. MacDonald wrote:

My view, developed in Chapter 3 of Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism is that traditional Christian theology was fundamentally anti-Jewish and was developed as a weapon which was used to lessen Jewish economic and political power in the Roman Empire. Here Corey describes the writings of the fourth-century figure, St. John Chrysostom who has a chapel dedicated to him inside St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome as well as a statue outside the building. His writings on Jews are nothing less than scathing and reflect long-term tensions between Jews and Greeks in Antioch. And Chrysostom was far from alone in his hatred.

Despite the fact that the Muslim Jihadists are anti-Jewish, many contemporary Jews promote the Islamisation of Europe for the simple fact that the best goyim (whites) must be destroyed
according to them. Jews are willing to have some of their own fall in order to win their ultimate battle against the Aryans. Something similar happened with the hostile takeover of the classical world by Judeo-Christians, many of whom had Semitic blood. Their anger was directed against the white world. They didn’t care that those fanatics MacDonald talks about committed anti-Jewish acts. What mattered was to overthrow the classical world at all costs. MacDonald ignores that what was ultimately at stake, as explained in the climax of ‘Rome against Judea; Judea against Rome’:

435 CE: In this year occurs the most significant action on the part of Emperor Theodosius II: He openly proclaims that the only legal religion in Rome apart from Christianity is Judaism! Through a bizarre, subterranean and astonishing struggle, Judaism has not only persecuted the old culture, and Rome, its mortal archenemy, adopts a Jewish creed—but the Jewish religion itself, so despised and insulted by the old Romans, is now elevated as the only official religion of Rome along with Christianity!

That diabolical political game of different kinds of Semites is what MacDonald has failed to see. He speaks highly of St. John Chrysostom, as if this ‘antisemite’ was a champion for the Aryan cause. What did this saint, so revered among clueless white nationalists do? Do nationalists know what happened to the immense Temple of Artemis, one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World? As we explain in The Fair Race, it was built near Ephesus in the 6th century BCE over an area considered sacred since, at least, the Bronze Age. Its construction took 120 years and it could be said that it was comparable to a cathedral. St. John Chrysostom and his henchmen flattened it in 401 following a Christian emperor’s edict—the year after Chrysostom had instigated the massacre of 7,000 Goths in Constantinople! The stones were used for a tomb and a bath-house and a cross was raised on the spot where Diana’s statue had stood.

It was the religion of the pure white that had to be flattened at all costs, not the Judaism that survived the Aryan apocalypse of the ancient world.

It is clear that history must be rewritten from the viewpoint of the priest of the 14 words, and that stupid books like Corey’s must be vehemently repudiated if we want to save the race from
extinction. Not only books of this type are bad history: they are as toxic reading of history as that which we could read from a Jew. MacDonald wrote:

And although Protestantism was generally far more amenable to Jewish interests even before its current malaise, there certainly are exceptions. Here Corey emphasizes Martin Luther’s writings on Jews. Luther emphasizes Jewish hatred toward Christianity and their sense of superiority vis-à-vis Christians, seeing the latter as ‘not human; in fact, we hardly deserve to be considered poor worms by them’.

I’ve been saying that people like MacDonald don’t know the stories of the white race written not by charlatans like Giles Corey, but by genuine racialists. Let’s remember what William Pierce says about Luther. I apologise for the following long quotation but it is necessary to quote from *Who We Are* because of the stubbornness of those white nationalists who refuse to read it:

*The Reformation.* Another factor which undoubtedly made the West more susceptible to the Jews was the Reformation, the lasting effects of which were confined largely to Europe’s northwestern regions, in fact, to the Germanic-speaking regions: Germany, Scandinavia, England and Scotland, Switzerland. The Church of Rome and its Eastern Orthodox offshoot had always been ambivalent in their attitudes toward the Jews. On the one hand, they fully acknowledged the Jewish roots of Christianity, and Jesus’ Jewishness was taken for granted. On the other hand, the Jews had rejected Jesus’ doctrine and killed him, saying, ‘His blood be on us and on our children’ (Matthew 27:25), and the medieval Church was inclined to take them at their word. In addition to the stigma of deicide the Jews also bore the suspicion which naturally fell on heretics of any sort. During the Middle Ages people took Christianity quite seriously, and anyone professing an unorthodox religious belief, whether he actively sought converts or not, was considered a danger to the good order of the community and to the immortal soul of any Christian exposed to him.

What the Protestant reformers did for the Jews was give the Hebrew Scriptures a much more important role in the life of the peoples of Europe than they had enjoyed previously. Among Catholics it was not the Bible but the Church which
was important. The clergy read the Bible; the people did not. The people looked to the clergy for spiritual guidance, not to the Bible. Among Protestants that order was reversed. The Bible became an authority unto itself, which could be consulted by any man. Its Jewish characters—Abraham, Moses, Solomon, David, and the rest—became heroic figures, suffused with an aura of sanctity. Their doings and sayings became household bywords. It is ironic that the father of the Reformation, Martin Luther, who inadvertently helped the Jews fasten their grip on the West, detested them and vigorously warned his Christian followers against them. His book *Von den Jüden und ihren Lügen* (On the Jews and their Lies), published in 1543, is a masterpiece. Luther’s antipathy to the Jews came after he learned Hebrew and began reading the Talmud. He was shocked and horrified to find that the Hebrew religious writings were dripping with hatred and contempt for all non-Jews…

Alas, Luther could not have it both ways. He had already sanctified the Jews by elevating the status of their history, their legends, and their religion to that of Holy Writ. His translation of the Old Testament into German and his dissemination of the Jewish scriptures among his followers vitiated all his later warnings against the Jews. Today the church he founded studiously ignores those warnings…

The great tragedy of Luther is that he failed to… recognize that no religion of Jewish origin is a proper religion for men and women of European race. When he cut himself and the majority of the Germanic peoples off from Rome, he failed at the same time to cut away all the baggage of Jewish mythology which had been imposed on Europe by Rome. Instead he made of that baggage a greater spiritual burden for his people than it already was. The consequence was that within a century of Luther’s death much of Northern Europe was firmly in the grip of a new superstition as malignant as the old one, and it was one in which the Jews played a much more explicit role. Before, the emphasis had been on the New Testament: that is, on Christianity as a breakaway sect from Judaism, in which the differences between the two religions were stressed. The role models held up to the peoples of Europe were the Church’s saints and martyrs, most of whom were non-Jewish. The parables taught to children were often
of European origin. Among the Protestants the Old Testament gained a new importance, and with it so did the Hebrew patriarchs as role models, while Israel's folklore became the new source of moral inspiration for Europe. Perhaps nothing so clearly demonstrates the change, and the damage to the European sense of identity which accompanied it, as the sudden enthusiasm for bestowing Hebrew names on Christian children.

The Reformation did more for the Jews than merely sanctifying the Old Testament. It shattered the established order of things and brought chaos in political as well as spiritual affairs—chaos eagerly welcomed by the Jews. Germany was so devastated by a series of bloody religious wars that it took her a century and a half to recover. In some German principalities two-thirds of the population was annihilated during the conflicts between Catholics and Protestants in the period 1618-1648, commonly known as the ‘Thirty Years War’. Everywhere during the 17th century the Jews took advantage of the turmoil, moving back into countries from which they had been banned (such as England), moving to take over professions from which they had been excluded, insinuating themselves into confidential relationships with influential leaders in literary and political circles, profiting from the sufferings of their hosts and strengthening their hold, burrowing deep into the rubble and wreckage of medieval society so that they could more easily undermine whatever rose in its stead.

Thanks Dr. Pierce but you fell short as Nietzsche saw beyond what you saw. Just keep in mind my quotation of Nietzsche in the article ‘Wagner vs. Bach’ in this book: Luther revitalised Christianity when it had begun to die in Rome itself! (see the Nietzsche quote in the appendix of ‘Rome against Judea; Judea against Rome’ in The Fair Race). Had Cesare Borgia reached the papacy in a world without Luther, the transvaluation of values—the salvation of whites—could’ve started from the Renaissance in Rome. But exactly the opposite happened: the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation vindicated Christianity.

One thing is clear: MacDonald is not a reader of Nietzsche or Pierce. He wrote:
Mainstream Christianity from traditional Catholicism to mainstream Protestantism was fundamentally adaptive in terms of creating a healthy family life.

Here MacDonald is not only ignoring the subject mentioned above, that a cohesive family is useless to our cause if marriages in Catholic Latin America have been, for half a millennia, between white and non-white. And regarding Europe MacDonald is also ignoring the catastrophe that occurred in Portugal. After their forays into Africa the Portuguese not only imported blacks to the Iberian Peninsula, but unlike the Anglo-Germans in North America who originally did not marry them, the Portuguese immediately proceeded to stain their blood forever—courtesy of an Iberian, Recceswinth-like Christianity that didn’t care of racial preservation. MacDonald writes about the traditional family in Christendom ignoring what happened in immense territories where Catholicism had a grip on the white psyche. And even in the US where miscegenation was not perpetrated for quite some time, the havoc that Puritans caused for their infatuation with the sacred book of the Jews can be seen in the names they gave their white children.

Pierce is worth quoting again. He wrote:

Even before the Reformation a few Jewish names had been adopted by Europeans, but they were in most cases variations of the names of Christian saints of Jewish race: John (Heb. Johanan), Matthew (Heb. Mattathiah), Mary (Heb. Miriam), Ann (Heb. Hannah, supposedly the name of the maternal grandmother of Jesus). In addition, a few other purely Hebrew names had come into fairly common usage in parts of Christian Europe prior to Luther’s time: Adam, Daniel, David, Michael, Elizabeth, and Sarah are examples. During the 17th century, however, practically every name from the Old Testament came into general use. The madness reached its height among the Puritans, who scorned the names of their own ancestors and christened their offspring with such atrociously alien appellations as Israel, Amos, Ezekiel, Lemuel, Deborah, Reuben, Esther, Abner, Samuel, Nathan, Noah, Ephraim, Gideon, Jesse, Rachel, Susannah, Leah, Elihu, Abigail, Benjamin, and Abraham. The Puritans brought this pernicious habit with them to America, and Hebrew names were more common in the New World than European names during the Colonial period.
Don’t be surprised, professor MacDonald, that the US became the Number One philosemitic country of the world! So what’s the primary cause of white decline, Judaism or Christianity? What’s worse: the external enemy—the Jew—or the traitor—the Christian? MacDonald wrote:

As I write this in the summer of 2020, we are experiencing what feels like the end game in the Jewish conquest of white America.

End game of the Jewish conquest or of the Christian conquest of the Aryan soul? Has MacDonald read the words of Joseph Walsh on the sidebar of The West’s Darkest Hour?:

The deep-seated death-wish that seems to have taken hold of the collective subconscious psyche of the Aryan race after Hitler’s death is I believe a consequence of centuries of Jewish brainwashing via Christianity and its secular offshoots.

Once the majority of Aryans had rejected Hitler they embraced what remained of Christianity, Christian ethics, with a vengeance. Aryans are aware of what our race is capable of becoming from the photos and films of NS Germany and many of them hate and fear their own race’s potential for greatness due to attachment to an irrational morality and so our race is in a sort of self-destruct mode.

If the National Socialists had won the Second World War our race would not have entered into this intense struggle to overcome the oldest and most effective weapon of the Jews, Christianity. So this post-1945 struggle with the mental disease of Christianity does serve a purpose in that it will either destroy us for good or make us even stronger.

But MacDonald wrote:

I agree entirely with Corey’s conclusions and recommendations for a revival centered around the adaptive aspects of Christianity…

And what are Corey’s conclusions and recommendations? He wrote, as quoted by MacDonald:

We must not tolerate subversion. Liberalism must go; we cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the Enlightenment. We cannot afford to countenance any further anti-American, anti-family, anti-white speech, and this should be reflected in a new Constitution. Just as conservatism was not enough, the
United States Constitution was not enough, with gaps that left it gaping wide for judicial ‘interpretation’. For another thing, we must circle the wagons and inculcate the Männerbund, restraining our individualism at least for the time being. For another, we must return to (((our Lord and Savior))).

I have added the triple parentheses to MacDonald’s quote of Corey. What these guys don’t get is that, as a commenter put it, thinking you can aid in saving the white race while, at the same time, bending the knee to Jewish deities—Yahweh and Yeshua—is some kind of combination of insane, dishonest, cowardly, naive, or very stupid. To bottom line it, it won’t and can’t work. See also Ferdinand Bardamu’s essay criticising MacDonald’s apologetics in *The Fair Race*.
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