

Source: National Vanguard Magazine – Number 115 (November-December 1995)

Dividing the Race

Editorial

When it was cited by Niccolò Machiavelli early in the 16th century, it already was a strategy as old as the race: Divide et impera. It is the strategy which the enemies of our people have used successfully against us more than once, and it is the strategy which is responsible for our present peril.

Surprisingly, the division of our people is widely discussed in front of us by the enemies who have accomplished it, although the discussions are heavily laden with disingenuousness: the heterosexual White male, they gloat, has been dispossessed; his power has been taken by minorities and women, and there is nothing he can do about it except learn to live with the fait accompli.

Actually, it's not that simple. The division itself is far more complicated than heterosexual White males on one side and Jews, homosexuals, Blacks, Asians, mestizos, and women on the other. The most important complication is that many White women, probably a majority, are on the side of their men; and many heterosexual White males have joined the other side. Furthermore, there is much which can be done about the situation.

The division we would like to see, of course, is all heterosexual White men and women on one side and all Jews, homosexuals, Blacks, Asians, and mestizos on the other. Then we would be ready for the shooting to start, and we would settle matters pretty quickly. The Jews understand that, and that is why their efforts have been directed not only toward empowering the non-Whites and the perverts but also toward alienating as many White men and women from their own race as possible.

I remember talking to groups of White university students 25 years ago and pointing out to them where the "civil rights" agitation, which even then had become quite fashionable on campuses, was heading. I told them that it would lead to the decline of our morals and our culture, the disintegration of our society, and finally to a race war between Whites and Blacks in America. Most of the students just listened without noticeable reaction, as if they were watching yet another television program. Only small minorities expressed either a favorable or an unfavorable response. Nearly all of the former were males: unfortunately, many of them males with a low testosterone level, who crept up to me quietly afterward and expressed their approval when no one else was around to hear them.

Both males and females were among my vocal opponents, but I was always sad to note that the girls tended to be more numerous and more hostile than the boys. After a talk I gave at the University of Maryland, one White girl proudly told me, "Well, if there's a race war between Whites and Blacks, I'll be shooting at you from the Black side."

I spoke to a class of seniors at a private high school, also in Maryland, and while the teacher smirked in the back of the class a blonde girl in the front row sat next to the only Black male in the class and kissed and fondled him throughout my talk, in an obviously prearranged effort to disconcert me.

Women are much more fashion conscious than men. Of course, there are men, even heterosexual men, who worry very much about wearing the latest style in cuff links or ties, but women always have been far ahead of them in such matters, far more easily persuaded that they absolutely had to buy new wardrobes every time the fashion moguls raised or lowered hems an inch.

The Jews, to their credit, understood before the rest of us that the female tendency to be a slave to fashion is an innate, sex-linked characteristic, and they also realized that ideological fashions could bind women as strongly as fashions in dress and ornament. It is no coincidence that nearly all of the influential gurus and heroines of feminism of the past half-century have been Jewesses: Betty Friedan, Bella Abzug, Andrea Dworkin, Shulamith Firestone, Lucy Komisar, Lynda Schor, Gloria Steinem, ad nauseam.

Thus, the arbiters of fashion in Hollywood and New York who used the cinema and television to make racial mixing fashionable among the trendy set also made feminism fashionable among White women. The madness has gone so far today that substantial numbers of otherwise normal, heterosexual White women have let themselves be persuaded that not only can they be just as capable combat pilots or firefighters as men but that only women really know how to give women sexual fulfillment.

Fortunately, most of them have not yet brought practice into line with that doctrine, but they have managed to make themselves thoroughly neurotic trying to reconcile doctrine with instinct. More relevant to the matter under discussion here, many women have let themselves be maneuvered into a position where they view any assault on the currently fashionable ideology of racial equality as an assault on their "right" as women to be military-school cadets or corporate raiders. These women have a subconscious understanding that this "right" is just as artificial as the "equality" claimed by non-Whites and homosexuals, and they have accepted these others as their allies in fending off the efforts of heterosexual White males to drag them out of the cockpit and the boardroom and put them back into the kitchen, the bedroom, and the nursery. They have bought the Jewish argument that heterosexual White males should be regarded with suspicion until the latter have demonstrated their "sensitivity."

Unfortunately, all too many men have done just that. Men may not be quite as trendy as women, on the average, but that's not saying much for them. The difference is a matter of degree, not kind. There are all too many men who are as afraid of having a Politically Incorrect idea in their heads as the average woman is of being caught in unfashionable attire: if "sensitivity" is "in," they gladly will put on the most disgusting display of it. And there are men who simply have no ideas in their heads except getting ahead. Unlike the "sensitive" ones, they have no shortage of testosterone, but they also have no sense of responsibility or propriety: they will ally themselves to whatever faction seems to offer them the best career prospects, and they will pay lip service to the corresponding ideology. Like the feminists, they will regard any other man who tries to rock the boat they are in as an enemy.

Actually, that's too stark a picture. Most people, on both sides, are not really partisans. They're just spectators, who find themselves, by accident more than by choice, in one camp or the other, and they sing along with the crowd without really thinking about the meaning of the words.

That makes the division no less real and no less dangerous for us, however. If looking at the great, passive middle tends to blur the division, it is sharp enough at the extremes, where there is passion aplenty: passion most often expressed as hatred.

In the trendier circles in Washington, D.C., and other large, eastern cities, there is more bigotry than there ever was in a Ku Klux Klan klavern. It may be that back in the 1930s some of the more backward Klansmen didn't like Catholics or foreigners (although the Klan since has had the good sense to drop those divisions), but that's nothing compared to what the Politically Correct bigots in Washington don't like today.

Walk into one of their cocktail parties wearing a National Rifle Association button, and the conversation will freeze as suddenly as it would if Nelson Mandela showed up at a Klan picnic. If you speak with a rural accent, you will be regarded with immediate suspicion. If you're from the South, then you'll be expected to prove that it's only the "New" South of Jews, Blacks, and Politically Correct yuppies with which you have any connections. If you're especially "Aryan looking" (a la Rutger Hauer or Daryl Hannah, for example), you can deflect hostility by coming with a Black date.

In these circles the word "White," used as a racial designation, evokes instant fear and loathing, especially among the Whites. They usually won't admit their hatred of their own kind to non-trendies, but among themselves they are quite open about it. They all agree that it is a good thing that North America is becoming darker, and they look forward eagerly to the day when the continent will have a non-White majority. Things will be much better then, they all aver: the greatest evil on the planet, White racism, finally will be suppressed, and love and brotherhood will reign.

When they watch a cowboys-and-Indians movie, they always root for the Indians: when a White is scalped or tied to a stake to be burned, they cheer. Reading The Turner Diaries, or any book in which the Whites win, "sickens" them (to borrow the word most often used by mainstream journalists to describe their reaction to my novel in the reviews they wrote of it following the Oklahoma City bombing). Viewing Leni Riefenstahl's Triumph of the Will, with its magnificent portrayal of proud, racially conscious White men and women, is a "chilling" experience, they say, even though it was made by the greatest woman cinematic genius.

Their dream world is one high in melanin and low in testosterone. It is a world in which strong women, wearing trousers and holding the key executive positions, share power with Blacks, Jews, and other non-Whites, and everyone lives in a city much like New York. Everything will be run by committees, and problems will be solved by talking them to death. White males will be tolerated in subservient positions, if they are either homosexual or have been "sensitized." This picture of the world is one which has been drilled into them during the past 30 years, starting at puberty with MTV and Politically Correct comic books.

They tend to fall into the mistaken belief that they are the universe, because they live inside a media-generated illusion-world and talk only with each other. But they do chatter in nervous fright whenever they are reminded that there are still some of those awful heterosexual White males left out there who haven't been sensitized yet. They look to the government to protect them from this threat and maintain their empowerment, and they are hot to have the government use whatever measures are expedient for that purpose. In particular, they want a roundup of guns and a clampdown on Politically Incorrect speech.

Then there's our side of the division. Close to the middle are those White men and women who still believe that the traditional family, with a male breadwinner and protector and a female homemaker, is not only worth saving, but that it's the natural way for men and women to live and by far the best way to raise emotionally and spiritually healthy children.

Unfortunately, the changes in American society during the past half century or so have made the traditional family an endangered species. In 1940 most married women were full-time homemakers. Between 1940 and 1990 the portion of married women working outside the home increased by a factor of four, to approximately 60 per cent. More than half of married mothers with children under 17 years of age are now employed full time outside the home, and the percentage rises every year.

This change has not been entirely a matter of choice: increasing urbanization of the economy, with jobs moving from rural to urban areas, and the rising cost of housing relative to per capita income have made it much more difficult to maintain a family on one income. Greatly exacerbating the situation, however, has been a trend in life-styles

toward ever greater consumption. People on both sides of the division have let themselves be persuaded that they cannot live without many things that their grandparents found quite unnecessary.

The division at the middle, then, is not between people who are members of traditional families on our side and those with working wives and mothers on the other. Rather, it is between those who would live in traditional families if they could, and those who regard traditional families as old-fashioned and repressive and look on the present trend with favor.

Looking at the division from a different viewpoint, those near the middle on our side are those who value freedom above comfort and security, while the converse is true for those on the other side. The herd instinct is a little weaker on our side than on theirs. They have a near-monopoly on authoritarian personalities: on people who like to speak with reverence of "our President" and "our government" and to hate anyone who lacks their reverence.

We look to ourselves to satisfy our needs; they look to the government. We also tend to live more in tune with our instincts—more the way God intended us to live, the Christians on our side would say—while the others favor life-styles as artificial as their politics.

As we move further away from the middle, the passion becomes stronger. Trendy people—people who always want to do only what everyone else is doing and would never dream of striking out in a new direction, away from the crowd, or trying something they hadn't seen on television—feel comfortable with lots of rules and regulations. Things that aren't regulated by the government make them nervous. They like to buy licenses and apply for permits and pay fees and be told just what's permissible and what isn't. It's like having a stamp of assurance from the government that what they're doing is fashionable, or at least acceptable.

They cannot imagine the feeling of rage and resentment that rises in people with a more independent or adventurous nature when the latter are confronted with one of these artificial government barriers. Here's an example: When I was a kid I loved fireworks. I could go to a fireworks store and buy whatever I wanted. I could ride my bicycle to a vacant lot and set off my firecrackers and bottle rockets without violating any laws. Today there are very few places left in the United States where kids can do that. Certainly, there always were inept dolts who managed to blow off a finger or lose an eye playing with fireworks, just as there are people who will manage to shoot themselves or a member of the family by accident if they get their hands on a gun. We used to be willing to accept such risks. We were aware that if you're not careful you can hurt yourself. We understood that living was an inherently dangerous business. We preferred a world in which there were freedom and risks to a supposedly safer world walled in by rules.

By the time I was 12 years old or so, I had developed a more serious interest in rockets and related matters than store-bought fireworks could satisfy. I used to take the money I made mowing lawns in Dallas, Texas, and get an adult to give me a ride downtown to Greene Brothers, the big laboratory supply warehouse, where I would give a clerk the list of chemicals and glassware I wanted, and then I would walk through the warehouse with him while he found the items for me on the shelves. A dollar would buy a lot more nitric acid or powdered aluminum in those days than it will today. The important thing, though, was that I didn't have to fill out any forms or show the clerk a permit from the government to buy what I wanted.

Pyrotechnics isn't everyone's thing, of course, but the same thicket of government restrictions has overgrown nearly every activity that's not on the beaten path: flying your own airplane, building your own house, collecting your own firearms, operating your own business. It can't be that the government is trying to protect us with its restrictions: it still pays farmers to grow an addictive drug which causes the deaths of 400,000 cigarette smokers in the United States every year. Whatever the government's reason, it is infuriating to plenty of people besides me.

I live in one of those rare, backwoods places where there are no building codes, and a property owner doesn't have to ask city hall for permission to dig a hole in his backyard or change his plumbing around. He just does it, and it's nobody's business but his. The trendier locals are trying to change that. They believe that building codes are "progressive" or something of the sort, and they want to have the same sort of rules that property owners in Philadelphia and New York have. Fortunately, there are plenty of other folks like me around here who are resisting, but the trendies are looking for allies in the state government. People who live in New York just wouldn't understand, but there are those of us who really get steamed about such things.

It used to be that men valued their personal honor above all other things, and governments understood and accommodated themselves to their citizens' sense of honor, albeit reluctantly in many cases. That was a long time ago, of course. Even some politicians had a sense of personal honor. (That was a very long time ago.)

In those olden days, if a man were in public with his wife, and a stranger made a lewd remark to her or put his hands on her, the offender could count on having to defend his life. If the husband killed or seriously injured him, and there were witnesses to the original offense, the husband would have been justified in his actions, in the eyes of his peers and of the government. Similar considerations applied if the original offense were against the husband himself. The corollary to this was that people tended to be more polite in public, more careful not to give offense.

How different it is today! The feminists become infuriated at the mere suggestion that a man should feel any obligation to protect a woman. Protection suggests a sense of possession. Protection is a job for the government, not for individual men. And the

Jews, who always have regarded with a sneering sort of amusement and disbelief the Aryans' willingness to fight for the sake of honor, have joined the feminists in moving us all into a more enlightened era, where honor counts for nothing.

There are, of course, a few of us whose hearts are still back in the Stone Age. We may control ourselves most of the time. We may swallow insults and other offenses without reprisal, just to stay out of jail; but when we do, we feel dishonored, and when we feel dishonored a feeling of hatred begins building in us: hatred against the government which forced us to dishonor ourselves, hatred against the politicians and the bureaucrats and the other supporters of the government.

I am acquainted with the details of a recent case in which a White man and his wife were insulted in a mall parking lot by a Black who had nearly hit their car with his. After screaming his insults about White "crackers" and "honkies" and being told in turn that he and his fellow "niggers" should go back to Africa, the Black drove off, then came back a few minutes later with a Black friend and a brick. Advancing on foot with the brick in hand toward the car in which the White man and his wife were sitting, the Black screamed at the White man, "I'm gonna smash your motherf---ing head in." Whereupon, the White man tore open his glove compartment, grabbed a pistol, and shot the Black dead.

During the subsequent trial, both the defense and prosecution witnesses agreed that the Black had threatened to smash the White man's head with a brick. The only difference in the testimony was that the prosecution's witnesses—the Black's male friend and a White woman—said that the Black dropped his brick and took a couple of steps backward just before he was shot, while the defense said that the Black still was holding the brick when the White man fired. The key to the outcome of the trial, however, was that the prosecution emphasized that the White man, who was a university graduate with a good job and a stable marriage, happened to be a "racist," who didn't believe that Blacks should be permitted to remain in America. The Jewish prosecutor read excerpts to the court from Politically Incorrect books and letters seized from the White couple's home.

The mostly White jury, showing to the world that it had no sympathy for White "racists," brought in a Politically Correct verdict of guilty of premeditated murder, and the White judge sentenced the White man to life in prison. Such an egregious injustice may be considered only a fluke by some—the consequence of an unlucky combination of a "sensitive" jury, a Jewish prosecutor, a politically ambitious judge, and an inept defense lawyer—but those who pay attention to such matters can cite a hundred similar cases from recent years.

The Jews, the feminists, and their collaborators would like to lock up all of us Stone Age men, who would rather fight than crawl. Our presence makes them uncomfortable. And

so they have perverted the "justice" system to serve their purpose. And they're getting away with it.

Or are they? Every time they have a success of the sort cited above, every time they gloat and smirk publicly about such a victory over heterosexual White males, the hatred against them builds, the burning desire to tear out their throats and smash their heads grows.

Which brings us back to sex again. Heterosexual White males who used to know instinctively what to do when a Black attacked them with a brick also used to know instinctively how to behave when they wanted a mate—or even the temporary company of a woman. The changing of all the rules to suit feminist and Jewish notions of "equality" has confused many of them.

Most of us, to be sure, have learned to adapt. Whether we liked it or not, we learned the new etiquette. We also learned that there still are old-fashioned, unreconstructed women to be found—feminine rather than feminist women—if one knows where to look for them. But they definitely are scarcer than they used to be, and the fellows who have a harder time adapting to unnatural conditions have suffered accordingly. There's hardly anything to make a man angrier than depriving him of a woman's company for an extended period.

So here's what it all boils down to: the war between the Clinton constituency and the rest of us is heating up. Astute observers have been commenting for years on the "culture war" raging in America. It was a war between those on one side who believe that children should be raised in a disciplined environment and have old-fashioned values instilled in them, and those on the other side who believe that all any child needs is a big dose of "multiculturalism" via MTV every day.

The folks on the old-fashioned side were fighting with one hand tied behind their backs, though, because they were careful never to admit even to themselves that the "culture war" is really a race war: that what makes MTV so elementally evil is that it is Jewish, that it is the fiendishly crafted instrument of the sinister Jewish billionaire Sumner Redstone. They railed against "multiculturalism," but they retreated in embarrassment when the multiculturalists charged them with "racism."

So obviously the Clintonistas were winning, and the rest of us were losing. One easy triumph after another caused the Clinton constituency to throw caution to the winds and to push ahead more rapidly and more brazenly. Homosexuals, radical feminists, and Blacks were brought into more policy-making positions in the government than ever before. Jews came out from behind the scenes and assumed more visible positions of power: on the Supreme Court, in the Cabinet, and as movers and shakers in the Congress. Military leaders who were considered insufficiently "sensitive" were canned.

The Jews defined a new category of crime—"hate crime"—and got the government to go along. The Politically Correct elitists announced that the Constitution is obsolete, and the government decided to prove it by making bloody examples of dissidents, first shooting in cold blood the wife and child of a White separatist at Ruby Ridge and then burning to death nearly a hundred Second Amendment dissidents at Waco.

All of this became a mite too much for us unsensitized heterosexual White males. We decided to make ourselves heard, and we began speaking out more loudly than before. We began using the Internet, and we began making radio broadcasts on those few stations not yet under Jewish control. And a few crazies among us did some wild and stupid things: shooting abortion doctors, bombing a government building, shooting up the White House.

The Clinton constituency responded by announcing the need to silence dissident voices: specifically, to keep Politically Incorrect messages off the Internet and Politically Incorrect radio programs off the airwaves.

Actually, this response was only the unveiling of a small part of a scheme on which they had been laboring for years. The Jews want in the United States the same sort of laws they have succeeded in forcing on the populations of Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Denmark, and a dozen other White countries, where it is now illegal for Whites to dispute the Jewish version of history or to criticize Jewish efforts to "multiculturalize" their people. They had succeeded in introducing codes of Politically Correct expression at most universities, in many of the larger corporations, and in the government itself, but they were still wondering how they could put real teeth into these codes by criminalizing what they cleverly refer to as "hate speech" when the Oklahoma City bombers presented them with a golden opportunity. Now they're trying to make the most of it.

It remains to be seen how successful they will be. If they do succeed even partly in their efforts to scuttle the Bill of Rights—even if all they're able to do is knock another brick or two out of the Second Amendment and close down a few Politically Incorrect broadcasters—I believe they'll get a response from us Stone Age types which will make everything which has happened so far seem like a church social.

And I believe that they will be at least that successful. Certainly, free speech has never been truly popular. Joe and Jill Sixpack have never understood why anyone should be permitted to write or say things that offend conventional people. During the 1960s, when the Jews were offending a great many conventional people through their "counterculture" campaign, the freedom to shout obscenities and preach treason was zealously promoted by their trendy collaborators in the cultural, academic, and media establishments. That era is far behind us now, however, and the same trendy collaborators are warning everyone that we really must outlaw "hate speech."

That'll be another step for them in the division of our people. Many people on our side who're near the middle now will be pulled far out toward the extreme. This radicalization will make us stronger.

The authoritarian types will remain where they are for the most part, on the other side near the middle, supporting "our President" and "our government" as self-righteously as ever. About the only ones we can expect to cross over to us in substantial numbers are those whose oxen are gored by the changes. Fortunately, more and more oxen will be gored, as the Jews rush to cram everything they can down our throats while they still have a grip on the situation.

In particular, their continuing drive to usher in the New World Order as soon as possible, with its attendant deindustrialization of America and the proletarianization of the White middle class, will force many to take a position with us who would have preferred to remain squarely on the fence. We should be thankful that the Jews' campaign for the division and destruction of our people is committed to a number of fronts simultaneously, and they cannot easily pull back on one while pushing forward on another.

In our effort to defeat their campaign we may find ourselves allied with many people whom in the past we barely tolerated: the religious zealots of the Christian right, the essentially conservative types who have been gravitating toward the militias, the wild and undisciplined young White people in our cities who had nowhere to turn but to the skinhead movement when they were abandoned by our "multicultural" society, libertarians who finally are waking up to the fact that if they are to preserve any liberty at all they may have to compromise their individualism temporarily, perhaps even a few authoritarians from the military and police establishments who have overdosed on Clintonism.

Thus, even as the division of our people continues, new unions will be formed. By the time the shooting begins in earnest things almost certainly will not be divided along the lines we would prefer. What we must strive for now is to ensure that those on our side of the division will be able to win