

"Hate Crimes" and the New World Order

Source: Free Speech - November 1998 - Volume IV, Number 11

By Dr. William Pierce

There have been a few items in the news during the past few days which have caught my attention, and I want to share my thoughts on these things with you.

One of these items was the reaction to the robbing and killing of a homosexual man in Laramie, Wyoming, earlier this month. I'm sure you've heard about that a number of times by now: the controlled media really have been raising a fuss about it everywhere. Mr. Clinton, of course, commented solemnly to the nation on it and held it up as another reason for enacting the Federal "hate crime" law that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and other Jewish groups have been clamoring for.

Just to refresh your memory, on October 6 a 21-year-old homosexual, Matthew Shepard, went into a bar in Laramie, picked up two other young men he thought were homosexuals but who were not, and left with them. Shepard's intention was to have sex with his two new-found acquaintances; their intention was to rob him. And that's what they did. They also gave him a vicious beating and left him tied to a fence. He died six days later.

Let me assure you that I do not approve of such incidents. Prior to the Clinton era — way back before homosexuality became a government- favored lifestyle — when I was in military school, some of my classmates occasionally amused themselves by going into bars known to be homosexual hangouts, letting themselves be picked up by a homosexual, then beating him up and robbing him. They called it "rolling a queer." I considered it an especially lowlife sort of criminal activity. And today I believe that, just as our society should not tolerate homosexuals or public homosexual behavior, neither should it tolerate the lowlife criminals who prey on them.

Shepard, of course, knew that he was taking a big chance when he left the bar with two strangers — especially in a town like Laramie, which is not San Francisco. Media people have been complaining that if two homosexuals hold hands or kiss in public in Laramie, they are liable to be insulted by other residents. Imagine that! Anyway, a homosexual anywhere who goes into a bar which is not an exclusive homosexual hangout and tries to pick up a "date" is asking for trouble, and Shepard found it.

But you know, the only reason this Shepard case is of interest to us is that the media bosses decided that it could be made to serve their purpose, and so they brought their

television cameras to Laramie. And when the television cameras arrived, all of the eager-beaver local politicians and the oh-so-righteous preachers hastened to express their shock and horror about the awful "hate crime." And then various hysterical women grabbed their chance to become emotional in front of the cameras as they affirmed their Political Correctness. And then, as I mentioned, Bill Clinton got into the act too.

Now, you know and I know that if Matthew Shepard had been killed by two of his fellow homosexuals in an argument over the affection of another homosexual, we never would have heard of it. Or if his killers had been Black instead of White we never would have heard of it. Let me tell you about another brutal and sadistic killing which occurred just a few days before the Shepard killing. This one took place in the Madison County, Alabama, jail. A 19-year-old retarded man, Robert Sevigny, was arrested on the charge that he had said some sexually suggestive things to a girl under 16 years old. He hadn't done anything, just used "suggestive" language. He was, after all, retarded, and he was heterosexual. And he had never hurt anyone. He was a gentle and friendly person. While he was in jail the other inmates tortured him and beat him to death. Why? They told police that they had done it because Sevigny was weak and naive, because he didn't know how to defend himself, and it amused them to kill him.

Now, I'll wager that this is the first you've heard of Sevigny's murder, which occurred last month. The reason you haven't heard of it is that Sevigny was White, and the inmates who tortured and beat him to death are Black. I'll guarantee you that you would have heard of it if Sevigny had been Black and the other inmates had been White. Mr. Clinton would have told you about it. Hysterical women would have wrung their hands and cried in front of the television cameras as they proclaimed their shock and horror over the "hate crime."

I'll tell you about something else which happened a few days ago that you haven't heard about. A Black man, Arthur Bomar, was convicted early this month of rape, first-degree murder, and sexual abuse of a corpse. Bomar had driven up behind a car driven by a 22-year-old White university student, Aimee Willard. Aimee was home on summer vacation from George Mason University, which is in Fairfax, Virginia. She was visiting her parents in Philadelphia, when Bomar deliberately bumped her car. She got out to check for damage; he grabbed her, beat her savagely with a tire iron, tore her clothes off, raped her, and then dumped her corpse in a vacant lot.

Now, I don't have to tell you why you didn't hear about that vicious, depraved crime, unless you live in Philadelphia and caught a brief mention of it on the local news, but have heard about the killing of Matthew Shepard over and over again regardless of where you live. But I'll tell you anyway. The reason is that Matthew Shepard is one of them, as is Arthur Bomar, as are the Black inmates in the Madison County Jail, and as also are the hysterical, hymn-singing women demonstrating against "hate" in Laramie. They're all part of the Clinton coalition, all part of the "diverse" crowd which can be counted on to get on whatever bandwagon the media bosses are driving.

Something else, entirely different, which has really been in the news a lot recently is the situation in the Yugoslav province of Kosovo. The ethnic Albanians in Kosovo would like for the province to be detached from Yugoslavia and become part of Albania. The Serbs, who are the ethnic majority in Yugoslavia, are not willing to give Kosovo to the Albanians. So there's been a civil war going on in Kosovo — and, this being the Balkans, it's been an especially cruel and bloody civil war. The Serbs have been massacring Albanians of all ages and both sexes. And the Albanians are not above castrating the Serbian soldiers they capture and then gouging out their eyes. That's the way wars always have been fought in the Balkans — at least, since the Turks brought their Oriental methods of warfare to the area during the Middle Ages. Fighting against the Turks for a few hundred years and surviving makes a people hard. So now the Clinton administration wants to send an international "peacekeeping" force into Kosovo to keep the Serbs from killing any more Albanians — at least, that's what he says — and the U.S. government is threatening to bomb and rocket the Serbs if they refuse to cooperate. Of course, it's all being done under the guise of a NATO operation, although it's really the gang of Jews around Clinton who're pulling the strings: Holbrook, Albright, Berger, and the rest.

I don't like it. This business of forcing the Serbs to be nice to the Albanians really is worse than the sending of U.S. and NATO troops into Bosnia in 1995 to stop the fighting between Bosnian Serbs, Muslims, and Croats. Bosnia, after all, is an independent country, and a substantial portion of the people invited the U.S. forces in, more or less. In Kosovo we're proposing to force our way into a sovereign country which doesn't want us in order to make the people there behave the way we think they should. Suppose the rapidly growing Hispanic-mestizo minority in Texas or California decided to start a civil war aimed at returning one of those states to Mexico, and we got rough with the mestizo rebels. Perhaps we should permit the United Nations to come into Texas or California and force us to be nice. Actually, to the Clintonista gang, that's not an unreasonable proposition.

You know, I am not against this meddling in Kosovo because I am on the side of the Serbs. I had an older friend, now deceased, who was an American bomber pilot during the Second World War. He was shot down over the Balkans and managed to make contact with Serbian communist partisans who hid him from the Germans and eventually smuggled him through the German lines to a part of Yugoslavia which was not under German control. Before he left they had a celebration for him, and to entertain him they killed, in an especially sadistic way, some German prisoners they had captured. My friend was horrified, and the Serbs didn't understand why. And just as I did not approve of the torture and murder of German prisoners 55 years ago, I didn't approve of the Serbs raping and then cutting the throats of Muslim Bosnian women five years ago, and I don't approve of their slaughtering of Albanian children today. But, as I said a minute ago, this seems to be the way things are done in the Balkans, and the Serbs also get tortured and slaughtered when their enemies get the upper hand over them.

But you know, we Americans are responsible at least in part for the current hatred and bloodshed in the Balkans. We had this idiotic idea after the First World War that we could erase centuries-old ethnic boundaries, mix people of various ethnicities together in artificial countries such as Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, and make them like it. The same sort of thing was reinforced by the communists after the Second World War, after we made it possible for the communists to impose their will on much of Europe. And so when these people begin unmixing themselves through the process of ethnic cleansing, we bear a substantial part of the responsibility.

And so now we are forcing ourselves on these people again, just as we did after the last two world wars, telling them how to behave. Let's just be sure that we really understand what we're doing. The media bosses and the Hebraic gang around Mr. Clinton would have us believe that we're threatening the Serbs with air strikes and an occupation force in order to save the lives of Albanian children. Baloney! Do you believe that Madeleine Albright really cares about children — that is, non-Jewish children? She's the one who in arguing for maintaining the embargo against Iraq said that she thought that the lives of half a million Iraqi children who had died because of the embargo was not an unreasonable price to pay for keeping Saddam Hussein uncomfortable.

No, for the Clinton gang the only motivation for imposing its will on Kosovo is to set another precedent for the New World Order. They want the people of the world to become accustomed to the idea of "peacekeeping" forces and punitive air strikes whenever a country fails to obey orders or to conduct its internal affairs in an "approved" way. Murdered Albanian children simply provide the sort of excuse needed to fool the shortsighted American public into going along for the ride.

What does the American public think about starved Iraqi children? Not much, because the public doesn't have much chance to see starved Iraqi children on television, and when the public does occasionally see them their plight is blamed on Saddam Hussein, not on Madeleine Albright and her crew.

As I said, as much as I disapprove of some of the things the Serbs do, I am opposed to using American pilots or American ground forces to compel them to change their ways. I don't like the precedents being set. We may very well see those precedents applied to California or Texas in the not-too-distant future.

You know, if we are going to be the world's bully — if we are going to take the position that we have the right to tell everyone else what to do, but no one has the right to tell us what to do because we're bigger than the rest — then let's be honest about it. Let's just let everyone know that we can push the Serbs around if they mistreat the Albanians, but nobody can push us around if we forcefully put down a mestizo revolution in the southwestern United States.

The most important advantage of honesty is not that it gains us the respect of the rest of the world; it is that it helps us understand what's really going on. The deceit our government has been practicing serves more to keep the American people confused about motives and interests than anything else. It's clear that we can have a proper policy and make proper decisions only when we know what our motives are and understand whose interests are being served by our actions. I'm not really opposed to being a bully, if we do it honestly: if we have as our motive doing what is best for our people, for our European race.

But of course, we can't do that as long as the Clintonistas are in place and as long as most of our mass media are in the hands of the Jews. And as long as that deplorable and dangerous situation lasts, then every patriot must be opposed to the sort of policy the Clinton gang is pushing in Yugoslavia: this policy of telling other countries how they must handle their internal affairs and then bombing them if they don't obey. It is a policy which pretends to offer humanitarian relief to the Albanians but which in fact just strengthens the tyrannical hand of the New World Order crowd.

It is the same sort of bullying policy which led to our blowing up a pharmaceutical factory in Sudan a few weeks ago: a deceitful, bullying policy. We claimed the pharmaceutical factory was a facility for making nerve gas. That claim increasingly appears to be unsupportable. It looks like we destroyed that pharmaceutical factory primarily because we knew we could get away with it — we knew that the Sudanese weren't strong enough to hit back — and the Clinton gang believes it's smart to slap the Muslims in that part of the world around every now and then so they won't think about making trouble for Israel.

If we were serious about controlling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, then Sudan certainly is not the country that needs to be slapped around. You know and I know that there is only one country in that part of the world which is a threat to world peace or to our interests and which also has a huge stockpile of weapons of mass destruction.

Iran and Iraq can drop anthrax bombs on each other, or Jordan can nuke Damascus with a stolen warhead, or the Syrians can rocket Cairo with nerve gas — and it will be worrisome if that happens — but there's really no way we can prevent it, short of depopulating the entire area ourselves. Iran and Iraq already have used poison gas against each other during their war in the 1980s. The bright side of the situation is that most of these Middle Eastern countries have only local interests, and they have very limited capability for making trouble beyond their immediate neighbors.

The one country which serves as a constant irritant in that part of the world, the one country which provides an incentive for all the rest to acquire weapons of mass destruction, is Israel. Israel is the only country there which has been engaged in military conflict against all of her neighbors at one time or another during the past 25

years. Israel is the only country there which we know has been engaged in the development and manufacture of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons on a large scale and which has major stockpiles of all of these weapons now. And really more significant than these other observations is the fact that Israel is the only country there with global ambitions, the only country there with megalomaniac delusions of grandeur and galloping paranoia, a combination which makes dealing with Israel like trying to negotiate with a certified lunatic who has his finger on the trigger of a doomsday device.

If you're a careful reader of newspapers, you may have noted the dispute between Israel and the government of the Netherlands which has been raging this month. Six years ago an Israeli 747 cargo jet on its way from New York to Tel Aviv crashed into an Amsterdam neighborhood, killing 39 people on the ground. It was the worst air disaster the Netherlands has experienced. If you don't remember reading about it, it's because news agencies in America decided that it was a piece of news you really didn't need to know. Ordinarily such things are kept hushed up permanently, but what has caused this story to flare up recently is that a lot of people in the Amsterdam neighborhood where the crash occurred have been coming down with strange and serious ailments.

The Israeli aircraft had among its cargo 50 gallons of dimethyl methylphosphonate — DMMP for short — which is an exotic chemical the only known manufacturing use for which is the production of the nerve gas sarin. Also on board were quantities of the other chemicals which are required, along with DMMP, to produce sarin. The Jews, of course, are angrily insisting that their aircraft was carrying no "dangerous goods" over the Netherlands, that the DMMP on board was intended only for testing and research purposes, and that they aren't responsible for the sickness of the people who live near the crash site.

Now, everyone in the Netherlands involved in the investigation of this crash, as well as everyone in the United States concerned with controlling the spread of weapons of mass destruction, understands that the Jews are lying. They understand that the DMMP and the other chemicals on the Israeli 747 were for the manufacture of nerve gas. They understand that the United States never should have permitted the export of the DMMP — and in fact, would not have permitted its export to any country other than Israel. It is the one precursor chemical involved in the manufacture of sarin that is a little tricky to make. Once you have the DMMP, a high school chemistry student can make sarin with it and a few other easily available chemicals. In other words, exporting DMMP to Israel is tantamount to supplying Israel with nerve gas for use against her neighbors or anyone else. Let's remember that Israel is a country which sends its agents into other countries to squirt exotic poisons into the ears of religious leaders it believes are hostile to the Jews.

So let's not put on quite such a big pretense of being worried about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction when we blow up pharmaceutical factories in Sudan or

threaten Saddam Hussein with another war. It may be that one of these days we will want to take drastic measures against people who are building stockpiles of nerve gas. It may be that we will want to interfere in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia or some other country. It may be that we will decide that it is proper for us to dictate to all the governments of the world how they should behave. But until we get our own affairs in order and become masters in our own country, we'd better just butt out of everyone else's business.

© 1998 National Vanguard Books · Box 330 · Hillsboro · WV 24946 · USA