

*Whoever walks a mile full of false sympathy
walks to the funeral of the whole human race — D. H. Lawrence.*

Instauration

VOL. 1, NO. 12


NOVEMBER 1976

Rasputin

Marxist Dummy?

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Bruno Bauer
The True Story of Dixie
Conservative Twaddle
Economic Backtalk



The Safety Valve

□ I was discouraged to read in *Instauration* that only 35,000 copies of *The Dispossessed Majority* had been printed. We simply must find a way to put this book in the hands of 35 million Majority members, not 35,000. If only old misanthrope Howard Hughes had left his fortune to me, our problem would be solved.

351

□ The University of Illinois book store reveals that the minorities and their liberal supporters have dropped all cover. They are rabid Trotskyites out to overthrow the remains of the U.S.A. and also the Soviet Union. The Wasp types want a global bureaucracy. There is also a new rash of Jewish-authored, anti-Soviet books.

618

□ You pretend to care about the worldwide fate of Anglo-Saxon civilization, yet as you print idiotic installment after installment of "The Game and the Candle," White Rhodesia is slowly being destroyed by Kissinger and his fair-haired puppet, Ford. Can't *Instauration* even mount a fund-collection service to recruit mercenaries to defend a deserving Anglo-Saxon redoubt like Rhoc sia? Can't *Instauration* write articles? If the white race perishes in southern Africa, the beginning of the end everywhere has begun.

080

□ The poem in the June issue of *Instauration* is a disaster area. If you are going to draw a line between Celtic and Germanic, which is way beyond the knowledge of 99.99 percent of Americans, you should at least do it right. As long as the Roman armies were in what is now England, Germans could be kept out. But after the Romans left, the Britons were left fighting a losing battle. What remains of them as a people are the modern Welsh.

210

□ I am curious about Justice Thurgood Marshall's voting record. I suspect that he has never voted against a case that had the backing of the NAACP. If, as I suspect, this is true, wouldn't it be a clear-cut case of conflict of interest?

212

□ *Instauration* (August 1976) was very good. The only thing I take issue with is Speer's remarks about Hitler. Speer is no longer a reliable source, since he decided to sell out to get a little retirement money.

208

□ Since about 1820 sulphite has been added to paper as a bleaching agent. Moisture and time eventually turn sulphite into sulphurous and sulphuric acid, which makes paper yellow and crumble. This means that everything printed since 1820 or so will eventually disappear, which may be a good thing.

211

□ The present Soviet regime is following a traditional policy of imperialism, using Cuban Negro troops like the French used Senegalese and the British used Indians. On the other hand, the Russians have never generated conquistadores or soldiers-of-fortune and never sent troops outside a contiguous perimeter. This is rather tribal and conservative as opposed to the adventurous behavior of Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians.

210

□ Regarding "Is It Time To Organize?" (*Instauration*, August 1976): Handbills on windshields can help the cause but might we not obtain better results from a "Book of the Month Club?" Each member would send the price of *The Dispossessed Majority* to be mailed to an uninformed Majority person engaged in public office or perhaps the educational or ministerial fields. Personally, I have purchased several copies, but feel that an organized movement is needed since our opposition has enjoyed such phenomenal success in this manner. In conclusion, some may be interested in knowing of my failure to get *The Dispossessed Majority* on our public library shelves. I did request that the library order Agnew's *Canfield Decision* and find that there is now a waiting list for this publication. When your front door is locked, always try the side entrance.

317

□ If no research into the subject of race is permitted and funded, how will we ever be able to build "intellectual foundations" for racial inequality? Who really cares if the Negroes' destructive behavior is culturally or genetically determined? When environments are equal for the Majority and the black, the Negro is still very destructive. We have plenty of evidence that multiracial societies destroy civilization. Does it really matter if it is genetic or cultural? The decline is there for all to see.

921

□ Since America's problems are biological, the solution must be biological. Social, political and economic issues are merely symptomatic. "Is It Time To Organize?" (*Instauration*, August 1976) makes this pretty clear without getting gory about it. What emotions does the "Virginity of Freshmen Women" arouse? I don't see any significant Majority resistance to anything.

115

□ If you had to waste postage sending a book to that incredible jackass, "Puffin' Billy" Hargis, you should at least count yourself fortunate that you were edified instead of raped. I haven't heard what has happened to the American Christian College, in which Hargis exercised his glands before he was given an opportunity to retire without scandal on an income of \$40,000 a year from the college and his other businesses.

618

□ *Instauration* (August 1976) had an article "Stalin's Anti-Semitism" which is completely off base. The people who end up hating the Jews are the ones who get most intimately involved in horsetrading with them. My brother is a buy-and-sell man, a walking pawn shop, and he regularly unloads tirades against Jews. Arthur Bliss Lane wrote a book *I Saw Poland Betrayed* which has a literary scorching section on the Jewish thing after World War II. That Stalin foamed at the mouth about the Jews only proved how deep he was in with them.

537

□ I spent the July 4th weekend at Ocean City, Maryland. We saw a number of grotesquely overweight, pudgy, chubby, paunchy, big-bellied people roaming the shore and the boardwalks. Unfortunately, the Majority figured mightily among this unfit lot. The battle of such bulges is almost irretrievably lost.

306

□ Thanks a lot for including bits of my letters in *Instauration*. In print my incoherent scribbles look better. Also, you take small bits, phrases, sentences. I can make a few brilliant words, but not a long coherent string.

310

□ Although I'm often in profound disagreement with the theses propounded in your magazine, it is always intriguing and thought-provoking. I enjoy especially your "Game and the Candle" serial.

021

Instauration

is published 12 times a year by
Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc.
Box 76, Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Annual Subscription \$12

Student \$6, Foreign \$15

Make checks payable to:
Howard Allen

Wilmot Robertson, Editor

©1976 Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc. All rights reserved

Contents

The Men Behind Rasputin	5
The True Story of Dixie	6
Bruno Bauer	7
Conservative Twaddle	8
Economic Backtalk	9
Cultural Catacombs	10
Inklings	13
The Game and the Candle	14
Stirrings	23

□ I am sending my own skull measurements as a sample of racial anthropometry. I was happy to find out that I was a full-fledged Nordic type with dolichocephalic skull! My skull index was 73.9. The work sheets which showed me how to make the measurements were obtained from *Physical Anthropology*, a Syllabus of Supplemental Data, by George J. Bellamin, pp. 52-53, College Book Store, 3413 S. Hoover Blvd., Los Angeles, CA, price \$4.

907

□ While I certainly won't disagree entirely concerning your comments on Tijuana, even an insane asylum must have some good points: (1) Contrary to opinion, one can walk, alone and at night, anywhere in Tijuana's downtown area with far less chance of ending up a crime victim than in almost any large American city. The police are careful to protect the tourist and his dollars. (2) I know Tijuans of small and moderate income who at least have enough nationalistic pride to prefer living poor in their own country rather than jumping the border to the milk and honey of Gringolandia. They should, at least, be complimented and encouraged in their desire to remain in their own madhouse rather than seek residence in ours.

920

□ Through ten generations our ancestors removed themselves from Europe, where they left behind the old and oppressive inhibitions, bringing hands and eyes to this new continent of hope. Europeans said: "It cannot be done, we have had centuries of experience." But we forgot the centuries, rolled up our sleeves and conquered one primitive hemisphere. It could not be done? And so we did it! Like Noble George and Ignoble Jimmy we cannot tell a lie. And we shall accomplish a good deal more because much life yet remains in these supple limbs of brakeless enterprise.

804

□ One of the frustrations of being at once an English major and a racist is that there seems very little possibility of adapting one's ideology to criticism. The Marxists are able to do this very easily; they can show how Shakespeare is a bourgeois propagandist or a proletarian hero. I would be hard put to show, except in the most superficial way, how he is a white man. Perhaps this is the merit of our position: we take account of facts so subtle that to make anything of them seems almost absurd.

222

□ *Instauration* is a breath of fresh air in an otherwise stagnant, hopeless atmosphere. Your July article on "Flexibility" was inspirational (as indeed are most of your articles). *Instauration* fills a need for a publication at once racial and literate (a supposed contradiction in terms) and arrives at a moment in time when, I believe, the majority of the Majority is fed up enough to be receptive.

293

□ Why all of a sudden this fuss about the swine flu? America has had a wicked case since 1933.

142



□ I think your article on the Olympic games was much too wordy and diffuse. To get a better idea of how the games have changed in the 2,000 years of their existence, why not look at the enclosed sketches. The top one is B.C.; the bottom one A.D. — not perhaps A.D. 1976, but certainly A.D. 2000.

619

□ If anything, intelligence is a disadvantage in this society. It gives one the privilege of having one's brains exploited instead of one's brawn — for a slight increase in pay. Cunning and shrewdness are more valuable. To be a success in today's America it is essential to be a total psychopath (and go to law school instead of an insane asylum).

111

□ For me the reconstruction of probabilities about Ike's ascent to the White House (*Instauration* July 1976) was the main thing. It's like "The Game and the Candle" explanation of how the Munich crisis wasn't allowed to be "It," but the Polish Corridor.

209

□ I don't know why it's said that Kant is the backer of liberalism. I cannot any more use or define that ism than neo-Platonism. Words are becoming simply hopeless in denoting anything at all.

210

□ I went downtown to Scribner's bookstore a few weeks ago with a sample of *The Dispossessed Majority*. The Majority purchasing agent read the back cover and glanced at the first chapter, and then choked up. His refusal to stock the book went unexplained, as I didn't push the matter. I did leave him, however, a copy of the flyer advertisement. A friend told me later that I should have stressed that the book's controversial nature would boost its sales, thus converting its verboten theme into an advantageous sales pitch. Next time I'll think of this.

802

□ Jimmy theme in your July issue devastatingly good.

136

□ Your Rockefeller Quiz in the July issue reminds me of two men at a bullfight for the first time. The first said that the matador controls and eventually kills the bull. The second man disagreed: "Just look. Twice the matador has jumped behind the barricade to save himself. Once he leaped over the fence. He's had his jacket torn and two other toreros had to come to his rescue, diverting the bull's attention. He also had to jump aside to dodge the horn. What do you mean that the matador has control of the bull?" However, a little later, the bull was dragged from the ring, dead.

606

X Safety Valve (cont'd)

□ The main thesis of white racism is that the whites are more advanced in the evolutionary process than the blacks because of the ice ages, which put a premium on intelligence as a survival mechanism and weeded out the less intelligent. On the other hand, no race of blacks experienced an ice age so they were left behind. The blacks never advanced beyond a tribal culture on their own, but the whites have a civilization that now has technical equipment exploring Mars. However, an interesting question remains. Why did not the Mongoloid race not advance beyond feudalism without the help of the white race? The yellow race also partially experienced the effects of the ice ages. I would like to suggest that because parts of the Asian continent escaped the glaciers, the weeding out process was not as intense. This led to less genetic diversity. The European whites differ greatly among themselves, but the Asians tended toward greater conformity in characteristics. Possibly, this lack of genetic diversity is the key to why the yellow race is on a slightly lower level than the more diversified white race.

554

□ Choo-choo train of progress, its engineers are selling us another shiny but shoddy bill of goods. Operation Headstart (Democratic National Convention) has stated under a Carter administration America will be on the move again. A land of milk and honey will at long last spread its sweetness and largess to constituents one and all — except us. Nevertheless, we have been ordered to hop aboard.

038

□ The Politburo's attitude to Soviet Jews is a question of vital importance, for we must understand the nature of the enemy. Visitors to Russia continually state that the Jews are treated better than any other group. The very fact that they can leave Russia should say something. No one else is allowed to go and some Jews return to Russia after they find Israel is not to their liking. Jewish bankers and capitalists do business with Russia every day. Just because Russia gives Arabs arms to fight Israel does not mean that Russia is free from Jewish influence. Stalin may have hated the Jews, but he is dead. I am afraid the Jews may have resurrected some of their lost power. I do think your analysis of the question was quite brilliant and creative, but I have strong suspicions that it may not be as correct as previously thought. An additional reason for my saying this is that I have met quite a few girls from Eastern Europe. Most of them are very anti-Semitic and most of them feel that Jews wield significant influence in their governments. International Communism is not totally Jewish as it once was, but the Jews are still calling the tune to a great extent.

312

□ In Philadelphia was a lethal drug used on human guinea pigs for experimental purposes?

038

□ I would like to say that our movement needs a scientific formula to apply to a given situation. The Communists apply dialectical materialism to their problems and have done quite well. We have no such standard. I suggest that dialectics in the pure Hegelian form should be looked into. Marxism is a perversion of the Hegelian dialectic. Hegel was on our side. Let us use his genius for our own ends. We must have a method.

708

□ Frankly, I believe that the Odinist movement is our best vehicle. The advantages are: (1) If we are persecuted by the Jews and liberals, we can invoke the First Amendment, while at the same time using religion as a political movement (tax-free) — like the unscrupulous Reverend Moon. (2) Now that the Supreme Court is able to force Negroes into private schools in the South, we can set up Odinist parochial schools, Odinism being a racial religion which prima facie makes it mandatory that a member be a Nordic. (3) The only way many of our racial comrades can organize in Germany, Canada, England, New Zealand, etc., is under a camouflage of religion.

576

□ I still stick to my view that the renegade white plute is the main enemy Good to see something of Douglas Reed back in print. He had a lot of good stuff in a string of books, though he got carried away with a little English warmonger stuff in the earlier ones. My sympathies were always with the English who ended up in the jails under Regulation 18B, and I knew a lot of them. It is a story which still remains to be told by someone over there Was amused that your July issue contained nothing about the "buycentennial sellabration." Had fun watching Cronkheit on CBS the 4th. The Majority got the antemeridian and the minorities the rest of the day, along with pious whither-goest-we, phony speculative philosophical mutterings by such as I. I. Rabi, Mumford and others of similar stripe. The cultural saturation by this lot is nearly total I agree with the letter writer castigating Rhodesian whites for bringing on their own tribulations with the cheap darkie labor compulsion. It is a repeat of the Virginia USA experience, 1619 et seq. (to 1860). There is a variant of it going on in England now and for the same reasons: fewer people want to do exhausting work or take jobs which result in dirty hands and clothes. There is a variant in France, crammed with Algerians, and Germany, ditto with Turks. I did not know that the chap who looped that film to make it appear Adolf was doing a jig at Compeigne in June, 1940, had died. Laurence Stallings had an article on this back in the October, 1958, *Esquire* There was another famous photo fake, by a Chinese cameraman, of that pathetic little crying and dirty Chinese kid sitting in the middle of the railroad tracks presumably after a Japanese air raid, around the Nanking times. This was exposed in an issue of the *Smithsonian* magazine last year. One would think all pictures would be discredited by now, after the exposes of the Paris *papier mâché* corpse factory in World War I by Arthur Ponsonby.

The Zionist concentration camp fabrications in World War II will get theirs in good time. That is a novel idea loosed in "The Game and the Candle," that the Comrats in Spain were supported feebly so that England and France might be spared having Stalin squatting on The Rock. Very plausible. Speaking of the latter war, that Guernica fraud is in a class with the two photo fakes mentioned above. Luis Bolin's book and the work by the young American of Spanish extraction, Alfred M. De Zavas, in *National Review* in August, 1973, and more recently in the German periodical *Wehrforschung* have certainly exposed that product of Comrat Willi Muenzenberg's atrocity factory in Paris. And to think that Commie millionaire Picasso made so much money on that crude daub he scrawled commemorating that non-event It was Stalin's army and journalists who entered Auschwitz first, and it was a story by a Comrat newspaperman, Roman Karmen, which got into print here first, in *Time*; said hearty also conducted the tour of the premises in which the captive pro-Stalinists lodged in the Hotel Metropole in Moscow were allowed to get out and look around; they were the ones who expanded liberally on the original Red totals of alleged deaths there. The Reds cleverly derailed attention from Katyn by this one, and the worst of the liars at the Nuremberg trials were those under Red discipline, such as Mme. Vaillant-Couturier. Why courts which presumably operate under Anglo-Saxon legal principles accept the testimony of any Communist, who is under Party discipline to lie, is beyond me. I wonder how the Israel desperados think their comrades in New York City and Moscow will escape if they launch an atom war and it spreads to the United States and Russia? It would be interesting to see what any White House occupant would do if the Israelis atomized Arab cities and the Russians fried Israel in return. Would the President be inclined to conclude things were evened up and go on about his business? Or would he cave in to the ADL and call for a second round? If so, let us hope the first incoming ICBM lands in Seymour Graubard's office.

801

□ In reply to the letter criticizing my article about Schoenberg, the reader is correct in pointing out that there have been a few notable composers in this century — e.g. Bartok and Shostakovich. What I was referring to specifically, however, were twentieth century idioms and forms. The composers mentioned above were related more to the nineteenth century idioms that were pushed off the track of development by the Schoenberg theories. As to Schoenberg's influence, it is much stronger than the reader realizes. In the universities the twelve-tone technique is the major compositional method taught. In addition, since the wild improvisations of today came about as a reaction to the tightly controlled music of Schoenberg, both begin at the same starting point. To use Hegelian terms, this is a case of thesis and antithesis, with both being equally anti-Western. Schoenberg was the stimulus for each.

147

THE MEN BEHIND RASPUTIN

Was the Mad Monk really a Marxist dummy?

Y

There exists in the popular American mind, largely induced by a ridiculous Hollywood film that was successfully sued for perversion of historic fact, a conception of Grigory Efimovich Rasputin ("The Mad Monk of Russia") as a lurid mastermind of quintessential evil, dominating the corrupt and idiotic government of the Czar and ushering in its downfall through control of the superstitious Czarina; his uncanny power to cure the sick Czarevitch; and his usurpation of the Czar's authority. However, it is forgotten that nearly all of the hundred or more books ground out about Rasputin have been written from a pro-Marxist viewpoint and that a necessary prerequisite for a successful takeover of a country by proletarian revolutionaries is to prove it "corrupt." The popular view of Rasputin is greatly appealing to the imagination of the public, but the general nonsense about his bestial personality is not nearly as interesting as the almost unknown facts about his sponsors. For Rasputin was in reality obsessed by religion and sex, sex being an essential facet of the Khylysty sect. He cared little for political power, but he soon met, upon his arrival in St. Petersburg, political plotters who saw in him an invaluable tool.

Rasputin came to St. Petersburg in 1905. In the course of time, as his talents began to circulate among the Russian public, he acquired, as a close friend, a Jewish gentleman by the name of Aaron Simanovich, a jeweller who suddenly discovered that Rasputin had cured his son of St. Vitus Dance. Simanovich had moved to St. Petersburg in 1902, whereupon he had become the Czarina's jeweller. Simanovich had found out that the Czarina was somewhat miserly around money, an odd trait for a member of Russia's monarchy, which had access to great resources. Once having made contact with the Czarina, Simanovich plied her with bargains, selling her very expensive jewels on extended credit and at extremely low prices. Although Aaron lost money on the deals, he gained it back from other members of the Court. He often spoke contemptuously of the extraordinary ignorance of the Russian nobles in business matters.

Now if a conspiratorial cabal — and in St. Petersburg such cabals were legion — had wished to subvert the Czar's government, and this was the principal mission of almost every cabal, there would be nothing that could accelerate the process from within as much as the introduction of a quack faith healer, libertine, and degenerate like Rasputin into the Imperial Court. It would be fine copy for every newspaper in the world to project, free of charge, an image of utter degradation. It must be

remembered that Lenin's seizure of power took place in St. Petersburg and that the city had intellectual and conspiratorial revolutionary elements within it in great depth. And in this city of plotters, Simanovich was a stellar light; it would be naive indeed to think that he did not know the leaders of the Bolshevik groups. Aaron moved through the maze of St. Petersburg conspiracies with great success and delight, seeing endless opportunities for moneymaking, organizing nightclubs, cabarets, gambling hells, and brothels, all activities, with unlimited facilities for espionage and blackmail. Simanovich's activities, unknown to the Czar and Czarina, would have confirmed the worst fears of the anti-Jewish "Union of True Russians," a group to which Rasputin at one time belonged, in somewhat the way the late liberal Justice Hugo Black was once a dues-paying member of the Ku Klux Klan.

Aaron's triumphs rendered void, as they applied to himself, the deprivation in Russia of the Jews' civil rights, where they were confined to settlements on the edges of towns, forbidden to have Christian servants, and not allowed to send their children to school. Russian police treated their Jewish fellow countrymen with legal tyranny; there was no protection of law for them. Jews were permitted to run protection rackets among themselves without hindrance. The probability, therefore, that Simanovich, given a good chance, would strike back at the tormenters of his people was naturally high. Here again is posed the age-old question: Did the Jews get that way because of repressive measures against them or were repressive measures exerted against the Jews because they were that way?

The facts presented by all historians, Marxists or not, lead to the belief that (1) Aaron Simanovich saw great possibilities for Grigory Rasputin at the Czar's court; and (2) Aaron Simanovich introduced his faith-healer by way of an intermediary to the Czarina. Here was a situation made to order for a conspirator: an ignorant and superstitious Czarina in an absolutist regime; a sickly and pampered heir to the throne on whom the physicians had given up hope; a weak and unintelligent Czar; a venal court; and a general ministry composed of one sad mediocrity after another.

The golden opportunity apparently came with the daughter of the Chief of the Imperial Chancery, Anna Vyubov, the Czarina's favorite. Her father, Alexander Tanayev, a distinguished composer, had acquired the favor of the Czar (and very probably the post in the Chancery) through the Czarina's love of music. Anna's

Continued On Page 16

The True Story Of Dixie

Music is perhaps the most accurate meter of the fire in the communal soul. When there is fervor, there are stirring marches and heart-wrenching ballads. When there is only propaganda, there is only Irving Berlin. Unfortunately, the best songs of America have grown out of its disunity, not its unity. The North was never closer together than in the Internecine War when troops were shouting "Mine eyes have seen the glory!" The south was never more unified when the words of "Dixie" were echoing through the Confederacy. The supreme irony, however, is that "Dixie" was the work of a Northern Irishman, and the music for "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" was composed by a Southerner. In the first of two articles on the subject we delve into the origins of "Dixie," which, as noted in earlier Stirrings columns, has now been banned by several Southern bandmasters for fear of stirring up a racial Majority backfire. The article, written by a prominent professor of psychology, is reprinted with the permission of the fraternal organization in whose magazine it first appeared.

As a psychologist and former bandsman (and incidentally a Hoosier who counts two Buckeye bluecoats in his ancestry), I am occasionally nettled by comic-serious public demonstrations and television protests spotlighting persons claiming to be offended by the singing and playing of the tune "Dixie" at athletic contests. Some particularly thin-skinned individuals object to "Dixie" rendered by bands on parade or in concert, even when the event is broadly patriotic and full of equal-time provisions for numbers like "Yankee Doodle," "We Shall Overcome," "America," "Battle Cry of Freedom," "Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean," and "Glory, Glory, Hallelujah!"

It is probably safe to say that most people's enjoyment of "Dixie" has nothing whatever to do with secret longings for a neo-slavocracy or the return of the Invisible Empire. If the aggrieved parties knew a bit more musical Americana or were somewhat less inclined toward irrelevant confrontations, such flapdoodles might be laughed off or possibly sublimated into a larger vision.

It is well known that Daniel Decatur Emmett — native of Mt. Vernon, Ohio, tunesmith extraordinary, and sparkplug of Bryant's Minstrels — composed the deathless words and music of "Dixie's Land." What is not common knowledge is that he scratched it out one drizzly Sunday in

I WISH I WAS IN

DIXIE'S LAND

Written and Composed expressly for

Bryant's Minstrels

by

DAN. D. EMMETT.

Arranged for the Piano-forte by

W. L. HOBBS.

NEW-YORK:

Published by **FIRTH, POND & CO.,** No. 547 Broadway.

London C. V. FORDA New-York P. P. WHEELER Pittsburgh H. KLEBER & BRO.

Warren, Mass. Herald, No. 43 Centerville, N. Y.

1859 during a New York engagement. It was intended merely as a "walk-around" number for the troupe of burnt-cork comics. Emmett's inspired "hooray" chorus probably derived from the plaintive remarks of touring vaudevillians who yearned to trade Gotham's cold climate for that green and pleasant land down South. Obviously, the lyrics of "Dixie" were unrelated to slavery, secession, or Southern militarism.

At its world premiere (on Monday, Apr. 4, 1859) the song was greeted with instant delight on the part of blase New Yorkers. Early the following year P. P. Werlein and Mrs. John Wood introduced the catchy tune to New Orleans, queen city of the Creoles, whose French- and English-speaking inhabitants had long been trading in \$10 banknotes, labeled DIX (meaning 10), which Americans everywhere quickly corrupted to "dixies." The final link was forged in January 1861, when a popular music-

hall team at the Variety Theatre brought the house down with a stirring rendition of Uncle Dan's keening showboat ditty, with its southern theme and blackface comedy style. So it was that Dame Fortune integrated "Dixie's Land" and "land of the dixies." Talk about the Mason-Dixon Line as the origin of "Dixie" is mostly fantasy. So is that yarn about the Manhattan planter named Dix.

In the wake of President Lincoln's election, Southern secession and confederation, the inauguration of President Davis, and the tragedy of

Continued On Page 17

BRUNO BAUER

The Young Hegelian's anti-Semitism caused Marx a great deal of intellectual grief

In Germany the 1840s, leading up to the abortive liberal revolution of 1848, were years of frantic intellectual activity, in which were sown the seeds of all major twentieth century revolutions, both Communist and Fascist.

One of the great figures of this period was Bruno Bauer, a philosophical firebrand who was the highbrow counterpart of the street agitator. That Bauer was a radical is beyond dispute. But a radical what? In more than one way his radicalism foreshadowed the ideas and suggestions put forward by the young American philosopher Richard Swartzbaugh.

Bauer studied under Hegel, ultimately winning a position as lecturer in theology at the University of Berlin. Partial to Hegelianism, he advocated a defense of Christianity from the standpoint of reason, which raised the hackles of most of his colleagues, who put all their religious money on faith. Inevitably, the academic brouhaha got tangled up in Prussian politics.

It so happened that in the 1840s Prussia's rulers and their ministers had some fixed and heady ideas about Christianity. Contrary to expectations, their theology was not the high church dogma of an Aquinas or a Niebuhr, but a low church, populist and fundamentalist faith, closer to Pietism. A few cabinet ministers, however, backed the high theology of Hegel and Hegel's followers, among whom was Bauer. When Bauer's friend, the Minister of Education Altenstein, died, his low church successor dropped the lecturer in theology from the state payroll.

The occasion of this firing was a critical point both in Bauer's life and in the history of the leftist Young Hegelians, who rose to Bauer's defense. As the acknowledged leader of this group, Bauer made an open declaration of atheism and, by implication, a declaration of independence from the Christian state, which was also the Prussian state. The state promptly declared war on Bruno Bauer.

Enter Karl Marx, Moses Hess, Eduard Bernstein and a flotilla of anti-Prussian agitators. Marx had attended Bauer's lectures while the latter was still in the good graces of the government. Even then, perhaps, he had spotted Bauer's trouble-making potential. As the battle between Bauer and the religionists grew heated, Marx lurked in the shadowy background, waiting, perhaps, to grab a part of the spoils. Displaying his plagiaristic traits at an early age, he relied heavily on Bauer for material and inspiration for his doctoral dissertation. One authority on the Young Hegelians, David McLellan, puts it this way: "There seems



little doubt that the subject of Marx's dissertation — a comparison between the natural philosophy of Epicurus and Democritus — was inspired by Bauer . . . His claim . . . that 'the practice of philosophy is itself theoretical' is taken from one of Bauer's letters to him that says: 'Theory is now the strongest form of practice.' "

After Bauer had lost his teaching post and Marx had given up hope of getting his own post through him, the two continued to correspond. One interesting exchange was provoked by Bauer's article "Die Judenfrage" (The Jewish Question). Bauer saw Judaism as a typical religion and, as such, negative and harmful to human life and society. Not sparing the Jewish faith from the "radical criticism" to which he also subjected Christianity, he

Continued On Page 18

CONSERVATIVE TWADDLE X

The Soldier of Fortune, a publication that reeks of the good old days when Northern European nations squandered their best genes on asinine colonial ventures in Asia and Africa, has lately been getting into the news for its help wanted ads for white mercenaries. In line with its Errol Flynn image, the magazine ran an editorial by Lt. Col. Alexander McColl in its spring 1976 issue, which made all the right points in the beginning and all the wrong ones in the end. As an example of the confusion and self-defeating propaganda that permeates so much of present-day conservative writing, we reprint the final one-quarter of the editorial, which began by comparing our present times with the last days of Rome.

One is reminded of the time of the breaking-up of the Roman Empire, the collapse of the old Mediterranean civilization, the onset of the Dark Ages. Yet Christendom survived, and the names of the heroes and saints of that age are honored and remembered even yet. Aetius, Charles Martel, Roland of Roncesvalles, Columba of Iona, Benedict of Nursia, Augustine of Canterbury. The Goths and the Vandals, the Huns, the Vikings and the Saracens, all were either thrown back or converted, and of the institutions of the older time, only the Holy Church survived.

But meanwhile let us not forget these things

- that the South Vietnamese and the Cambodians — even the Buddhists — were fighting and dying for the defense of Christendom and against the sworn enemies of God and His Holy Church

- how appropriate it was that the insignia of the late U.S. Command in Vietnam was the Crusaders' sword and shield, and its color scarlet red — in the rubric of the Church the color of blood, and hence of martyrdom

- that the disaster in Southeast Asia is not only an appalling human tragedy for the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, but also an avoidable and irreparable defeat for Western Christendom and the final requiem for the United States as a great power

- that the last time round, the Dark Ages lasted about five hundred years

McColl's *Soldier of Fortune* editorial was so out of ideological kilter that it provoked the following abrasive clarification from an *Instaurationist*.

For sheer blithering drivel I have seen nothing that surpasses the claim that "the South Vietnamese and the Cambodians . . . were fighting and dying for the defense of Christendom and against the sworn enemies of God [Yahveh?] and His Holy Church." Hell and damnation! Even a schoolboy, if his brains have not been addled and pickled, knows that those people fought (a) to save their own lives and property, and (b) because we paid them to

fight so that we could degrade and debase ourselves by ensuring our ignominious defeat in a war that a world power could have won in a week, and ensure our defeat for the express purpose of (a) killing many young Americans and demoralizing the rest, with few exceptions, and (b) pumping more blood out of the taxpayers to slush it down so convenient a sewer, and (c) training blacks for use in future massacres of our people.

Christendom? An unfortunate but accepted geographical term that designates Western Europe in the Middle Ages and also the inhabitants (Europeans), thus becoming an anthropological term.

"His Holy Church?" In the Dark and Middle Ages Europe was united by a common religion in which the great majority of its inhabitants then believed, and in which a dwindling minority now believe. Roman Catholics profess to belong to an organization that is a continuation of the Medieval church and they still have a high priest installed in Rome, but even fifty years ago their doctrines were so different from the doctrines of the Medieval church that they were in fact, though not in name, a quite different sect, although that was not obvious to superficial observers. What the Catholics have today is a spiritless organization which is committing suicide religiously by claiming that God's Vicar and God himself did not know what they were talking about for fifteen centuries.

And so we come to the "heroes and saints."

Aetius. A Nordic, perhaps a Slav, of great military ability and courage and a ruthless singleness of purpose that eventually made him the supreme commander of the armies of the Roman Empire (i.e., the empire established by the Romans, who became extinct long before his time). In that capacity he, with his German allies, defeated the Mongoloid Huns at Chalons and thus saved Europe. He was undoubtedly a man: he killed Count Boniface with his own hands in a duel which somewhat anticipates the chivalric code of the Middle Ages, and perhaps the best proof of his character is that after he was assassinated by the little punk, Valentinian III, two of his officers revenged him by murdering the Emperor at the first opportunity. Aetius fought for himself, of course, and perhaps he may have entertained ambitions to reach an even higher rank, but he fought also for the Roman Empire, which was still being held together by the desperate exertions of a few men and, whether consciously or not, for Western civilization. He was nominally a Christian, but he certainly did not fight for Holy Church, for which he had a kind of amused contempt.

Charles Martel. A German who made himself master of

Continued On Page 20



ECONOMIC BACKTALK

The articles “Economics and Race” and “Minority Economists” in the first two issues of *Instauration* stimulated such a heated response that all we can do is turn over a few pages of this issue to the author of the second article in the hope that he will restore some sweetness and light to the dark mood of the offended, most of whom can be described, in the words of Henry Adams, as “gold bugs.”

When a country is off of the gold standard, it is also off the silver standard. It is off the cotton, sugar, copper and coffee standards as well. The legal tender is a piece of paper. There is nothing special about gold as a money standard, except that the central banks own huge amounts of it and can manipulate its price.

The idea that Ricardo was a “free enterpriser,” who “abolished the corn laws” and “put England back on the gold standard,” as one critic of my article has written, is absurd. He did publish a pamphlet advocating that England, after suspending specie payment during the Napoleonic wars, go back on the gold standard at the prewar price of gold. This forced the Bank of England to contract credit and the merits of the scheme were debatable. In general, however, Ricardo actually favored a paper legal tender, one that would be controlled “exactly as gold would naturally move.” By this he meant that the international flow of gold would automatically regulate prices. David Hume is credited with first explaining how this “international specie flow mechanism” works. It is little more than a crude quantity theory adjustment process. Assume, for the moment, that money income and hence prices are linked to the quantity of gold. Assume all countries are on the gold standard. Now if domestic prices rise, then imports rise and exports fall. Gold flows out and income decreases, thereby checking the rise in prices. Ricardo advocated a central bank for the issuance of inconvertible paper money that would be managed in such a manner as to effect the same result. That is to say, the central bank would be instructed to control the stock of “the circulating medium” so as to stabilize foreign exchange rates. Ricardo’s pamphlet was entitled “Proposals for an Economical and Secure Currency.”

After Ricardo was no more, his disciples (known as the “Currency School”) favored regulation and reserve requirements for the Bank of England. They were opposed by the disciples of Adam Smith (known as the “Banking School”). The importance of Britain’s 1844 Reform Act has been greatly exaggerated. Demand deposits were not regulated. More important, whenever there was a “crisis” — a shortage of bank notes — Parliament quickly suspended the reserve requirement for notes. For all

practical purposes, we can say that throughout the 19th century the Bank of England was unregulated, and the supply of currency (coin, bank notes and demand deposits) was flexible.

The question is “What determined the supply of currency?” The answer is that it was an established practice for banks to create new currency only when the loans involved were for short-term commercial purposes. Basically the success of this policy was due to its preventing the banks from inflating the income of their clients, whether capitalists or politicians. In this connection, it should be remembered that an increase in the demand for short-term commercial loans is more likely to reflect a genuine currency shortage than does an increase in the demand for capital loans. In fact, as Knut Wicksell showed, there is *always* a demand for long-term loans. But present-day libertarians continue to blame the government for inflation. Why should a loan to the government for an army jeep be more inflationary than a loan to me or you for a pickup truck?

My views on the libertarian Jewish economists have been expressed in my *Instauration* article. Henry Hazlitt is almost an exception. He is singularly anti-government and the only New York libertarian who does not advocate one hundred percent reserve requirements. Also, in his booklet *Economics in One Lesson* he says that money is a standard of value rather than a medium of exchange. This is an uncharacteristic remark for a man who runs with the libertarian pack. I wonder if he has ever thought about it. In other words, there is more than a touch of Adam Smith in his writings. But his analysis for the most part is rather shallow.

You will note that my explanation of the determination of price levels (the value of money as reflected in prices) is, broadly speaking, “Keynesian.” That is, it involves an income-expenditure approach rather than the quantity-theory approach. In this Keynes had been anticipated by the members of the “Banking School,” most notably Thomas Tooke, Newmarch and Fullarton. On the whole, I do not think that Keynes was all that bad. My general impression is that the liberals — the spenders — have twisted him around to suit their purposes and that the free enterprisers have done the same. But both groups have caused the fundamental issues to be forgotten and turned the controversy into a debate between freedom and government.

Liberal economists like Keynesian fiscal policy because it gives Congress control over a bigger chunk of money income. Conservative economists like the quantity theory because it gives control to the international bankers. I am

Continued On Page 21

The Cultural Catacombs

French Cassandra X

In 1895, in the closing years of the West's most vortical century, a French social scientist wrote a book which talked about the unconscious before Freud, the revolt of the masses before Ortega y Gasset, and residues (manifestations of instincts) before Pareto.

The title of the work was *La psychologie des foules*, which has been variously rendered into English as *The Psychology of the Crowd*, *Mob Psychology* and latterly *The Crowd*. The author was Gustave Le Bon, who lived through the three most disquieting and shabby episodes of France's Third Republic: (1) the Dreyfus Affair which was concerned with the deification of a Jewish army officer who was first convicted and then cleared of spying for Germany; (2) the rise and pathetic fall of Ferdinand de Lesseps, the hero of the Suez Canal, who was sent to jail for financial scandals arising out of his failures in Panama; (3) the career of General Boulanger, the man on horseback who could have been an early DeGaulle, but who, blind to the beckoning finger of fate, ended up a suicide.

Le Bon could not escape being disheartened and disgusted by these sleazy events, which he blamed on the emergency of the crowd or mob as the decisive factor in human affairs. "The divine right of the masses," he predicted, "is about to replace the divine right of kings."

The mob, Le Bon assures us, is not the sum of its parts. Its behavior is quite different from that of the individuals who compose it. "Civilizations as yet have only been created and directed by a small intellectual aristocracy, never by crowds. Crowds are only powerful for destruction."

Crowds, according to Le Bon, are characterized by their anonymity, the contagious nature of their acts and, more importantly, their proneness to suggestion. Juries pronounce verdicts of which the jurors as individuals would disapprove. The French nobility voted to give up all its privileges on the night of August 4, 1789 — an act of renunciation to which its members, taken singly, would never have agreed.

People who make up crowds act as if they were under the influence of their spinal cords rather than their brains. Their sentiments are exaggerated out of all proportions, as "in beings belonging to inferior forms of evolution." Often they are distinguished by their feminine and childish characteristics, being incapable of sorting out the subjective from the objective. "Isolated," Le Bon declares, "[a man] may be a cultivated individual; in a crowd he is a barbarian. . . ."

Le Bon's masterwork, however, is far more than an insightful essay on mass behavior. His many meanderings are often more enlightening than his central thesis. Here is what he thinks of history books:

[They are] works of pure imagination . . . fanciful accounts of ill-observed facts . . . To write such books is the most absolute waste of time. Had not the past left us its literary, artistic, and monumental works, we should know absolutely nothing in reality with regard to bygone times. Are we in possession of a single word of truth concerning the lives of the great men who have played preponderant parts in the history of humanity — men such as Hercules, Buddha, or Mahomet? In all probability we are not . . . It is legendary heroes, and not for a moment real heroes, who have impressed the minds of crowds. Equally illuminating is Le Bon's attitude towards science:

Science promised us truth, or at least a knowledge of such relations as our intelligence can seize: it never promised us peace or happiness. Sovereignly indifferent to our feelings, it is deaf to our lamentations. It is for us to endeavor to live with science, since nothing can bring back the illusions it has destroyed.

On education:

[I]nstruction neither renders a man more moral nor happier. Statisticians have brought confirmation of these views by telling us that criminality increases with the generalization of instruction . . . and that some of the worst enemies of society are recruited among the prize-winners of schools.

On socialism:

Not truth, but error has always been the chief factor in the evolution of nations, and the reason why socialism is so powerful today is that it constitutes the last illusion that is still vital. In spite of all scientific demonstrations it continues on the increase. Its principal strength lies in the fact that it is championed by minds sufficiently ignorant of things as they are in reality to venture boldly to promise mankind happiness. The social illusion reigns today upon all the heaped-up ruins of the past, and to it belongs the future. The masses have never thirsted after truth. They turn aside from evidence that is not to their taste, preferring to deify error, if error seduces them. Whoever can supply them with illusions is easily their master; whoever attempts to destroy their illusions is always their victim.

On religion:

There are great difficulties in the way of establishing a general belief, but when it is definitely implanted its power is for a

long time to come invincible, and however false it be philosophically it imposes itself upon the most luminous intelligence. Have not the European peoples regarded as incontrovertible for more than fifteen centuries religious legends which, closely examined, are as barbarous as those of Moloch? The frightful absurdity of the legend of a God who revenges himself for the disobedience of one of his creatures by inflicting horrible tortures on his son remained unperceived during many centuries.

And finally on what Le Bon considers to be the chief determinant of human behavior:

This factor, race, must be placed in the first rank, for in itself it far surpasses in importance all the others . . . [It] dominates all the feelings and all the thoughts of men . . . [It] should be considered as an essential law that the inferior characteristics of crowds are the less accidental in proportion as the spirit of race is strong.

Le Bon died in 1931 at the age of ninety, after most of his predictions about the shape of the future had come to pass. Precisely because he x-rayed events and trends so thoroughly, his works were relegated to the "file and forget" basket of the all-powerful, liberal-minority scholasts. Like Cassandra, whose prognostications were never believed, Le Bon spoke the truth about the future, but no one would listen. Cassandra had promised bodily favors to Apollo for the gift of prophecy, but when the time came to pay up she reneged. Though he had not doublecrossed Apollo or any other deity, Le Bon suffered the same penalty.

Truth, it seems, can be slanted, desecrated and tortured, but it cannot be murdered. Le Bon and his ideas are still around, though almost totally unknown to the general public and, incredibly, not mentioned once in the entire twenty-four volumes of the fourteenth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The fact that such shamans and intellectual con artists as Marx and Freud are household words, while Le Bon remains an unknown soldier in the battle for rationality, is only one more proof of his own thesis about the credulity and ignorance of that most important and credulous of all crowds — the intelligentsia.

Plague On Both Houses

The United States is such a remarkable institution that it can undergo a complete change of oligarchy without a change in government. The southern planters, who had done the most to lead the new nation through the revolution and its early years, lost their ascendancy by the 1850s and the

Interne War destroyed them as a group. Industrialists became the new ruling class, but they in turn began to decline around World War I and were overthrown in Roosevelt's bloodless coup of 1933. Under the name of conservatives some of them now form part of the weak and token opposition to the present or third American establishment.



Robert W. Whitaker

In his new book *A Plague on Both Your Houses* (Robert B. Luce, Washington, DC, \$9.95), Robert W. Whitaker, a young historian, takes pains to describe the new ruling class because it is more diverse and much more broadly based than the two elites which preceded it. He calls it the education-welfare establishment, though it also contains elements of the super-rich, most of the mediocrats and practically all the minority leaders. To a large extent it lives off the tax money and the inflation generated by its endless human betterment programs, which almost always promise one thing and deliver the opposite. This mile-wide discrepancy between goal and fulfillment, instead of justifying their termination, furnishes excuses for the consistent expansion of such programs to the point where they are now getting completely out of hand. If the trend continues, the education-welfare establishment is bound to push the country beyond the breaking point, beyond the point where lower-middle-class whites will no longer have anything to lose. At that time, Whitaker contends, the white working man and the remains of the old conservatives will arise and vote the parasitic liberal politicians, bureaucrats, unioners and academic types out of office. He does not rule out the possibility of a violent reaction, but hopes the present establishment will give up his power as gracefully as did the industrialists. Whatever the outcome, Whitaker writes, "We are now for the third time in our history as an independent nation in the stage of popular rebellion against an elite group."

Whitaker describes the here-again, gone-again Wallace movement as the first manifestation of a born-again American populism. Two young minority members recently wrote a book called *The New Populism*, which also predicted a rebirth of populism. But their populism was to be a coalition of blacks, chicanos and poor whites. This is by no means the middle-class populism that Whitaker has in mind.

Populism, which provided such an interesting and stormy interlude in American history, was primarily based on rural opposition to the late 19th century New York banking circles and their political and academic minions. One might ask Whitaker, if the basic populist voting base of the smalltime farmer and other dwellers in the boondocks has eroded, how can populism be resurrected? Also it should be remembered that populism flourished in the South, where it should have been most successful because it threatened to divide the white (anti-Negro) vote. Whitaker implies but does not say that the populism he both predicts and urges has a racial tinge. If this is so, we should give it a more accurate name.

There are a few social and economic groups Whitaker neglects in his stimulating analysis. One is the vast new bureaucracy of hired managers, the non-entrepreneurial executives of the multinational corporations. Usually they are more liberal and radical than civil servants, if not so far to the left as academics. On the other hand, small business, the only area where anything resembling free enterprise still functions, is forgotten.

The outlook of Whitaker's book is Marxist in the sense that class struggle is its central theme. This is an excellent strategy in that it turns the liberal establishment's own arguments against itself. The all-important global situation looms up for no more than a few seconds as the result of a passing reference to *The Camp of the Saints*. Presumably interested in straight thinking, Whitaker occasionally drops off the deep end, especially when he praises a scientific charlatan (and convicted forger) like Erik van Daniken.

In one sense Whitaker's *Plague* fills in some empty spaces of *The Dispossessed Majority*, which concentrates on race and culture and devotes much less space to economic and class issues. Perhaps a third book is needed to examine the interaction of race and economics. Richard Swartzbaugh's *The Mediator* covers the ground very well in an abstract and theoretical manner, but it seems to be beyond the ken of college graduates (let alone the hardhat crowd). We also need a study that probes the warped souls of the Majority renegades whose cooperation has brought the education-welfare establishment into being.

Unfortunately for Whitaker, blue-collar people do not read books, not even ones as lucid as this. The boob-tube is their

favorite diversion and we know all too well who is projecting the images there. Conservatives drugged on Birch society fantasies will not be able to benefit from *A Plague on Both Your Houses* (or from anything else), nor will dyed-in-the-wool libertarians. Nevertheless, Whitaker offers a great deal for serious-minded Majority members to ponder, when he shows that the short-term interests of the incommunicative white working masses represent the only real political power that could be adapted to the Majority cause. Conservatives, he indicates, have always done their very best to keep this power firmly in the leftist camp.

Whitaker declares — and who can dispute him? — that the education-welfare establishment is leading to total ruin, as it expands its voting base to include hordes of immigrants fleeing from the teeming, steaming slums of Latin America and East Asia.

As an optimistic aside to *A Plague on Both Your Houses*, we note that the publisher, Robert B. Luce, was once the publisher of the liberal-minority propaganda sheet *New Republic*, and that the book has a foreword by William Rusher, the crown prince of the Buckley empire, who recently distinguished himself by opposing William Shockley in an aborted debate at Yale. If the arch-leftist Luce can publish a book and the arch-equalitarian Rusher can praise a book that is so hostile to their previously touted ideologies, then Majority members have cause for at least a thin smile, if not a stentorian guffaw.

Richard Wagner's Attack On Jewish Music

Richard Wagner was one of those rare composers who was as skillful in his theoretical writings as in his music (another was the Frenchman Jean-Phillipe Rameau). Wagner did not rely on his music alone to gain a reputation, but attempted to construct a coherent theory on which to base his compositions. It was an ambitious undertaking in which he never completely succeeded. But the ideas he formulated played a large part in showing the interdependence of biology and culture.

The piece of writing for which Wagner is most famous is entitled "Judaism in Music." In it he noted the inevitable failure of the Jewish artist to be assimilated into the culture of his country of residence. The cosmopolitanism of Jews, he asserted, was the primary reason for their artistic superficiality. While Jewish artists often gained great temporary popularity, their efforts to work within an alien culture produced only a pale imitation of that culture.

Continued On Next Page

Cultural Catacombs (Cont'd.)

It is often claimed that Wagner's article was inspired by his personal resentment at the popular success of many Jewish composers, in contrast to his own struggle for popularity. No doubt there is some truth in this, but it does not answer the real question. And in that respect, we can see that Wagner has been vindicated. As proof, we can note that while Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn were extremely popular in Wagner's time, the former has been nearly forgotten today and the latter reduced to second or third rank, while the reputation of Wagner has only grown with each passing year.

Significantly, Wagner did not sign his name to his article, publishing it anonymously. Because of this, many writers have discounted its importance, feeling that Wagner himself repudiated it. But the fact is that he never denied writing it or having the sentiments contained in it. It is probable he maintained his anonymity because of concern with his professional position. He knew he would suffer severe financial penalties if he became openly associated with the article.

To understand Wagner, he must be seen as both a revolutionary and a romantic. He was a participant in the revolutions that swept Europe in 1848 and worked throughout his life for revolutionary changes in the artistic world. But it is important to remember that the 1848 revolution in Germany was basically nationalist in character, and Wagner remained a firm nationalist throughout the rest of his life. His theories were somewhat utopian (he wanted to recreate the artistic spirit of the ancient Greeks), which accounts for his failure to completely carry them out. But he left us with a wealth of ideas and music that greatly enriched Western culture. Perhaps it is important that while Wagner's work approaches the limits of tonality, the basis of our musical culture, it never actually moves into atonality, as Schoenberg later did. Wagner was a pioneer, but he worked within Western culture, not outside of it.

La Gaya Scienza

"False theology has transformed the Bible from a token of love into an instrument of torture." So said recently the Reverend Malcolm Boyd, an Episcopal priest who is eminently qualified to speak as an expert on the perversion of theology. An activist in the civil rights and antiwar movements and the author of a 1967 book of prayers entitled *Are You Running with Me, Jesus?*, Father Boyd has striven mightily to transmute Christian doctrine into an instrument for shackling Majority Christians to the liberal-minority rack. Unfortunately, his is not recanting his "Liberation Theology." He is characterizing as false the theology which

takes seriously the Bible's condemnation of homosexuality. His position is not, it turns out, a disinterested one.

"I'm gay," the minister declaimed. "In saying this, I feel secure, unthreatened and happy." He does not find homosexuality inconsistent with Biblical teachings. "Clearly the Bible teaches that all persons, and obviously this includes gay persons, are children of God."

We wonder if Father Boyd feels just a little less secure, unthreatened and happy when he considers what the Bible teaches as to the fate of the residents of a certain city of the plain.

Mektub

Some of our subscribers have taken us to task for not writing more about Rhodesia. We must reply that there is nothing to write about, at least nothing in the events themselves that should come as any surprise.

Rhodesia's fall is preordained, not because of black threats or black guerrilla warfare, not because of any inability of white Rhodesians to defend their country, not because of Vorster's pusillanimous sellout of his white neighbors, but because white racism is "out" in the Western world and minority racism is "in."

As long as this mood lasts, Majority members will continue to abandon their own and Jews and blacks will continue to support their own. Rhodesia is just a delayed rerun of the Belgian Congo, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, Algeria, Spanish Morocco, Angola and the other defunct white colonial regimes in Africa. After Rhodesia will come Namibia, and after Namibia, South Africa.

Left alone, the 270,000 white Rhodesians could easily have maintained their merited ascendancy over the nation's 6 million blacks. But no one would leave them alone — not the *New York Times*, not the black caucus in Congress, not the B'nai B'rith, not Castro, not Brezhnev, not the white-financed Emperor Joneses of Zambia, Tanzania, Mozambique and not, most importantly, Henry Kissinger, who has devoted the best years of his life to presiding over the liquidation of Western influence in Southeast Asia, the Middle East and now Southern Africa.

"Mektub," say the Arabs. "It is written." First comes the transfer of the power to the blacks. Then, while the world press talks glowingly of democratic progress, will come the black terror, the white flight, the white economic surrender, and finally the return to barbarism. It is exactly the same process that is taking place in Detroit, St. Louis, New York City, Atlanta, and at a slower pace in London and Paris.

Africa is lost to the West. Perhaps it is

just as well. The most enduring result of European domination of Africa has been a black population explosion.

It would seem that eventually Northern Europeans, both here and abroad, must learn that their association with the black race is in the long run overwhelmingly against Western interests. Blacks outnumber whites in South Africa four to one and in Rhodesia more than twenty to one only because white ingenuity developed a social organization able to support the millions of blacks that a purely black government in the same area could never have supported.

The worst of it is that the emerging black African states (emerging from what to what?) which have expelled their former white rulers now exist largely on white handouts, on the profits of white enterprises, or the genius of Western and Iron Curtain technocrats and on the administrative brains of bored and spoiled colonials who have returned to serve those who had once served their forebears.

With due apology to Afrikaners who will be the last to surrender to black African racism, apartheid will never solve South Africa's problem or the problem of the separation of the races anywhere. Apartheid is spurious separation because it permits blacks to exist *side by side* with whites. In this situation whites live off black labor and blacks live off white charity, industry and technology. Higher standards of living and improved medical care will then overwhelmingly increase the black portion of the population, while inflation and liberal-minority moral rot have precisely the opposite effect on the white birthrate. Stimulated by equalitarianism and democracy, sheer numbers will soon make their weight felt at every political level. As quantity replaces quality, as the worst outbreeds the best in both races, civilization goes into a deep decline.

Appeasement of blacks only accelerates the inevitable. The only way to stop what may be described as *sequential racial surrender* is the total separation of the races. The mere presence of blacks is a threat to white civilization. To put it more plainly, whites are simply allergic to blacks. Whoever does not realize this has only to study history or take a trip downtown (downtown almost anywhere in big American cities).

Western civilization will only survive in South Africa if white South Africans are willing to pull in their belts a hundred notches, remove the black labor pool from their midst and regroup in a shrunken but all-white territory behind a twenty-mile-wide *cordon sanitaire* that will isolate them completely from the blackness beyond.

The Inappropriateness Of Truth

In 1974 General George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was reprimanded by President Ford and excoriated by the media for stating that Jews owned the nation's banks and newspapers and had entirely too much influence in Congress. In June of this year General Brown was approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee for a second two-year term at his present post.

Before obtaining approval, however, Brown had to eat humble pie. He explained that of his former statements two had been wrong and one "inappropriate." Where he had erred, he asserted, was in saying that Jews owned the banks and newspapers. His inappropriate remarks, he explained, had been those about undue Jewish influence in Washington. Pressed on this point, he had to admit "in all candor" that there was such influence, but saw nothing "sinister" about it.

We feel that Brown ate his words a little too quickly. The fact is that only a few of the big commercial banks are in the hands of Jews, but they probably own at least half of the investment or private banks. Here we have only to mention such gilded names as Kuhn, Loeb, Lazard Freres, Lehman Brothers and Goldman, Sachs. And we should not forget the biggest bank of all, the Federal Reserve Bank, headed by Arthur Burns, who is by no means a non-Jew.

As for the newspapers, obviously if all of them are counted together most are owned by non-Jews. But if you zero in on the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, the "national impact" press as Spiro Agnew aptly describes it, then Jews certainly own the most influential newspapers.

Equally influential are the television networks, which Brown neglected to mention. At present CBS and ABC are under direct Jewish ownership or control and NBC-TV has as its president Herbert Schlosser, though the parent organizations, RCA and NBC (radio and TV) are currently headed by non-Jews. To make the cheese more binding, the president of PBS, the educational TV network, is Lawrence Grossman.

If the three leading news magazines, *Time*, *Newsweek* and *U.S. News and World Report*, are included, Jewish influence in the media is inarguably

dominant. The managing editor of *Time*, Henry Grunwald, is Jewish; the major stockholder of the *Washington Post Co.*, which owns *Newsweek*, is Katharine Graham, the daughter of the late Eugene Meyer. The executive editor of the *U.S. News and World Report* is Marvin Stone, also Jewish.

So, in one sense, General Brown was at least partly right in his statement about Jews in journalism and at least half right about Jews in banking. He would have scored much higher if he had extended his remarks to include other areas of the media. As for Jewish influence in Congress, though he has considerably softened his tone, he is still 100 per cent right. This can easily be confirmed by simply reviewing the Congressional voting record.

Returning to that quixotic word "inappropriate," if a fact is a fact, if a truth is a truth, why must it be hidden or soft-pedalled, particularly when it has to do with the crux of present-day U.S. foreign policy.

Is the mere mention of the truth now inappropriate? Apparently so. In the old days they used to tell us "Better Red than Dead." The tune has now changed to "Better Dead than Said."

Nevertheless, some progress has been made. Ten years ago it would have been unthinkable for a high military figure to make such charges and not be fired in disgrace the next day. Today, by means of a purely ritualistic apology, Brown was able to retain his post. Also today, the media are at last raising questions about the Jewish question. Though the answers are all the same and are palpably propagandistic, the silence — that insufferable, debasing, mind-numbing silence — has after so many long years finally been shattered.

People And Food

U.S. Population, 1976: Robert Cook, Population Consultant to The Environmental Fund and formerly President of the Population Reference Bureau, recently announced that the population of the United States is substantially larger than the official figure reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The Census Bureau's official estimate of the number of Americans in July, 1976, was 215.7 million. But this figure does not include the official undercount of 5.3 million announced by the Bureau of the Census several years ago, nor does it allow for the entry into this country of illegal aliens since the undercount was determined. The actual population of the United States, therefore, is more than 222 million.

Of the 11 million foreign visitors to this country in the past year, Mr. Cook continued, a million may have stayed on illegally. There is no record of their departure. The Immigration and Naturalization Service estimates that a minimum of 400,000 are still illegally in this country. In addition, 2 or 3 million other aliens entered the country illegally, and fewer than 1 million were apprehended and deported. Some of the others may have returned voluntarily, but INS estimates that at least 800,000 have stayed on illegally, probably more. The natural increase of 1.3 million (excess of births over deaths) increased our population by .59% in the past year, but when immigration is added, our population growth is more than 1.2%. The first figure would cause U.S. population to double in 117 years. The second figure would double our population in 57 years.

According to Justin Blackwelder, president of The Environmental Fund, increasing population pressure brings increased taxes, more inflation, more unemployment, and more crime. Increased demand for limited resources forces prices ever upward. "If this keeps up for a decade or two," Blackwelder says, "the conservationists and ecologists can close up shop. It will be impossible to conserve anything."

Can anything be done about it? Both Blackwelder and Cook recommend what nearly every other developed country in the world has already done — sharply reduce immigration. "Immigration," they assert, "must be balanced with emigration, and the birthrate must be cut."

Unlike most demographic experts, Blackwelder does not believe that world population will quadruple. "It can't," he says, "the world has already passed its carrying capacity, which means that death rates will rise until they equal birthrates, and population growth will stop." How will this come about? "There are three possibilities: starvation, pestilence and war. Usually, the three go hand in hand."


World Population, 1976: According to a 1951 United Nations' projection, the world population in 1980 would be 3,636 billion. The UN now says we reached that population in 1970. In 1949 Colin Clark predicted a world population of 3.5 billion in 1990. In the same year, E. C. Rhodes (University of London) predicted 3.02 billion in the year 2000. In 1950 Frank Notestein predicted 3.3 billion by the year 2000. All of these 50-year projections were realized in 20 years or less. Quite likely the 1976 U.S. Census Bureau estimate of the world population (4,069 billion) is conservative.

Continued On Page 17



THE GAME and THE CANDLE

A dramatized rendering of the
secret history of the United
States (1912–1960)



The Action So Far: The Old Man, a Midwestern oil magnate, elects a president in 1912 who promises him a Federal Banking System, nationwide prohibition and control of the State Department. Later, an English Lord offers the Old Man a fifty percent interest in Middle Eastern oil if he will put the U. S. into World War I on the side of Britain, which he obligingly does. Twenty years later the Old Man's oil empire, now in the hands of his descendants, is feuding with Huey Long. Negotiations are opened with Harry, a White House aide, and Dex, a Stalinist, to get rid of the Senator. A few years later the Communists' nominee for Army Chief of Staff is opposed by Harry, who is warned by the Publisher that the only way to start World War II, which they both want, is to persuade Russia to abandon Spain to Franco. The Kremlin reluctantly agrees to go along, provided General Marshall is appointed Chief of Staff. Later Harry is appalled by the Russian-German Nonaggression Pact and is even more appalled when the Publisher explains that Henry Wallace should be Democratic vice-presidential candidate and Wendell Willkie Republican presidential nominee in 1940. Meanwhile, interventionist forces push the U. S. to the brink of war, and the unholy team of FDR, Stalin, Litvinov, Comintern Spy Sorge and the U. S. Chief of Staff set the stage for Pearl Harbor.

PART TWO, ACT I

Scene 1: The office of an important State Department official in Washington in early 1942. Two men are present, the Official, well dressed to the point of foppishness and effeminacy, and a man who identifies himself as a member of the Communist Party.

COMMUNIST. I officially represent the Communist Party, Mr. Secretary.

OFFICIAL. I am not the Secretary.

C. You will do for him. As I said, I am officially representing the Party and I am making an official demand. But the communication, as you will understand, is private.

O. You have me confused. It is official, yet it is private?

C. Enjoy your joke. Our official demand is that you immediately begin changing the personnel of the Far Eastern Division of the Department, particularly the China Desk. We demand that the present personnel be replaced by men more sympathetic to the people's democratic movement in China and the course of agrarian reform and social progress.

O. I see. Have you a list of such persons?

C. Those to be replaced need no list. Just remove all those that are there now. They are all of them capitalist hirelings and dupes and stooges of the corrupt Kuomintang.

O. You mean the American officials are?

C. Obviously.

O. What proof have you?

C. The fact that they refuse to assist the democratic peoples' forces in China and instead give support and recognition to the corrupt regime of Chiang.

O. I suppose you have a list of those who would be more favorable to the democratic forces in China?

C. Yes, I do. *(Hands him a list.)*

O. Are all these persons now employed by the Department?

C. Some, but not all, are in the Far Eastern Division.

O. *(looking at the list)* Good heavens! I did not know we had so many Communists in the Department.

C. They are not Communists. They are simply men who will take a democratic rather than a reactionary view towards events in China.

O. Nevertheless, this "democratic" view will be a view approved by the Communist Party?

C. Why else would I give you the list?

O. Isn't that an admission that these men are de facto Communists?

C. Perhaps.

O. Isn't that a rather damaging admission? Why shouldn't I just fire the men on this list on the basis of your statement? Our talk may be recorded, you know.

C. It probably is, but you'll destroy the tape.

O. I will?

C. I'm sure you will.

O. What are you talking about?

C. This. *(He pulls out a paper.)* It's the sworn deposition of the porter on train #106, Washington to New York. It swears to the receipt of money from a man as an inducement to commit an act of homosexual intercourse. It deposes that the act was committed and it identifies the man as you. It further states that you have often been seen on the same train as a member of the Presidential party, travelling from Washington to Hyde Park. *(Tosses the paper to him.)*

O. *(barely able to speak)* You bastards. You utter bastards.

Scene 2: A bench in Lafayette Park, Washington, a few days later. Dex is seated reading a newspaper. The Laborer, who some years before had talked with the District Attorney about his father, enters and sits beside him. They pay no attention to each other for a moment.

LABORER. You got the sport page there? Who won the fifth at Bowie?

DEX *(searching the paper)* Bowie? The fifth? Here it is. Whirlaway. You want to know what he paid?

L. No. I know the odds, 96 to 1.

D. Correct.

L. For a fact who did win? I put \$2 on a horse called Seagoer, just for luck.

D. *(looking)* Seagoer? Placed at \$8. Good for you.

L. Well, whaddaya know. So you're the guy I was to report to. What's up?

D. You know the ship *Normandie*? She's at one of the North River piers in New York being refitted as a military transport.

L. Yeah, I know.

D. Are your men on and off of her all the time?

L. Who else?

D. Do you run, what do you call it, the daily shape up, so you could see that a force of obedient, competent cadres was aboard at one time?

L. Don't worry none about that. What do you want done?

D. Not so fast. Do you know a firm of A. Cameron supposed to be ship chandlers on South Street?

L. No, I'm new on this coast. But if it's a drop, some of my boys will know about it.

D. A Miss Eve Adams there will have a package for you. Pick it up in the next few days. It will be two hundred thermite pencils. They're pointed at one end and you set them off by twisting the dull end. There's a delay fuse so they go off in about fifteen minutes. Each of your men should be able to place about ten before the first ones begin to burn and the alarm sounds. I know that the mattresses for the bunks will be going aboard in about three days. A friend of ours over in the Maritime Commission saw to it that they weren't fire-proofed. So they seem like the best place to shove most of the pencils, though, of course, if your men have access to any paint lockers, that will be fine.

L. What kind of a lousy deal is this? Are you a Nazi or something? We've been told to load every goddamn ship we can for Russia, and the stuff that doesn't go direct to Russia is supposed to go too because it all helps out. Now you want me to burn one of the biggest and fastest ships afloat. This will take some explaining, Mister. If I hadn't been told you're real high Party brass. . .

D. I know it sounds odd, but this is a special situation. Despite everything we've done here to try to get her diverted either to England or Murmansk, the President is determined to use her to get a powerful force into Burma, where the Americans and British want to keep supplies flowing to Chiang. Burma's the only supply route that's still open. General Stilwell is scheduled to leave on the *Normandie* with a large force and a lot of the best up-to-date equipment. He's quite friendly with some people very close to the Party, so we're thoroughly informed about the whole thing and the Soviet Command quite properly feels that it's a poor use of our limited resources at this time. They think it would be better, for now, to let the Japs take Burma. Then vital supplies needed elsewhere simply can't be diverted to Chiang, whatever his friends in the American government want to do. Stilwell himself has advised against the strength of the force assigned to him but, of course, he can't balk at a direct Presidential order and we certainly don't

want him removed and somebody we don't know put in command. We hate to destroy a ship as big and fast as the *Normandie* with so much submarine warfare going on, but if her present mission will actually delay our main effort — the opening up of a second front — then sinking her is the lesser evil. We lose the ship, but we save the supplies for a valuable purpose and prevent their being used against us by Chiang.

L. Yeah, I get you. Will do.

Scene 3: A bleak military office in Cairo, Egypt, 1943. The Chief of Staff is there with Harry.

HARRY. The President asked me to come and see you.

CHIEF OF STAFF. I don't see the need of this. He could have talked to me at Teheran. He can talk to me here any time he wishes to.

H. Please don't be so stiff about it. I think the fact that the President asked me to have a private talk with you shows he cares very much about how you feel.

C.O.S. He didn't tell you he was going to appoint me to the Supreme Command, did he?

H. Of course, he didn't. If he had, I would have told you.

C.O.S. What he wants you to do is to get me to say I'm willing to be passed over for it. That's why he sent you here, isn't it?

H. That's not what he said at all.

C.O.S. If he didn't mean that, and he didn't mean you to tell me he'll give me the appointment, what on earth is there for you to tell me? That we all made great progress at eliminating friction between the allies at Teheran? I know that. I was there too.

H. He wants you to realize that he may be *unable* to appoint you. That's what he wanted me to discuss with you. I think it was fine and honorable of him, and I don't think he was at all moved by any desire to have you say you don't mind being passed over. He's the President of the United States and I can't imagine why in the performance of his duties he could care at all whether an officer agrees with him or doesn't about his own promotion.

C.O.S. Why shouldn't he be able to appoint me? Not that I'm going to argue with you or with him for the job. That's not my way. This is too important for personalities. But I am curious about why he feels he can't appoint me. I'm curious, too, about who has a better right.

H. I don't think he feels the job goes by right. I think he feels the job goes by who can most successfully win the war.

C.O.S. Again I'm not arguing for the job, but I'm curious who you think could win the war in that job any better than I can. My little boy Eisenhower, perhaps?

H. Whoever is in that job has to win the war with the cooperation of the Russians and the British.

C.O.S. You don't have to insult me by overemphasising the "and."

H. I wasn't trying to insult you, George. You just reminded me you were at Teheran. So let me remind you of Churchill's attitude there. Was there one point where he agreed with you? Or showed the least confidence in what you planned?

C.O.S. What difference did that make? Churchill got nothing and nowhere. Roosevelt sided with me. So did Stalin.

H. It was my impression, from sitting in at those discussions, that you sided with Stalin and after awhile so did Roosevelt. The difference may seem subtle, but in the best of friendship and good will I think you should keep it in mind when you wonder how Roosevelt weighs this problem of naming a Supreme Commander.

C.O.S. Well, Stalin has a good strategic head on his shoulders. He didn't want to waste strength in half a dozen meaningless jabs all around the perimeter. He wants to strike at Hitler's solar plexus.

H. Provided the Anglo-American blow at that solar plexus doesn't approach it by the Brenner or the Danube.

C.O.S. There's just no sense in my arguing strategy with you, Harry. You just don't have the training to understand it.

H. That's so true. My military training was largely confined to lessons from our mutual friend, Dex.

C.O.S. Is that supposed to be a crack? What's it supposed to mean?

H. Nothing. Forget it. Let's get back to the war. I repeat, the President wants you to know he may not be able to appoint you. If he doesn't, do you have any ideas about any other officer you think would be best qualified.

C.O.S. If I can't have the job, I'm not going to propose some other candidate.

H. Is that a fair and soldierly position for the Chief of Staff to take when the President of the United States asks for his professional advice on a high appointment?

C.O.S. Well, was it a fair thing for Churchill to knife me with the President? I was certain from the way Roosevelt acted at Teheran he was going to name me. But the minute Stalin's back was turned, Churchill must have gone to work and changed Roosevelt's mind. And now somebody is pressing him to get it settled while we're all here in Egypt before I can talk to *her* about it. I hope we can get back stateside before there's any public announcement.

H. I wish you wouldn't talk that way.

C.O.S. If Roosevelt isn't going to name me, he's certain to name Eisenhower. If Churchill thinks Eisenhower is going to have any other policy than mine, he has accumulated a weird mass of ignorance about our little boy wonder, the greatest military genius Africa has seen since Hannibal's last elephant.

husband-to-be was a naval lieutenant shell-shocked at the Battle of Tsushima in the Russo-Japanese War. Aaron Simanovich acted as a solicitous go-between for Anna with Rasputin in the interest of a possible cure. In April 1907, Anna came to the house of the Grand Duchess Militsa and met Simanovich's new guru, Rasputin, who immediately predicted that the marriage of Anna and the lieutenant would not work out. His prophecy, of course, came true, but the issue of his talent was small compared to the monstrous fact that the Mad Monk had thus become ensconced solidly in the Russian Court as a successful prophet and was poised ready to exercise his considerable hypnotic ability on the afflicted Czarevitch, which would make him indispensable and in a position to exercise great influence or possible coercion.

Aaron Simanovich began to monopolize Rasputin's time as the Mad Monk's political tutor. Aaron had devoted his entire life to intrigue and considered, by his own statement, idealism to be ridiculous and useless. His opinion of Rasputin was charged usually with contempt. It seems Aaron sometimes had to scold Rasputin about like a child to make him obey, for in spite of repeated instructions and forcefully delivered guidelines, Rasputin showed little ability to learn how to operate politically on his own. Simanovich, the Svengali behind the Svengali, frequently became disgusted with his planted faith healer and found him stupid and difficult to steer properly. To help out, another guru named Badmaev (who hinted at secret connections with Tibet) was hustled into the Court along with a number of ordinary accomplices, assistants, and lesser crackpots. Badmaev, however, was soon accused of engineering the Czarevitch's illnesses so that Rasputin could "cure" them.

It became obvious to Aaron Simanovich that he was on to something big and needed professional assistance of a high order if he were to control efficiently the mess that he had already created in the Czar's court. He got it. Soon materializing as Simanovich's and Rasputin's most important "adviser" came none other than Manasevitch Maniulov, an intriguer to the purple born, a Jewish gentleman of taste and quality and a snappy dresser. Manasevitch had started on the road to power as a protege of a homosexual prince

named Meshchersky, who groomed Maniulov initially as a police spy.

Manasevitch was so extraordinarily gifted that he was sent to Paris to assist the Russian espionage head, Rachkovsky, but was soon dismissed for spying on Rachkovsky himself, whereupon Maniulov was dispatched by the home office to Rome, where his occupational specialty became the corruption of members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Triumphant again, Maniulov was soon back in Russia working for Plehve, the Chief of Police, who directed him to intrigue against the Czar's most trusted minister, Sergius Witte. In a masterpiece of duplicity, Manasevitch, who always tried harder, first betrayed Witte to Plehve, then betrayed Plehve to Witte. His conspiracies and treacheries became so complicated that supervisors and close observers had difficulty in determining exactly who Maniulov was betraying at a particular time.

Did Aaron Simanovich have direct contact with the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks who were interested in discrediting the Czarist government? And therefore deliberately wiggled Rasputin into the Czar's Court with the express purpose of wrecking it by inducing an image of corruption and cretinism in the court? If he did not, he would have been guilty of an unlikely and most untypical oversight.

As for Maniulov there is no question whatsoever that he had close connections with revolutionaries, having in fact posed as a revolutionary and having betrayed the revolutionaries to the Czar's police. He then divulged police secrets to the revolutionaries, particularly to Vladimir Burtsev, the noted terrorist. Needless to say, by all these complex treacheries, Maniulov had amassed a fortune. "I am a vicious man," he remarked. "I love money and I love life."

In 1905 Maniulov accomplished the supreme feat of conspiratorial prowess for his beloved Mother Russia — he managed to steal the Japanese cryptographic cipher, an act for which the Czar, no doubt as a result of Russia's million-dollar infidelity, Simanovich-to-Rasputin-to-the-Czarina, awarded him the Order of Vladimir, a high Russian decoration. Maniulov's position in the court was now secure. Who actually stole the Japanese cipher will probably never be revealed. All that is known is that Maniulov was credited with

it, although judging from Russia's defeat by the Japanese it did little good.

Such was the new manipulator who began to be seen in Rasputin's house on a daily basis. When Maniulov appeared, the Mad Monk would abruptly cut short any interview and rush to embrace him. Meanwhile, through the court began to swarm the worst elements in St. Petersburg — intriguers, cheats, thieves, swindlers, prostitutes, self-seekers, gurus — all of whom had to be approved by Rasputin's "counselors." With Rasputin it had become a case of "clear it with Manasevitch or Aaron." And Rasputin who never at any time had been fundamentally interested in politics, began to appear ostensibly as the real ruler of Russia. But few realized who was running Rasputin. Under the political direction, guidance, and tutelage of his mentors, Simanovich and Maniulov, Rasputin had become the focal point of Russian politicking.

All available evidence indicates that Rasputin was a primitive, crude, naive, open soul — traits not all uncommon to the Russian peasant. Under the guidance of the two conspirators, he was gradually moved into a position where he could make high appointments. He had been placed in a unique position for obtaining all sorts of secret data and, to the cabal "advising" him, information was the most valuable commodity that could be peddled.

The final triumph in the manipulation of the Mad Monk by Simanovich, Maniulov and Co. was the appointment of Sturmer as Prime Minister in 1916, the most disastrous nomination in the history of the Russian Empire. During the premiership of Sturmer, which coincided with a wave of Russian military disasters, the super-conspirator Maniulov continued his maniacal campaign of swindles and extortions, piling up masses of money. Trapped by Hovstov, the Minister of the Interior, with marked money during a bribery, Maniulov manipulated Rasputin into getting the Czar to order Hovstov's dismissal. After the final murder of the Czar and his family, the assassination of Rasputin, and the seizure of the Russian government by the Communists, Aaron Simanovich, wining and dining in Paris, well-heeled financially and completely unscathed, cashed in on a sensational book entitled "Rasputin the All-Powerful Peasant," which he published in Paris. It is the most unreliable book on Rasputin that has ever been written.

Dixie *Continued From Page 6*

Fort Sumter, "Dixie" swept the land of cotton with its infectious syncopated rhythm and stirring melodic line. The official Confederate version heard in Montgomery on February 18, 1861, was arranged and played by Bandmaster Herman Arnold, a German immigrant of 1852.

In this fashion "Dixie" became the property of the CSA, although the 3rd Michigan, the 22nd Massachusetts, and other Union regimental bands played it early in the war. Oh, a few stuffy Confederate literati tried to cosmetize the words of "Dixie"; dogface soldiers in blue and gray amused themselves with parodies of it; and serious Unionist lyrics were written in calculated attempts to recapture the feisty little tune for the North's own legions.

All to no avail. Emmett — the gifted composer who numbered "Jim Along Josey" and "Old K.Y. Kentucky" among his credits — had triumphed over everyone. "Dixie" was an all-time hit, and that's all there was to it.

One of the perversities of the Civil War's treatment of "Dixie's Land" is that the only known lyrics that referred to slavery were penned by Northerners for a literary bomb called "Union Dixie." The Confederate military version, by Brigadier General Albert Pike (more poet and lawyer than soldier), was strictly a patriotic call to arms in defense of the homeland.

Now I concede that "Dixie" may be as much a state of mind as a balmy region or an irrepressible tune. And a great Southern essayist once reminded us that ideas do have consequences. Well, if so, then "Dixie" is no ghost. In all its richness and pathos it still lives, and I think it quite improbable that such a national gem will ever yield to the censorship of anti-intellectuals or humanist poseurs.

Fads in musical repression come and go. Wagner was banned by those who hated Germany, Tchaikovsky by Russophobes, "Giovinezza" by anti-Fascists, and "The Bonnie Blue Flag" by Yankee General Butler. When the Great Emancipator delivered his closing request to the U.S. Marine Band on the night following General Lee's surrender, he said to the leader: "I have always thought 'Dixie' one of the best tunes I've ever heard." That night it gave Mr. Lincoln and a delirious crowd on the White House lawn much pleasure, as good music should.

Thus, at long last, minstrel man Dan Emmett's prodigal song had rejoined the Union.

Lest we forget, Daniel Emmett was not just the composer of "Dixie" and dozens of other fine show tunes — he was also the founder of the first American minstrel troupe, the Virginia Minstrels (1843). An old Army bandsman, he was a versatile instrumentalist (drum, fife, banjo, flute, violin). After the Lee Unpleasantness he served as an orchestra leader and violinist in Chicago variety theaters until retirement in 1888.

During the 1895-96 season, at the age of 80, Emmett made a farewell tour with Field's Minstrels that turned into a triumphal march clear across Dixie's Land. Needless to say, when the Father of American Minstrelsy was called on stage to lead audiences in several verses of "Dixie," the people were galvanized into action with joyful clapping, singing, and cheering.

And when the ovations were done and it was all over, one could hear the keening Rebel Yell of wartime memory — that spine-chilling, unearthly "mingling of Indian whoop and wolf howl" that had hastened the demise of so many boys in blue. Yet here it was, thirty years after the stillness of Appomattox, being ennobled by the musical magic of a "Damn Yankee" deep in Dixie.

No wonder those proud Southerners loved Uncle Dan so much. His personal gift to them was an immortal piece of Americana, both regional and national in its appeal, a priceless legacy for all the people and for generations to come.

Inklings *Continued From Page 13*

Arable Land and Grain Resources: How much arable land is required to feed and clothe one person? The answer depends, of course, on the quality of the soil, temperature, the availability of moisture and the quality of technology. Estimates have varied from 1 acre to 2.5 acres per capita.


In 1949 E. C. Rhodes estimated that there was only 1.77 acre per capita available. The UN estimate for 1959 was 1.19 acre per capita. There is now 0.8 acre per capita. If present population growth rates continue, there will be 0.04 acres per person in 2100.

By the year 2500, if we divide the estimated world's population (if its present rate of growth continues) into the earth's *entire land mass*, there would be 1.13 square feet per person!

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the world produced 1,177 million metric tons of cereal grain in 1974-75; 1,132 million metric tons in 1975-76. This has brought per capita consumption of cereal grains down from 311 kilos per year to 274 kilos per year, due primarily to the increased number of people. These figures are difficult to reconcile with the oft-quoted statement, "World food

production is out-pacing world population growth."

After World War II, 35 countries were net exporters of cereal grains, which constitute 80% of the world's food supply. Today, 17-18 countries are grain exporters. Only 30 years ago, North African countries exported 55,000 metric tons a year. Today they import 6.2 million metric tons. Of the few remaining countries with large exportable surpluses, the U. S. grows more grain than all of the others combined. The world is rapidly becoming dependent upon U.S. grain, all of which will be consumed by Americans within 15 years at our own population growth rate of 1.2.



In the sheet music for the most popular Northern war song, no mention was made of William Steffe, the South Carolinian who composed the music.

Bruno Bauer *Continued From Page 7*

argued that Judaism enslaved men's minds. Specifically, it made God the objectified image of man, which irreconcilably separated the creator from the created. The alienated divine essence then turned back against man and tyrannized him. Bauer also rapped Judaism for an egoism that atomized the social order in a further process of alienation.

Bauer's article "Die Judenfrage" was the stimulus for Marx's "Zur Judenfrage," which was mainly an answer to Bauer. Writing in such an abstract and involuted manner that the reader is never aware of the actual situation of the Jews, Marx gave the impression that he was using his co-racials merely as a framework for a general disquisition on religious and political institutions. Summing up Bauer's work in a few words, "you Jews are egoists if you ask for special emancipation as Jews," Marx then concerned himself with questions of theoretical politics. Characteristic was the statement which denied that Jews were a historical and racial group, "In Germany, where there is no political state, no state as state, the Jewish question is a purely theological one." Marx next rebutted Bauer's claim that the state in its existing national form was essential to human life.

Another position attributed by Marx to Bauer, and then repudiated is that men must first be emancipated from religion before they can be freed from other forms of oppression. Bauer had made it clear that the oppressive state in Germany was specifically the *Christian* state. To overthrow the belief in Christian dogma would amount to rejecting the state's spiritual hold over its citizens. What would remain is the *secular* state, in which men would forever be free. Implied here is the Hegelian position — and in many ways Bauer remained a good Hegelian — that the medium of freedom is the state and that the state in an important sense *is* freedom.

Marx's reply to this train of thought was consistent with the later ideas he shared with Engels. His central point was that political liberation precedes religious liberation. The state, he declared, should and must be overthrown by violent revolution, in

the wake of which religious and spiritual liberation would follow.

In a second article "Das entdeckte Christentum" (Christianity Exposed) Bauer was criticizing both Judaism and Christianity when he wrote that the latter "shuts off man from the great social interests of the world . . . from art and science, it destroys his social being, his social customs, and interhuman links, it makes him single and isolated, an egoist, and brings about the sacrifice of all human aims and ends." Unlike later critics of the Jews, Bauer continued to view them as a purely religious community. He did say, however, that before they win political freedom they must throw off their religious slavery.

In the second part of "Zur Judenfrage," Marx attempted to answer Bauer's second and more explicit article on the Jewish question. Even here there was no indication that Marx had broken with Bauer to the extent of actually declaring him an enemy. Bauer was still his colleague. However, Marx now took a different tack. Christianity, he said, is simply refined Judaism, a Judaism pushed to its extreme historical conclusion. Let us by all means abolish Jewry, Marx declared, but first we must abolish the worst Jews of all, the Christians. By these he apparently means the "theological" Christians, perhaps the kind Max Weber depicted a half century later as the upholders of the Protestant Ethic.

Shifting the argument from a racial to a theological perspective, Marx concluded in typical Marxist obscurantism, "The social emancipation of the Jews is the emancipation of society from Jewry." In this way Marx tried to put himself in the advantageous position of collaborating with what was then intellectually acceptable anti-Semitism, while at the same time releasing the Jews from any intimidation by society or the state.

It is obvious from Marx's laborious arguments that Bauer caused the Communist Founding Father great anxiety and uncertainty. Bauer's line of attack was beginning to make an irritating dent in the ideology of his adversary.

Published the same year, 1843, but

resonating with a more pronounced hostility to Judaism, was Bauer's "Die Faehigkeit der heutigen Juden und und Christen, frei zu werden" (The Capacity of Today's Christians and Jews to be Free). The article, while still rather theoretical, took a very pronounced stand on the *differences* between Christians and Jews. In theological terms, and without touching on the broader racial and historical considerations, Bauer asserted he stood with the Christians — at least insofar as they were "liberated" from their Christianity — and against the Jews.

"Only in a sophistic sense, by appearances," Bauer wrote, "could the Jew remain in the life of the state. If he wished to stay a Jew, appearance would therefore be the essential thing." Taking the position that Jews were sunk in tribalism, Bauer stated, "The Jew as Jew has to be faithful to religious duty, to the family, the tribe and the nation." It was the Christians, according to Bauer, who, because they had so alienated and so abstracted their god, had risen to the utmost artificiality of spiritual life. Only by overthrowing their religion would they arrive at their own true humanity. This had already been accomplished by isolated Germans and in France by a whole intellectual movement, the Enlightenment (which Bauer, unlike so many German intellectuals, favored).

Bauer discounted the Jewish criticism of Christianity, because it was entirely from the Jews' own subjective standpoint and solely in the interest of their religious and national community. Since this attitude toward Christianity only reinforced their tribalism, Bauer has contempt for it, calling it "Jewish Jesuitism." He goes on to say with increasing sarcasm and with the help of *schimpfwörter* (we would call them slurs) that the Jews have contributed nothing whatsoever to the cause of enlightenment and the ideals of humanity. (This last statement might be singled out as sounding peculiar to contemporary Americans, who have been instructed that Jews are leaders in the cause of reason and universalism.)

A few points not found in the formal argument of "Das entdeckte

Christentum," largely nuances of tone and manner, are also worthy of mention. Bauer seems to slide quietly and unobtrusively from the purely theological and theoretical aspects of Jewry not only to its tribal but to its racial aspects. More openly, however, he evinces sorrow and sympathy for a Christian who is under the yoke of his religion, while admiring and applauding the ex-Christian freethinker. On the other hand, a Jew who remains a Jew in any sense — either theologically or by identification with the Jewish community — is in Bauer's eyes *infra dig*.

The more strident tone of Bauer's third article had to produce a backlash from Marx, and from Engels who by now had become his collaborator. A mass of paradoxes and contradictions, Marx was a Jew by race, baptised a Lutheran and married to a Gentile of the petty nobility. Having proclaimed Communism the salvation of the world, Marx wanted to disassociate it from Jewish national interests. And yet in his character and aspirations he was a Jew in the deepest, most pervasive sense of the word. On the other hand, Engels was, at least in isolated statements in his letters, a crypto anti-Semite (see *Instauration*, May 1976). Taking all this into account, how are two men, one of whom is a conscious Jew and the other an occasional anti-Semite, going to reply to an article bursting at the seams with intellectual anti-Semitism, particularly when they are both anxious to avoid linking their political philosophy either with philo- or anti-Semitism?

Here some remarks are in order regarding the status of the Jewish question and, by inference, anti-Semitism during the 1830s and 1840s in Germany. First of all, anti-Semitism was very current in all intellectual circles except in the Young Germany movement, where Jews had a dominant position. At the same time there was a widespread feeling that anti-Semitism was not polite and that any radical expression of it was not suitable for publication. There were, of course, exceptions to the rule, the principal one being Bruno Bauer. Significantly, even in his case he

published his final comments on the Jewish question anonymously.

In the three sections of the *Die Heilige Familie* (The Holy Family), where Marx and Engels subject Bauer's article to detailed analysis, the coauthors' level of emotion gradually rises to a shrill pitch. By their differing attitudes to anti-Semitism, Marx and Engels had their own private reasons for this growing hysteria. Nevertheless, neither reveals that this hysteria was brought about by Bauer's references to the Jews as such. The authors at least pretended to be solely concerned with what they found most objectionable in Bauer's thought, that is, the priority of religion over politics.

Published in 1845, *Die Heilige Familie* was also an attack on most of Marx and Engels's former friends, who were not only taken to task for their philosophical heresies, but anathematized and declared enemies of mankind. By now Bruno Bauer was one of these enemies. In the tradition of Communist polemics, Bauer was called every *schimpfwort* Marx and Engels had at their disposal — except for one. Despite all their pejorative salvos, they never once resorted to "anti-Semite." Why this glaring omission? Was it because the use of the word would tend to ingratiate Bauer with the very people whom Marx and Engels were trying to win over? Was anti-Semitism at that time a term of praise as well as an insult? Nietzsche employed it to malign Wagner, only after having given vent to anti-Semitic utterances himself. Whatever the semantics of the situation, it seems necessary to repeat that anti-Semitism in those days was only in poor taste when its use was "excessive." Wagner bordered upon excess in this connection. Having at that time not overstepped the limits, Bauer was still invulnerable.

Die Heilige Familie does not need to be described at any great length, except to point out the rise in emotive phraseology. It is enough to say that Marx and Engels did quote Bauer directly when his words had a definite anti-Semitic ring. For instance: "The Jews, by exerting pressure against the moving forces of history, have called forth counter-forces." But the gist of

Marx and Engel's attack was that Bauer had betrayed certain principles — not Jews but principles — which he had originally supported when he was a "progressive". In contrast to Marx's previous scholarly language, we now find such words as *bornierte* (insipid) to describe Bauer's arguments.

By and large *Die Heilige Familie*'s approach to the Jewish question is, even after careful reading, a morass of confusion. It is pervaded by a spirit of uncertainty and internal contradiction that is obvious even in its most innocuous theoretical premises.

On the more solid ground of authentic scholarship, we can learn much more about Bruno Bauer from some words in the *Berliner Revue* of 1860: "1848 was the year of birth of the conservative party, that by 1859 had learned to stand on its own two feet . . . His [Bauer's] significance for the conservative party is that he made it conscious of the Jewish question."

After commenting on the *Berliner Revue*'s statement, the modern German historian Ernst Barnikol has this to say: "Next to Wagner it is essentially attributable to his [Bauer's] efforts, that anti-Semitic ideas were able to make their way into conservatism. . . . He observed the Jewish question neither from the religious nor from the racial perspective, for which scientific grounds were still lacking, but concentrated on the disintegrating style of thinking and mental constitution of the Jews, which he tried to prove through historical documents and apply to the present. According to [his view], the Jews strive to dominate whole peoples and erect their own Jewish world rule. They are spongers who take advantage of and suck dry the ingenuous host people. This anti-Semitism was tied in with the anti-capitalistic tendency of the *Revue* . . . [Bauer] called for the circumscription of Jewry. . . . Also the fight against Freemasonry was developed in detail by him. Although both points were not taken up by the [official] conservative program, they did not disappear from political thought until they were realized in the [National Socialist] revolution. Bauer gave them their first scientific formulation."

Conservative Twaddle

Continued From Page 8

what is now France (keeping the Merovingian king as a useful puppet), a talented leader of the disorderly forces that in the Dark Ages took the place of the disciplined Roman armies, and, as the despoiler of Holy Church property, the founder of the feudal system. He decisively defeated the Saracens at Tours (Poitiers) and drove out the invading Semitic Arabs from France, though he did not recover Spain or even Narbonne. He fought for his own power, needless to say, and for the kingdom of which he was the actual ruler, and he may have been aware that he was fighting an alien and non-European race. He was a Christian, but he certainly did not fight for Holy Church, although he found it expedient to make a deal with the Pope.



Roland

We know too little about Roland to say what manner of man he was or why he fought, but it is likely that a

man who was made the subject of an epic three hundred and more years later must have been memorable. The *Chanson* is one of the great epics of our race, and a moving one, as all readers must admit who accustom themselves to the crude and unformed language in which it was written. The poet added Christian trimmings (but has eschewed the pious nonsense one finds in the Pseudo-Turpin and the trash derived from it). The poem itself makes it quite clear why Roland fought: for his typically Nordic determination to preserve his honor at all costs, for his loyalty to his emperor, and for the Germans (called Christians) against the alien race of the Semites (called Paynim). He is another Leonidas, the hero who gives up his life to save a hopeless situation. He fought for Christendom in the sense that the empire of the Franks was officially Christian, and the term included their kindred of the same race who were not Franks; and that empire was the heart of Europe at that time. The epic includes two other elements that are significant of its racial origin: (1) Archbishop Turpin, a formidable warrior himself, his religiosity appearing principally in his determination to convert Saracens permanently — convert them into corpses, I mean; and (2) at the conclusion of the poem, Charlemagne returns and takes condign vengeance of the Saracens in the manner of a true statesman. (He exterminates them; it is true that here the Christian god, who has evidently been asleep thus far, intervenes and stops the sun in its course so that Charlemagne will have uninterrupted daylight for the good work.) There are few passages in all our literature more moving than that in which Roland, the last survivor, unable to break his sword, places it beneath him as he dies with his face toward the enemy — and hears in his last instant of consciousness the thousand trumpets of the returning army shake the hills.

The *Chanson* is an epic of honor in the specific Nordic sense of that word. The religious trimmings could as well have been taken from the Norse or the Homeric religions, but, given the time, they are Christian — but it is a Christianity that has been made fit for

men by simply ignoring the inappropriate pages in the cult's holy book — and that means most of them. There isn't any gabble about luff and brudderhoot and all mankind and the rest of the mind-poisoning nonsense that one hears now whenever a holy man goes into his act.

Columba of Iona. The exquisite sonnets of Thomas S. Jones, Jr., have cast a glamour of romantic pathos over all the monasteries of western Scotland and Wales, but apart from the poetry and from the silly stories about miracles, we feel that there must have been something manly about an Irish princeling who was able to lead a band of his unruly brethren and establish a large monastery on the barren isle of Iona, and we admire that quality in a man, however mistaken his beliefs. Columba is memorable for his intelligence and his courage, rather than for his religion.

And finally we are told that it was appropriate that "the insignia of the late U.S. Command in Vietnam was the Crusaders' sword and shield." Given the operations of that command (no doubt under the duress of orders from Rooseveltgrad), the only appropriate device on its shield would have been that of a jester in cap-and-bells in the act of blowing out his brains with a blunderbuss.

McColl does appeal to whatever sparks of manhood may be left in our people, and there may be some, invisible under the ashes that have been shoveled over them; but he fatally misleads the men whom he may move by his words. About the only thing in his editorial that stands the test of sober reflection is his prediction of new Dark Ages.

If McColl had suggested to Aetius or Charles Martel or Roland that even one soldier should be detached from the army and sacrificed to save the Christians in Abyssinia (where there was a large Christian population at all three of the dates we are talking about), to say nothing of the Khmers in Cambodia, McColl would have been hanged with breath-taking celerity. Those commanders were Christians, at least in the sense that they probably accepted the prevailing religion of their times, but they did not have maggots in their brains.

Economic Backtalk

Continued From Page 9

referring now to such anti-Keynesians as Milton Friedman. The gold standard conservatives like the gold standard because it supplies them with a pat answer to questions they do not understand.

Anyone really interested in these matters should look through Benjamin Anderson's *Economics and the Public Welfare*. So far as I know, he is the only writer of this century who treats these questions with competence.

Here I must agree with the reader who suggests that our chief economic concern should be the allocation of manpower and not the size of the government budget. I was impressed by his remark that the "international bankers" are chiefly interested in the volume of foreign trade and not, as orthodox economists contend, in the benefits of trade.

As for conspiracy theories, bankers may behave as if they are engaged in one, but a coalition of the necessary size would be broken for much the same reasons that cartels are unstable. One of the conspirators would "sell out." I am merely guessing, but if there were some strong centripetal force, some "cause" around which they could rally, a tacit conspiracy might be possible.

Whoever the conspirators are they would have to have aides — lawyers, economists and secretaries — and they would have to meet to make the "big decisions." Now let us suppose they decided to drop the axe on Mexico. Why Mexico? Well, for one reason, the Mexican government is nationalistic. Assuming that they are all united against Mexico, how do they proceed? Some aide is instructed for foment fears in the investment community. Does he telephone the editor of *Barron's*? If the peso is in fact sound, how does he convince all the necessary people that a devaluation is inevitable? It's true he might own one of the *Barron* writers. But if he writes what he knows to be a lie, might he not also tip off some of

his friends and tell them to buy the peso? Might not one of the bankers do the same? Of course, if the fomented fears are grounded on fact, this stage of the strategy is not part of the plot, but a spontaneous event.

Let us suppose that the first stage of the conspiracy can be pulled off. Surely the Mexican monetary authorities know their own position. If it is strong, they will see what was going on and protect themselves. There must be some country not in on the foreclosure. The international bankers can play favorites with their own funds, and perhaps put pressure on others, but I am reluctant to accept the view that they can bring down a government that was not ready to fall. Also, I don't think all the multinational corporations are ready to sacrifice legitimate investment opportunities and concentrate exclusively on the interests of the bankers.

Offhand, my provisional conclusion is that there may be some international bankers up to something other than legitimate investing. They have direct control over some pretty large funds and exert some powerful leverage. But when they use their power, however skillfully, to topple governments or install puppet rulers, they sacrifice the income that could have been earned honestly. It is a very expensive process to manipulate money markets, stock markets, exchanges, land values and so on. Perhaps in agencies like the State Department things happen that would benefit the bankers, but again these would be more or less spontaneous moves in response to certain opportunities, few of which were engineered.

It would seem more plausible that an international conspiracy would have its power base in government, which would then include the central banks.

I have been giving some thought to another article for *Instauration* —

perhaps on the degenerate Majority economists. But I am not sure there is anything special about them. The social sciences are generally bankrupt, largely because the graduate programs attract intellectual trash. Some professor takes some mixed-up students under his wing and grooms them for the "profession." To anyone sensitive to the real issues, all this appears staged, though some of them really feel they are fighting the great battle of scientific advancement.

Since J. S. Mill, most people have been introduced to economics in a manner that makes them think the subject is important. I have a good friend who believes in "transaction analysis." There are Majority members who have the habit of reading the Old Testament. Well, some people believe in economics. I once believed in it, or thought I did. Even Alfred Marshall never recovered from supply and demand. Now I hate to call these people "degenerate." In fact, the only economist who was able to keep a clear head was W. E. Hearn, a neglected 19th century writer. In addition to Hearn's *Plutology*, I would recommend his *Aryan Household* as a sample of the kind of work that anthropologists ought to do. If read with caution, the men that wrote around the turn of the century have something to offer. Pareto, Wicksell and Veblen were all good scholars. And there were others. If you find an old work that no one has heard of, chances are it's worth reading. But by the 1920s or 1930s the "profession" began to attract a different breed of man. Read him or listen to him with a grain of salt.

Today only someone who is partly neurotic can take the subject seriously. I was lucky to have had teachers so bad that I turned to a program of self-education and found inspiration in the older writers. But it took me fifteen years to shake off the nonsense that I was entering a noble profession.

The Game And The Candle

Continued From Page 14

H. He might name Clark.

C.O.S. Over Eisenhower's head?

H. He has a habit of naming people over the heads of other people. You remember?

C.O.S. Stalin would never consent to Clark.

H. Do you know that or are you guessing?

C.O.S. I never discussed Clark with the Russians, but both from his connections and the strategy he wants to follow I'm sure of what Stalin's reaction would be.

H. If Churchill and Roosevelt agreed, why should Stalin's opinion matter too much? The command is only in the West. There'd be no Russian troops involved.

C.O.S. Stalin might get mad and drag his feet. Or even make a separate peace.

H. He'd never do that. If he did, he's not the kind of ally we want anyway.

H. We certainly did for awhile, but do we need it any more? When we were both in London just a little over a year ago, the Germans seemed about ready to take Stalingrad and Cairo. The Japanese were shelling Ceylon and the Pacific was a Japanese lake from the Aleutians to the New Hebrides. That was when we needed the Russians, and they needed us. But hell, we've both had time to get our

second wind. What's important about relations with Russia now is how they're going to act after the war. From my experience with them you get nowhere by begging, bribing or thinking something you do is going to make them like you. Nowhere at all. They don't understand it.

C.O.S. Is this your long, roundabout way of getting me to say Clark is a better general than Eisenhower? I tell you, I'm not in the nominating business.

H. Patton?

C.O.S. I told you, Harry, I'm not offering any candidate.

H. Bradley?

C.O.S. My own school teacher? What is this, a roll call? I told you I have no candidate. Let the President make up his own mind.

H. Suppose I tell the President that you won't recommend anyone, but my own estimate of the situation is that Clark is the best man?

C.O.S. I'm sure that would lead to trouble, Harry.

H. What trouble?

C.O.S. I'm afraid I'd have to make a strong objection to Roosevelt.

H. Any reason? I mean any shortcomings in Clark?

C.O.S. No reasons. Just an objection.

H. Do you mean that someone would make your life miserable if you didn't object?

C.O.S. (*shrugging it off*) All right, let it go at that.

H. Which leaves us with Eisenhower? I take it naming him would not result in your life being made miserable?

C.O.S. He's a nothing, Harry.

H. You built him up.

C.O.S. There were pressures on me. Aubrey and Dex, you know. His brother Milton had lots of friends. But Harry, he's really a nothing. You know, there are things in my career I'm not proud of, things I wouldn't have done if I'd known then what I know now. But maybe the worst thing I ever did was . . . Maybe when I'm long buried and everybody knows all about me, the words on my tombstone will read: "He made Eisenhower."

H. You really hate him.

C.O.S. I don't hate him. He's sort of my child. My own creation. Does a man hate the poor defective infant who is his own son? He pities him. He rues the day he conceived him. But he doesn't hate him.

(To Be Continued)

One Year Of Instauration

Readers will note that the cover of this issue bears the imprint, "Vol. 1, No. 12," an unobtrusive way of announcing that *Instauration* has now reached the venerable age of one. Many magazines, especially those with a heavy list to the right, have expired long before their first birthday. Whether *Instauration* lives another year or lives to be a hundred will depend largely on reader interest and the whims of our official and unofficial censors. At present we are relatively free of harassment, for the simple reason that no one takes us seriously.

What has *Instauration* learned in its first year? Principally that there is room in the country for such a magazine. With almost no promotion and with practically no resources, our circulation has inched upward every month. Only one subscriber cancelled — a female libertarian in California who wanted all her money back after receiving four issues. We repaid her in full and kissed her good-by.

Secondly, we have learned that there is a pool of intelligent people who share our ideas and who have the talent to express them in parseable English prose. In fact, *Instauration* is probably more important to its writers (all, alas, unpaid) than to its readers. It serves as a training camp for the young Majority intellectual corps on whom we depend to fight and win the ideological battles of the future.

Instead of presents on the occasion of our first birthday, we would prefer to receive our subscribers' continuing forbearance. We have made a lot of mistakes, particularly in the realm of sloppy layout and shocking typographical errors. We plead guilty, but ask for clemency on the extenuating circumstance that we can afford only one proofreader — namely, the editor. Also, since we have no money to lose, we could spend none on the various personnel which other magazines consider absolutely necessary, such as art directors, photographers, illustrators, paste-uppers,

copyreaders, assistant editors, department heads, researchers, file clerks, circulation managers, etc., etc. Of sheer necessity all of these multifarious tasks had to be performed by one aching head and one pair of twitching hands.

But as more readers grew interested in the magazine — helping with promotion, sending in interesting clippings, writing stimulating letters, contributing informative articles and, most welcome of all, pen-and-ink drawings — the editor's load was happily lightened. As a matter of fact, if the silver lining thickens and brightens, he plans to take a one-day vacation during the Christmas holidays of 1979.

Meanwhile, we thank you for your subscriptions and your gift subscriptions and we thank you in advance for your renewals. In spite of our nonprofessionalism, you have been patient and loyal. We hope that in our second year *Instauration* will earn your respect.

Louisiana: Walter Hetherwick of Pineville was arrested recently on two counts of disturbing the peace. His crime? Playing Dixie twice a day over a loudspeaker system in a vacant building he owned.

Kentucky: The following is taken from a pamphlet published by the Athanasian Society of Lexington, Kentucky. Nice to know that all Catholic priests are not equalitarian Tartuffes:

Thousands of the letters we get are variations on the same theme: "Father, all we ever hear from the pulpit any more is Civil Rights!" — "The priests here can talk of nothing but prejudice and Open Housing!" — "I'd hate to need a priest in a hurry: he'd probably be out in a demonstration!"

And the "Catholic" press, skipping through which these days is like waltzing with the Lass from Tass, can write of little else either.

We are all bored to tears!

But the most disconcerting thing about it all is that the ill-bred New Breed who have commandeered the barque of Peter (they boarded her from portside, of course) have invented for us a new and unpardonable sin — Prejudice!

It's all right for them to blaspheme our Lord and deny or explain away ¾ths of the doctrine of the Faith, but *you* dare not decline to live next door to a coloured family, or send your children to a school not "racially balanced," or dislike your friendly neighbourhood agitator, or oppose a new "Civil Rights" bill or "Open Housing" ordinance, or *you* are prejudiced, and that is the Sin.

Well, pardon me, but it is not. The New Breed are entitled to their opinion that racial separateness is sinful, but that is merely their opinion, and no more. It is not the teaching of the Catholic religion. The Catholic religion teaches us to be kind and loving towards every human being, as we all know and as most of us sincerely try to do, for the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, but that doesn't mean you have to live next door to him, or invite him to join your club, or come along on your vacation or marry your sister.

Besides, if keeping the races socially separate is so gravely sinful, how did it happen that Catholic parishes and schools in parts of the United States were until comparatively recent times, rigidly segregated?

The truth of the matter is that between the White and Negro races, in Thomas Jefferson's phrase, "nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction."

England: Some observations from an *Instauration* subscriber who is making the Grand Tour. Last night I attended a social gathering for active members of the National Party. I had serious discussions

with a number of members and was impressed with what I saw and heard. It is refreshing to witness a group dedicated to the preservation of race, country and tradition. Entire families are working for the National Party cause. At last an organization has been formed which is fighting to rectify the plight of the British Majority. Quite frankly, I think the National Party will triumph over the obstacles ahead of it. The National Party broke away from the National Front because it felt the leadership of the latter group was heading down a deadend path. Although at first glance the split appears divisive and counterproductive, in the long run it will actually strengthen the Majority counterattack. The leadership of the National Front is in the hands of a man named John Tyndall, who has more or less proclaimed himself the dictator of the organization. He feels that uniforms would give him and the National Front a more dignified look. Tyndall, it seems, has not learned from the folly of Oswald Mosley. Any political cause that strays outside the British tradition will ultimately become stuck in the mud. On the other hand, the National Party has organized itself on republican principles, so that the best men at any given time are at the helm. Portugal and Spain are examples of what happens when a rightwing movement is based around a single man.

The National Party is already receiving more votes than the National Front and both parties have been receiving more votes than the Liberal Party in recent elections. Evidence of minority concern is present in the amount of editorial space used to attack the National Front and National Party in the daily tabloids. No one bothers to attack something which is too small to see.

The government has now found it necessary to change and strengthen the language of the Race Relations Act. Jewish and minority racism seems to be tolerated, but never British racism. When the Race Relations Act gets tougher, many Britishers will have to go to jail — merely or supporting their race and culture.

Of interest is the fact that most of the members of the National Party and National Front come from the working class. This sector of society seems to be the only one which has an idea of the magnitude of the present dilemma. Though nothing less than the survival of their way of life is at stake, 99% of the affluent members of British society either do nothing or actually support the people and causes dedicated to their destruction.

London has now become a multiracial potpourri. White flight is a common phenomenon. But since Britain is seeing hard times economically, not everyone can leave and buy a house in the suburbs.

Unfortunately, many a suburban Englishman is like the typical middle-class American. He doesn't care if his biggest city is no longer British. It doesn't affect him. He is so shortsighted he can't understand that if things go along as they are now going in 10 or 20 years the horrors of megalopolis will move his way.

Europe: Further news from our peripatetic reporter: Eastern Europe held many surprises for me. For example, in Warsaw disco bars play the same degenerate music as their Western counterparts. An American can't walk into a bar in Warsaw without taking the chance of being suffocated by a horde of prostitutes, who belong to the highest paying profession in Poland. I talked with a number of Communist Party members while in Warsaw. I believe it can be said with some assurance that Communism is no longer a Jewish monopoly. Those who say Communism is Jewish are speaking an archaic lingo. Therefore, it would seem your Russian Theory is not far from the truth. However, Russia is not the Russia of the Stalin years. Joseph Stalin is a man to be studied not for his political or economic philosophy, but for his mastery of the dialectical process. He had a talent for manipulating his enemies into positions which favored his own. He lived in a Jewish world and emerged the victor.

New Zealand: A communication from the editor of a small *Instauration*-like periodical. What has happened here, as elsewhere, is miscegenation on a large scale between the European majority and the Polynesian natives. It has been estimated that should interracial marriages continue at their present rate, this country will have a coloured majority within twenty-three years. Our British background does not seem to count for much these days; whilst we are still a member of the British Commonwealth and have the Queen's Representative in the form of a Governor-General as our titular head of state, we are now considered to be a 'leader' in the South Pacific. What this means is that New Zealand should no longer place too much reliance on her ties with Britain but concentrate on a glorious and irreversible 'Asian Destiny.' Apart from being typified by our growing economic relationship with Japan rather than other British Commonwealth countries, acceptance of the 'Asian Destiny' concept by our politicians has meant that New Zealand has taken up the responsibility for a number of South Pacific Islands and conferred upon their inhabitants the benefits of New Zealand citizenship.

The new citizens have preferred to exercise their rights as citizens by immigrating to New Zealand. Auckland now has the peculiar distinction of being the largest Polynesian city in the world.

What we do enjoy here, however, is a land that is exceedingly fertile with a small population of some three millions. What we don't enjoy is the prospect of liberalism completely ruining our land and society.

SEMINAL BOOKS FROM HOWARD ALLEN

Sometimes a great new book or a great old book is published or reprinted by a big publishing firm yet dies on the vine. The publisher may not have the heart to promote a controversial book and the media may refuse to mention it. As far as the general public is concerned, the book might as well have remained unpublished. To shine some light in these black holes of knowledge, Howard Allen has made arrangements to distribute, at the regular retail price, a few landmark books of other publishers.

The Crowd by Gustave Le Bon. The great, half-forgotten French prophet, who spoke more truly than Cassandra, but was even less believed, jumped the gun on Freud, Ortega y Gasset and Pareto in an epoch-making study of the popular mind. Crowds, wrote Le Bon, do things which the individuals who compose them would never do. They have a personality of their own, more often a destructive personality, and they are the unruly offspring of mass democracy. Le Bon's low opinion of history, his rueful opinion of religion and his high opinion of race cast a fresh and perspicacious look at the social order. Reprinted in 1973 by the Viking Press. Paperback, \$3.50.

Hereditary Genius by Sir Francis Galton. Inventor of fingerprinting and founder of the science of eugenics, Galton demonstrates the inheritance of intelligence by tracing generations of achievement in eminent British families. Almost a century before anyone ever heard of IQ, the famed British scientist graded nations and races according to their mental ability, while brilliantly marshaling the historical evidence for profound racial differences in intellect, character and temperament. The biological origins of celibacy and individualism are also examined in this epochal work, of which Charles Darwin wrote, "I do not think that I ever in all my life read anything more interesting and original." Reprinted in 1972 by Peter Smith. Hardcover, \$6.75.

Race by Dr. John R. Baker. A world-renowned Oxford biologist has written the definitive work on racial differences. Almost all the available physiological and historical evidence has been assembled to prove once and for all that there are important and measurable intellectual as well as physical disparities between the races. Now, whenever Negro backwardness is blamed on environment and oppression, the argument can be easily refuted by citing chapter and verse from Dr. Baker's encyclopedic study. A Fellow of the Royal Society — in England the nearest thing to a Nobel prize — Dr. Baker has produced an inexhaustible reservoir of documentation for the ideas of Arthur Jensen and William Shockley. Published in 1974 by Oxford University Press. Hardcover, \$20.

The Camp of the Saints by Jean Raspail. Ghastly, shuddering, mind-reeling scenario of what is in store for the Occident if liberalism and apathy continue to weaken the Westerners' will to survive. The author, a bitterly sardonic Frenchman, charts the dying convulsions of France from the day a million famished Third Worlders pile on a fleet of leaking hulks in Calcutta and sail off to the land of milk and honey. The first great uncompromising novel of modern times. Published in 1975 by Scribner's. Hardcover, \$8.95.

A New Theory of Human Evolution by Sir Arthur Keith. The greatest modern anthropologist is almost unknown to the American reading public, and the media monopolists are unabashed. This is Keith's major work and contains the principal threads of his ideas about evolution and the constructive role played by nationalism and prejudice in race building and genetic progress. No book offers a more penetrating rebuttal to the Boas school of anthropology, whose perverse and unfounded assertions about racial equality have dominated Western thought for most of this century. Reprinted in 1968 by Peter Smith. Hardcover, \$7.75.

A New Morality from Science by Dr. Raymond B. Cattell. An internationally prominent social scientist, who has authored 30 technical books and more than 300 research articles, rejects liberalism and racial leveling in a profound and challenging work that searches for new ethical values from the domain of science. A great mind dares to come to grips with the most controversial issues of the age. His eminently sensible proposals for a new evolutionary ethics based on behavior genetics rather than on religious, liberal or Marxist dogma have so enraged the book reviewing establishment that hardly a mention of his work is to be found anywhere. Published in 1973 by Pergamon Press. Softcover, \$8.

The Conquest of a Continent by Madison Grant. The classic work on American racial history in which the author, beginning with the Nordic settlement of the colonies, examines the genetic components of every state in the U.S. and every country in the Western Hemisphere. By making race his central theme, Grant enriches his pages with events that have escaped the attention of conformist historians. If the test of genius is the ability to predict the future, Grant is by far America's greatest historian. Reprinted in 1975. Hardcover, \$10.

I wish to order the following:

_____ **THE CAMP OF THE SAINTS**, 311 pages, hardcover,
Copy (ies) \$8.95, 35c postage.

_____ **THE CONQUEST OF A CONTINENT**, 393 pages, index,
Copy (ies) hardcover, \$10, 45c postage.

_____ **HEREDITARY GENIUS**, 446 pages, index, hardcover,
Copy (ies) \$6.75, 35c postage.

_____ **RACE**, 625 pages, index, hardcover, \$20, 45c postage.
Copy (ies)

_____ **A NEW MORALITY FROM SCIENCE**, 482 pages, index,
Copy (ies) softcover, \$8, 45c postage.

_____ **A NEW THEORY OF HUMAN EVOLUTION**, 451 pages,
Copy (ies) index, hardcover, \$6.75, 35c postage.

_____ **THE CROWD**, 207 pages, softcover, \$3.50, 25c
Copy (ies) postage.

Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc.

P.O. Box 76
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

Date _____

I enclose \$ _____

Reduce postage on multiple orders by 50%. Florida residents please add 4% sales tax.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____

State _____ ZIP _____