

NATIONAL VANGUARD

Toward a New Consciousness; a New Order; a New People

Number 140

September -- October 2007

\$6.00



The Hypocrisy of
Modern Democracy

CONSTANTINE BY THIS SIGN

NATIONAL VANGUARD

Founded in 1970 by Dr. William L. Pierce
Published by National Vanguard Books, Inc.,
a non-profit corporation,
Post Office Box 330, Hillsboro,
WV 24946, USA

Publisher: Erich Gliebe
Managing Editor: Richard Preston
Circulation: Patrick Martin
Email: submit@natallnews.com

Note from the Editor

There are few things more sickening about modern society than the utter hypocrisy of the masters of the democratic state -- they claim to be supporters of freedom of speech, conscience, and action, but, when confronted with opinions and ideas with which they do not agree, these same "democrats" respond with an autocratic vigor which would shame any genuine dictator. This state of affairs is the main article of this issue of *National Vanguard*, and well worth distributing far and wide. Farnham O'Reilly's thought provoking discussion of our race's creativity is another winner, while John Clarke's astounding research into the racial origins of the Middle East serve as a somber warning of the consequences of failure in this racial struggle. The link between Jews and communism both in Russia and South Africa, will make fascinating reading. Enjoy!

All contents © copyright 2007
by National Vanguard Books, Inc.
Opinions expressed herein are not
necessarily those of National Vanguard
Books. Please write for prices on bulk
quantities for resale or distribution.
We welcome manuscripts or articles:
please send them to the address above.



The symbol which appears in the NATIONAL VANGUARD logotype is the Life Rune. It comes from an ancient alphabet, or futhark, used in northern Europe for many centuries before the general adoption of the Roman alphabet. The Life Rune signifies life, creation, birth, rebirth, and renewal. It expresses in a single symbol the *raison d'être* of NATIONAL VANGUARD and of the movement of Aryan renewal.

NATIONAL VANGUARD

Number 140 September - October 2007

CONTENTS

Cover Story

The Hypocrisy of Modern Democracy 3

Features

Diversity: America's New Sacred Cow 7
Race in the Middle East: The Price of Miscegenation 10
Stalin's Jews – A Frank Admission from a Jewish Journalist 12
Jews and Communism in South Africa 13
Our Aryan Creativity 16
Jim Ring's The Bell: Our Enemies Believe in Us — Even When We Don't Ourselves 24

Our Cover: A statue of the Roman Emperor Constantine. The Roman Emperors were absolute dictators, ruthlessly suppressing any opposition to themselves -- much like modern democracy -- except that the Romans did not pretend to democratic at the same time.



Subscribe today! Make a copy of this page to avoid damaging your issue of NATIONAL VANGUARD MAGAZINE or subscribe online at www.natvan.com

Subscription prices: \$25 for six issues in the United States; \$36 via surface mail in Canada; Foreign: \$50.

Subscription Form National Vanguard Magazine

Name: _____
Address: _____

State: _____ Zip Code: _____ Country: _____
I enclose \$ check/postal order/international money order made out to National Vanguard Books for my subscription.
Send subscriptions to National Vanguard Books, Post Office Box 330, Hillsboro, WV 24946, USA

The Hypocrisy of Modern Democracy

Richard Preston reviews the track record of modern democracy -- and finds out that it is far worse than the so-called "Fascist dictatorships" which it opposed in World War II . . .

how individual freedoms were saved by the sacrifices of that conflict.

Yet, as one reviews the state of modern democracy, one cannot be faulted for asking if those who believed they were fighting for democracy in 1944, would actually be happy with the state of democracy today.

While there is, of course, no final definition of democracy, few would argue with the basic presumption that the most common feature of modern democracy are competitive elections. Competitive elections are usually seen to require freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and some degree of rule of law.

Competitive Elections

The United States of America is held aloft as the beacon of competitive elections. In fact, elections in America, particularly for president, have reached circus proportions, with almost no

discernible difference between the candidates (the outside dark horse, Ron Paul, being a hiccup on the political screen).

As if the Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum nature of the candidates was not injurious enough to the much-acclaimed principles of democracy, the insurmountable – for a truly independent candidate – funding demands of a modern presidential election campaign put it out of reach of all but a tiny elite.

If the costs for both Democratic and Republican campaigns are added together (for the Presidential primary election, general election, and the political conventions) the costs have more than doubled in only eight years (\$448.9 million in 1996, \$649.5 million in 2000, and \$1.01 billion in 2004).

In January 2007, Federal Election Commission Chairman Michael Toner estimated that the 2008 race will be a "\$1 billion election," and that to be "taken seriously," a candidate will need to raise at least \$100 million by the end of 2007.

to page 4



Questioning the Holocaust- David Irving's Democratic Thought Crime

The Allied invasion of Normandy in June 1944 in World War Two, was hailed by historian Stephen E. Ambrose as the "turning point" in modern history.

Speaking in his now famous commentary on the Steven Spielberg movie *Saving Private Ryan*, Ambrose said that that day – the largest amphibious invasion in history, determined whether the "world would be Nazi or it would be the freedom of democracy which we have today."

In one sense, Ambrose was at least partially right (although it could be argued that Germany had lost the war far earlier than 1944), as the Western World had, by then, chosen to side with what it thought was democracy, against what was perceived to be a dictatorship, suppressing individual freedoms and free speech, in the form of Nazism.

This belief is still propagated today, with each generation of schoolchildren being told of how the "world was saved for democracy" by World War II, and of

Sometimes a word becomes so laden with positive connotations that no one can oppose what the word stands for without incurring considerable criticism. Some such words are "freedom," and "liberty." A new word to join the unassailable realm is "diversity."

Dictionaries define "diversity" as the quality of state of being "different" or "dissimilar." So, one may ask, what is so positive about diversity? What is so desirable about the presence of difference?

A few years ago, a high school student in my hometown won an essay contest answering the question, "Should schools teach moral values?" The student seemed to think that some things are definitely right and wrong and should be taught as such. Nevertheless, the student said, great care should be taken so as not to violate the principle of moral diversity.

But do we really want moral diversity? Is it bad, for instance, if everyone in society decides that rape and incest are immoral? Is it bad if everyone in society decides that treason and armed robbery are immoral?

If we have a society of Albert Schweitzers, should we try to import a few Jeffrey Dahmers and John Wayne Gacys for the sake of moral diversity?

Would life be too boring and conformist if there were no child molesters and serial killers? Most people would say no, demonstrating in the process that most people really don't believe that diversity in all of its forms is positive. If diversity is not positive in all of its forms, when is it positive and when is it not.

Surely nobody would criticize a society for having a wide variety of restaurants from which to choose. Surely nobody would criticize a society for

allowing a wide variety of musical forms, art forms, books, hobbies, etc. Surely society is not harmed if I choose to play chess and you choose to play scrabble. These are all cases in which diversity seems praiseworthy and desirable. But let's now examine the dark side of this word.

On January 31, 2007, the editorial page of the Charleston, Illinois *Times Courier* sported the following headline: "Diversity is the key to growth and prosperity." The writer begins by praising America as a "melting pot" that embraces the promise of equality. Still praising diversity, the writer gleefully points out that, "In a matter of decades, America's skin will no longer be white, but a light tan, a blend of races, creeds and colors. We will truly be a multicultural society."

Unfortunately, multicultural societies don't have a very good record when it comes to growth and prosperity. For example, the Balkan countries have been very culturally diverse. They have also been at war both without and within because of that cultural diversity, usually requiring strong dictators to keep the peace. Consider the provinces of the former Soviet Union. Same story.

What about the strife between French- and English-speaking Canada? What about Northern Ireland where age-old religious differences still spark violence? And was it not cultural differences between the Northern and Southern states that led to America's Civil War?

Actually, history shows that countries with a homogeneous culture grow and experience prosperity better than culturally diverse countries. It has been good when these homogeneous countries have had commerce with other countries and cultures, thereby being exposed to different ideas, but it has not been good when a multiplicity of cultures spring up within a homogeneous country and tear that country apart.

Continuing to ignore the lessons of history, the editorial writer points to the declining birthrate of Euro-Americans and says that the economies of Europe and America depend on immigrants to keep their economies booming. We hear in America that immigrants from Mexico will do jobs that Americans won't do, but that is not true.

Americans won't do those jobs if paid the same wages paid to illegal immigrants, but if those illegal immigrants were not here, businesses would have to

to page 8

DIVERSITY: AMERICA'S NEW SACRED COW

by Don G. Smith, Ph.D.

Thinking is the Aryan's finest pasttime. For it is from Aryan thinking that our greatest strength is brought forth -- *creativity*. And the Enemy, cunning though he be, cannot match our creativity.

The nature of creativity is simplicity. Cunning is, of necessity, complicated. This is because creativity is based on truth, and cunning on lies. And, in a larger sense, good versus evil. This is why one of the advantages of telling the truth is that you never have to remember what you said!

Creativity is the action whereby something is *produced* - brought into being either through our physical or mental efforts. Henry Ford once said the Enemy was a *tradesman that did not produce*. He did not deny that they were tradesmen, only that they did not produce.

A comparison of the names of our folk and that of the Enemy is illustrative. Our folk, because of the value we have always placed on honest work, often assigned family names that indicated our ability to create. Thus, names such as Cooper, Baker, Miller, Taylor, Singer, Weaver, Cartwright, Carpenter, and Hooper were taken with great pride. It is no coincidence that the most common name of our folk was, and still is, Smith! Whether he be a locksmith, blacksmith or tinsmith, our

Aryan folk have always placed great value and honor on those who created from metal, wood, or stone. These are the same men that the Enemy derisively labels 'blue-collar workers.' Yet, every Aryan with an honest heart knows better, and those with ears to hear remember the words of Adolf Hitler: *Honest work, no matter of what kind, is never a disgrace*.

The Enemy is different. He despises work, especially trades, and considers it not only demeaning but, in accordance with his ancient scriptures, a curse. What he values, above all else, is *wealth*. He also, again in accordance with his elitist theology, considers all other peoples of the world to be mere cattle for his exploitation, and holds his tribe to be the only ones worthy of the title of *Man*.

So said his god, and so he believes. Hence, it is not uncommon to encounter names among his kind that indicates either wealth, identification as a *man* among lesser mortals, or both. Names like Pearl, Goldman, Ruby, Stoneman, Diamond, Feldman, Rich, Bronfman, Silver, or Friedman.

Or, his well known chameleon characteristic may asserts itself - he simply changes his name - for he knows that other people, deep down inside, really don't like or trust him. It's the same old deception down through the years, from Saul/Paul of Bible lore, to Levi Bronstein/Leon Trotsky of 'Russian' communism, to Murray Rothstein/Sumner Redstone of media fame.

Cunning is oftentimes confused with creativity. For cunning, like creativity, employs ingenuity and skill, and can be very, even fatally, attractive towards those to whom it is directed. Indeed the two concepts have their parallels in good and evil. For example, while from creativity may come exquisite sculptures, healing medicines, or pride in craftsmanship, cunning will spawn its evil counterparts - cheap plastic moldings, narcotics, and profit maximization at the expense of quality.

And this is the reason why in the long run - and by 'long run' we mean God's time, not man's time - creativity prevails over cunning. It always has, and it always will, for the simple reason that it is the Will of Heaven that life go up, not down, that it rise to ever higher levels, even as it has in aeons past. That in the long run, beauty prevails over ugliness, natural over unnatural, and good over evil.

Creativity requires quiet time by oneself. It is not without reason that our best inventors were known as 'daydreamers.' We need quiet time, which is one reason why we should endeavor to live in rural settings. For we are happiest in the country, and, second only to

