

ARROWS AND COMMENTS ¹

by Jack Frost

1.-

Amor vincit omnia
Caritas vincit omnia
*Agape vincit omnia.*²

Perversely, the suicide of the West (Christendom) is an expression of its civilizational confidence—confidence in its own moral purity, in its vision of universal brotherhood, in the power of charity and love, and in its ability to assimilate the victimized Other, who recalls to them the victimized Jesus.

That this is all horribly misconceived according to the rational principles of Darwin is ignored. Calls to faith and universal brotherhood are stronger.

Thus, the poisoned arrow of Christian charity strikes home before the shield of reason can be raised to knock it away.

2.-

The society-wide pandemic of anti-racism and philo-Semitism we are experiencing has very clear Christian origins.

¹ These texts, some of them replies to other commenters, were posted at the comments section of the webzine *The Occidental Observer*.

² Note of the Ed.: The term *Agape* or *Love Feast* was used for certain religious meals among early Christians. Originally it was used as a verb but the noun form first occurs in the Septuagint. Other ancient authors have used forms of the word to denote love in contrast to *phyla* (an affection that could denote friendship) and *eros*, an affection of a sexual nature. Christianity developed *Agape* as the love of the Providence for humankind. In the New Testament it refers to the covenant love of God for humans and the term extends to the love of one's fellow man.

3.-

Very interesting talk by the professor referenced above. [*Note of the Ed.: an Occidental Observer article*] One thing that stood out for me was how, while he did spend a lot of time discussing Puritans and their universalistic outlook, he avoided the “C” word (Christianity) entirely. I’m with Sunic on this, and would even go him one better. I would venture to say you can’t hope to understand the origins of this white pathology without a full analysis of the way Christianity has shaped the culture of the West. Attempts to locate the source of the pathology in prehistoric times, as a response to severe environmental conditions, fail for at least a couple of reasons.

For one thing, if that were the case, wouldn’t individualism and pathological altruism also be found at similar latitudes all over the world? It isn’t. As KMD [Kevin MacDonald] himself acknowledges, whites were the only ones to develop in this way. Also, if the origins of individualism and pathological altruism were really that ancient, why didn’t it manifest itself in classical times?

Pre-Christian Roman society was decidedly un-altruistic, and un-empathetic. You can scour the history books all you want, and you will find no mention of Roman charity missions to help foreigners. They wouldn’t have understood that idea at all. Foreigners were taken to be useful as slaves and made into tributaries, but little else. Those who didn’t cooperate were put to the sword. And empathy? Forget it! The Romans were expert torturers and considered death an entertainment. On a typical weekend they’d watch gladiators hack each other to pieces just for fun! The excruciating and prolonged death by crucifixion was a Roman specialty of which they made frequent use. After the failed revolt of Spartacus they crucified the surviving rebels along a 300 mile stretch of roadway, about one every hundred yards or so. The bodies were left to rot, as a lesson to the rest.

All of this changed eventually only with the coming of Christianity. It is Christianity, in its manifold forms, and especially in its cultural residue, which influences and shapes the perceptions of even non-believers, that is the source of the racial egalitarianism and philo-Semitism that rules modern life.

Christianity has even reshaped our genetics, as KMD has documented elsewhere in his paper that dealt with outbreeding as a policy promoted by the Catholic Church. Over time it has become, in

effect, a fully metastasized cultural and genetic cancer that has changed who we are.

4.-

The Christian idea that “God is love,” taken together with Christianity’s fundamental premise of universal brotherhood, means that anyone who opposes this, who wants to stand outside of this undifferentiated mass of humanity as a separate race, must be a hater.

5.-

“When we get a chance to vote we always cite against immigration and affirmative action, we still vote pro American and pro White.”

It’s hard to square this with the election of Obama, the affirmative action President; or with the enormous popularity of Eisenhower, who integrated American schools at bayonet point, and whose greatest achievement was crushing white racial consciousness in Germany; or with the apotheosis of Lincoln, who re-founded on principles of racial equality what had originally been a white supremacist nation.

6.-

“The Jewish commitments and motivations of the main players were never a subject of discussion, and the movements themselves were presented as scientifically sound and morally superior to the traditional culture of the West.” [*Note of the Ed.*: This is a sentence in an April, 2015 article by Kevin MacDonald]

Deceptively phrased. Jews never oppose the “traditional culture” (whatever that’s supposed to mean) of the West directly by presenting an alternative that they claim is morally superior. Rather, they work within the traditional framework of moral values established by **Christianity, the ultimate source of Western morality**. Moral authority comes from the Bible, churches, and Jesus, not Freud or Karl Marx. **Anti-racism and philo-Semitism are things already present within Christianity, and all the Jew does is draw them out.** Any positive moral value ascribed to these things is only possible because Christianity already endorses them. The stress laid on universal brotherhood in the Bible is the source of

communism's attraction; and Freud's message would have fallen on deaf ears in a non-Christian culture.

7.-

Christianity has so shaped white culture that nothing was able to stand outside of it. Its project has been nothing less than to change the nature of mankind: to impose an insane, anti-Natural vision of reality; to build a world where race and gender truly don't matter.

Its stress on non-violence, universal brotherhood, love, and a reverence for life makes it a very good way to domesticate a people, and also a very good creed for spreading itself all over the globe. The bitter irony is that these same virtues (if they actually are virtues) become very grave defects once the task shifts to preserving the race that gave it such prominence. Apologists for Christianity try to phrase this positively but there is no way to ignore what a death cult for whites it has become.

8.-

While it's always possible to argue over interpretations, the one thing that seems utterly inarguable in the case of both Christianity and the Constitution is their absolute failure to protect the white race. When you understand the importance of Christianity in shaping the culture of the West, and the horrific implications of its anti-racist outlook, the reason for this failure should be obvious.

9.-

Jesus' message of love and universal brotherhood (i.e., anti-racism) is revolutionary precisely because it is a New Covenant that replaces the old one described at length in the Old Testament. To accept the New Covenant message is to deny the importance of race, and even family. All are one in Jesus.

10.-

The crucified rabbi, of course, is the only hero that has any influence anymore. With him sucking all the oxygen out of the room, all the white folk heroes of bygone times have gradually disappeared from public consciousness. In their place, a proliferation of "innocent" victim-heroes now revolve around the crucifix like minor

planets circling a sun. The Jews you mention are only their publicists. Andy Warhol said that in the future everyone will be famous for fifteen minutes, but perhaps he should have said everyone will get to be Jesus for fifteen minutes. Faggots, dykes, trannies, liberated and unliberated women, abused children, negroes, Holocausted Jews, injuns—all conceive themselves and are presented to us as victims, innocent and heroic in equal measure, brutally crucified by the innately evil white man.

11.-

(Note of the Ed: Here Frost responds extensively to a comment of Kevin MacDonald:)

I'm just saying that the source of the moral justification for the West's immigration problem is to be found in its Christian past; that **the entire worldview of life as some kind of moral contest is a Middle Eastern import that didn't exist in whites before the coming of Christianity.** Saying, as you did, that it has "nothing to do with Christianity" because the elites in Sweden are secular and have turned against the churches just makes me think you don't see how two thousand years of Christianity have seeped into every atom of the white man's bones. **I'll be convinced that the Swedish elites have turned against Christianity when you can show me they've turned their backs on the Christian ideals of universal brotherhood, peace, love, and charity.**

I find it extremely odd, to say the least, that I should be the one to have to point out to someone who is frequently considered to be one of the world's foremost anti-Semites, that maybe, just maybe, trusting a moral system developed by Jews, and built around the idea that one Jewish rabbi in particular is God, is not the best of strategies for white people concerned about limiting Jewish influence.

Nevertheless, that's the situation I find myself in. KMD and many of his acolytes, who unabashedly here tout Christianity as good for whites, must also then be of the opinion that, in at least this one instance, whites benefited from their association with Jews; that the relationship was symbiotic, not parasitic in kind. How this relates to the central thesis of this site, which as I understand it is that the Jewish race is locked in a struggle with the white race and is attempting to dominate it, is unclear.

KMD appears to think this struggle only commenced in the twentieth century; that there's no possibility that Christianity itself was developed as a weapon of interracial warfare to subvert whites. I don't think that reconciles very well with sociobiological theory. If the races are at odds, then haven't they always been at odds? Aren't they, according to the principles of Darwin, necessarily at odds, since in a world of finite resources a win for one is a loss for the other? Why should that have only begun in the twentieth century? It would be interesting to see how he deals with that thesis, which is something that Nietzsche appeared to believe, and also Revilo Oliver. If KMD has set this out somewhere, I haven't seen it.

Then we have these two rather threadbare arguments presented above, which I've seen many times before, and I'm sure others are equally familiar with. In the main, they are:

(1) Christianity was the religion of the West during the period of its expansion, therefore it can't be something inherently wrong with Christianity that's the source of the modern problem with whites.

This is supposed to be the strongest argument.

(2) There's "real" Christianity (which is smuggled in here as "traditional" Christianity), and subverted Christianity. The former is A-okay for whites, the latter is poison.

The first doesn't deal with the argument which compares Christianity to a cancer. Cancer, too, doesn't necessarily kill immediately. You can have cancer for years until it suddenly metastasizes and kills you. You can have it and be apparently strong and have many accomplishments; but nevertheless, you have it, and it will eventually kill you. So this argument in favor of Christianity doesn't actually come to grips with the charge against it. It's not a strong argument at all.

The second argument is a confused muddle. "Traditional" Christianity is supposed to be good for whites, yet in the next breath, KMD says that throughout history, Christianity has been on both sides of every issue. So which side is "traditional"? In the American Civil War, was it the South or the North? Were the Puritans traditional, "real" Christians, or not? Since the term is never defined and no examples are ever given, it's hard to avoid the impression that "traditional" Christianity is whatever the author approves of, and subverted Christianity is whatever the author disapproves of.

Of course, the implication is that "traditional" Christianity is not corrosive to white racial solidarity; that

Christianity hasn't always been universalistic and has at times been racial. But then, in the next breath, he refers to the early Church Fathers, who were anti-Semitic because the Jews weren't good race mixers like they thought Christians were supposed to be. So it would appear that the early Church Fathers weren't "traditional" either; and also that the race mixing proclivities of Christianity are of very ancient vintage.

How then can it be argued that there's nothing inherent in Christianity that subverts race? Is KMD saying that the Christianity of the early Church Fathers had already been subverted? By whom? When? Some details would be nice.

12.-

In prior posts I've covered how even non-believers and anti-religious people see things with Christian eyes. They accept without questioning that universal brotherhood is good, the triviality of race, that who they really are has nothing to do with their bodies (i.e., Christian dualism), free will, etc.

All of this is pre-scientific thinking that has to go if we are ever to make any headway.

13.-

In our culture, shaped as it has been by Christianity, the premier innocent victim is and always has been Jesus. He laid the groundwork; established the archetype. **It's inconceivable that the Holocaust racket would have been as successful as it has been in a non-Christian culture.**

14.-

Since Christianity is premised upon the belief that a certain Jew is God, why should it be at all surprising that America, with its deeply Christian heritage, adores the Jews?

15.-

I'd suggest re-titling this piece ["Is Universalism So Bad for Whites?" by Enza Ferreri on *The Occidental Observer*]: "Is Worshiping a Jew So Bad for Whites?" or in the alternative "Is Anti-Darwinism So Bad for Whites?" Maybe then the well-worn silliness of these arguments in favor of Christianity would stand out a bit better.

As I've written before, Christianity's worldview opposes on virtually every point the scientific view presented by evolutionary theory. Nothing could be clearer than that **the racist case will never succeed among people still hypnotized by the pre-scientific belief systems of Christianity**, so we should welcome its demise, and do what we can to accelerate it... Any theoretical arguments pro and con may be beside the point. Owing to its universalism, it's simply a fact that today Christianity is very close to the tipping point of being a majority non-white religion worldwide, if it hasn't already passed it. Come to think of it, a third alternative for a better title might be "Is Racial Suicide So Bad for Whites?"

After all, that is what all the Christian churches are promoting with their evangelism and their enthusiastic support of immigration. Of course, one would not expect to encounter such a straightforward question coming from a disciple of the crucified rabbi. But the honesty would be refreshing, and it would be equally good to at last see a Christian admit that, according to all the precepts of his religion, the answer must be "No".

16.-

Note of the Ed.: Here and in §17 and §24 Frost responds to the white nationalists at The Occidental Observer that were dismayed by Dylann Roof's actions:

Tell us, please, how you expect to take back the media, the government, and academia without violence. What magic words are you going to utter that your adversaries are just going to shrug and hand over power without a fight? Frankly, I have no idea what you mean by an educational project, when at the same time you claim that hardly anything has been done in that regard up to now.

Over 150 years ago Darwin tried to educate the entire world as to racial inequality, but the white man would have none of it, conflicting as it did with Christian creation myths. Sir Francis Galton, Lothrop Stoddard, and Madison Grant tried to talk to the public about race, but got shouted down or ignored. Charles Lindbergh, a great American hero, tried to tell the semitophilic public about the Jews, and he was ostracized. Ezra Pound, some say America's greatest poet, likewise fell into disgrace due to his educational efforts regarding Jewish money power.

One could say much the same about one of America's greatest industrialists, Henry Ford, who documented his case against

the Jews meticulously and even gave free copies of his work to all of his customers. He eventually was compelled to issue a retraction and a grovelling apology, perhaps the first of its kind in what is now a long tradition. Even our host, Kevin MacDonald, has expended considerable effort in this regard, and has received the usual recompense.

17.-

“But a larger reason is probably the fact that most current white nationalists are, as I’ve alluded to earlier, thinkers and not doers...”

It would be more accurate to say they are losers, not winners. They are immature fools who expect a race war to be fought—by white people anyway—by Marquess of Queensberry rules.

Also hysterical: their claim that on the one hand, Jews control the media, and on the other that their own actions have something to do with the way they are portrayed in that media. They will tell you they understand, but it obviously still hasn’t penetrated their skulls that they are going to be demonized no matter what they do.

That’s how we get these loons who claim to be white advocates, who are more upset about the loss of nine negroes than they are about poor Mr. Roof, who, taking his manifesto at face value, has sacrificed his own life for his race. In truth, and by every principle of Darwinism, the white race would be infinitely better off without any negroes at all. So long as this kind of non-thinking prevails, the status quo will continue, and whites will continue to be victims. After a while, you begin to suspect that that’s what these pretenders want. They like being victims because they think it gives them a superior moral position, and it also frees them from the painful and dangerous responsibility of taking action.

The whole thing is really quite nauseating.

18.-

“Western civilization is like the ouroboros, the snake that swallows its own tail. It is eating itself.”

19-

Politics can change, certainly. But I would maintain that the Christian worldview, with the characteristics I have listed (a belief in

universal brotherhood, free will, equality of sexes and races, life as fundamentally a moral contest between Good and Evil, and all the rest, such as the supposed value of repentance and forgiveness mentioned by Alain DeBenoist), hasn't changed. You can find all of these ideas in the gospels, and they didn't exist before Christianity.

Their implementation in politics is subject to change, but these changes will in most cases be only superficial. The implementation can in fact be quite different (for example, monarchy vs. democracy) without changing underlying beliefs. **Even Hitler, who actually was a proponent of a radically different worldview, had to pretend to be a Christian.** You might want to think about that and why it was necessary. If worldviews could change so easily, such subterfuge wouldn't have been needed.

If the Third Reich had been victorious in WWII, it would have gone a long way towards fostering the rejection of Christianity and its associated worldview, and introducing a different one with quite different politics. It seems safe to say we would definitely: (1) have gotten rid of the extreme philo-Semitism that is part of Christianity; (2) a belief in free will would probably also have been a casualty (Darwinism is deterministic) and the Christian faith in universal brotherhood would have been completely abandoned; the Nazi belief in eugenics would have taken them in quite different directions.

That this Nazi worldview was rejected by the rest of the white race meant that the political trajectory would remain unchanged.

20.-

As we've seen, **there is great resistance from certain quarters even on the racial right to the very idea that the Christian worldview is in any way responsible for the current political situation**, even when it's easy to show that the core doctrines of political correctness are quite consistent with Christian teachings, and even when there are so many on the left who are churchmen.

This is no doubt a great help to the system, and more proof, if any is needed, that worldviews don't change easily. Change is difficult because people become emotionally invested in something that touches them so deeply, and also because a worldview is, in some ways, beyond the reach of reason.

When Christianity took over white civilization so long ago, it didn't triumph by its skill at argument, or appeals to evidence or logic, but largely by the sword, just as it proclaimed it would. You don't reason people out of a worldview. You don't "educate" them out of it. **The lesson of the Christian takeover is that a new worldview may arrive, but if it follows precedent, its arrival will be unheralded, unplanned, and accompanied by great bloodshed.**

21.-

Given the general Christian insistence on regarding all souls as "equal in the eyes of God," cognitive dissonance without doubt has had a lot to do with the evolution of anti-racism throughout what used to be called Christendom. For example, the discomfort (i.e., cognitive dissonance) of the Founding Fathers with regard to race-based slavery conflicting with their worldview is palpable when you read their writings. Some, like the deeply religious Benjamin Franklin, became abolitionists, and freed their own slaves (n.b., but only after using them for most of their lives). The descendants of those same slaves no doubt are still preying on whites even today. How many murders, rapes, and robberies of white people have been the result of Franklin's act of Christian generosity? How many shattered, ruined lives?

We'll never know. Given the prevailing worldview, the question is uninteresting, just as the ongoing genocide of whites in South Africa is uninteresting. Eventually, of course, other abolitionists even fomented America's Civil War over the issue, and their descendants, such as the founders of the NAACP, worked sedulously to make the negro the white man's equal in law. Nearly all of these abolitionists were Christian fanatics who framed their objections to slavery in moral terms. Confronting such people with evidence they are wrong will usually only increase their fanaticism. This being the case, could it be that efforts at "education" are not only fruitless, but counter-productive? This would explain much about the racial right's long history of failure.

22.-

[Christianity] hasn't vanished, and that's the hell of it. In two thousand years, its doctrines have sunk in to form the core of the worldview of Western man. Christian universalism and

egalitarianism are stronger than ever, only now people desperately try to justify them scientifically.

23.-

“...the French Enlightenment. If John Adams is correct and Helvetius was the first person to really believe in human equality, then the idea arose, not in Christendom, but in secularism. Worldviews can and do change. There is no reason to think that the ideas of the modern world are related to Christianity.”

So you're saying these ideas were autochthonous developments that bore no relation to Christianity whatsoever. You claim they sprang up out of the native earth of Christendom and had nothing to do with what preceded them? Frankly, given the powerful role played by religion and the church at that time, I think that's more than a little ridiculous.

The greatest help that the ideas of egalitarianism and universal brotherhood ever received was when Gutenberg invented the printing press and translations of the Bible became widely available. People could then read it for themselves and make their own decisions as to the meaning. As with so many other aspects of white culture, traditional Christianity was, in that way, another casualty of technology; it was steamrolled by Progress.

“If egalitarianism is taken in its modern sense then that's impossible [that there are many gospel passages that extol universal brotherhood and egalitarianism], because the modern idea didn't exist in the ancient or Medieval world.”

Human equality isn't a difficult concept, and it hasn't changed at all in two thousand years. All are one in Christ (Galatians 3:28), and according to Christian creation myths, all are of the same blood. Apparent divisions such as race and gender therefore are all illusions. God values all equally, with the implication that so should we, since life should be lived in imitation of Christ.

“Christianity has ceased to play a role in the modern world.”

Someone should tell the Pope this, and the Christian Zionists who keep sending money to Israel, and also the seventy percent of Americans who still call themselves Christians.

24.-

White feelings of shame and their attempts at shaming Dylann Roof really say more about them than it does about Roof or his action. Such people have been thoroughly cowed and are in tacit support of a system that is killing them.

25.-

If the Founders had been serious about a whites-only United States, they would have sent back or hanged all of the negroes and exterminated the injuns. Indeed, if we were serious, that's what we would do. But that would have cost a lot of money, and perhaps more importantly, they thought it would be un-Christian.

Not doing so, however, has consigned the posterity they pretended to care about to being doomed demographically. Such are the hazards of a raceless worldview.

26.-

Terms like “White supremacist,” “racist,” “anti-Semite” “Nazi” have been devastatingly effective, but they are only effective because they are disseminated by our hostile elites. [*Note of the Ed.:* This is a quotation from Kevin MacDonald’s article “The Cuckservative Phenomenon” on *The Occidental Observer* of July 30, 2015]

They are only effective because whites take them seriously and accept that they’re evil. But this was no mere invention of modern mass media, as they were accepted as evil long before its advent. Racism and white supremacy have been out of style in America at least since the Civil War. **White supremacy was offensive to Christians back in that day because it goes against so many Biblical teachings: the insignificance of race, the equal importance and uniqueness of all souls to God, the unimportance of the body, etc.** Thus they abolished it, at great cost to themselves in blood and treasure, before Jews even began arriving on these shores in any great number. Further, doesn’t the Bible (Matthew 19:28-30) predict that when Heaven on earth arrives, that then when Jesus’ followers have completely forsaken their blood relations in order to follow him, that those who were last shall be the first, and the first shall be last?

Here we have the essence of cuckservatism, foretold in the sayings of Jesus. Hence, a devout Christian must prep the bull, in order to make up for having sinfully been first (cf. Mark 9:35). It shows proper humility.

27.-

Although it might be possible to develop a racist interpretation of Christianity (e.g., what the Nazis tried), I've never seen a convincing theological justification of it. The fact that all major churches, and 99 percent/plus of all who today call themselves Christians reject racism ought to tell you something... You probably want to hang on to most of Christianity as it has been "traditionally" practiced in relatively modern times, while discarding only the anti-racism. Everyone who ever tried that has failed, but I guess you don't see that as a problem.

Then again, the cognitive dissonance issue is nearly as problematic. **In order to accept being called a racist or a Nazi with equanimity, normal American whites would have to reconcile that with their country's history of being violently opposed to racism of any kind, from the Civil War forward. They would have to admit to themselves and to others that all of that blood shed in trying to stamp out racism had been shed in vain, and in fact, worse than in vain, in an evil cause. They would have to admit that their ancestors were evil, and that they themselves had also been evil before they saw the light and became racists.**

28.-

I agree that the power of the state is the only thing forcing the races together, but the Christian religion, with its maniacal focus on overcoming everything natural, provides the perfect moral justification for this action. **This is why, if the white race is to survive, both the state and the religion that supports it must be destroyed.**

29.-

"Christianity didn't prevent Austrians, Hungarians and Croats to stop the Turks for five centuries or Spaniards to expel Jews and Arabs from their lands."

The Christian fight with Muslims was never based on race, but religion. Had the Turks or Arabs agreed to convert to Christianity, history would have taken quite a different course. As if to demonstrate the preceding point, the Spanish monarchs did indeed expel some of their Jews, but only after trying to force them to convert. Only Jews who refused to convert to Christianity were expelled by the Alhambra decree of 1492. But the grounds were never racial, only religious.

30.-

Note of the Ed.: This is part of a long exchange between Bob, a monocausalist, and Frost:

“In this case we know how politicians (and others) behaved in the past. We know that since the rise of Jewish power, they have come to act in a dramatically different manner. We know about the control of information and we know about the system of incentives/disincentives. It would take some serious mental gymnastics to deny the causal relationships here.”

The main problem with this narrative isn't merely that it's an example of *post hoc ergo propter hoc* reasoning, but that it contradicts history. The biggest boost toward legal and social equality with the white man the negro ever received was during and in the immediate aftermath of the American Civil War. **Whites did this on their own, in the absence of modern mass media and the modern educational techniques, and before Jews even began arriving on these shores in any great numbers.** This again points up the importance of worldview, since this first step in the direction of equal “civil rights” for everyone, regardless of race, was framed and justified in terms of Christian morality. A great many of the most prominent Abolitionists were Christian religious fanatics.

“We shouldn't forget that it is not just the incentives / punishments that are in play here, there is also the power of Jews to control the flow of information upon which individuals rely to form their own world views. This is at least as important as the incentives/punishments in my opinion.”

Worldview is in fact much more important and more powerful than a system of incentives because it is logically prior to any such system. Worldview establishes a system of value that determines what can be used as an incentive and what can't. For example, it determines whether money or race is considered more

important. Someone who truly puts race first can't be "incentivized" with money.

It's not clear that Jews control white worldviews though, unless you want to allow that they've been in control of whites for two thousand years or more. A difficult position to maintain! In any case, to eliminate Jewish influence you'd have to go all the way back to pre-Christian times.

"In fact, the subject of abolition of slavery is not even relevant to subject here."

I think the setting of negroes on equal footing with whites by means of a war that cost hundreds of thousands of white lives is extremely relevant. What it shows is that whites are quite willing to impose racial genocide upon themselves without any help from Jews.

"It has been well established that if you can control the information that people are exposed to, you can to a large extent mold their opinions and world view."

Your argument here is tautological. If you can control people, then you can control them. Yes, that's true, but so what? Information about Jews is widely available. That's not the problem. The problem, from the white point of view, is that people overwhelmingly reject both racism and anti-Semitism. They just don't agree with you. It doesn't necessarily indicate they're being "controlled". If you have ever managed to persuade anyone to see the Jewish question your way does that mean that you're now controlling them? The question you're not coming to terms with is, how do you distinguish between someone who simply doesn't agree with you from someone who is being "controlled"? If the problem is only lack of information, then it should vanish as soon as you supply the missing information.

But it doesn't.

"Clearly using their control of the money and media has been used to transform the culture and the society. It has been used to mold public opinion by altering the worldview of millions of Whites (and non-Whites)."

After the Christian takeover of white civilization, the philo-Semitic, anti-racist worldview of Christianity has never been altered by Jews. There's been no need. The program it set forth has just been carried out and refined over generations by willing participants.

“It seems a reasonable and logical assumption that if one can control these environmental factors, that one can affect the worldview of an individual or even an entire society.”

If you can control people, then you can control them? Again, a tautology. But I’m not persuaded that anyone really controls the worldview of a whole society or can dictate a change in it. There’s such a thing as reality, after all, and instinctive drives, such as the will to live, and to procreate. Surely that must count for something. Everyone has immediate and unrestricted access to the world itself through their own senses. They can see what is going on.

“I have held positions in the past based upon my exposure to mass media that I have since repudiated when I discovered that the ‘facts’ upon which I had based those opinions were not true.”

Again, the issue you are avoiding is how to tell the difference between someone honestly disagreeing with you and their being “controlled” to disagree. Also, I have to ask, what accounts for your peculiar immunity from this seemingly omnipotent Jewish “control”? Why is such immunity not more widespread? Why doesn’t merely informing the vast majority of people of the “facts” as you see them change their minds on the Jewish question?

All attempts at educating white people out of their Christian worldview of universal brotherhood and racial/sexual equality have failed, and I believe this is because worldviews don’t so much depend on facts as determine what is regarded as a fact. They provide the framework for interpreting reality; for saying both how the world is and how it ought to be. They aren’t political opinions, but lay the groundwork for those opinions by defining what is permissible and what isn’t.

Even a fellow like you, who thinks he is above being “controlled”, has actually accepted it, as your denunciation of slavery showed. In the Civil War you’d have been an abolitionist, fighting against your own race! Christianity is a very good religion if you want to build a race-neutral technological civilization, but, as history has shown, it is quite inadequate to the task of preserving race.

“It shows nothing of the kind, unless of course you buy into the propaganda that the war was waged to end slavery. This is something that we know to be untrue. We need only look at the contemporary writings of Lincoln and others who were directly involved in the decision to wage that war.”

It's something that you think you know is untrue, for reasons that are entirely unclear to me. What about the songs the soldiers would sing before marching into battle? Read the lyrics to *The Battle Hymn of the Republic* some time, replete with Christian religious imagery, and the telling phrase "let us die to make men free." Or how about that other popular ditty, *John Brown's Body*:

Old John Brown's body lies moldering in the grave,
While weep the sons of bondage
whom he ventured all to save;
But tho he lost his life while struggling for the slave,
His soul is marching on.
John Brown was John the Baptist of the Christ we are to see,
Christ who of the bondmen shall the Liberator be,
And soon thruout the Sunny South the slaves shall all be free,
For his soul is marching on.

Or read Harriet Beecher Stowe's 1852 book *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which sold more copies in its day than any book except the Bible. These are facts that are very hard to explain unless abolitionism had a great deal to do with the war.

"The truth is that mistrust of Jews and belief in racial separation were the norm just a few generations ago. The average White American in the 1950's would find nothing controversial about most of the views expressed here on *The Occidental Observer*. Why have they come to reject 'anti-Semitism' and 'racism'?"

Please think about what you are saying. The average white American man of the 1950s had just returned from crushing racist, anti-Semitic Nazi Germany, and he was mighty damn proud of himself for doing so, Bob. If anti-Semitism and racism had not already been so unpopular, there would probably not have been a war at all.

"I do appreciate your contribution and your efforts certainly do cause me to think about things from different points of view. Thanks."

Likewise, Bob. I appreciate your efforts too. Even when we disagree, they challenge me and help me tighten up my thinking.

31.-

The interposition of the [Charles] Dickens character Mrs. Jellyby [who neglects her own children in favour of Blacks in far-off

Africa] is provocative. Her behavior towards her own children contradicts evolutionary theory, doesn't it? She would seem to have her counterpart in those other nineteenth century do-gooders across the pond, **the American abolitionists**, who were more concerned with the supposed plight of the negro slave than they were with their own posterity's. **They were the ones who set loose the negro land sharks to swim among the white fish**, and they did it without being "controlled" by Jews, unless Christianity is conceded to be such a means of control.

Or can we point to any other Jewish cause of these phenomena other than the long-standing influence of Christianity in creating a culture of moral masochism? Who were the Jews behind the Mrs. Jellybys and the Harriet Beecher Stowes of this world besides Jesus and his apostles?

32.-

An examination of history will show that whites are actually much more loyal to the civilization they've built than they are to their own existence as a race. Forced to choose between the two, they invariably try to preserve their civilization at the expense of race.

For example, the states they have built, which are the political form of this civilization takes, promote racial equality as a matter of good public policy, in order to minimize disruptions to the system caused by racial friction, while at the same time making the best use of human capital. That such an arrangement spells the doom of discrete races is built in, but it's apparently a result to which whites, some of them albeit reluctantly, have become reconciled. Certainly it's a result which the Christian religion, with its teachings of racelessness, the moral value of self-sacrifice, and fanatic belief in a continued life after death, has amply prepared them to accept.

33.-

You have to be completely blind to the essence of Christianity not to see that its most basic message is one of unlimited self-sacrifice. In damaging themselves to help racial aliens, **whites are just taking the moral paradigms of their religion to their logical conclusion**. Immigration is their cross to bear, and they are picking up that cross and following their rabbi, just as the passage I quoted [Matthew 10:34-39] exhorts them to do.

In the final analysis though, it doesn't matter what I think, or what you think, or even what Aquinas thinks. The Pope and his Church and all of the other major branches of Christianity in the West are all for it. They are some of the biggest instigators and supporters of this genocidal influx.

By their fruits shall ye know them, indeed.