

let themselves be persuaded by the puppeteers manipulating the images on their television screens that racial integration was fashionable. And when the changes of the 1960s brought nothing but evil, White Americans let themselves be persuaded that the cure for the evil was more change of the same sort. If there is a just God in heaven, he must laugh in scorn when he hears White Americans whining now about drugs and crime and violence and how they are afraid for the future.

Crime and violence came to America as a direct and immediate consequence of the loss of racial homogeneity in American society. When Blacks and other non-Whites were released from their ghettos and came flooding into the White world they brought their life-style of drugs, crime, and violence with them. And the attitudes and behavior of Whites — especially young Whites — also changed. With the loss of racial and cultural homogeneity went the loss of a sense of community. The world in which White boys and girls were growing up became more alien, more hostile. It was no longer their world. They no longer had a sense of family, of belonging. They no longer had clear standards and models, no longer a clear image of what was expected of them. When young Whites lost their sense of belonging in the chaotic, racially mixed world into which they suddenly were thrust, many of them also lost their sense of responsibility to that world. Immorality, crime, and violence increased among young Whites as among Blacks. It was a natural and inevitable consequence of the loss of homogeneity.

So what do we do about this horrible increase in crime and violence which so frightens people? Well, we might think about restoring the homogeneity and the sense of community White Americans used to have. We might think about that, except that if we said anything about it we would be immediately denounced by the controlled media as “racists.” Now to the average TV-bred citizen, to be considered a “racist” is a fate worse than death. He cannot blame the decline in the quality of American life on a loss of homogeneity. He cannot blame racial mixing. Powerful taboos forbid it. And so he is easily enough persuaded by the manipulators behind his television screen to blame firearms instead.

The manipulators understand this psychology all too well, and they are exploiting it fully in their campaign to disarm Americans. They are using the fear of soaring crime and violence to stampede the frightened, unthinking voters into letting their only means of protection from this crime and violence be taken away from them — into giving up their only means of settling scores with the manipulators of the media and their collaborators in the government who have made such a cesspool of America.

Crime and violence can only increase, of course, because almost no one has the courage and honesty to discuss their real causes, much less to do anything realistic about cleaning up the mess that has been made of America. Therefore, the stampede will continue until White Americans — that is, the ones who obey all the laws — have been completely disarmed. I'll repeat that: The present campaign to disarm Americans will not abate. Neither the controlled media nor the government will back away

from a goal of total disarmament of the civilian population. They won't reach this goal in a single step, but they'll continue taking steps until they do reach it. The target now is semiautomatic rifles. Later it will be all semiautomatic pistols. Then it will be other types of handguns. After that it will be all firearms which hold more than three cartridges. “That's all a sportsman really needs,” they'll say. Then it will be all firearms except muzzle-loaders. Somewhere along the line, various types of ammunition will be banned. “Only a criminal would want a cartridge like this,” they'll say.

Before too many steps have been taken there will be compulsory registration of all firearms and firearm owners, in order to facilitate confiscation later.

This bleak prospect has a silver lining, and it's this: A very substantial portion of gun owners will defy the government and become outlaws rather than give up their weapons, if the populations of California and New Jersey are at all representative of the country as a whole. When bans on so-called “assault rifles” were enacted in those two states fewer than 10% of the people owning such weapons turned them in.

Bans of the California and New Jersey sort have a marvelously salutary effect on the attitude of the people who refuse to comply with the bans. Relatively few of these people are militant patriots or committed revolutionaries. The great majority are simply people who have enough character, enough backbone and common sense, to refuse to let themselves be stampeded along with the sheep into giving up their only effective means of self-defense in a time of civil disorder. Most of them have been law-abiding citizens all of their lives, and it is not an easy decision for them to consciously disobey the law — especially a law which could send them to prison for years. They are not happy about being forced to become outlaws. Once they have crossed that bridge, however, they should have a much healthier attitude toward the government. Most will see it thenceforth as their enemy. Many will be ready to fight it when the time comes for fighting.

They have passed the first test of manhood in the new world of repression and revolution we are entering now. The more such armed, angry outlaws the government makes, the better it will be for all of us in the long run.

I'll leave you with this word: Don't do anything violent or foolish. Don't do anything prematurely. We are in a very serious situation, a situation of extreme danger for the future of our race, and we must use the utmost prudence in dealing with it.

Keep your firearms out of sight, but within reach. The day will come for using them. The day for a great cleansing of this land will come. Until that day, keep your powder dry.

This article was brought to you as a public service by local National Alliance members. For \$24, we'll send you 100 copies of this flier. To print out more copies yourself, visit natall.com/fliers

NATIONAL  ALLIANCE

BOX 172 • LAUREL BLOOMERY • TN 37680
NATALL.COM • NATIONALVANGUARD.ORG

WHY THEY WANT TO DISARM YOU

by Dr. William L. Pierce
and the editors of *National Vanguard*

THERE IS HARDLY AN ISSUE which more sharply divides White Americans than “gun control.” There is hardly a more significant difference than that which exists between the people who want gun control and those who don't. For there is a great temperamental and ideological divide between those who believe in self-defense and those who believe in surrendering and begging for mercy.

Except for a relatively small minority of very sick persons who actually relish the idea of surrender and fantasize about being victimized, those who choose to give up their arms are hoping to be protected by the government. They trust the government. They believe the government has their best interests at heart. They think of the government as a friend and generally approve of the government's policies.

This divide becomes deeper and wider by the day. In Boston, a crazed Black, Kirk Figueroa, shoots and critically injures two White officers, and sends nine others to the hospital. Gun control advocates see this attack as support for their position. “A gun wounded and almost killed those people,” they say. “If we get rid of all the guns, then Blacks and Whites will not be able to kill each other.” And people on their side of the divide believe them and clamor for the confiscation of guns. At the same time people on the other side of the divide rush to gun stores, determined that they will be prepared to defend themselves if any White-hating Black ever threatens them or their families.

Now, this divide certainly didn't exist a century ago. Then every White man was armed, and every woman expected him to be. In that more civilized age violent crime was a minute fraction of what it is today. People could walk the streets of their cities at night and, in most places, leave their doors unlocked without fear. The government interfered relatively little in people's lives. Most communities had police, but a man's right to defend himself, his family, and his property was absolute.

What caused people's attitudes to change so radically? Well, there are a number of reasons: A century ago the coun-

try was substantially less urban than it is now. People living in small towns and rural areas always are more self-reliant and independent, on the average, than city dwellers. Rural people live a little more naturally, a little closer to Nature. They do not depend on the elaborate infrastructure of the city, which provides garbage collection, public transportation, shelters for the homeless, and a thousand other protections and shields against the natural world. Even little things, like drawing water from one's own well and chopping one's own firewood for winter warmth, give one a sense of reality and self-sufficiency that most urbanites and suburbanites lack. As the nation's population became more urban during the past century it also became less self-reliant.

Then there is the fact that in the early years of North American settlement the flow of immigrants was not only entirely White (not counting the slaves imported from Africa, of course), but it consisted of a tougher, more independent breed than in recent years. People came to America from Europe seeking freedom, adventure, or opportunity; but certainly no one came looking for a handout, because everyone understood that there were no handouts available. As the country became more urban, however, the stream of immigrants began to include more of the wretched refuse of various teeming shores yearning to receive welfare checks, and the politicians began looking to the public treasury as a source of funds for buying votes. The consequence has been the growth of an urban underclass of citizens dependent on the government in one way or another: citizens who always are ready to increase their dependency on the government and to trade freedom for the promise of more security.

The Mass Media Hate Guns: Here's Why

All three of the factors above have to do with the changing character of the U.S. electorate, and they are important reasons for the declining fortunes of the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. They are dwarfed to insignificance by a fourth factor, however, and that factor is the growth in the degree of influence on public opinion of the Jews through their control of the mass media of information and entertainment.

Both the Jewish control of the media and the media bias against the citizen's right to keep and bear arms are generally recognized but seldom discussed publicly, for fear of the charge of "anti-Semitism." Also manifest but inadequately publicized is the Jewish leadership of the legislative drive to restrict or abolish the private ownership of firearms. The names of the principal anti-Second Amendment legislators — Feinstein, Boxer, Schumer — tell part of the story, and the anti-gun lobbying organizations, of which the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith — the ADL — is the most powerful, tell the rest.

When a "group of concerned citizens" or an association of mayors or chiefs of police issues a statement to the press calling for the banning of firearms as a way of reducing violence in America's cities, a close examination nearly always will reveal the hidden hand of the ADL. Especially insidious has been the ADL's use of local, state, and federal police agencies as front groups. For several decades the ADL has been lobbying actively for a group of what it calls "model statutes" restricting firearms ownership and penalizing what it deems to be "hate crimes" perpetrated by Whites

against members of minority groups. Typically the ADL will have a police official or two in tow when it shows up at a state legislature to lobby for one of these politically oriented laws.

The ADL's program to subvert police departments was revealed in late 1992 when a San Francisco police inspector, Thomas Gerard, was arrested for illegally selling confidential police investigative files to the ADL. Police searches of ADL offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles a few months later turned up evidence of widespread corruption of police agencies around the country by the ADL. Brave indeed is the local police chief who will turn away an ADL emissary who visits his office with a couple of the community's leading Jewish businessmen and requests the chief's endorsement of a "model statute" banning semiautomatic firearms.

Now, far less obvious than the fact of Jewish leadership of the drive to ban the private ownership of firearms is the *reason* for this Jewish activity. The reason is the almost universal Jewish support for *globalism*. To put it very briefly, globalism is a utopian system in which the U.S. economy will be "globalized," the wage levels of U.S. workers will be brought down to those of workers in the Third World, national boundaries will for all practical purposes cease to exist, an increased flow of Third World immigrants into the United States will have produced a non-White majority in the country, and internationalized military forces will be used to keep anyone from opting out of the system.

To be sure, Jews are not the only ones behind globalism. It appeals to egalitarians, many of them Christians, who are tormented by the fact that most of the population of the Third World lives in a state of perpetual squalor and poverty. They really believe that the unfavorable condition of these non-White masses is not due to any innate inferiority. They really believe that these masses can and should be lifted up to a White level, and that it's worth pulling the White living standard down in order to "equalize" everyone. And, of course, it appeals to many people in the upper echelons of Big Business, who are entranced by the prospect of paying lower wages and exporting their goods to a bigger market. It was considerations of this sort which gave us the unholy alliance of egalitarian ideologues and international capitalists who backed the disastrous North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the more recent Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

Globalism is A Disarmed America

There are two prerequisites for safely bringing about a globalist world order: First, the people who are not convinced that surrendering national sovereignty, opening our borders, and permitting ourselves to be "equalized" with Third World labor are good things must be silenced with "hate" laws designed to criminalize any expression of fact or opinion which the globalists call "racist." Second, the same people *must be disarmed*, so that they have no recourse but to obey the laws and remain silent.

In the United States the number of people likely to take up arms against an oppressive government is not large at this time. We live in an age when comfort and safety are valued more highly than freedom. If economic conditions worsen substantially, however, those few willing to fight for freedom may persuade many others who are more concerned with their pocketbooks than their honor to take up arms as well, and if that happens the globalists

will be in serious trouble.

What all the foregoing means is that the present drive to disarm American citizens is motivated by a fear of rebellion, not by a fear of crime.

The people in the media and the government beating the drums for globalism understand that as the program of "globalization" proceeds, millions of newly dispossessed citizens will be angry and desperate. If these citizens still have firearms in their possession, they may strike at their despoilers.

Patriots need to understand this fact as well as their enemies do, and they must not be bashful about stating it plainly and forcefully. They need to drop the pretense that the purpose of the Second Amendment is to protect the rights of hunters, target shooters, and collectors of antique firearms. When Senator Schumer or Senator Feinstein holds a semiautomatic rifle or pistol up for the television cameras and says that "no legitimate sportsman needs a weapon like this," he is laughing up his sleeve at the same time.

The needs of sportsmen and hobbyists are utterly without importance or significance when compared with the two serious needs served by the private ownership of firearms: the need of the individual for weapons with which to protect his person, his family, and his property against the growing hordes of criminals in our disintegrating society; and the need of the patriot for weapons with which to keep governmental tyranny in check.

America's Problem: Race, Not Guns

There is another very important dimension to the change which has brought Americans to the point that so many of them are eager to surrender and beg for mercy. That is the racial dimension and its relationship to the enormous increase in crime and violence in America. Those who are able to remember America as it was five or more decades ago remember a life as different from that of today as day is from night. There were no drugs or gang violence in the schools. There were no drive-by shootings. Burglary and armed robbery were so rare that when such a crime did occur it was the talk of the town for months afterward. Readers who find it difficult to believe that such an America ever existed need only view a few motion pictures from the 1950s or earlier: Look at the crowds on the streets that you see in those films. Look at the students on the university campuses. Look at the faces in the offices and factories. It was a White America.

America prior to the mid-1960s was a vastly gentler and kinder country than it is today. The drugs and violence endemic in the non-White community had not been permitted to spread to the White community. White children still could play in fields or vacant lots near their homes without fear. No one ever was killed or raped on a school playground. But then our enemies decided that the time had come to begin transforming America, to begin getting it ready to fit into their scheme of things. Blacks and Whites must be integrated, without regard for the consequences!

It is astonishing how easily White Americans permitted themselves to be dispossessed in their own land. It is disgusting how many of them collaborated in the campaign of genocide against their own people — and still do. Of course, the Jews and their globalist allies had an immensely powerful weapon in their hands by the 1960s, and they used it with deadly skill: television. Americans