

Miscellany15: Was America Destroyed by the Jews?

© 2006 Joseph George Caldwell. All rights reserved. Posted at Internet web sites <http://www.foundation.bw> and <http://www.foundationwebsite.org> . May be copied or reposted for non-commercial use, with attribution. (18 February 2006, updated 24 February 2006)

Commentary on recent news, reading and events of personal interest.

Contents

The Relentless Attack on White Christian Culture; or, Was America Destroyed by the Jews? 1

The Relentless Attack on White Christian Culture; or, Was America Destroyed by the Jews?

The Immigration Act of 1965

It is an historical fact that Senator Ted Kennedy was a principal proponent of the Immigration Act of 1965, which has led to the flooding of America with over 100 million immigrants, mainly from non-European countries. At the time when the Act was being debated, Sen. Sam Ervin of North Carolina warned that this Act would have a severe impact on US culture, and end up flooding the country with aliens from quite different cultures. Proponents of the Act argued that this would not happen, but history has proven Senator Ervin to have been quite correct in his assessment. The Act has been responsible for massive destruction of the environment (an estimated 100 million acres of natural land destroyed, converted to paving, buildings, and other uses that are inimical to wildlife) and for a significant increase in the crowding and ethnic strife in our cities.

The following editorial by Georgie Anne Geyer appeared in the October 6, 2005, issue of the Spartanburg Herald-Journal.

Immigration Act gave us just what proponents said it wouldn't

Forty years ago, Sen. Ted Kennedy made some famous comments about immigration control that rival those of Neville Chamberlain predicting "peace in our time" on the eve of World War II.

When the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 was passed, the always cocksure "Teddy," one of the most perfervid supporters of "new egalitarianism," told Congress: "First, our cities will not be flooded with a million immigrants annually. Second, the ethnic mix will not be upset"

Now, on the 40th anniversary of the bill that transformed America – with millions of immigrants annually and an ethnic mix that has been set on its head – it is appropriate that some groups should look at what that important 1965 bill has wrought.

"The U.S. added at least 40 million immigrants after 1965," Steven Gillon, a historian and dean of the Honors College at the University of Oklahoma, told the annual Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) meeting in Washington last weekend. "Before 1965, 95 percent of the new immigrants had come from Europe. After 1965, 95 percent came from the Third World. The 1965 act has transformed American society and had consequences exactly the opposite of what we were promised."

At this point in the meeting, lending artistic irony, a film was shown of an interview with Norbert Schlei, one of the drafters of the bill in the attorney general's office at that time. "We believed the bill would have negligible effects on the United States," he said. "We predicted 165,000 immigrants a year. We believed that the idea that tinkering with immigration would make any difference was just silly."

Then he smiled – a big, wholly unapologetic smile. "It surely didn't turn out that way," he summed up.

How nice of him to say so! What the bill did was to take quotas away from mostly Europeans (until then, immigrants were taken according to their percentage of the American people) and open immigration to Asia and the rest of the Third World. It provided for the noble-sounding but disastrous "family reunification," by which immigrants could bring virtually any family member here.

It was so "successful" – in its non-intent – that analysts at the FAIR meeting predicted that by 2050, America will have a population of approximately 436 million and, for the first time, the largest "minority" of the population will be non-Hispanic white people – exactly the people who originally populated and founded America.

Other specialists, like the prescient political economist and author Pat Choate, convincingly developed the idea that along with the massive immigration over the past 40 years, the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, which was supposed only to accelerate trade between the two Americas, has asked: "released corporate America from its stakeholder responsibilities within the United States. Today its only responsibility is to shareholders, not to workers."

Two-thirds of Americans say consistently, in polls and surveys, that they want to reduce immigration. Their voices are becoming rightly impatient. Of course, there is a lot of talk – from the White House as well as Congress – about controlling immigration. There are currently three bills before Congress, two of which would only bring more illegal aliens here through "guest worker" programs that would easily become permanent.

But it is doubtful now that any of them will pass (probably blessedly so). The Washington Times reported Monday that new and salacious scandals (sex for green cards was one of the accusations) are being outlined to congressional committees about the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. It's clear that the service does not have the capacity to oversee any guest worker program.

And yet, there doesn't seem to be the desperately needed serious national debate on this crucial subject.

At the end of the meeting, FAIR President Dan Stein turned to me and asked: "How, in the wake of the London bombings by children of immigrants, can there be no discussion of immigration in this country? How can there not be a soul-searching national debate?"

I had no answer.

Georgie Anne Geyer is a foreign correspondent with Universal Press Syndicate.

[End of Geyer editorial.]

Ms. Geyer is also the author of the book, *Americans No More: The Death of Citizenship* (The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1996).

I lived in the US during the time when Ted Kennedy was promoting passage of the Act, and I thought that I understood the motivation for his enthusiasm for its passage. The Catholics had always held very little power at the national level in the United States. It was remarkable that John Kennedy got elected; and the fact that he was a Catholic very nearly cost him the election.

US Protestants were convinced that if a Catholic were elected President, his primary allegiance would be to the Pope in Rome, rather than to the American electorate.

Some time ago, one of my readers sent me a note, stating that I was quite wrong in my assessment and characterization of the forces behind the Immigration Act of 1965. My reader informed me that the primary force behind the Immigration Act of 1965 was the Jews, not the Catholics. As backup for his position, he cited three books by Prof. Kevin MacDonald of California State University at Long Beach: *The Culture of Critique* (1st Books, 1998, 2002); *A People That Shall Dwell Alone* (Praeger Publishers, 1994; Writers Club Press, 2002); and *Separation and Its Discontents* (1st Books, 2004). Quoting from the cover of *The Culture of Critique*, "I describe Jewish efforts to shape United States immigration policy in opposition to the interests of peoples of non-Jewish European descent, particularly the peoples of Northern and Western Europe. An important thesis is that all of these movements may be seen as attempts to alter Western societies in a manner that would neutralize or end anti-Semitism and provide for Jewish group continuity either in an overt or in a semi-cryptic manner. At the theoretical level, these movements are viewed as the outcome of the fact that Jews and Gentiles have different interests in the construction of culture and in various public policy issues (e.g., immigration policy)."

Following are a number of selections from *The Culture of Critique* (and from the preface to the first paperback edition).

"In the end, the 1965 law passed because it was advertised as nothing more than a moral gesture that would have no long-term impact on the ethnic balance of the US. However, to its activist supporters, including the Jewish organizations that were critical to its passage, immigration reform was what it had always been: a mechanism to alter the ethnic balance of the United States (see Ch. 7)."

"The best strategy for a collectivist group like the Jews for destroying Europeans therefore is to convince Europeans of their own moral bankruptcy. A major theme of *CofC* is that this is exactly what Jewish intellectual movements have done."

"Individualist societies are therefore an ideal environment for Judaism as a highly collectivist, group-oriented strategy."

"A principal theme of *CofC* is that Jewish organizations played a decisive role in opposing the idea that the United States ought to be a European nation. ... The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) today (May 28, 1999) lauded the passage of sweeping changes in Germany's immigration law, saying that easing of the nation's once rigorous naturalization requirements "will provide a climate for diversity and acceptance. It is encouraging to see pluralism taking root in a society that, despite its strong democracy, had for decades maintained an unyielding policy of citizenship by blood or descent only." ... There is no mention of analogous laws in place in Israel restricting immigration to Jews and the long-standing policy of rejecting the possibility of repatriation for Palestinian refugees wishing to return to Israel or the occupied territories. The prospective change in the "us versus them" attitude alleged to be characteristic of Germany is applauded, while the "us versus them" attitude characteristic of Israel and Jewish culture throughout history is unmentioned. Recently, the Israeli Ministry of Interior ruled that new immigrants who have converted to Judaism will no longer be able to bring non-Jewish family members into the country. The decision is expected to cut by half the number of eligible immigrants to Israel. Nevertheless, Jewish organizations continue to be strong proponents of multi-ethnic immigration to the United States. This pervasive double standard was noticed by

writer Vincent Sheean in his observations of Zionists in Palestine in 1930: “how idealism goes hand in hand with the most terrific cynicism; ... how they are Fascists in their own affairs, with regard to Palestine, and internationalists in everything else.

“My view is that Judaism must be conceived primarily as an ethnic rather than a religious group.”

It was a little surprising to me that MacDonald did not elaborate on this, as others have. When pro-immigration Jewish are confronted with the question of how they can prescribe mass immigration and culture destruction for the US, but not for Israel, they claim that Israel is a religious concept, not a political one, and so it is morally justified. You see the statement that “Zionism” is a religious movement, not a political one. It appears that most people accept that Zionism is in fact a political movement, and that the relentless assault on American culture by Jewish organizations promoting mass immigration (and the relentless assault on white culture and Christian culture through movies and books produced by Jewish-controlled communications / entertainment media) are politically motivated, not religiously motivated. David Icke presents much material on this, in his book, *Tales from the Time Loop* (Bridge of Love Publications, 2003). Sample quote: “Jack Bernstein, an American Ashkenazi, moved to Israel from the United States, lured by the propaganda about the Jewish homeland. What he experienced sickened him and he detailed what he witnessed in an article entitled, “The Life of an American Jew in Racist-Marxist Israel.” He said that Zionist propaganda has led the American people to believe that Zionism and Judaism are one and the same, and that they are religious in nature. This, he said, was a blatant lie, “Judaism is a religion; but Zionism is a political movement started mainly by East European (Ashkenazi) Jews who for centuries have been the main force behind communism and socialism,” he writes. The ultimate goal of the Zionists, said Bernstein, is a one-world government under the control of the Zionists and the Zionist-oriented International Bankers.”

Continuing with quotations from MacDonald’s *CofC*: “The Internet is a major gap in [Jewish] control of the major media, but Jewish organizations have taken the lead in attempting to censor the Internet. The Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC) distributes a compact disk titled, “Digital Hate 2001” that lists over 3000 “hate sites on the Internet.” Both the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the ADL [Anti-Defamation League] have attempted to pressure Internet service providers (ISPs) like AOL and popular websites like Yahoo into restricting subscriber access to disapproved websites. Recently Yahoo removed 39 Internet clubs originally identified as “hate sites” by the SWC. Internet auction sites have been subjected to protests for selling Nazi memorabilia. Amazon.com and Barnesandnoble.com have come under fire for selling Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*.”

“The other side of the coin is that Jews have often reacted quite negatively to Jewish writers who portray Jewish characters as having negative or disapproved traits. For example, Philip Roth [author of *Portnoy’s Complaint*] has been extensively criticized by Jews and Jewish organizations for portraying such characters in America, where his work could be read by anti-Semites.”

In Chapter 7 of *CofC*, MacDonald continues: “The Jewish involvement in influencing immigration policy in the United States is especially noteworthy as an aspect of ethnic conflict. Jewish involvement in influencing immigration policy has had certain unique qualities that have distinguished Jewish interests from the interests of other groups favoring liberal immigration policies. Throughout much of the period from 1881 to 1965, on Jewish interest in liberal immigration policies stemmed from a desire to provide a sanctuary for Jews fleeing from anti-

Semitic persecutions in Europe and elsewhere. Anti-Semitic persecutions have been a recurrent phenomenon in the modern world beginning with the Russian pogroms of 1881 and continuing into the post-World War II era in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. As a result, liberal immigration has been a Jewish interest because “survival often dictated that Jews seek refuge in other lands” (Cohen 1972, 341). For a similar reason, Jews have consistently advocated an internationalistic foreign policy because “an internationally-minded America was likely to be more sensitive to the problems of foreign Jewries” (p. 342).

“There is also evidence that Jews, much more than any other European-derived ethnic group in the United States, have viewed liberal immigration policies as a mechanism for ensuring that the United States would be a pluralistic rather than a unitary, homogeneous society.”

MacDonald quotes Earl Raab: “The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will be able to prevail in this country.”

MacDonald continues: “Because liberal immigration policies are a vital Jewish interest, it is not surprising that support for liberal immigration policies spans the Jewish political spectrum.”

“Similarly, [D. A.] Hollinger notes that Jews were more influential in the decline of a homogeneous Protestant culture in the United States than Catholics because of their greater wealth, social standing, and technical skill in the intellectual arena.”

“The Jewish effort toward transforming the United States into a pluralistic society has been waged on several fronts. In addition to discussing legislative and lobbying activities related to immigration policy, mention will also be made of Jewish efforts in the intellectual-academic arena, the area of church-state relationships, and organizing African Americans as a political and cultural force.”

“Of particular interest here is the ideology that the United States ought to be an ethnically and culturally pluralistic society.”

“Throughout the almost 100 years prior to achieving success with the immigration law of 1965, Jewish groups opportunistically made alliances with other groups whose interests temporarily converged with Jewish interests (e.g., a constantly changing set of ethnic groups, religious groups, pro-communists, anti-communists, the foreign policy interests of various presidents, the political need for presidents to curry favor with groups influential in populous states in order to win national elections, etc.).”

“The family-based emphasis of the quota regulations of the 1965 law (e.g., the provision that at least 24 percent of the quota for each area be set aside for brothers and sisters of citizens) has resulted in a multiplier effect that ultimately subverted the quota system entirely by allowing for a “chaining” phenomenon in which endless chains of the close relatives of close relatives are admitted outside the quota system: ‘Imagine one immigrant, say an engineering student, who was studying in the United States during the 1960s. If he found a job after graduation, he could then bring over his wife [as the spouse of a resident alien], and six years later, after being naturalized, his brothers and sisters, husbands, and children. Within a dozen years, one immigrant entering as a skilled worker could easily generate 25 visas for in-laws, nieces, and nephews (McConnell 1988b, 98).’”

“In a highly revealing discussion of the bill before the Senate, Senator Sam Ervin (*Cong. Rec.*, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965, 24446-51) noted that “those who disagree with me express no shock that Britain, in the future, can send us 10,000 fewer immigrants than she has sent on an annual average in the past. They are only shocked that British Guyana cannot send us every single citizen of that country who wishes to come.” Clearly the forces of liberal immigration really wanted unlimited immigration into the United States.”

“The 1965 law is having the effect that it seems reasonable to suppose had been intended by its Jewish advocates all along: The Census Bureau projects that by the year 2050, European-derived peoples will no longer be a majority of the population of the United States. Moreover, multiculturalism has already become a powerful ideological and political reality. Although the proponents of the 1965 legislation continued to insist that the bill would not affect the ethnic balance of the United States or even impact its culture, it is difficult to believe that at least some proponents were unaware of the eventual implications.”

Addressing the issue of Jewish pro-immigration efforts in other Western countries, MacDonald observes: “It is remarkable that the sea change in immigration policy in the Western world occurred approximately the same time (1962-1973), and in all countries the changes reflected the attitudes of elites rather than of the great mass of citizens. In the United States, Canada, Britain, and Australia public opinion polls of European-derived peoples have consistently shown overwhelming rejection of immigration by non-European-derived peoples. A consistent theme has been that immigration policy has been formulated by elites with control of the media and that efforts have been made by political leaders of all major parties to keep fear of immigration off the political agenda.”

“As in the United States, family unification became a centerpiece of immigration policy in Canada and Australia and led to the “chaining” phenomenon mentioned above.”

“At present the interests of non-European-derived peoples to expand demographically and politically in the United States are widely perceived as a moral imperative, whereas the attempts of the European-derived peoples to retain demographic, political, and cultural control is represented as “racist,” immoral, and an indication of a psychiatric disorder.”

“As discussed at several points in this volume, the radical individualism embodied in the Enlightenment ideal of individual rights is especially problematic as a source of long-term stability in a Western society because of the danger of invasion and domination by group strategies such as Judaism and the possibility of the defection of gentile elites from the ideal represented in the other two models of social organization.”

MacDonald’s books are long and detailed, and I do not intend to present or even summarize his arguments here. The main point of his writings that relates to passage of the Immigration Act of 1965 is that Jewish organizations promoted it and the inevitable destruction of then-US culture that it portended, whereas they absolutely forbid the destruction of their own culture and nation (Israel) by means of mass immigration from alien cultures.

One cannot but be amazed at the incredible hypocrisy involved in their program to destroy American culture, in view of Israel’s own rigid immigration policies and racist / apartheid policies (e.g., the genetic system used to allot housing: first choice to Ashkenazi Jews living in Israel for many years, second choice to Ashkenazi Jews from Europe, third choice to Ashkenazi Jews from the United States, fourth choice to Sephardic Jews, and last choice to Muslims, Druze and Christians (see David Icke, *Tales from the Time Loop*, Bridge of Love Publications, 2003).

Based on MacDonald's in-depth research, it does indeed appear that passage of the Immigration Act of 1965 was primarily enabled by Jewish efforts, and that my attributing its passage largely to Senator Ted Kennedy was in error.

The Assault on White Christian Culture

Since my reader wrote me, I have perhaps been sensitized to the issue of attacks on white Christian culture by the US communications / news / publishing / entertainment media, especially films. It is a fact that the (communications / news / publishing / entertainment) media in the US are heavily controlled by Jews (MacDonald writes at length on this topic). It would seem that the attacks on white Christian culture are tacitly approved by Jewish interests, if not controlled and directed by them. Some examples of things that caught my eye recently in this regard are the following.

During the time of celebration of Martin Luther King's holiday in January, there was much coverage of the life and times of the man. As chance would have it, I happened to watch the movie, *Nixon*, directed by Oliver Stone, a few weeks ago. The movie contains a scene in which FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is decrying King's womanizing, comparing his morals to those of a "tomcat." The interesting thing to note is that, in all of the media coverage of King last month, no mention was made in anything that I read of his womanizing. This fact is in stark contrast to press or movie coverage of John F. Kennedy, that rarely fails to make significant note of his womanizing and alleged affair with Marilyn Monroe. This difference is notable because of the fact that Kennedy was simply a politician, whereas King was a pastor of a church and an ordained minister. As a religious leader, King had a responsibility to follow the moral rules that he was preaching. Kennedy was not a religious leader – he was, quite simply, a politician – and was under no such strictures or moral obligation. Yet the press and the movies, which are controlled by Jewish interests, make much of Kennedy's womanizing and suppress King's womanizing completely. This seems strange indeed.

It is possible that the media's reluctance to say anything publicly about King's womanizing was a sign of respect for Mrs. Coretta Scott King, Martin's widow. Time will tell if this is the case.

MacDonald comments on the relationship of Jews to blacks: "Cruse also points out the asymmetry in black-Jewish relations: While Jews have held prominent roles in black civil rights organizations and have been actively involved in funding these organizations and in making and implementing the policies of these organizations, blacks have been completely excluded from the inner workings and policy-making bodies in Jewish organizations. To a considerable extent, at least until quite recently, the form and goals of the black movement in the United States should be seen as an instrument of Jewish strategy with goals very similar to those pursued in the arena of immigration legislation."

I skimmed through MacDonald's books, and he certainly presents some interesting facts and arguments. He observes, for example, that Israel promotes mass immigration from third-world cultures to the US, but allows only Jews to immigrate to Israel. A similar phenomenon is that today's movies and books, spawned by an industry dominated by Jewish interests, encourage intermarriage of whites with nonwhites or Christians to nonChristians, but strongly discourage intermarriage of Jews and nonJews. When taken to task on this and similar viewpoints, the rationale is that their discrimination, exclusiveness, and intolerance are based in religion, and are therefore quite acceptable.

The point that I am leading up to here is that there seems to be a constant attack, in the media, against the character and morals of white Christian Americans. Why, for example, do the media never comment on King's womanizing, but always does on Kennedy's, when just the reverse would be expected (since King was a pastor and Kennedy was a politician)? Why do so many movies stress homosexuality between white males? The current movie, *Brokeback Mountain* is a good example. The story centers on two white homosexual males. The director, Ang Lee, is ethnic Chinese (Taiwanese). The two sexual deviants in the picture are white males. This is typical. Why are sexual deviants not two Jews, or two Chinese, or two Indians, instead of almost always two whites? Racial miscegenation is now routinely depicted on television and in the movies, and in printed literature. This miscegenation is usually a white male and a black female, or a black female and a white male. Why is it never a Jew and a black, or a black and a Japanese, or an Indian and a Chinese? It seems rather evident that there *is* a concerted effort on the part of the media, which in the US is dominated and controlled by Jewish interests, to subvert the morality of white Christian Americans.

Here is a segment of a recent issue of *The Stroller* column, from the Spartanburg Herald-Journal newspaper (3 February 2006). "Just As Disgusted: Roy Lowe of Union says he must defend Betty Jo Howell in her disgust for the publicity given the movie, "Brokeback Mountain." "In response to Donnie Patterson, I doubt that there is any artistic merit in this film of unnatural and, according to the Bible, abominable lust," says Mr. Lowe. "Another writer suggested that Mrs. Howell crawl into a hole. This is what the politically correct crowd would like. I implore other like-minded people to stand up to society's incessant flaunting of sinful behavior. We don't have to accept it and should take action to change it. Write to the newspaper, and call the theaters. Tell them that you think that your money will not be spent there. Enough calls backed by actions will remove films and television programs like this. And kudos to Mrs. Howell. You are not alone."

In the 2006 issue of the Spartanburg Herald-Journal's *Physicians and Health Care Source*, the front cover features four medical professionals. The three in the foreground are a Chinese, a black, and a white female. In the background is a white male. The picture clearly symbolizes the marginalization of the white male in US society. The symbolism would perhaps have been a little more appropriate had the white male been "faded out."

The title to this piece is, "The Relentless Attack on White Christian Culture; or, Was America Destroyed by the Jews?" With respect to the first part of the title, it does appear to me that the entertainment media, which are strongly controlled by Jewish interests, are continually picking away at white Christian morality. But that seems to be very salable merchandise in today's television and book market, so one can hardly fault the vendors any more than the sellers – similar, one might say, to the market in illegal drugs.

But what about the second part of the title: "Was America Destroyed by the Jews?" At once, it should be recognized that the question is ill-posed. First, because it does not define the word "destroyed," and second, because "the Jews," like any other racial, ethnic, political, social or religious group, are not a monolithic group of people all having the same interests or motives. What I mean by "destroyed" is that (1) a significant portion of America's environment has been destroyed (converted from natural to urban use) by the addition of 100 million people to the country since passage of the Immigration Act of 1965; and (2) America is no longer controlled by a single dominant culture, viz, the white Protestant culture of the early twentieth century. In this sense, America has clearly been destroyed, since (1) the environmental destruction caused by mass immigration has in fact taken place; and (2) the formerly dominant culture is in fact no longer in control of the country. With respect to the phrase "by the Jews," I would comment that

while Jewish culture is strong, I am sure that there are many individual Jews and Jewish organizations that do not give any thought to the environment, to immigration policy, or to degenerate literature (movies and books). A more specific formulation of the question would be, "Was the American environment damaged, and were the political and social power of America's dominant white Christian or European-derived culture weakened, diluted or destroyed by the liberal immigration policies and decadent entertainment and literature promoted by certain Jewish individuals or organizations?" You can perhaps see why I may have been a little less specific in the title. I have close friends who are Jews, and who have little interest in the environment, in immigration or in trashy novels. I have no intention of offending them by posing a question that "paints all Jews with the same brush," and so it is important to me to define exactly what I mean by the question posed in the title of this piece.

Once again, some Jewish organizations certainly picked away at America's policy of trying to maintain a white Christian or European culture in America, and that culture was eventually destroyed (weakened, diluted, marginalized, stripped of its political hegemony). But other groups pressed for liberal immigration, too – including America's own plutocrats, many of whom are not Jewish at all, but from the mainstream of America's European-derived white Christian culture. The pro-liberal-immigration Jewish organizations were simply better funded and more consistent in their program (of mass immigration from alien cultures to America) than other groups, and they were outside of the wealthy elites of America's European-derived white Christian culture who also welcomed mass immigration and massive international free trade. Now that American culture and environment have been destroyed, it is easy (and human) to look for scapegoats. Jews (and this means *some* Jews, and *some* Jewish organizations) deserve some, perhaps much, of the credit for passage of the Immigration Act of 1965, to be sure. But are they to blame for the destruction of America that followed its passage? Was Delilah responsible for Samson's downfall? Of course not. As historian Will Durant observed, "A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself from within." No, the Jews did not destroy America. Sadly, America, once the strongest nation and culture in the world, destroyed itself.

Because American communications media, including the Internet, are controlled by Jewish interests, it is relevant to ask whether my opinion that Jews were not responsible for the destruction of America is sincere, or tempered or motivated by my awareness that saying something negative about the Jews may cause my website to be shut down, or removed from major search engines, such as Google, or major search websites, such as Yahoo. I assure you that my opinion in this matter is sincere. Consider the following allegory: Suppose that a man has built a successful family business, in which he employs his wife and children. Suppose that a member of the firm, who is not a member of the family, presses year after year that the business should expand greatly, by taking in stockholders, directors and many additional employees who are not members of the family. Suppose that the owner of the firm eventually relents, and does so. And, finally, suppose that after years of expansion, the new stockholders and directors assume control of the firm, strip the founder of his control, and demote the owner's children. Although the firm still exists, and is in fact much larger, the founder has now lost his firm and has squandered the birthright of his children. Who is to blame for his misfortune? Is it the man who pressed the former owner to dilute his control and his children's ownership by taking in new stockholders, directors, and employees? Or is it the founder, who followed his advice? In my view, the founder is responsible. No one held a gun to his head. For whatever reason he was convinced to jeopardize his firm and family's security, his decision was freely made. He is to blame. It may be unfortunate that he accepted as an employee someone who gave him advice that resulted in the eventual loss of his firm and his children's birthrights, but that was his decision. The employee who gave him the advice that resulted in his family's

downfall achieved his goal, and the foreign directors, stockholders and employees certainly benefited from his advice. The man and his family were destroyed by this advice, but it was their decision, and theirs alone, to take it.

In my view, this allegory characterizes well what has happened to America. The dominant culture – white Anglo-Saxon Protestants – listened to Catholics and Jews and other minority groups who wanted to dilute the dominant European-derived culture by adopting a policy of mass immigration, and that once-dominant culture eventually lost control of their own country. They had something unique and very valuable, and they simply gave it away because someone asked them to. If they were so foolish as to give their culture and country away simply because some minorities asked them to, then they certainly deserve just what they got.

The passage of the Immigration Act of 1965 led quickly to the destruction of American culture and the American environment. Despite the protests that you hear today that no one could have seen this coming, it was strongly emphasized by opponents of the Act that this would happen. This attempt to escape blame for destroying American culture and environment is as sorry as the attempt of today's leaders to escape blame for the September 11 attacks on the US, when it was America's policies of open borders, mass immigration, and massive international free trade that led directly to America's vulnerability to attack.

If you are a descendent of the European-derived culture in America, then you are now reaping what your leaders and progenitors sowed. They foolishly squandered your heritage, your birthright. No, it was not the Jews who destroyed America. It was your elders. If someone comes to your house and asks for you to give part of it to him and his family, you can refuse. That is your right in all cultures of the world (except, perhaps, for radical Christianity). If you are so foolish as to give part of your house to another family, and that action eventually results in your losing your house – and your children's house – to the others, then you have no one but yourself to blame. As Will Durant observed, "A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself from within."