

# National Alliance Handbook

## 2.d. Opposed Ideologies

Every member should not only understand the ideology of the National Alliance, but he also should have at least a passing acquaintance with the ideologies of those opposed to us. A brief synopsis of seven racially destructive ideologies -- egalitarianism, feminism, individualism, humanism, materialism, Christianity, and New Ageism -- is presented below. In studying these synopses, the member should keep in mind the fact that most people are not ideologists: their espousal of one or another of these hostile ideologies does not mean that they have thought carefully about the ideas they are claiming as their own. Usually people "inherit" an ideology along with the rest of their cultural environment: a person usually does not choose to be a Catholic or a Protestant, for example, but simply adopts unquestioningly the beliefs of the people closest to him. In some cases people have chosen an ideology in response to some internal problem -- the arrested emotional development which characterizes many individualists, for example. More often they are simply being ideologically fashionable: their only attachment to a particular ideology is that it is currently fashionable among their peers, and they would with equal fervor support an opposite ideology if that became fashionable instead.

### 2.d.ii. Egalitarianism

The mother of most of the destructive ideologies plaguing our race is the doctrine of the innate equality of all men. Sometimes an effort has been made to restrict this doctrine to equality before the law: i.e., all persons, regardless of intrinsic differences among them, should have equal legal status, equal civic rights, equal treatment by the government. Such a restricted egalitarian doctrine does not assume the sameness of all persons in the way that the more general egalitarianism does. Nevertheless, the doctrine of legal equality is based on the notion of intrinsic equality in at least some, if not all, characteristics or qualities, and as a practical matter the restricted doctrine leads ultimately to the same consequences as the more general doctrine.

If all men, regardless of differences in intelligence, values, character, accomplishment, or race, are to have the same voice in choosing a society's leaders and the same opportunity to hold public office, it really doesn't matter a great deal whether this state of affairs is based on the doctrine of equality before the law or on the doctrine of human sameness. The doctrine that all persons should be treated the same by the government has a way of evolving into the doctrine that all

persons should be treated the same by everyone, as White Americans have seen all too plainly in the decades following the Second World War: if the government is obliged to treat every type of sexual pervert and the members of all races equally, then so must employers, real estate agents, landlords, social organizations and clubs, and the administrators of private schools.

Egalitarianism, in its general sense, has a strong emotional appeal for people who harbor a conviction of inferiority. It also appeals to those tormented by feelings of guilt for undeserved or unearned success, privilege, status, or wealth. And it is the doctrine of choice for those motivated by resentment or envy.

Flying in the face of reality as it does, egalitarianism does not stand up well to scrutiny; it is not, therefore, so much a formal ideology in its own right as it is the emotional driving force for more specific ideologies and policies. It is the mainstay of democracy, just as it was the mainstay of communism. Feminists draw their sustenance from it, just as do those opposed to deporting illegal aliens.

Egalitarianism in turn gains support from Christianity, which declares all believers equal: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." By denigrating all worldly aspects of life, where natural inequality is so manifest, and emphasizing the otherworldly, which is less subject to scrutiny, Christianity has been able to maintain without revision much of the original egalitarianism which gave it a strong appeal to the slaves and other dispossessed groups in the decaying Roman Empire. Today Christianity provides a moral prop for those who want to justify the doctrine of human sameness.

Persons whose egalitarianism is rooted in an emotional need will not easily be persuaded to abandon their folly. Many egalitarians, however, will be found to have a less tenacious grip on the doctrine. Some have simply accepted without question or reflection the claims of the egalitarians that there are no innate intellectual or behavioral differences among races or between male and female, and they may be receptive to the abundant evidence to the contrary.

Others, with a more theoretical attachment to one form or another of egalitarianism, must be approached differently. There are those, for example, who tacitly accept the average intellectual and behavioral inferiority of Blacks relative to Whites, and of some Whites relative to other Whites, but believe that this natural inequality is unfair and should be redressed in various ways: by providing artificial compensations for the inferior, such as a head start in schooling or a preference in hiring or promoting; by doing away with testing and other processes which separate people on the basis of natural ability; by

shunning any mention of differences, lest feelings be hurt; etc. Such egalitarians may more profitably be approached by examining their notion of fairness rather than by pointing out the facts of inequality to them.

### **2.d.iii. Feminism**

Although in some senses feminism is merely a special form of egalitarianism, it also has aspects which put it in a class by itself and make it even more pernicious than other forms of egalitarianism. Feminism is the system of ideas in which sex is regarded as the primary identifying characteristic, more important than race; in which men and women are regarded as innately identical in all intellectual and psychical traits, and in all physical traits except those most obviously dependent on the configuration of the genitalia; in which filling a traditionally male role in society is valued above being a wife and mother; in which men and women are regarded as mutually hostile classes, with men traditionally in the role of oppressors of women; and in which it is regarded as every woman's primary duty to support the interests of her fellow women of all races against the male oppressors.

Many feminists might define their ideology in less forthright terms or quibble over one or two points in the preceding definition. Indeed, there are differences among feminists, with man-hating lesbians at one extreme and more-or-less normal women at the other who have merely extended a theoretical belief in egalitarianism to include sex differences. We might distinguish between the extremes by calling the former intrinsic feminists and the latter incidental feminists, but the definition given here will suffice for most purposes.

We should note that there is an analogous malady, usually called male chauvinism, which expresses itself in a range of attitudes toward women, from patronizing contempt to outright hatred. Many feminists have attributed the growth of feminism to a reaction against male chauvinism. Actually the latter, which never afflicted more than a minority of White men, has been more an excuse for the promoters of feminism than a cause of that disorder.

Feminism is a threat to our race for two principal reasons: it divides the race against itself (which is the principal reason for its practically unanimous support by Jews), robbing us of solidarity and weakening us in the struggle for racial survival; and it reduces the White birthrate, especially among educated women, and undermines the family by taking women out of the home and leaving the raising of children to television and day-care centers.

Unfortunately, men have reacted to the growth of feminism in several unhealthy ways. Some men, confused and angered by the breakdown in the traditional relationship between men and women, have been driven to male chauvinism, and some have retreated from the field altogether. Others have tried pitifully to do what they think is expected of them: to be more "sensitive" and less aggressive.

Even many racially conscious White men have simply given up on women and written them all off as hopelessly "liberal." This is a terrible error. Whether women are inherently more "liberal" than men or not depends upon the definition of "liberal." Women definitely are more conventional than men, however: more eager to be fashionable. They sense what is expected of them and attempt to conform themselves accordingly. Whatever the image of the ideal woman presented to them, they will ape it. When the image is one of a feminist and a racemixer, we have the result we see today. Men, of course, have a similar tendency, but to a lesser degree.

The bright side of this is that most women are not ideologues. Personal relationships are much more important to them than ideas or ideologies or causes. There are exceptions, of course, but for most women the need for a strong man is more pressing than the need to be ideologically fashionable. The weakness of White males today is a source of frustration and anguish to healthy women. And the White male who excuses his failure to find a suitable woman for himself with the explanation that they're all too "liberal" only reveals his own weakness thereby.

#### **2.d.iv. Individualism**

We Europeans are, on the average, more individualistic than members of other races. We value privacy more. We admire individual accomplishment more. We respect the right of dissent more. We are not happy in the one-big-family or ant-heap style of existence which seems natural to Asians or Africans. We cherish our individual liberties, our freedom from religious, social and governmental constraints more. We look at the world more as individuals than as members of a group.

Complementing this individualism, we have a more impersonal and highly developed altruism and a greater sense of responsibility for the world around us than other races. Concern for the preservation of redwoods and whales and spotted owls, revulsion toward cruelty to animals, opposition to the killing of magnificent jungle cats so that rich women can adorn themselves in their skins may be characteristic of only a minority of our people -- but these concerns are, for all practical purposes, unique to Europeans. Despite the shortcomings we have had in this regard -- and which all too many of us still have -- there would be no environmental movement anywhere were it not for us.

Our ideal is a highly-developed sense of individuality combined with a sense of responsibility for the world around us. Unfortunately, in some people these two elements are not in balance: in them individualism has remained in the infantile stage of egoism, and a sense of responsibility to anyone or anything except themselves has failed to develop. There has been a large growth in the number of such cases during the period of permissiveness which began after the Second World War, and because of this individualism has become a racially destructive ideology.

Actually, individualism is more a mind-set or an attitude than a well-defined ideology. It is expressed in the sort of irresponsible hedonism of those who say that they value racial and cultural "diversity" in their living and working environment because diversity makes their existence more interesting; life would be terribly dull for them, they aver, if everyone around them were White. Any claim on their loyalty to the race is resented as an infringement of their individual freedom and denounced as a form of "collectivism." The same "Me Generation" attitude is expressed in the flood of "self-development" books on the newsstands, offering the reader recipes for developing a more "assertive" personality and "getting what you want," as well as in the novels of Jewess Ayn Rand. One of individualism's crassest spokesmen in the postwar period has been Harry Browne, author of several best-selling "I'm the only one who matters" self-development books in the 1970s. In *How I Found Freedom in an Unfree World*, Browne asserts:

A free person doesn't try to remake the world....He merely appraises every situation by the simple standard: Is this what I want for myself? If it isn't, he looks elsewhere. If it is he relaxes and enjoys it....You can enslave yourself by assuming a responsibility to observe, judge, and correct any social problems. For the problems will continue indefinitely.....But through them all, free men in any country have found ways of living their lives freely and happily without feeling a responsibility to be involved.

One sees individualism's ideological aspect in the manifestly silly but often repeated demand that every person be regarded only as an individual and not as a member of a group. If a member of a Gypsy clan applies for a position as a bank teller, the bank manager should put out of his mind what he knows about the tendency of Gypsies to steal and should consider only what he can observe in the way of individual characteristics in the applicant. When one's daughter comes home with a Black boyfriend, one should ignore the fact that he is Black and evaluate his desirability as a son-in-law solely on the basis of his earning ability, his sobriety, his sense of humor, and the like. And if a Jew is offering his advice on any matter of importance to Aryan society, the

Aryans should not be suspicious and look for hidden motivations just because the adviser is a Jew.

A cautionary note: Among the adherents of individualism are persons of anarchist-libertarian tendency. Because such people are outspokenly opposed to the same government we oppose, some recruiters may think that they are good prospects. Very often they aren't. If their libertarianism is merely a developmental phase through which they are passing -- a youthful rebellion against excessive governmental meddling -- the recruiter may be able to help them along to a more mature outlook. But if their libertarianism is rooted in a fundamental selfishness, recruiting efforts directed toward them will be wasted time.

Individualists also are found in large numbers in conservative, third-party movements and in tax-protest groups -- especially in groups which appeal to the upper-middle-class. Very often these people seem to be in superficial agreement with us on many moral and social issues. They may even seem to share some racial feelings with us, because they are opposed to "Affirmative Action" and quotas, but actually they are at the opposite pole from us on the racial issue. What they believe in is equal opportunity for everyone as an individual, without regard for race, sex, etc. In many cases, of course, opponents of governmental favoritism for minorities choose the individualist position because it is still respectable, and they are afraid of being not respectable. Whether they are individualists from fear or from conviction, however, they are still hostile to us.

## **2.d.v. Humanism**

The term "humanism" has several meanings, some of which describe ideas and attitudes which are by no means racially destructive or hostile to our own ideas. We are concerned here with only one rather narrow meaning of the word: namely, humanism as the belief that man is not really a part of the animal kingdom and is not subject to the same natural laws which govern the development and behavior of other animals. Everything which follows in this section assumes this restricted meaning. Some but not all humanists base their belief on the Judeo-Christian doctrine of special creation (which confuses the situation a bit, when one considers the hostility which exists between Fundamentalist Christians and so-called "secular humanists").

Whether they invoke supernatural authority or not, humanists are universalists: every creature which qualifies as "human" is in an elevated class separated by an unbridgeable gulf from all other creatures. Every creature in this class has "human dignity" and is a "brother" to every other. Every human life is regarded as sacred (or, in the case of the secular humanists, "precious"). Humanism is hostile to

the idea of improving the race through either artificial or natural selection: instead it favors the preservation of the life of every human being, no matter how worthless or depraved.

#### **2.d.vi. Materialism**

This term, like humanism, has several meanings. The one we are concerned with here is the idea that the concrete, material world of pain and pleasure, of the here and now, is all that matters.

To the materialist idealism is folly. He contemplates our goals, and he asks himself: How can the survival of the White race bring me more pleasure or wealth or power or security? That is something in the future, and the future does not exist -- at least, not beyond my lifetime; it is only an idea; it is not real. Money and new clothes and fast cars and big houses and my pleasure are real; honor and beauty and right and wrong are not. Perhaps races are real, but if so they are not especially relevant; people are simply economic units -- laborers or managers, as the case may be -- and all that matters is how much they produce. If Whites are more productive than Blacks and will work as cheaply, fine: employ Whites; but if Asians will produce more for a dollar than Whites, then employ Asians instead.

A materialist is a man who looks at a primeval forest and calculates how much money he can put in his pockets, either as an entrepreneur or as a simple chainsaw operator, by cutting down all the trees. A materialist is also a woman who looks at a meadow and thinks how nice it would be if it were paved over and a beauty parlor, a jewelry store, and a fashionware emporium built on the spot.

When Blacks riot and burn down a city, the egalitarians and the Christians may rush forward with new welfare programs to feed and house the homeless Blacks, and with all sorts of schemes designed to reform their behavior and make productive citizens of them. The materialists may also rush forward with the same schemes and programs, not because they are moved by Christian guilty or egalitarian brotherhood, but because rioting is bad for business. More to the point, the materialists will continue to support the present system so long as it keeps them prosperous or comfortable, and they will oppose our effort to replace it with something better unless they are convinced that there will be a profit for them in its overthrow.

#### **2.d.vii. Christianity**

The National Alliance is not a religious organization, in the ordinary sense of the term. It does, however, have to concern itself with religious matters, because religions influence the behavior of people,

society, and governments. The doctrines of various religious groups -- Christians, Muslims, Jews, Buddhists, et al. -- deal with temporal as well as spiritual matters and therefore often conflict with National Alliance doctrine.

Christian doctrines are of much greater concern to the National Alliance than the doctrines of other large religious groups, because Christianity is the most influential religion in the United States, Europe, and the rest of the White world. Most members of the National Alliance come from families which are, or a generation ago were, at least nominally Christian, and very few come from families which practice, or practiced, Islam, Buddhism, or other religions. Furthermore, the history of our race for the last thousand years has been inextricably bound up with Christianity. The National Alliance really cannot avoid taking positions regarding Christian beliefs and practices, despite the complications this causes in our work.

The immediate and inevitable fact which forces us to come to grips with Christianity is that the mainstream Christian churches are all, without exception, preaching a doctrine of White racial extinction. They preach racial egalitarianism and racial mixing. They preach non-resistance to the takeover of our society by non-Whites. It was the Christian churches, more than any other institution, which paralyzed the will of White South Africans to survive. It is the Christian establishment in the United States which is preeminent in sapping the will of White Americans to resist being submerged in the non-White tide sweeping across the land. Most Christian authorities collaborate openly with the Jews, despite the contempt and abuse they receive in return, and the rest at least follow Jewish policies on the all-important matter of race. The occasional anomaly -- a Catholic bishop in Poland speaking out angrily against Jewish arrogance, a few Protestant groups in the United States expressing sympathy for oppressed Palestinians -- does not invalidate the rule.

We are obliged, therefore, to oppose the Christian churches and to speak out against their doctrines. But we do not, as some groups have done, accuse the Christian leaders of being false Christians. We do not say, "We are the real Christians, because we stand for the values which the mainstream churches stood for a century ago, before they were subverted." We do not reach for our Bibles and point to verses which seem to be in accord with the policies of the National Alliance and contrary to the present policies of the Christian churches. A diligent Bible scholar can find in the Judeo-Christian scriptures support for -- or ammunition against -- virtually any policy whatsoever.

Beyond the immediate conflict between us and the Christian churches on racial matters there is a long-standing and quite fundamental ideological problem with Christianity. It is not an Aryan religion; like Judaism and Islam it is Semitic in origin, and all its centuries

of partial adaptation to Aryan ways have not changed its basic flavor. It was carried by a Jew, Saul of Tarsus (later known as Paul), from the Levant to the Greco-Roman world. Its doctrines that the meek shall inherit the earth and that the last shall be first found fertile soil among the populous slave class in Rome. Centuries later, as Rome was succumbing to an internal rot in which Christianity played no small part, legions of Roman conscripts imposed the imported religion on the Celtic and Germanic tribes to the north.

Eventually Christianity became a unifying factor for Europe, and in the name of Jesus Europeans resisted the onslaught of Islamic Moors and Turks and expelled the "Christ-killing" Jews from one country after another. But the religion retained its alien mind-set, no matter how much some aspects of it were Europeanized. Its otherworldliness is fundamentally out of tune with the Aryan quest for knowledge and for progress; its universalism conflicts directly with Aryan striving for beauty and strength; its delineation of the roles of man and god offends the Aryan sense of honor and self-sufficiency.

Finally, Christianity, like the other Semitic religions, is irredeemably primitive. Its deity is thoroughly anthropomorphic, and its "miracles" -- raising the dead, walking on water, curing the lame and the blind with a word and a touch -- are the crassest superstition.

We may have fond memories of the time before the Second World War when pretty, little girls in white dresses attended all-White Sunday schools, and Christianity seemed a bulwark of family values and a foe to degeneracy and indiscipline. We may cherish the tales of medieval valor, when Christian knights fought for god and king -- if we can overlook the Christian church's bloodthirsty intolerance, which stifled science and philosophy for centuries and sent tens of thousands of Europeans to the stake for heresy.

We may even find Christian ethics congenial, if we follow the standard Christian practice of interpreting many of its precepts -- such as the one about turning the other cheek -- in such a way that they do not interfere with our task. But we should remember that nothing essential in Christian ethics is specifically Christian. Any successful society must have rules of social conduct. Lying and stealing were shunned in every Aryan society long before Christianity appeared. Our pagan ancestors did not need Christian missionaries to tell them how to behave or to explain honor and decency to them -- quite to the contrary!

Historians may argue the pros and cons of Christianity's role in our race's past: whether or not the unity it provided during a period of European consolidation outweighed the loss of good genes it caused in the Crusades and the bloody religious wars of the Middle Ages (and

through the Church's policy of priestly celibacy); whether the splendid Gothic cathedrals which rose in Europe during four centuries and the magnificent religious music of the 18th century were essentially Christian or essentially Aryan in inspiration; whether Christianity's stand against the evils of self-indulgence -- against gluttony and drunkenness and greed -- was worth its shackling of the human mind in superstition or not. One thing is already clear, however: Christianity is not a religion that we can wish on future generations of our race.

We need ethics; we need values and standards; we need a world view. And if one wants to call all of these things together a religion, then we need a religion. One might choose instead, however, to call them a philosophy of life. Whatever we call it, it must come from our own race soul: it must be an expression of the innate Aryan nature. And it must be conducive to our mission of racial progress. Christianity, as the word is commonly understood, meets neither of these criteria.

The fact is that, completely aside from the racial question, no person who wholeheartedly believes Christian doctrine can share our values and goals, because Christian doctrine holds that this world is of little importance, being only a proving ground for the spiritual world which one enters after death. Christian doctrine also holds that the condition of this world is not man's responsibility, because an omnipotent and omniscient deity alone has that responsibility.

Although some Christians do believe Christian doctrine wholeheartedly, most do not. Most instinctively feel what we explicitly believe, even if they have repressed those feelings in an effort to be "good" Christians. Because of this many nominal Christians, even those affiliated with mainstream churches, can, under the right circumstances, be persuaded to work for the interests of their race. Other nominal Christians -- especially those who stand apart from any of the mainstream churches -- have interpreted Christian doctrine in such an idiosyncratic way that the contradictions between their beliefs and ours have been minimized.

For these reasons, we want to avoid conflict with Christians to the extent that we can. We don't want to give unnecessary offense, even when we speak out against the doctrines of their churches. We don't want to ridicule their beliefs, which in some cases are sincerely held. Some of these people later will reject Christianity's racial doctrines. Some will reject Christianity altogether. We want to help them in their quest for truth when we can, and we want to keep the door open to them.

Members who want to study the subject of Christianity and its relationship to our task in depth should read *Which Way Western Man?* by our late member William Simpson. The book's initial chapters

describe the spiritual odyssey of a man of exceptional spiritual sensitivity, who was far more intensely a Christian than nearly any Christian living today and who eventually understood the racially destructive nature of Christianity and rejected it.

A more concise study of the difference between the Christian world view and ours is given in Wulf Sorensen's *The Voice of Our Ancestors*, which was reprinted in *National Vanguard* No. 107.

### **2.d.viii. New Ageism**

This is the least coherent of the racially destructive ideologies described here. It is really only a syndrome of attitudes, tendencies, and ill-defined myths, and it is not so much hostile to racial survival as it is diversionary. It is important only because it has infected the minds of millions of our people and is likely to infect millions more in the future. If we liken the egalitarians to traitors recruited from among our people by the Jews to throw open the city gates to the enemy army, then the New Agers are people who have accepted the gift of a barrel of whiskey from the Jews and gone off into a corner to drink themselves into a stupor, so that they cannot assist in the defense. They are the Egyptians the Jew Isaiah describes gleefully in his recitation of the age-old Jewish recipe for the destruction of races and nations: "And the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof, and I will destroy the counsel thereof, and they shall seek to the idols and to the charmers and to them that have familiar spirits and to the wizards."

New Agers are people who believe, in whole or in part, in reincarnation, in astrology, in the miraculous power of pyramids and crystals, in spiritualism, in telepathic contact with extraterrestrial beings, in ESP, in "chakras," in transcendental meditation, in telekinetic levitation, and in quite a few other things. They believe that if a large enough group of them synchronize their watches and then at an appointed moment begin thinking about something they want to happen, perhaps with the accompaniment of chanting to aid their concentration, they can bring about the desired consequence.

The growth of New Ageism from the "flower power" movement of the 1960s is easy to trace, but it has roots which go much further back -- into the most remote reaches of prehistory, in fact. New Ageism is merely the modern manifestation of the belief in magic. Life is a difficult and uncertain matter, and men are given to wishful thinking; they want to believe that there are easier ways to obtain the objects of their desire. When this urge is guided by hard-headed intelligence, with constant reference to reality, the result is science. When the thinking becomes excessively wishful or when intelligence is lacking, the result is magic.

Magic always experiences a resurgence in popularity when people begin losing confidence in themselves and become fearful about the future. New Ageism is popular today because our civilization is visibly collapsing, and many people don't have the strength of character to face the crisis with both feet on the ground and their minds in gear. The charmers and wizards have come out of the woodwork in droves to take advantage of the situation.

A person whose mind has become infected with New Ageism is useless to his race; he will not admit the necessity to fight for our cause, because he believes he is in contact with powers which transcend the struggle for racial survival. He has abandoned the real world for his make-believe world, where men are not responsible for their fates.

# NATIONAL ALLIANCE HANDBOOK