

HAMMER OF THE PATRIOT

A handbook on rhetorical counter-terrorism

CHARLES CHAPEL

Hammer of the Patriot

A handbook on rhetorical counter-terrorism

By
Charles Chapel
2014

-Version 1.3-

Copyright Charles Chapel

When distributing this book, please use the following link to access the most up-to-date version:

<http://laraj.ca/AGwiki/uploads/Contemporary/IronmarchOriginals/Zeiger%20-%20Hammer%20of%20the%20Patriot.pdf>

You can contact the author by personal message on his Iron March profile:

<http://ironmarch.org/index.php?/user/2170-zeiger/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION.....	4
Purpose and use of the book.....	4
Judging the situation.....	9
General guidelines.....	12
Notes on the arguments.....	16
CHAPTER II - POLITICS.....	19
Ethnic Nationalism.....	19
Democracy.....	23
Freedom.....	28
Capitalism and libertarianism.....	32
Use of violence.....	36
Helping the third world.....	41
CHAPTER III - SOCIETY.....	46
Moral relativism.....	46
Feminism/natural gender roles.....	50
Religion in society.....	56
Homosexuality.....	62
Human rights.....	71
CHAPTER IV - RACE.....	75
Racial differences.....	75
Diversity.....	80
Jews.....	86
White genocide.....	93
White pride.....	97
CHAPTER V - MISCELLANEOUS.....	100
General attacks.....	100
Historical questions.....	107
Christianity vs paganism.....	114
Conspiracy theories.....	121
CONCLUSION.....	124
APPENDIX A - REWARDING THE OPPONENT.....	126
APPENDIX B - DEVELOPING NEW ARGUMENTS.....	129
APPENDIX C - TROUBLESHOOTING.....	135

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND USE OF THE BOOK

The striking paradox which becomes apparent when we're exposed to liberals and their discourse, is that on one hand they seem to always repeat the same simple nonsensical arguments and attacks, while on the other hand they have overwhelming success while debating nationalists and other enemies of Marxist thought. Why is it so hard for us to win debates against tape recorders stuck on "repeat"? Why can I turn on the television right now and see a liberal accusing a conservative of being "stuck in the 1950's", and be amazed that the conservative has no good answer to this tired cliché?

The very illogical nature of liberal "sound bites", like "check your white privilege", "you just hate women" or "religion is the cause of wars and oppression" is precisely their greatest strength. Why? Why doesn't the public realize that those arguments are flawed, and that those mouthing them are dishonest? Why don't people respond positively when nationalists explain calmly that "I don't hate women, I just want what's best for everyone"? It seems like no matter how logical and straightforward our rebuttals are, they just can't get through to people, and we end up being demonized by the liberals.

Well, the answer to that question is actually quite simple. When people within the same group debate a point, they are playing for the same team, and genuinely want to learn the truth, because they will all benefit from having correct knowledge. But debates between opposing groups of people like liberals and nationalists are not about logic, or finding out the truth. They are struggles for dominance. They are shows of force. The two parties don't want the same thing, they're not playing for the same team. So the public wants to know which team to join. They don't care which team has the best arguments, they want to be on the side of the winners. In such a verbal struggle, strength is truth.

So to know how to win such a debate, we have to differentiate between dominant behavior and submissive behavior. This is because the outward sign of strength, the clue we can look for when trying to determine who has the better position and who is the most confident in victory, is to determine which person dominates the other. If the public perceives the liberal as “dominant”, they will inwardly think that he must have the most legitimate position, regardless of whether his arguments make sense or not. Once we understand what is dominant behavior and what is submissive behavior, we have to maximize the former and eradicate the latter.

The essence of dominance is to impose our will on others. How this is done, in the absolute simplest way describable, is to reward others when they do what we like, and punish them when they do things we don’t like. The king is dominant because he can shower his friends in gold and put the heads of his enemies on spikes.

Then how does submission differ from that? The submissive man cannot punish people for doing things he doesn’t like, because he doesn’t have the power or the courage to do so. He can only reward others in the hope that he will be liked and accepted. But he will not be respected, because others understand they risk no punishment for trampling on his expectations. The submissive man rewards people when they do things he doesn’t like, in the hope that they will feel bad for him and stop.

In conversation, where there is no gold, no spikes and no violence in general, the rewards and punishments take the form of words and facial expressions.

Everything that comes out of your mouth is either positive (rewarding the person you’re talking to, making them feel good) or negative (punishing the person you’re talking to, making them feel bad). There is no exception to this. There is no neutral statement, or at least, no statement will be received neutrally by the listener.

What are some of the ways in which you can reward people with positivity? By giving them attention, by sharing your expe-

riences, by expressing your acceptance of their person or their opinions, by praising them, by teaching them things, by apologizing for any wrong you might have committed. Even just agreeing with someone can make them feel good. When you feel the need to explain yourself, or justify your actions and opinions, that is an attempt to make the other more comfortable, and is thus rewarding too.

Then, what type of things would be negative? Disagreeing or just rejecting a person and/or his opinions. Scolding him for bad behavior. Ignoring him, or ignoring statements he has made. Associating him with unpleasant people or things. Using social pressure by implying his actions or opinions are unpopular and widely disliked. Mis-characterizing what he is saying to distort his views, or plain old ridicule and sarcasm.

Knowing this simple breakdown, let us ask: what do people do when they are attacked by liberals as being “racist” or “misogynists”? They start justifying their position and explaining why they’re not this or that. That is submissive behavior. They are attacked, and instead of punishing this lack of respect, they submit and try to be accepted by the enemy. Anyone can instinctively understand this as being a sign of weakness. You might think, “well, we want to be accepted by the public, so we can’t just ignore when we’re characterized negatively!”. This is the problem mindset - it presupposes that the public is on the liberal’s side, that you’re a weak minority viewpoint trying to win the majority over. With that mindset, you’ve lost the debate before it’s even started, because the public will pick up on your attitude, and will understand just that: that you’re a small, fringe viewpoint, they want nothing to do with fringe viewpoints. Have a different attitude: the cultural Marxists are a small but vocal minority who promote strange and hostile theories, while you’re on the side of the public. Always assume that most people listening are on your side.

Thus, the basic strategy in verbal struggles against our enemies is quite elementary: punish the liberal when he attacks you or makes absurd statements, reward him when he admits to agreeing with your points, and continuously reward the audience to enforce the idea that they’re on your side.

This, like most things of value, is easier said than done. Men of virtue who value truth and honor will instinctively gravitate towards arguments that are rational, objective and relevant. They will shirk things like personal attacks or mis-characterisation of the opponent's points, thinking these things dishonorable in a civil discussion. But that is precisely the point to get in our collective heads - this is not a civil discussion. This is war. At this point in time, the war must be waged with words, but those words may in time turn into lives saved or lost. It is our duty to win at all costs. Liberals understand this, and are neither rational nor honorable, they only seek to remove our ideas from public discourse. It's time to turn the tables on them, and after 100 years of dominance, they sure don't expect it.

The meat of this book is a catalog of liberal arguments - or "sound bites" - and examples of effective rebuttals. But the rebuttals have been carefully crafted, not to be logically bullet proof, but to place you in a more dominant position. The point is to punish their impertinence, not convince them of the error of their ways. Thus rebuttals will involve ridicule, scolding the liberal for the character flaws he is showing, showing how the liberal is the enemy of the public (peer pressure), pointing out how their ideas are fringe theories normal people don't subscribe to, and so on. And as much as possible, the rebuttals avoid complex explanations, use of statistics and studies, obscure examples the public is not familiar with, and of course apologies and justifications.

If you have a lot of experience debating and discussing these topics with hostile liberals, then this books will provide a rich array of examples you can use to adopt the right attitude and frame of mind in you future discussions. You may also add numerous new arguments and comebacks to your rhetorical arsenal. For those of you who do not have that kind of experience, you should study all the arguments carefully and even memorize them. This will give you confidence that you can deal with any situation decisively, and will motivate you to start talking to people without worrying that they will shower you with platitudes like "what do you care what people do in their private lives?". Knowing you can rebut most liberal platitudes instantly and with an impressive

show of strength and confidence will unknot your tongue in public.

The next sections of the introduction chapter will continue discussing principles and guidelines to effectively counter liberal arguments, and then each following chapter will hold common arguments related to general themes: Politics, Society, Race and Miscellaneous.

JUDGING THE SITUATION

I've said previously in very clear terms that we are not involved in civil discussion, but in war. The most basic necessity in any war is to differentiate between friend and foe. This bears explaining further, because while our opinion remains the same when arguing with allies or enemies, our tactics will be radically different.

First, you need to be able to classify people according to a few criteria: are they immune to reason, or amenable to being convinced by logic and facts? Do they **hate** whites, men or Christians, or are they just confused by the propaganda around them? Do they respect you and trust what you say, or do they reject all facts that you might bring up? And finally, do they have a crucial stake in the issue against us (being Jews, working in the mass media, having a non-white spouse, etc).

Depending on their attitude and situation, you will use two tactics: punish or educate. Educating someone is simple. Simply present them with facts, statistics and logical argument until they understand your point. If you're not knowledgeable enough or eloquent enough to do this confidently, just present links to good websites or books and encourage them to read up. Better yet, watch informative documentaries together and discuss the contents afterward. This is simple. But of course, none of this can be used when talking to enemies, because they are **hostile**. It's not that they don't understand - they **DO** understand, yet they still disagree. In that case, rather than education, what they require is punishment for their hostile attitudes.

So how do you know which tactic to use? There are several criteria to consider. First, what is the person's attitude? If they have an aggressive and confrontational attitude, and if they don't respect you, then there is no point in trying to educate them. You must punish them. Second, consider if the person is open to reason. Do they reflect when you argue, or just repeat things without thinking? If they do not respond to facts and logic, then you must use the punishing tactic. Finally, determine if the person is a potential ally or not. If the person is a Jew, or is married to a

non-white, or is a dedicated cultural Marxist scholar, they will not join our movement because it would mean too much personal loss. There is no point wasting our time on these people.

Only provide your valuable educational effort to people who will respond to it and appreciate it. For other people, you should simply ignore them unless there is the potential to convince those watching and establish your authority within the group. Debating a group of die-hard bull-dykes with no one watching serves no purpose, except perhaps practice.

All rebuttals to liberal arguments in this book are compatible with the “punish” tactic. Many are not appropriate when having a civil discussion with people who respect you and just want to learn the truth. A friendly, open attitude should always be met with reciprocal friendliness and warmth - don’t be rude to the people you’re trying to recruit to our side, of course. But even friends, if they get out of line, need to be corrected firmly. If they don’t respect you, they won’t be your friend for long anyway.

You will notice that the general tone of the replies and tactics in this book is negative. If you adopt these lines and argue with the suggested attitude, the liberal will not feel good at all about the conversation - and liberals in the audience who identify with liberalism will also be made uncomfortable. This is normal. It is always necessary to inflict some small pain to earn respect and establish dominance (or at the very least, the people must understand that you *could* inflict it if they get out of line).

If you have *any* experience with social interactions, though, you will be wondering at this point: “why would people deal with this guy’s negative attitude and his hurtful rebuttals?”. Yes, why indeed? Only you can answer that question. Why does the child accept the parent’s punishment? Because the parents provide the child with food, clothes, shelter and most importantly, love and affection. Why does a guy put up with his girlfriend’s nagging? Because he loves her and doesn’t want to sacrifice their relationship. Do you give people a reason to put up with you? Are you providing for their needs? Are you fun to be around? Are you organizing their social life? Are you helping them out when they need it? If you’re all pain and no pleasure, then no one will listen

to you regardless of what your opinion might be.

In other words, you have to attract people with positive things while you beat the liberalism out of them. How do you attract people? Impress them with your strength of character and virtue. Attract them with your leadership. Earn their thanks by giving them your assistance when they need it. Just be a fun, pleasant person in general. It's not something you can learn in a book, obviously, so it's just a reminder to be a human being, not just an activist.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

The liberal can make three types of arguments: he can make complex points supported by studies, statistics and historical examples, he can repeat platitudes such as those found in this book, and he can attack you and your position. The weakness of the liberal is that it is nearly impossible for him to make simple, coherent and easy to understand points. The reason that the liberals cannot argue simple point is that all their ideas, when expressed in simple terms, are obviously false or destructive. This is why liberals loathe people like us who speak plainly.

How do we respond to their sophisticated arguments, their studies and statistics? Do we rebut it point by point? Do we counter their numbers with better numbers? Do we point out that their sources are biased? Do we go into a tirade about liberal professors? No. We just reject their whole argument dismissively (“No, that’s wrong”) and then make our own simple point instead. It is truly unfortunate that liberals rarely make these sophisticated arguments by themselves. They have learned to avoid it because they usually lose in a straight debate. Our job is to trick them into doing it. Because when the audience see one person making a complex point relying on numbers, and another making a simple point relying on common sense, the winner is obvious. By sticking to simple concepts and hammering them with confidence and common sense illustrations, we project strength, while the liberal seems like an academic disconnected from reality. Conversely, by dealing with their argument in detail, we get sucked into their own frame of reference, where we will lose the debate.

Then, how do we deal with their default mode of argumentation, unloading their arsenal of cliches and platitudes? That is the purpose of this book. You are to study the comebacks in this book carefully until you have a reflexive reply to all the most common cliches you’re used to. I have collected over 250 of the most common things liberals say to avoid having to defend their points. If you account for the minor variations (very minor - reading this book should make you dizzy with *déjà-vue*), the majority of what you can expect to hear out of a liberal is in this

book. But of course, life is full of the unexpected, so pay attention to the principles spread all over the book so you can formulate answers to the odd cliché on the fly.

The final liberal technique, one that is impossible to avoid, is the low flying attack (“That kind of thinking killed 6 million Jews” or “if you’re so worked up about gays, you must be uncomfortable with your own sexuality”). The liberal expects you to either become angry or flustered after this, and move to the defensive. You must always respond to attacks by moving on the offensive and diffusing their own attacks this way. You will see many examples of this spread throughout the book. In the chapter on “general attacks”, there are also a few simple ways of diffusing attacks instantly and without effort, that you can use occasionally if you want to get back to your point quickly.

But that is the liberal’s game plan. What is our game plan? We stick to simple points. You should be able to articulate your position on all common topics in one or two short paragraphs. I’ve included brief examples of this at the beginning of each section to illustrate and inspire you. Your points should be articulated without the need for citing studies, statistics or historical facts, unless they are common knowledge. You must be particularly careful to avoid thinking that people know about the things we as nationalists know. It’s easy to forget that most people are not aware at all that Sweden is being invaded by Muslim hordes or that Jewish commissars instigated genocides against the Poles and the Ukrainians. Remain conscious of the state of mainstream culture, and if you have a doubt - err on the side of caution and assume people are ignorant.

Once you’ve stated your position succinctly (and hopefully, with confidence), normally the liberal will start unraveling his clichés at you and you can rebut them firmly. What if the liberal runs out of clichés, and you want to continue on the topic for a while (maybe because the audience is responding well)? Just start trotting out the clichés yourself! “Liberals say that... XYZ” and then rebut them. This should make the liberal panic (because he is losing all control of the conversation) and he will want to change the subject. Allow him to do so if you like, and ask him questions to help him make his position clear. Then explain your

own position. The cycle goes on.

Favor arguments that can only be addressed by relying on statistics and complex reasoning. "Blacks aren't doing well, because they're not as smart as whites". Everyone knows by experience that blacks aren't as smart as whites. Thus the only way to address this is to start talking about nature vs nurture, constructivism, childhood stimulation and stuff like that. The liberal will do everything he can to avoid having to take this route of course. He will call you a racist. He will whip out cliches like "we're all born equal" and "check your white privilege". But by diffusing his attacks, staying on point and pressuring him, he will have to start making the complex arguments that academics rely on in the comfort of the crystal towers when they talk to each other. That's when you win. Just listen to his rambling, and then say "no, you're wrong, that's non-sense, life doesn't work that way" and reaffirm your position in full confidence. You can then change the subject and the audience will remember you as the clear winner.

During this process, the opponent may pull some ridiculous statistics or facts out of his hat to bolster his position ("70% of women were sexually harassed last year" or "Blacks earn less money for doing the same work as whites"). Just reject them without hesitation, ideally with ridicule ("Yeah, and 95.3% of Asian college professors get abducted by aliens"). Because you don't use statistics and obscure facts yourself, you run no risk of having this tactic used against you.

What attitude should we strive for when talking about these things? Should we be aggressive, angry, emotional? Should we remain calm and rational? The main point is to show no doubt or confusion. Always be 100% confident in everything you say. Never use indecisive language "I think that..." or "it's my opinion that...") or qualify your statements ("I'm not racist, but..." or "I know it's not popular to say this, but..."). Be positive and firm. The liberal will panic seeing this, and may attack you ("you're dogmatic" or "it's like you're in a cult"). Use these attacks to underscore the contrast between you and him - that you take responsibility for your statements, while he's afraid to commit to his own half baked positions. As for your emotional state, the an-

swer is very simple: don't fake it. If you feel angry because the subject is troubling (white genocide, the crimes of the Jews), then it's okay to let it show - but never fake it. These subjects, if you're a red blooded man, should subject you to different emotions, from disgust, to inspiration, to anger, to laughter. Don't hide how you feel, just let it show in your voice. Be genuine. But don't fake emotions. Hiding emotions and faking emotions are two things that will completely discredit you to a prospective audience. Liars fake emotions, so everyone is creeped-out by that. I can't stress this enough - go back and read this whole paragraph a second time if you need to.

And don't forget the main point of all this: we're not arguing just to defeat the liberal, because he will probably never join our side, we're arguing to influence the audience. Thus you must make sure the audience feels on your side. Praise the audience for their achievement, their hard work, their qualities. Defend the audience against the accusations of the liberal. Show the audience how the liberal is against them. Don't argue from the point of view of the ideology ("we fascists want this..." or "we nationalists think that...") but from the point of your people ("we white Americans think that..." or "we ethnic Frenchmen want that...") so that the audience can feel included in your group even if they don't accept your ideology. Make sure that your victory in the debate is the audience's victory.

NOTES ON THE ARGUMENTS

Before moving on to the arguments, some quick notes:

Many of the arguments here are nonsensical, and I hesitated to include them because of this. “No one would be dishonest enough to say this” I briefly thought. But then I realized that the more nonsensical an argument is, the more likely it is to make us hesitate. Liberals have no shame and will not hesitate to use these twisted bits of verbiage if their minds can think of them.

Some of the arguments are similar to each other in spirit, but are worded differently. I included them all because sometimes a rebuttal is more effective if it incorporates the same words as the statement it is refuting.

The arguments are classified in a logical way according to topic. But make no mistake, a liberal can and will use pretty much any of these platitudes regardless of the subject at hand, often in an effort to get you to change the subject. If you don’t want to change the subject, just scold him (“hey, you’re bouncing around like a monkey on crack here, stay on topic”), or you can give the default rebuttal and just come back to your original point. If you prefer to change the topic, just enounce your position after you’ve made your comeback.

Inversely, you can mix and match the rebuttals at your leisure depending on the liberal’s arguments. Many of these can be adapted to serve many different purposes.

Some of the rebuttals include likely replies from the liberal. Of course, we can’t know what they’ll say, but sometimes we make an argument to lead on our opponents to respond in some specific way. Then we smash them. If the liberal doesn’t fall for the bait, just move on as normal.

Some of the arguments have several different rebuttals. They might not all be equally appropriate or effective depending on the setting and the opponent. Choose the one which will be most effective according to your judgment.

The rebuttals are given in a generic form. You should personalize them to fit your speaking style, and of course translate them into your language if you'll be debating in a language other than English. This needs to be done **in advance**, not on the fly, because this can cause you to hesitate, or search for words when there is no cultural or linguistic equivalent to the default form in the book.

Many of the rebuttals have multiple parts. The most common form is to first state our own position, and then attack their ideas as being destructive or weak. Do not let your shyness prevail and omit the second part, thinking it "in poor taste". If you omit something, omit the explanation and keep the attack! Remember, this is a struggle for dominance. The purpose of your statements is to establish you as the stronger person, as an avatar of the stronger movement. When we make arguments, it is only to appear as though we are arguing. The point of our speech is not logic, but rather an expression of our strength and resolve.

Accordingly, do not worry if the points are illogical, or fear that the liberal will raise objections. His objections are opportunities to show your determination! In fact, the less logical the points are, the more effective they will be at pressuring your opponent. All that matters is that the points seem relevant, or at least related, from the audience's perspective. Remember, this is a live debate. None of this will be written down for future generations. All that people will remember is the feeling of your dominance, not the details of what you said.

The rebuttals usually attack a general enemy ("liberals are XYZ") rather than the opponent directly ("you're a XYZ!"). There are two reasons for this: this stigmatizes the opponent's ideas, rather than stigmatizing him - so he can escape blame by rejecting those ideas. This makes him look submissive and moves the conversation in your direction. Second, it prevents the liberal from complaining effectively about you being "vicious" and about "personal attacks" being directed against him. If the opponent is openly hostile and there is no hope of his backing down, you can start to attack him personally once you've established that he is hostile to the public and they will sympathize.

A note on pronunciation: while you should not try to affect a manner of speaking that isn't natural, as it will lower your credibility, you must speak with emotion to be credible also. The rebuttals make liberal use of quotes and bold text. These change the meaning of the text, and are an important guide to intonation while speaking them out loud. Bold text should be said louder, and be followed by a short pause for emphasis. Quotes should be said with a sarcastic tone, or with a very different accent than you normally use, to show the public you disapprove of the words being said, to make the word sound strange and foreign.

CHAPTER II - POLITICS

ETHNIC NATIONALISM

The different races and ethnic groups are like great families. Families stick together and work to ensure their survival and welfare. Thus it is only natural that these groups have vied for control of the resources and territory they need to prosper. It has always been this way, and will always be this way. No family will sacrifice it's children so that the children of the next family will prosper instead. That is human nature, and it would be futile and immoral to try to change it.

From this we understand that wherever two ethnic groups co-exist in the same space, there will eventually be a struggle for the limited resources within that space. The only way to ensure that there is no ethnic conflict is to separate the groups into their own territory. Conversely, one sure-fire way to instigate ethnic conflict is to force disparate groups into the same geographical space or political jurisdiction.

This is why the only viable political system is ethnic nationalism. For a country to function smoothly, it must be united into a single family of people, not a rag tag gang of ethnic groups who distrust each other and compete for favors from the government. It is fundamentally immoral for a government controlled by one ethnic group to govern a different competing ethnic group.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: A nation can be based on ideals rather than ethnicity. Then as long as everyone agrees on the ideals, everything will be fine.

Rebuttal: People will not betray their blood or their family based on abstract ideals. Vague "ideals" have no power to break ethnic loyalties that divide **any** multicultural society. We're supposed to have a society based on ideals **today**. And anyone with half a brain can see that it's not working - only the whites seem

to be even trying, while all the other groups are knee deep in ethnic politics. You want us to continue this obsessive fixation with the “proposition nation” until **everything** is taken away from us?

~

Argument: A nation is based on language and culture. Once immigrants are integrated, they are part of our nation too.

Rebuttal: We are not “blank slates” that can be molded to fit any role as we grow up. You think humans are slabs of clay that will take any shape you want? Life doesn’t work that way. Culture is an expression of the innate nature of a people, and that’s not something you can learn if your genetics are not compatible. It’s possible to pretend, for a while, but true integration will never happen. The ghettos will grow and we will face **open conflict** because of your naive idealism.

~

Argument: A multi-ethnic state is less likely to go to war with it’s neighbor, because there’s less ethnic chauvinism.

Rebuttal: Indeed, it’s hard to wage war against your neighbors when there’s a perpetual war going on inside your own nation.

~

Argument: The whole world is becoming multi-ethnic. It’s the future, get used to it.

Rebuttal: The world is not becoming multi-ethnic. **White countries** are becoming multi-ethnic, and nowhere but white countries. And the average white person is intelligent enough to know that they are being displaced by these immigrants. Only degenerate weaklings would embrace that and “get used to it”.

~

Argument: It’s impossible to separate people now, the damage is already done.

Rebuttal: It's impossible to do a lot of things if, like you, we must insure above all else that no one's feelings will get hurt. In fact, separating people would be quite easy with support from the military and the police - it could be done almost overnight. If we feel so inclined, we could also provide ample compensation to those we move to different areas - we have the resources. Let's not invent obstacles just because we don't have the fortitude to implement the solution.

~

Argument: How will we decide who's white? Genetic tests? Measuring the color of the skin?

Rebuttal: It's funny, no one seems to have a hard time deciding who's white when it's time to discriminate against us in affirmative action programs or when blaming "evil white men" for all the world's problems. The difficulty only arises when people like you are offended that white people might stand up for ourselves and protect our interest. Only those who hate white people would bring up such a non-issue.

~

Argument: There's no such thing as a pure race anymore, we're all mixed, so it's impossible to have a homogeneous nation.

Rebuttal: Normal, well adjusted people can easily recognize others of their own race, and they will naturally gather together. Just like oil and water which naturally separate when left alone, we will naturally separate into homogeneous groups without need of any kind of sorting. The only thing preventing this normal and healthy process is the policy of forced integration imposed on us by liberal social reformers - to disastrous effect.

~

Argument: Basing a state on ethnicity is so primitive and tribal.

Rebuttal: There is a rebellion going on now. A rebellion of a few radical leftists against nature itself; they reject their genes, they reject their animal natures and they even reject their biolog-

ical drive to survive and reproduce. They **hate** nature, and would rather live in a world of abstract ideals where such gross things as physical bodies don't interfere with their high-minded philosophies. But here in real life, our biological nature is at the core of who we are as individuals and as people. This is the strongest and most stable foundation for any association of people.

Note: This is a aggressive reply, made less violent by the use of the third person, in response to a direct insult against the idea of ethnic nationalism. Do not attack the liberal directly ("you are in a rebellion against nature") because it wouldn't stick as well.

~

Argument: Nationalism is just a tool to control the people.

Rebuttal: Nationalism isn't a tool, or an ideology - it's a **biological drive** of people to bond with those of common blood and cooperate in the struggle for survival. It's just a convenient name for the same instinct a mother has to protect her children, and for men to fight to protect their family. It's the source of courage men need to topple tyrants and resist invaders. It's the emotion driving noble acts of charity. No shallow plot can control those in whose heart burns the flame of blood and soil.

~

Argument: We have more in common with people of our own class in other countries than with the bourgeoisie of our own nation, so we should unite with the international proletariat.

Rebuttal: (*Sarcastically*) Well done, Karl Marx would be proud. I'll introduce you to a middle class Somalian on of these days, who speaks a language you don't understand, eats caterpillars as part of his diet, and has his daughter's genitalia mutilated when she reaches puberty. We'll see how much you have in common.

DEMOCRACY

The quality of any government depends entirely on the human quality of its decision makers and their ability to implement their policies. Thus we can judge any political system based on how effective it is at getting the best people to the top and preventing the worst people from being in positions of power and influence. By this criteria we can confidently say that democracy is the worst political system there ever was, and could ever be.

By being based on popularity, rather than quality or merit, it will always favor the clever liars and schemers, the cynical actors and the sociopathic social climbers. By having short term limits, it insures that no politician ever has to deal with the long term consequences of their policies. Inversely, the honest men, the honorable men, will have less success at getting elected because they will say unpleasant truths and refrain from making impossible promises.

The ones attracted to public office in a democracy are those who see it as a way to make dishonest profits through corruption, with little or no risk of being held accountable. Those who are not corrupt gain little benefit from their office, and thus are less likely to bother with the whole process.

Additionally, in any election with more than a few thousand electors, the people must rely on the media to form their opinion of the candidates because they cannot know them personally. Thus the winner of the election, to a overwhelming extent, will depend on the portrayal they receive from the media. But the media executives are not themselves elected or accountable to the people for their decisions. This makes democracy, beyond in small towns where everyone knows each other, effectively a plutocracy by the media bosses.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Without democracy, there is no way to remove tyrants.

Rebuttal: Democracy itself is a permanent tyranny of corrupt oligarchs and media bosses. Democracy is a system in which the amoral liars compete in popularity contests and get to escape all consequences for their disastrous decisions. And all for what? So that the few of us still in denial can bask in the illusion of control for a few minutes once every few years?

Rebuttal: A “system” will never remove a tyrant, only brave and honorable men can do that. Democracy is the system which **allows** clever liars get the edge over those brave and honorable men.

~

Argument: Democracy may not be great, but it’s the best system we’ve found until now.

Rebuttal: The 20th century, the “democratic century”, has seen the bloodiest wars, the most devastating famines and the appearance of the most atrocious weapons of mass destruction. It has also seen our European people go from being the undisputed masters of the world to being in danger of extinction. According to **my** values, that justifies calling democracy the **worst** system we’ve found until now. But apparently we judge things according to **different** criteria.

~

Argument: Democracy is important because we’re all equal, we all need to have equal say.

Rebuttal: People are equal? How so? Some people are strong, some are weak, some run fast, some don’t even have legs, some people are healthy, some are in a vegetative coma, some have PhD’s in electric engineering and design power stations, while some are too stupid to learn to read and write, some people are generous and kind, while others are serial killers and corrupt financial executives. People are only equal in a liberal’s fantasies.

~

Argument: You want a totalitarian state, huh? That’s scary.

Rebuttal: Those who compromise when confronted with evil are weak and cowardly. There's no salvation in half measures.

Rebuttal: We don't need leaders who lack the spine to take real decisions and try to please everybody. I'd rather we make mistakes along the way, but at least **try** to move forward instead of slipping back into the slime because of our indecision.

~

Argument: Yeah, megalomaniacs like you don't want democracy, you want to impose your own views on everyone else.

Rebuttal: Oh, on the contrary, megalomaniacs are like fish in water in democracy. Democracy gives a microphone to every delusional messiah who wants to reform humanity and gives him a chance to run for office!

Rebuttal: It's funny how liberals insist any nation which isn't "democratic" needs to be bombed and properly "reformed". It's funny how everyone who disagrees with their radical views are "backward" and "uneducated". And yet it's the rest of us who are trying to "impose our views" on them.

~

Argument: Kings and emperors brutally oppressed their people. Democracy prevents leaders from using violence on their people.

Rebuttal: Try not paying your taxes and see how long it takes before armed agents bust down your door in the middle of the night.

Reply: Well, that's normal, you need to pay your taxes.

Rebuttal: So you need to pay federal taxes, state taxes, city taxes, sales taxes, road tolls, administration fees, corporate taxes, inheritance taxes... And if you don't give most of your wealth and labor away to the government, you'll get your accounts frozen, your assets seized and you'll get locked up. And that's not oppression according to you.

Reply: We all need to do our part.

Rebuttal: So really, you don't care that the government uses violence, as long as you approve of it's policies. I agree with that. What I wonder about is, why did your "oppressive" kings and emperors tax their subjects to only a small fraction of what we're paying now? Could it be that we're being worked like slaves for the benefit of everyone else but ourselves?

~

Argument: We just need a free press, then we can choose the genuine good candidates.

Rebuttal: We wouldn't need a free press, we would need a good and moral press. If we just have a free press, it'll just seek profit and serve special interests. How would you prevent that in a democracy? Would you elect the media bosses? Haha, that's ridiculous.

~

Argument: Even if people are not equal, they can still vote for their best interest. So the government will serve the interests of the people.

Rebuttal: People will just vote for the candidate who mouths the most appealing lies. There are absolutely no consequences for a politician to promise the moon and deliver nothing. Why would politicians serve the interests of the people when they can make greater profits reaping bribes from lobbyists?

~

Argument: If we don't have democracy, we'll plunge into fascism.

Rebuttal: People aren't frightened of your boogie-men anymore. We're ready to part with the failed experiments of the past and do what works instead. Liberals have used scare tactics for so long now, that nobody flinches when we hear tired old cliches like "you're an evil fascist". It's time to start addressing the issues instead of succumbing to mindless panic.

~

Argument: We fought hard for the right to vote, and you want to throw that away?

Rebuttal: This “voting” business creates the dangerous idea that there is no longer need for struggle - we can just check the right box on the ballot and watch as good prevails over evil! That is a pernicious illusion. We fought hard in the past, and we need to continue this perpetual struggle for the survival and progress of our people NOW. Voting won’t get us there. And relying on it only makes us soft.

~

Argument: Democracy is the future, we’re not going to go back to these outdated form of government - come on!

Rebuttal: There is no mere “system” that can guarantee us a “future”. Our future lies in the strength of the virtuous and the bold. Our future lies in rekindling the fire that burns in our soul and making the sacrifices that are required to face the present. Neither “democracy”, nor “monarchy” or any other **system** will insure our future if we remain mere **spectators** and let the corrupt make our decisions for us.

~

Argument: Look around you... We’re very comfortable here, we’re lucky. In all those dictatorships in the third world, there’s violence, poverty, the streets are dirty, etc.

Rebuttal: Public order and the rule of law are hallmarks of **European** society everywhere and since the beginning of history. We had clean streets, low crime and charity for the poor and the sick thousands of years before democracy, and those things will remain as long as democracy has not managed to destroy our people. Changing the system in which people live does not change their nature.

FREEDOM

Freedom, in general terms is the ability to do what we want without restriction. But the freedom that is desirable is the freedom to do what is **right**. If you're walking near a cliff, you don't complain that there is a fence to keep you from falling, you only complain when there is a fence preventing you from going where you need to be. Thus freedom without moral guidance, or virtue, is not desirable to anyone. We understand this instinctively, as we put many limitations on the freedom of our children to protect them against the consequences of their ignorance and lack of discipline. We remove these limitations as the children show that they are becoming wiser and more responsible.

Our forefathers fought to live free of inappropriate meddling, and this was good and proper. But our forefathers were also uniquely virtuous and moral people, who restrained themselves without need of government intervention. Today, we live in a world where all moral standards and spiritual ideals are being abandoned as fast as possible. In this kind of world, freedom is really a synonym with freedom to do anything we want, and freedom from the negative consequences that result from our behavior. This kind of freedom is folly. When freedom is not informed by virtue, it becomes chaos.

In all things, there is one ideal way forward, the most direct and efficient, and an infinity of lesser paths. Some of these paths lead to the same place, but take longer. Some of these paths may be dangerous, while others will never reach the destination. The more bad paths we eliminate, the easier it becomes to follow the ideal path and reach our destination. We must restrain total freedom and preserve mainly the freedom to do good, if we are to live in a progressive and orderly society.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Preventing people from doing what they want is oppression.

Rebuttal: I have no problem with preventing someone from

engaging in destructive behavior. Public order is more important than satisfying the childish desires of minorities.

Rebuttal: A true leader is willing to guide people towards the right path. People afraid of responsibility and commitment, on the other hand, much prefer to let people do whatever they want and wash their hands of all responsibility.

Rebuttal: What world are you living in? You can barely take a leak without getting a stack of permits and jumping through bureaucratic hoops these days. This is what you call freedom? I want a world with fewer rules, simpler rules, but good rules. But in our “free world”, nobody accepts responsibility for anything, especially not the bureaucrats and politicians, and that’s why we need endless bureaucracy for everything.

~

Argument: And who decides what we can do or not? The king? The fuehrer? You?

Rebuttal: I think anyone who has the backbone to accept **responsibility** for his decisions would decide INFINITELY better than all the cowards who make our laws and then are completely unaccountable when the disastrous results come home to roost.

~

Argument: So you’re basically in favor of a totalitarian state where the government controls everything.

Rebuttal: The government **already** controls everything. That’s the result when we abandon moral guidance and rely on codes and bureaucrats to replace virtue. I’m sick of this stuffy bureaucracy where no one takes any chances and we can’t move a finger lest we violate some obscure “code”. We can reclaim **true** freedom once we put **responsibility** back into the equation.

Argument: Not everyone wants the same thing. Some people have different values and ideals, they should be allowed to pursue

them too.

Rebuttal: Our people have operated on essentially the same principles for thousands of years. These “different values and ideals” you’re referring to, they’ve popped up when the liberals opened our borders to people foreign to our culture. And it’s because of this dangerous experiment in “diversity” that we’re losing our **real** freedom, the freedom to express our own unique character without conflicting with hostile aliens.

Argument: Everyone is selfish, so any restriction of freedom is always to benefit someone at the expense of someone else.

Rebuttal: No, that’s wrong - some people are smarter, some people are stronger, and some people are nobler than others. We need to select the noblest people and allow them to restrict the excesses of the most selfish people. When you assume that everyone is selfish, the only alternative is to create a huge soul-less bureaucracy to regulate every aspect of our lives.

Rebuttal: No, that’s wrong - we restrict our children’s freedom because we love them and want what’s best for them, not because of selfish reasons. When a leader loves his people, he can do the same for them, and we all benefit from it.

~

Argument: Restrictions are always for the poor and vulnerable - powerful people set themselves above rules and do whatever they want.

Rebuttal: That’s the way things work under “liberal democracy” - when you’re wealthy enough to hire the right lawyer, the endless laws and regulations can be worked around or even ignored. We need to scrap this corrupt system and return to the **rule of law**, which existed in ALL European nations before it was undermined by greedy lawyers.

~

Argument: Virtue is an antiquated notion. Everyone is sinful

in their own way.

Rebuttal: Perfection is not of this world, yes, but when you lose the light of virtue to find your way, the darkness becomes thick indeed.

Rebuttal: Yeah, we've heard it all before, one guy reads romance novels, another digs up corpses - it's all the same, right? Nobody sane believes that. We all know instinctively that some acts are unspeakably filthy and obscene, while others are noble and admirable.

~

Argument: What matters is that people are happy. We have to be free to seek our own happiness.

Rebuttal: That's the difference between you and me. You'd see a blind man walking up to a cliff and you'd just watch and say "at least he's doing what he wants". I would stop him before he fell off.

Reply: Adults aren't blind, they can make decisions for themselves, they don't need you to tell them what to do.

Rebuttal: When I see someone engaging in destructive and dysfunctional behavior, I consider it my **duty** to stop him/her. Yeah, maybe I could be wrong, but I can **accept** the responsibility for my mistake. You're just not brave enough to act on your own values and understanding, you're afraid of being responsible for anything.

~

Argument: Freedom is part of the American way/french culture/etc, you can't change that.

Rebuttal: Our nation has already been distorted into a unrecognizable place. Is freedom to destroy American culture (or other) part of the "American way"? Is freedom to undermine all that our ancestors worked for to provide us also part of "American culture"? Is doing nothing while our people are being displaced by foreigners also part of "American culture"?

CAPITALISM AND LIBERTARIANISM

The free market is a good way to allow the most competent and aggressive people to reach positions of economic prominence. The free market is essentially the law of the jungle, and rewards competence while punishing those who don't have what it takes to operate industries. But good and evil, in the market, is judged by the standard of money and material things. Those things are important, but pale in the grand scheme of things to things like moral quality, genetic fitness and social cohesion. Thus a society based entirely on the free market, like capitalism and libertarianism, can only lead to the destruction of our people in the long term.

Sometimes economic efficiency must be sacrificed for more important things. Paying the lowest price for shoes is less important than having shoes made in our own nation rather than in the third world. Being competitive with foreign markets is less important than maintaining the human dignity of our workers. Selling movie tickets is less important than promoting healthy social values. These distinctions will never be made by business men, who will in time always sacrifice everything for increased profits. Thus the financial elite must be restrained by a moral elite, which has a power of veto over all their enterprises.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: The free market is always more efficient than government. Thus we need to avoid government intervention if we want the greatest good for all.

Rebuttal: The free market is more efficient at doing the wrong thing, too. Maybe if we didn't spend 90% of our resources efficiently making warming toilet seats, electric toothbrushes and disposable plastic junk, we'd all be a lot wealthier in ways that actually matter.

~

Argument: That's communism.

Rebuttal: Communism is total control of all aspects of life by the state, to insure “equality”. And that’s where we’re headed. What we need isn’t **bureaucrats** telling everyone what they can or cannot do, what we need is **moral men** setting limits on what greedy businessmen can do in their quest for profit.

~

Argument: That’s socialism.

Rebuttal: If stopping greedy businessmen from sacrificing our dignity, our culture and the environment on the altar of material profit is “socialism”, then we need more of it as soon as possible. If you’re not willing to protect our people against the cold calculating enterprises of bankers and industrials, then what kind of “progress” do you stand for exactly?

~

Argument: Capitalism gave us all of our wealth! If we abandon it we’ll just go back to the dark ages.

Rebuttal: Our technology wasn’t created by a “system”, it was created by the genius of our people. We’ve always done what was needed to provide us with the things we want, regardless of whether we were under an emperor, a king, a president or a minister. That will not change. What must change is how amoral business elites are permitted to trample upon our people without being held accountable.

~

Argument: All other systems have failed

Rebuttal: That’s nonsense. Laissez-faire economics is a recent experiment - for the overwhelming majority of our history, our leaders have regulated what could be sold, have put up trade tariffs to protect local economies and have had an active hand in regulating the money of the nation. That system **works**, that’s what is historically proven. Our foolish experiment in capitalism has resulted in us transferring our industrial capacity to the third world and seeing our culture attacked by amoral media bosses. **That’s** what’s failed.



Argument: All coercive authority is bad. A political free market maintains balance between interests.

Rebuttal: We don't want a balance between the interests. We don't want "checks and balances" between greedy sociopaths and the rest of society - we want **our** interests to reign supreme. A free market is just the law of the jungle - rule of the strongest, cleverest, most amoral. That's not what's good for our people.



Argument: Government intervention doesn't give good results.

Rebuttal: Whether intervention gives good results or not depends on **who** is making that intervention. Of course, corrupt bureaucrats will not make things better by giving handouts to their cousins in law, or by making laws to protect the interests of lobbyists. If we find that government policies are having destructive effects on our lives, then it's time to change government!



Argument: Capitalists are very good at regulating themselves, examples xyz

Rebuttal: Corporations "regulating themselves" gave us Enron's scam and Monsanto's genetically modified foods. Corporations "regulating themselves" is wrecking our environment. Capitalists will pay lip service to social responsibility when they think it's profitable to do so.



Argument: The solution to the excesses of the free market is to privatize everything, like air and rivers, that way someone will be responsible for it.

Rebuttal: Yes, the solution to our problems is to transform the very air we breathe into marketable products controlled by soul-less corporations. Ever heard the tale of the goose who laid golden eggs? What we'll have then is the golden goose of our pre-

cious earth killed for a quick buck. No, our natural resources are our common patrimony, it belongs to us all. We just need to give **real** authority to virtuous men to watch over it.



Argument: As consumers we can decide what company we support or not with our purchasing power.

Rebuttal: Don't put the blame on the people for the terrible things some corporations do - individuals can't be expected to know all the facts and make calculated decisions about every little thing they buy. That's why we need responsible leaders. You just want a mass of individuals who are easy victims for large predatory corporations?

USE OF VIOLENCE

Nobody sane and well adjusted likes or wants violence, but to a person with spiritual values, comfort and safety aren't the highest possible good. There are things worth shedding blood over. There are greater evils than war and physical suffering. Violence is preferable to extinction. Violence is preferable to moral decay. Violence is preferable to injustice. When a virtuous man is confronted with evil, violence may not be his first recourse, but it will always be an open option.

Pacifism is a profoundly anti-spiritual tendency. Those who wish to avoid violence at all costs are primarily concerned with comfort and safety, rather than higher spiritual values.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Nothing ever gets solved by the use of violence.

Rebuttal: Every form of life on this planet thrives by committing some kind of violence on it's competition, and that includes humans. Even **trees** slowly try to hoard the sunlight to themselves by growing the tallest branches. Those who have no stomach for the struggle that is life are the ones to go first.

Rebuttal: Oh, and how do **you** propose to solve problems then? By making laws? You think laws would actually **do** anything if there weren't men with guns to enforce them? Violence or the threat of violence, physical or mental, is the only thing that's ever solved **anything**.

~

Argument: Violence is never justified.

Rebuttal: You don't think violence is justified when savages break into your home and threaten to hurt your loved ones? Violence is **always** justified when it is done to protect our people. This may be sound harsh. But who wants a leader who is too cowardly to act boldly in our interest when it is necessary?

~

Argument: Think of the people who will suffer! You're heartless.

Rebuttal: People are suffering **now**. There has always been suffering, and only the most delusional think they can prevent all human suffering. I want what is best in the long term for our people. There may be some sacrifice required, but it is **nothing** compared with what we **will** lose if we remain idle. Don't let fear paralyze you!

~

Argument: We can always solve conflicts with diplomacy.

Rebuttal: No, we can't. When two different people are competing for resources and power, diplomacy can't achieve anything. Ultimately, one side of the conflict must triumph and win over the resources being fought over.

Rebuttal: Diplomacy isn't a alternative to war or violence, it's just another method of war. Once the issue is decided, there will still be a winner and a loser, and the loser will suffer from the loss just the same. Just because the suffering is hidden or stretched over a longer period doesn't make it less real. Diplomacy won't save our people from pain or destruction, but it's a convenient way to postpone it enough so that only our children will have to deal with it.

~

Argument: Violence only ever happens because people don't understand each other.

Rebuttal: No, you're wrong. The lion and the gazelle understand each other perfectly well - they **both** know that the one who loses the chase will suffer starvation or death. Understanding has **nothing** to do with conflict. Conflict has everything to do with competing for survival and progress. The native Americans and the American pioneers understood each other as well. They both understood that only one or the other would inherit the land, and they fought with all they had to be the victor.



Argument: If there were no more wars, then everyone would be happier.

Rebuttal: In a world with limited resources, if **wars** don't kill people, then starvation or disease **will**. If we avoid conflict with others, conflict will eventually come to **us**, because people braver and bolder than us will prefer war to a slow decay. If we want to avoid being victims, we have to be brave and bold ourselves.



Argument: Wars are always fought for the benefit of the rich and greedy, at the expense of the common people.

Rebuttal: Wars are always fought for the benefit of those who control society, yes. That's why it's so important to remove the greedy parasites who have sunk their claws in our society through their control of finance and the mass media. Once **our people** have total control over their own destiny, we won't have to worry about the "rich and greedy" pushing needless wars on us.



Argument: Violent revolution never results in a good government.

Rebuttal: The normal and healthy response to being victimized by infiltrators and parasites is that of violently shaking them off. If an organism has lost its survival instinct to the point where it allows itself to be drained of its life without fighting back, it doesn't have long left in this world.

Rebuttal: The violence of hostile minorities trying to dominate the population can never result in good government, indeed. But I find it dishonest to use the word "revolution" to mean both the infection by a parasite and the immune reaction to get rid of the invader.

Rebuttal: "Good government" comes when the wisest of our people guide us responsibly and have the courage to make tough decisions when called for. We must achieve that at all costs.

Whether we can accomplish that ideal through peaceful, violent or even treacherous means is only a question of tactic.

~

Argument: When you use violence, it just start a cycle of retribution. Only forgiveness can stop the cycle of violence.

Rebuttal: Forgiveness is important when our people fight amongst each other, because needless division makes us weaker. But if we are at war with an **alien** people over power and resources, forgiveness is irrelevant because there is nothing to forgive. Then seeking conciliation is a grave mistake, and liable to do us terrible harm - because what we need is not a stop to the violence, but **victory**.

Rebuttal: All life is a cycle of violence. This is not because of vengeance, retribution or any other superficial emotion of the sort. It is because **all** life wants to survive and prosper. Violent competition for mastery of the resources and territory is something all forms of life on this earth are engaged in - **outside** the mind of delusional liberals that is. The day you stop struggling is the day you forfeit your right to exist.

~

Argument: We need to set aside our differences and work for peace.

Rebuttal: Our “differences” aren’t things that can be set aside like old clothes. Are we going to “set aside” our belief in justice? Are we going to “set aside” our belief in human dignity? Are we going to set aside our values and our ideals? Never. Who would want peace while abandoning all that makes us who we are? Some people don’t care about **anything** except to live their lives in comfort and safety. If they need to sacrifice the future of their children, **so be it**. If they need to sacrifice thousands of years of culture and history, then - who needs it? Anything, **anything**, to be able to continue watching their television shows and loading their credit cards with shiny new junk. I think our people are stronger than that.



Argument: We need to ban gun ownership because it leads to more violence.

Rebuttal: Violence is produced by criminals and violent people, **not** by guns or knives. A prevalence of fishing rods won't cause the fish population to suffer - only a prevalence of fishermen can. Weapons are tools, and they can be used for good or evil. **You** would strip good people of weapons without affecting the evil ones at all. That's madness.



Argument: Even if guns are allowed, there's no reason to allow assault rifles or other powerful weapons. Those are only used to hurt people, not hunt or shoot at the range.

Rebuttal: Yes, weapons are used to hurt people. That's the point of a weapon. If we want to defend ourselves against someone who has a sword, we better not arm ourselves with a butter knife. If the criminals have assault rifles or combat shotguns, then the brave citizens who will **fight them back** need comparable weaponry. Restrictions on gun ownership only affect peaceful, law abiding citizens, **not** criminals.



Argument: We need to just let the police protect us. We can't take the law into our own hands, or else there will be chaos.

Rebuttal: I hate to break your illusions, and this may come as a shock, so brace yourself. The police **can't** protect you. They will **never** be able to protect you. What can the police do to prevent you from getting killed by a house invader? What can the police do if a crazed maniac starts shooting people in a restaurant? They can only get there **after** he's shot dozens of people. The police will investigate, maybe catch the criminal and prevent him from acting again. But if **you're** attacked, no one will save you. Not the police, not superman, no-one but yourself. Or a brave citizen close by who's **armed**.

HELPING THE THIRD WORLD

Whites have a natural tendency to lend aid to those in need. This is a noble and virtuous endeavor, especially when it comes to those who are close to us. But there comes a point at which helping others can become a form of treason - helping the enemy in a war, for example. When helping people outside our group harms those inside the group, then our compassion is misplaced and becomes self-destructive. Moreover, sometimes, helping someone in the short term will harm them in the longer term. This is especially the case when protecting someone from the consequences of his poor decisions and behavior.

Thus, the general principle when it comes to aiding the third world, and other people outside the white race, is that it can be done if it is not at the expense of white interests, does not waste resources that could go to whites in need, and is not simply putting a bandage on non-white incompetence. Thus helping victims of hurricanes and earthquakes could be acceptable, but boating tons and tons of food, water and medicine to people who could make these things themselves with their land and resources is not acceptable.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: We have to help all those who suffer, that's the humane thing to do.

Rebuttal: No. Suffering is necessary for life. Suffering allows us to grow, to learn, to become stronger. If we protect a child against all suffering, he will grow up weak and ignorant about life. People suffering now may lead to greater good in the future, while stopping suffering may result in much greater suffering later due to unforeseen consequences. Our duty is not to stamp out all suffering from the world, which is obviously impossible, but to **do what is good for our people.**

~

Argument: We need to fight to eliminate poverty worldwide.

Rebuttal: What we call “wealth” is a reflection of the character of our people, of it’s qualities and strengths. We are wealthy not because of our resources, but because of our resourcefulness. If we judge other peoples by our standards, they will **always** fall short. Sending them our resources will not change that one bit.

~

Argument: We can’t hoard all the resources to ourselves, that’s selfish.

Rebuttal: Our wealth is a reflection of our genius at **transforming** resources. Africans take mud and pile it to form mud huts. We make the mud into bricks and build **cathedrals** and **skyscrapers**. It isn’t the **mud** that’s different. It’s **us**. **We**’ve invented ways to turn saltwater into drinking water. To grow carrots in the desert or in the arctic. To turn tides, rivers, winds, the sun or even rotting garbage into usable energy. And we’re sharing this knowledge with the entire world **openly** and **freely**. That’s the most precious gift we could ever have made to the world. And instead of being thanked for it, we’re being **shamed** into handing out our food and medicine.

~

Argument: It’s our fault they’re poor, so we have to help them now.

Rebuttal: Our fault? Tell me, how were these people before they encountered the white man? Were they a well organized, productive civilization where peace and prosperity flourished? Of course not. **Nothing** we’ve done could have “made them” poor. They were **always** poor, by our standards. Don’t try to guilt **us** for crimes our distant ancestors didn’t even **commit**. **Nobody’s** falling for it anymore.

~

Argument: It’s a problem with education. They don’t have access to the knowledge they need, we have to teach them.

Rebuttal: All the knowledge anyone could ever need is on the internet, and by God, they **know** how to use the internet, or I

wouldn't be receiving all these letters from Nigerian princes asking for my bank information. It's not that they don't have access to our knowledge, it's that they can't understand it, can't get organized enough to use it, **and** they know they can get wealth more easily out of **us** than by creating it themselves.

~

Argument: Letting someone live in misery is a violation of their human rights.

Rebuttal: So, you think "human rights" entitle people from the third world to our resources and support? What about **us**? What do human rights entitle **us** to receive from the third world? Nothing, right? As I thought, this whole "human rights" thing is just a way to **guilt-trip** us into babysitting undeveloped people because **they** can't meet our standard of civilization and decency.

Reply: No, you're wrong, we would deserve the same help if we were that poor.

Rebuttal: Exactly, we're **not** that poor, and we **never** were, because we don't **let ourselves** fall so low. We're organized, we're disciplined and we're resourceful. **That** is what makes us wealthy, and the **lack** of those qualities is what makes third-worlders poor.

~

Argument: Restricting charity to whites is un-christian.

Rebuttal: Giving alms to the needy is a noble act, and conduces to expiation. There is no doubt that christian souls have a duty to help their brothers in need. However, saying that it is necessary to focus our charitable work on people living **thousands of miles** away across the ocean, rather than helping those **next to us**, is absurd. Preying on the noble christian sentiments of our people to implement destructive policies is **vicious** indeed.

~

Argument: They're not poor because of poor decisions or incompetence, they're just exploited by the west.

Rebuttal: Exploited? We're giving them technology, infor-

mation, help build them infrastructure and give them equipment they couldn't make themselves. And what are we getting in return? Cheap labor? We could **easily** replace that with machines. Minerals? And what have **they** ever done with their minerals? Nothing. The way **I** see it, **they're** getting a much better deal than **we** are.

~

Argument: We live in such wealth and abundance, it's obscene compared to the poverty in Africa.

Rebuttal: Obscene? I don't think you really want to help the third world, you want to bring us **down** to the same level as them. We live in the wealth and abundance that **we** create. Be proud that our effort and our creative genius has created these wonders, rather than being anxious that others have not achieved on par with us.

~

Argument: Most of the material goods are produced in the third world, yet we benefit from it. It's unfair.

Rebuttal: Our **treasonous** leaders have allowed our immense industrial capabilities to be transferred to other countries and races, enriching them tremendously. Now we are vulnerable and dependent on **foreigners** to provide us with our essential goods while we sell our nation to alien interests to finance the debts we accumulate. No, the situation is **definitely** not fair, and it's not going to change as long as we tolerate these traitors who've **sold us out!**

~

Argument: We have to make up for XYZ crimes our ancestors committed.

Rebuttal: Oh, so are we allowed to keep score for the crimes of people's ancestors now? Maybe we should go ask the mongols for a handout, reminding them of the horrors of Attila the Hun and Genghis Khan. Or maybe we might go to the Turks and demand reparations for the centuries of persecution and atrocities

we suffered at the hands of the Ottoman empire? Where does this “keeping the score” end exactly? Oh, but **I know**: it ends when it favors our people. Anything bad done to us is unimportant, and anything bad that we did is worthy of compensation.

CHAPTER III - SOCIETY

MORAL RELATIVISM

All points of view are not equivalent. Morality is not arbitrary, it's based on what is best for us, for our family, for our people, as a whole. We are not born in a vacuum, but brought into this world with a debt to the great sacrifices our ancestors made. We owe everything to them, and must do our best to repay that debt by working to secure the future of our family and our people. Taking the point of view of other peoples and cultures as equivalent to our own is perverse treason not only to the past, but to our very selves.

Moral relativism is either hostile to us, or a mark of great moral weakness in those who preach it thoughtlessly. Because of the difficult situation we are in, some people prefer not to side with what they perceive to be the "losing side", preferring to remain "neutral". Well, there is no neutrality in real life, and those who don't pick a side will have no real allies either.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: We did X to Y, so it's justified if they do the same to us.

Rebuttal: "But sir, the enemy soldiers are justified to be shooting us, we're shooting them too!" Do you know what we call a soldier who talks like that? A **traitor**. You obviously care more about Y people than your own family, so why don't you just leave and go live with them? We're in a struggle, and if you fail to pick a side, you don't belong anywhere either.

~

Argument: We can't just promote the interest of white people, we have to be fair and promote everybody's interest.

Rebuttal: We may decide to promote the interest of every race equally, but **they** sure as hell won't. They will just keep on

promoting their **own** interests, like they always have. What's going to happen then? Our destruction. Only **cowards** can't resolutely defend the interests of their own people and choose instead to remain "neutral". There is no "neutral" in the struggle for survival, and there is no "fairness" either. Only survival or extinction.

~

Argument: "good" and "bad" depends on culture - you're just euro-centrist.

Rebuttal: I judge things according to European values, European ethics and European culture. You can call that euro-centrist. if you want. What values are **you** using to judge the world? Chinese Taoism? The tribal laws of the Bantu people? We better settle this before moving on.

Reply: I'm a humanist, I don't rely on euro-centric views.

Rebuttal: Humanism is the most European ideology there is. Good luck finding "humanists" in the jungles of Congo or the mountains of Peru.

~

Argument: You lack perspective/you need to consider things from a wider perspective.

Rebuttal: Oh, I have a very specific perspective: I want what's best for my people. It's your perspective that's unclear here.

Reply: I don't have a specific perspective, I see things as they really are. I see globally.

Rebuttal: So you don't care about anybody or anything. It's all the same, right, "globally"? You just don't have the strength to commit to your own people.

~

Argument: How would you feel if we did X to YOU?

Rebuttal: That's what I asked my dentist before he drilled

into my tooth, “how would you feel?”. He said it would hurt. I still got drilled though. We’re not going to avoid doing what is **necessary** to insure the welfare of our people because it **might** hurt **somebody’s feelings**.

~

Argument: Think about the suffering of X... you’re heartless.

Rebuttal: Unlike you, I’m not paralyzed by suffering. Life is filled with suffering, and we just have to deal with it. When you take responsibility and **act**, it’s inevitable that somebody somewhere might suffer. But the solution isn’t to stay shut in your home and do nothing. A strong man does what is right and **accepts** the consequences.

~

Argument: It would be better if humans/whites/Americans/etc died out, the rest of the world would be better off.

Rebuttal: A world without whites would have no electricity, no vaccines, no books, no internet, no human rights, no democracy and certainly no liberalism. So your ideal world is one in which uneducated non-whites wallow in disease and suffering. If this is what you’re working towards, I guess liberal policies have had **just** the effect they intended then.

~

Argument: It’s better if we all make sacrifices equally, we can’t force the sacrifice X on others.

Rebuttal: Yeah, if there’s a food shortage, let’s all starve equally too. Sure, we’ll all die, but then we won’t have to make a decision and feel guilty afterward, right? Forget that nonsense. We have to do **whatever** it takes to secure the future of our people - **no** compromise is acceptable.

~

Argument: One person has no right to tell another what is right or wrong, that’s arrogant.

Rebuttal: This is the kind of individualism that's **destroying** our society. "I'll do what I want, and everyone else can go to hell!". We're all **connected**, and our acts influence others in an infinity of ways. If we want to live in a good and just society, we have to have common standards, an understanding that some behaviors are socially destructive, while others contribute to the general welfare. The **arrogant** one is the one who lives in society and benefits from it, yet thinks he's above its rules.

FEMINISM/NATURAL GENDER ROLES

Men and woman have traditionally been partners, each doing their own essential part to keep society running smoothly. Men and women are different both mentally and physically, and thus must play their roles in different ways. When the genders specialize at what they are most adapted to do, we can complement each other most effectively and everybody wins.

This is particularly true in the case of child bearing and child care. In order to have a healthy society, we need to have many children and we need to raise them as well as we can. This cannot be done effectively if women spend all their childbearing years studying and starting their career, putting off starting families until they are barely able to have one or two kids, and then put them in daycare because their careers are too demanding.

Similarly, men are needed to provide a both material support and a moral example for the family. If young men are only interested in playing video-games, having short term relationships with many different women and spending all their money on gadgets and luxury products, they will not be in a position to maintain strong families. And if they allow themselves to be weak, spineless and permissive, they will not be able to create a orderly moral setting - even if only by example.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Women are oppressed by men.

Rebuttal: You must really have contempt for women if you think they're these fragile, spineless **children** who must be protected from men by government regulations. And you must really have a dark view of **men** if you think they would conspire for **thousands** of years to keep women in servitude, while living with them, raising children with them and growing old together. I think you're completely disconnected from reality - you seem to hold **everybody** in contempt.

Argument: Women are discriminated against (lower pay, less promotions, etc)

Rebuttal: Women are less interested in their careers and prefer to work fewer hours and focus on their families. Are you saying you want women to be paid higher hourly wages and get more promotions than men, just because they're women? That's the feminist's goal, after all: not equality, but unfair privileges.

~

Argument: We live in a rape culture.

Rebuttal: In **Africa** they live in a rape culture. There are no real consequences for raping, and people don't really understand why it would be bad. White Europeans like us have **always** had strict laws regarding rape. Penalties have historically involved **death** or **mutilation**. Of course, the immigrants are importing **their** rape culture with them as they come to our nations. If feminists **really** gave a damn about rape, they would be the biggest opponents of immigration, but of course they're not.

~

Argument: Back in the days, women who didn't fit traditional gender roles were strongly criticized by society.

Rebuttal: Yes they were. That's called social pressure. Feminists seem to think that whenever their feelings are hurt, they are oppressed. Well I have news for you: disapproval is not oppression. Ridicule is not oppression. Even getting slapped in the face isn't oppression. There will never be a time where people can do whatever they want and nobody will judge them. That's an insane fantasy.

~

Argument: Back in the days, women had to work like slaves in the home for their man!

Rebuttal: In feminist's delusional minds, cleaning the home and taking care of children is slave labor, while maintaining a farm, mining coal or lumber-jacking is just fun and games...

News flash, in more difficult times, **everyone** had to work hard just to **survive**. Men and women cooperated with each other and did the things that were best suited to their nature. Everyone benefited from this.

~

Argument: Men have always been privileged.

Rebuttal: Men had the privilege of fighting and dying in horrible wars, of working in dark mines, of hunting dangerous animals for food. Men had the privilege of sacrificing everything to provide for their families. Feminists have nothing but **hatred** for humanity - you want to deprive women of their protected status and turn men into servile slaves.

~

Argument: Women have invented xyz, so they're smart! The only reason they haven't accomplished much is because they've been put down by patriarchy.

Rebuttal: Bringing life into this world is INFINITELY more important than anything anyone could possibly accomplish in a ordinary life. Inventing some bauble, or having a law career, or even being a queen, **pales** in comparison with the wonderful ability women are privileged to have: having children. I am much more impressed when I see a woman who has raised a big family of healthy, happy children, than when I see a woman who has managed to become an executive or a lawyer. The former accomplishment demands more strength, more character, more sacrifices, and it has the potential to affect the world for **thousands** of years as her descendants make their mark on the world.

~

Argument: It's oppressive to restrict women in their sexuality.

Rebuttal: When we remove all the rules of sexual behavior, **women** are the ones who lose out. Here are the results of sexual liberation: women now get to raise children on their own, aged women often end up alone and without support, women get sex-

ually exploited by pornography, the media and prostitution. By promoting sexual liberation, you're stripping **women** of the special protection society gave them by forcing men to protect them and stay faithful after they had sex. That's bad for **everybody**, but it's women who feel the worst of it. **Feminism** is what's truly oppressive to women.

~

Argument: Women are more spiritually evolved than men.

Rebuttal: Do you consider **arrogance** to be a sign of spiritual evolution? **Truly** spiritual women would be embarrassed to hear you speak.

~

Argument: You just hate women / have personal issues.

Rebuttal: I want a society where men protect and take care of women, while women are free to love and nurture their children. You want a **dog eat dog** society where the strongest can sexually exploit the vulnerable and where **everything goes**. I'll let the public decide who's the hater/who has issues.

~

Argument: Who cares if we have fewer children? The earth is overpopulated anyway.

Rebuttal: It's only whites who are having fewer children, and it's only non-white countries who are overpopulated. Is **Canada** overpopulated? Is **Australia** overpopulated? Are the **United States** overpopulated? No, we're just fine! And if you took out the non-whites out of Europe, **they** would be just fine too. The other races are multiplying at an incredible rate, and nothing we do will change that. The only thing we can change is, will **we** be a part of the future world?

~

Argument: Now we're liberated from all those old traditions, we're free! I don't want to be constrained like we used to be.

Rebuttal: Our ancestors weren't idiots. Those old traditions have been devised over thousands of years, and we kept them because they **worked**. The purpose of these traditions is to promote a society in which people are safer and happier. The traditions protected us against our own childish inclinations. We threw it all away to get a little bit of fast living in our youth, and as a result our civilization is on the brink of **destruction** while the fast-livers will be rotting in pension homes, with no kids to support them, no spouses to share their old age with and no one but **employees** paid by the government to take care of them. What a mess.

~

Argument: What's important in a couple is equality and compromise.

Rebuttal: What's important in a couple is cooperation and love. Endless bickering and competing for the last say doesn't make a happy home **or** a stable relationship. Once spouses truly think about what's best for each other, rather than thinking only of themselves and their desires, **real** love can arise. Individualists who promote "me first" mentality are responsible for the divorce rate and all the lonely, bitter people.

~

Argument: Feminists only want equality! What's wrong with that?

Rebuttal: You don't care about equality. If you did, you'd be arguing in favor of women being drafted in the army, complaining that men are doing all the dangerous and unpleasant jobs, and you'd be upset that courts are awarding unfair pensions to women from their divorced men. But you're only concerned about getting more for women, and less for men. And to hell with justice!

~

Argument: You're just frustrated because you've had a bad experience with a woman before / you have mommy issues

Rebuttal: You hate men and think they're all oppressive pigs, and you have nothing but **contempt** for women who decide to be stay-at-home mothers, yet it's everyone but you who has the issues, right? But this has nothing to do with just you **or** me. This is about our society and the future of our people. If we're to **survive**, we have no choice but to change our ways.

~

Argument: Women would never go back to traditional gender roles - they've always hated it.

Rebuttal: If women hated it, they would have stopped it as soon as they received full legal independence from their husband. Yet it's only after decades of insane feminist **propaganda** that women have decided that being childless old maids with 9-5 jobs was the way to happiness. And many woman are still quite happy in their traditional families. What about **those** women? Are they just kept down by patriarchy?

~

Argument: Women aren't just incubators!

Rebuttal: That's how you see the beautiful and sacred act of bringing life into the world? "Incubation"? Now we see how much you have contempt for women and life in general.

Rebuttal: Feminists like you have nothing but **contempt** for women and their natural gift to bring life into the world. You think a woman who devotes her life to her children and her family is a worthless failure. **We** have great respect and admiration for the **truly** strong women who have the character and courage to raise a large family. It demands much more character to sacrifice for a better future than to live the kind of selfish life the **feminists** promote.

RELIGION IN SOCIETY

Our present society is completely possessed by a materialist mindset and ethos. The highest possible good, in such a world, is to be comfortable and safe, comfort and safety being brought about by material goods. But such a mindset is profoundly anti-social, because a man preoccupied by comfort and safety is selfish and unwilling to sacrifice for the common good. A government which espouses a materialistic, non-spiritual viewpoint cannot help but reflect this sociopathic tendency in it's policies and laws. This cannot result in a strong and free society.

We want unity and strength, and this can only be achieved when the men hold a higher good than mere material satisfaction in esteem. When the people are ready to sacrifice comfort and safety, then we can achieve great things. A spiritual outlook on life will lead people to value principles and ideals rather than possessions, and this will form the moral basis for a healthy society.

Thus religion should not be pushed away from the center of the political discourse and away from our institutions and mainstream culture, but rather every aspect of our society should be infused with spiritual principles and values.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Religion has oppressed people for thousands of years.

Rebuttal: Yeah, this brutal and hated oppressor of the people was the first to be asked when anyone wanted advice on their life. This brutal oppressor was always the main source of charity to the poor and sick. And this brutal oppressor was the only source of asylum against mundane authorities.

~

Argument: Religion is a source of conflict - all wars are religious in nature.

Rebuttal: Wars have always been the result of conflict be-

tween different interest groups competing for resources and territory. If your dubious theory was true, then there would be no wars amongst nations of the same faith. But of course there are.

Rebuttal: Disagreements on religion are a source of conflict? How about this: Whenever people disagree on **anything** in general, there might be conflict. What's your solution? Prevent people from having different opinions? (sarcastic) Of course, if everyone in the world had the same opinions as you, things would be perfect everywhere!

~

Argument: Religion is the only thing that can make good people do bad things.

Rebuttal: No, hard drugs are the only things that can make good people do bad things. And generally religious people avoid them.

Rebuttal: Oh, I guess good people all over the world better check with you to make sure they don't do bad things by accident then, **you're** obviously the ultimate judge on morality, not God.

Rebuttal: Whether a man is good or not depends on his actions. If you disapprove of someone's actions then you obviously don't really believe they're good people. Then your statement really just means "religion can make people do bad things". Pretty much anything can make crazy and corrupt people do bad things.

~

Argument: Religion needs to be kept away from politics, to maintain democracy

Rebuttal: Democracy means "rule by the people". How is a system democratic if the policies don't reflect the religious beliefs and ideals of the people? It obviously isn't. But when liberals talk about democracy, they're not talking about rule by the people. They mean a godless and amoral system of rule according to liberal ideas and policies, **regardless** of what the people want. Liberals are the first to complain when people elect religious leaders or populist nationalists - they don't give a **rat's ass** about

what the people **want**.

Argument: Belief in religion/god is illogical/unscientific.

Rebuttal: Scientists don't see things that way though. You should probably warn all those religious scientists and philosophers before you complain to me. I'd love to see you explain to Isaac Newton, Max Planck and Albert Einstein that they shouldn't believe in god because, you know, it's "so unscientific".

~

Argument: Separation of church and state is very important, we can't go back to the past

Rebuttal: I agree that church and state should be distinct. But liberals have used this excuse to strip the state of all religious and spiritual content, until our governments were reduced to mere materialistic bureaucracies. We need strong **spiritual** men to lead the nation according to the religious principles that our whole society is based on. Not **administrators** who manage us like heads of cattle.

~

Argument: Religious people want to enforce their beliefs on us.

Rebuttal: Who do you mean by "us"? Are you talking about the tiny minority of atheist liberals found in universities, or the countless hordes of foreigners who don't belong here in the first place? No, religious people don't want to force their beliefs on those people. They just want **their** nation to reflect **their** beliefs and values.

~

Argument: We have people of many different religions, it would only cause conflict if we bring these things up to the forefront of life.

Rebuttal: Not talking about it isn't going to make the prob-

lem go away. The conflict is there, even if you'd rather sweep it under the rug. I'm not interested in avoiding problems - I'm interested in **solving** them. A single nation cannot accommodate people with radically different religious beliefs. This will have to be addressed one day before it explodes in a bloodbath.

~

Argument: Religious beliefs and values are oppressive and outdated, we've outgrown such superstitions.

Rebuttal: Western civilization has had essentially similar beliefs and values for **thousands** of years, (*sarcastic*) but thankfully for us a tiny minority of radical university professors has now determined that it's now all "outdated". How good of them to inform us of our thousands of years of oppression.

~

Argument: Religion is only a tool for the powerful to control the people.

Rebuttal: Religion is the **one** thing that makes it difficult for corrupt leader to do whatever they want. Religious people have always resisted bad leadership much more strongly than people with weak convictions. Think of the Christians who willingly died as martyrs at the hands of corrupt roman emperors rather than renounce their faith. People who are obsessed with bread and games, or money and gadgets, are much **easier** to keep under control.

~

Argument: Only weak minded people need to believe in a higher power / life after death.

Rebuttal: You're saying that you're a real tough minded person, while men like (Plato, Aristotle, George Washington, etc - insert anyone famous before 20th century) are **weak minded**? I've never heard anything so delusional and self important.

Rebuttal: Because it requires strength of character to reject all responsibility for our actions and live a life of hedonism,

right, unlike those Christians who worked hard and **built** this country by the sweat of their brows. Get over yourself.

~

Argument: Religion makes people take important decisions based on fantasy ideas about spirits in the sky.

Rebuttal: Whether a decision is good or bad can be judged based on the results of those decisions. Considering that our entire civilization was built by people who took decisions based on those “fantasies”, and that we’re in the process of destroying it while basing our decisions on liberal materialist ideas, maybe we need to stop and evaluate things objectively.

~

Argument: Look at how much progress we’ve made since we abandoned religion and promoted science instead!

Rebuttal: What progress? You mean iPhones and washing machines? Sure, those things are neat. But **gadgets** don’t make men happy. Progress should be measured by the state of our people, not by baubles.

Argument: Religion stops scientific progress, and persecutes independent thinkers.

Rebuttal: I’d feel a **lot** safer if religious and moral people were overseeing scientific research. Maybe we wouldn’t have seen **abominations** like the nuclear bomb, chemical weapons, napalm or genetically modified plants and animals. Religion puts a brake on dangerous and indecent research and ideas. Perhaps this has been too restrictive in the past... But it’s better to have restrictive control than to open the **Pandora’s box** and unleash **atrocities** upon the world. We need **reasonable** limits on science, and we have **none** now.

~

Argument: The crusades show christian bigotry!

Rebuttal: The Muslims invaded our lands, slaughtered our people and burned our churches. Europeans simply did their duty and fought to protect their christian brothers by fighting off the invaders. Yet people like **you** try to make us feel guilty for the heroic deeds of our ancestors? Think of the **courage** it would take to leave your home, march for months toward to a strange land, and fight brutal battles to help people you don't even know... To think that my ancestors had that kind of **guts** gives me nothing but pride. The bigot here is you.

HOMOSEXUALITY

Homosexuality is antisocial, and it's promotion in our society is damaging to people's sense of morality. What society needs is strong, healthy family ties, with mothers and fathers taking care of children. Anything which goes against that ideal is harmful to our people.

Additionally, homosexuals engage in very harmful practices (like anal sex, drug intake, having many partners, etc) which make them sick eventually. Homosexuality is also a gateway to even more extreme perversions like pedophilia and bizarre sexual fetishes.

Thus all promotion of homosexuality must be banned from the public sphere, as it can do no good to anyone.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Homosexuals can't help what they are - we should just let them be themselves.

Rebuttal: Homosexuals "can't help" making degenerate gay pride rallies? Homosexuals "can't help" having unprotected anal sex with hundreds of other men? We can all control our behavior with willpower, especially behavior as extreme as this. Do you think criminals should let free if we think they killed "because of their hormones"?

~

Argument: Some animals also show homosexual behavior, so it's natural.

Rebuttal: Who cares if animals do it. Dogs lick their balls in public, does that make it civilized human behavior? I don't care about what **chimps** do in the jungle, I care about what is best for my people.

~

Argument: You're homophobic, you're probably a closet

homo yourself!

Rebuttal: Do you like faeces? Do faeces make you uncomfortable? Do you dislike being surrounded by faeces? Maybe you're a closet shit eater then too.

Rebuttal: You must be a closet fascist then, since you're so angry and emotional at what I say. It's time to come out of the closet, my friend, we'll accept you for who you are, don't worry.

Note: You can substitute pedophile or something else instead of shit eater if you don't want to be vulgar (or people are eating at a dinner table!), but make sure to make this rebuttal offensive. You've been insulted, don't let this slide, punish their impertinence.

~

Argument: You're so insecure / you must be uncomfortable with your sexuality

Rebuttal: If your definition of a confident, secure man is one who enjoys seeing burly dudes making out in front of him, and hearing people talking about anal sex and their sick fetishes, then you're right, I'm not. But in **fact**, the insecure one is the one who pretends to be okay with disgusting things because he wants to sound "hip".

Rebuttal: A confident and secure man has no problem telling people what he approves of and what disgusts him. Only wimps/faggots are afraid of hurting people's feeling by sharing their opinion.

Rebuttal: All well adjusted straight males are repulsed and **appalled** by the very thought of homosexuality. Those who accept and embrace it have mental issues/have defective morality.

~

Argument: Homosexuals are just like hetero's, apart from their choice of sexual partners.

Rebuttal: No, you're wrong. Homosexuals live lives of hedonism totally unlike normal people. You could search your whole

life and never find a homosexual who doesn't have a venereal disease, or who only had one partner in his entire life. It seems like your only contact with this is from soap operas.

~

Argument: It's genetic.

Rebuttal: Some people are genetically blind - that doesn't make it good and natural to be blind. It doesn't make being blind just as good as being normal. It doesn't mean that it would be perfectly okay for a blind couple to adopt small children.

~

Argument: Gays just want to be happy, to be left alone. Why are you trying to oppress them?

Rebuttal: If gays just wanted to be left alone, we wouldn't be having this discussion. In fact, we wouldn't even be aware of them. No, we're talking about this because gays are shoving their lifestyle down our throats at every opportunity they can, they're trying to get schools to promote it, they're making public demonstrations, they're making out in public and propagating their ideas on television. You think that's just fine and dandy, while I think it needs to **stop**. Our people have a right to live their lives **free** from this degeneracy.

~

Argument: Great artists/scientists are or were gay.

Rebuttal: Van Gogh was a great painter, it doesn't make it a good idea to cut off your own ear.

Rebuttal: Just because someone did one good thing, doesn't mean they are a saint in all respects.

Rebuttal: Just because some artists are gay, doesn't mean art comes from gayness. Society wouldn't be less artistic if gays stayed in the closet, or if there were no gays at all.

~

Argument: A lot of gays have stable monogamous relationships.

Rebuttal: Yes, they do, on television soap operas and Hollywood movies. In real life - not so much.

Reply: I know many gay couples who have been together for a long time.

Rebuttal: Yeah, they appear to be stable, but they don't tell you about their weekly visit to the sauna together, their sex tourism in Thailand and the orgy their friend organized last month. A "stable **gay** couple" has nothing to do with a stable **normal** couple.

~

Argument: Maybe gay men are like that, but lesbians don't lead that kind of depraved lifestyle.

Rebuttal: If women want to end up alone, bitter and childless when they're 60 years old, it makes me sad, but it's their choice. As long as they're not allowed to promote their insane radical feminist nonsense, nobody can force them to do what's best for **themselves**.

~

Argument: It's better for children to have gay parents than no parents at all, or to live in poverty. At least they have a home.

Rebuttal: Look, I really don't care about compromises and fringe cases - all I care about is what is the best, the ideal way to live our lives. The best, the ideal way for children to be raised by a loving man and woman, ideally with several siblings. We, as a society, need to do everything we can to promote this ideal and stamp out the harmful situations which arise when we stray from that ideal. I'm not going to give my blessing to something harmful and dangerous because "it could be worse".

~

Argument: The ancient Greeks (or whoever) were tolerant of gays, and it worked out.

Rebuttal: It would have “worked” even better if they had a sensible policy instead maintaining this bizarre social anomaly.

Note: Don’t bother to discuss why this common misconception is wrong, obscure historical debates like this fly over normal people’s heads.

OTHER PERVERSIONS

Bizarre perversions and degenerate lifestyles are indications of mental illness in those who practice them. Being symptoms of a disease, they should not be accepted, but should be grounds for treatment. Their mental problems are sure to cause problems in other spheres of their lives, even if their fetishes are kept private. Because humans are social animals, one person who suffers from perversions and degeneracy will influence others around him/her.

For example, someone who is into ponies, or animals, deep down has a profound disdain of humanity, as well as self hatred. This cannot help but manifest, perhaps subtly, in other self destructive behavior as well as behavior damaging to society at large.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: It doesn't hurt anybody, why do you care?

Rebuttal: Everything we do affects others. From the words we speak to the money we spend, from our work to our bedroom, we're social animals and we're **all** interconnected. What one person does will always have consequences, and those consequences will affect others. Individualists are just selfish people who don't want to be held **accountable** for their actions and the consequences they have on others.

~

Argument: If something is done between two consenting adults, it's none of society's business.

Rebuttal: If two consenting adults make a campfire in the privacy of their bedroom, it'll definitely be society's business when the house burns down and damages the surrounding buildings. People these days have no sense of responsibility. Acts have consequences.

Reply: What consequences does it have if two people do S&M stuff?

Rebuttal: People with mental problems need to seek help. If they don't they will be a bad influence on society.

~

Argument: We all have our own little kinks, some people are just into stranger things, that's all.

Rebuttal: There's a huge difference between a "preference" and a "perversion". Some guys might prefer tall girls, some might prefer black hair girls, some girls might prefer stocky men, but that doesn't interfere with their lives. When a man can only get aroused by watching fetish porn, he is completely dysfunctional and needs help.

Rebuttal: Maybe your social circle is filled with perverts, but society at large is not.

~

Argument: You're just afraid of things you don't know about. If you approached these people, you'd see that they're just ordinary people with a strange sex life, that's all.

Rebuttal: I want to see people behaving with dignity and self respect. That's not possible when your hobbies involve masturbating with plush toys of animals.

~

Argument: There's always been some weird people. They're a minority, they'll stay a minority, there's nothing to worry about.

Rebuttal: No, that's wrong. If you let people with mental illnesses loose in a society, and no one condemns their deviant behavior, then progressively it will get normalized and the degeneracy will spread. Otherwise, we wouldn't have any problem with crazy people going around and promoting child abuse and similar filth. Are you okay with that? Should we let NAMBLA (substitute local pedophile advocacy group) make public conferences and promotions on the internet?

~

Argument: It's genetic, you can't help those things.

Rebuttal: Dressing up like a cartoon pony and masturbating while asphyxiating yourself are genetically determined? There's no doubt that your genes will affect your behavior, but your genes haven't changed much since we lived in caves. If things didn't exist back in the cavemen days, then it's safe to say that genes have nothing to do with it.

Reply: How do you know cavemen didn't do weird things like some people do today?

Rebuttal: If our ancestors spent all their time trying to have sex with foxes and masturbating to sick fantasies, humanity would have died out long ago.

~

Argument: You only live once, it's better to try to experience everything possible while you still can.

Rebuttal: I don't know about you, but I'm only interested in having **positive** experiences, not stuff like bone fractures and romantic comedy movies. If we only have one life, we should fill it with as much happiness and virtue as possible, not taint it with filth.

~

Argument: Why are you so concerned about what people do in their bedrooms? Aren't there more important things to worry about, like the economy?

Rebuttal: Maybe your main concern in life is your credit card balance and the shiny baubles you can buy with it, but I think the happiness and dignity of our people is **INFINITELY** more important than that. For our people to have a future, we need to be strong, we need to be moral, and we need to keep a common identity. When we're surrounded by people who identify more with their perversions than with our people, we are weak.

~

Argument: Live and let live.

Rebuttal: I'm not interested in just "living", just "surviving", I'm interested in people leading **good** lives, I'm interested in human progress, human **dignity**. When we let go, everything just goes back into the **slime**. To rise above being mere animals, we need to restrain ourselves, to practice virtuous behavior, rather than doing only what "feels good".

~

Argument: There aren't more perverts than before, the internet is giving that impression.

Rebuttal: The internet is allowing the perverts to socialize with each other and form new peer groups. Now we have new "oppressed minorities" who identify with their sick fetishes and who align against the majority. This is not a good development. The internet is a tool to evangelize and spread their **filth** to even more people - it can't **help** but create more perverts.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Human rights are a concept devised by whites to ensure the dignity and welfare of the people in their society. Analogous concepts have not been developed in other civilizations, and most do not recognize or even understand the concept today. It is thus misleading to talk of “universal rights”, as there is no such thing. Rights can only be conceived of within a specific society, and do not exist where there is no authority to enforce them.

It is a good idea to maintain certain rights within our civilization, to ensure that our people are always treated with a minimum degree of dignity. It is also a good idea to protect freedoms we consider important to the maintenance of the kind of society we want to have. But these freedoms and these rights do not extend to people outside our civilization, and are not to be applied when doing so is detrimental to our people.

Rights and freedoms are privileges that must always be balanced with duties and obligations. Failure to meet these obligations and respect those duties can and should result in a loss of the corresponding rights and freedoms. Those who shirk their duty to contribute to society by remaining on welfare programs could lose their freedom to manage their affairs themselves. Those who do not want to serve military or civil duty could lose their full citizenship. Those who refuse to respect certain eugenic principles could lose their reproductive rights.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Human rights are given by god and cannot be taken away by man’s laws.

Rebuttal: If human rights are given by god, why has there only been such a thing in white countries in the last 250 years? If human rights came from god, all humans would have know about them because the bible (or other scripture) would name them. A spiritual man doesn’t demand rights from God.

Rebuttal: God does not give rights, he only gives duties. And

our duty is first to our family and people.

~

Argument: All humans have the same rights, and it would be a crime against humanity to deny them those rights.

Rebuttal: Is it a crime against humanity to protect those you care for? Why should anybody be forced to spend his resources on strangers who don't care about him, rather than on his own family? Nobody is entitled to anything he hasn't worked for. I reject the idea that we have to sacrifice **our people** to provide for strangers - it's nothing less than an attack on us, and if we fall for it we'll be wiped out.

~

Argument: If we start on the path to denying certain people certain rights, then it's a slippery slope and we will end with tyranny.

Rebuttal: **True** tyranny is when the leaders of a nation neglect the welfare of their own people and instead make policies for the benefit of themselves and foreign powers. That's what liberals would have us do: break our people's back slaving away for the benefit of foreigners and parasites.

~

Argument: People have a right to healthcare, education, etc

Rebuttal: And who pays for all this? **We do**, by pooling our resources in the form of taxes. Why would anybody have a **right** to take your money in the form of tuition or healthcare fees? These services are not rights, they are **privileges**, and as the people who are **sacrificing** to make those privileges **possible**, it is **us** who have the right to decide who will benefit from it.

~

Argument: The united nations guarantees everyone certain human rights - so they are universal.

Rebuttal: You try and go complain to the united nations

when your right to free speech is violated, see what happens. A right is only in effect if it can be **enforced**.

~

Argument: Human rights are inherent, you can't make them conditional.

Rebuttal: All rights come with **duties**. The very idea of a right is linked to the idea of a corresponding duty. Your right to bear arms comes with the duty to take down tyrannical governments. Your right to liberty comes with a duty to respect the laws of the land. To desire every right and shirk every obligation is a **childish** attitude that no responsible adults should tolerate.

~

Argument: Eugenics is scientifically discredited.

Rebuttal: You think the idea that children resemble their parents more than strangers is "scientifically discredited"? Everyone has known, for thousands of years, that smart, healthy and strong parents tend to have smarter, healthier and stronger children. It doesn't take a genius to figure that out. It takes a lot of "education" to become blind to the simplest facts of life.

~

Argument: Eugenics is unethical.

Rebuttal: You think it's "unethical" to work towards healthier, smarter and more successful generations in the future? You think it's "unethical" to spare our children the pain of diseases, disabilities and deformities?. Your sense of ethics is only concerned about how people "feel" NOW. I actually **care** about future generations. Better to make small sacrifices now, and avoid bigger problems later.

~

Argument: People have a right to life, so it's unethical to withdraw welfare from them.

Rebuttal: I don't want anybody in our society to just "live",

just to survive like some animal in a zoo. What I want is for people to lead good lives, happy lives, productive lives. Anything that gets in the way of that needs to be examined and changed if necessary.

~

Argument: Immigrants have the right to housing, so we need to provide them with low rent or free apartments if they can't afford normal rent.

Rebuttal: Immigrants have no right to even **be** occupying our lands, much less having us toil away to provide them with extra luxury! You think **you'd** get free housing if you decided to move to Saudi Arabia or Korea? You would be laughed out of town for even asking, and I'd be laughing with them.

~

Argument: Human rights are not subject to a vote, or a change in government.

Rebuttal: Good idea. Maybe the president will decide that he has a "human right" to drive around in a Ferrari and eat in 5 star restaurants for the rest of his life... Of course, we can't change this policy because, you know, "human rights are not subject to a vote". When a **policy** is bad for my people, it needs to be changed - and I don't care what **pompous name** you want to give that policy.

~

Argument: Preventing someone from voting or participating in politics is a violation their human rights.

Rebuttal: Human rights sound a lot like an excuse to let foreigners take over our institutions and displace our people. I imagine those same human rights would prevent us from going in the third world and voting their leaders out of position and replacing them with whites, right?

CHAPTER IV - RACE

RACIAL DIFFERENCES

Humanity is a species with different distinct races. Each race has it's own mental and physical attributes, which it has acquired over it's long historical development. Thus race, and racial differences, are a **biological** reality, not a social construct. No amount of government program or cultural engineering can change the basic nature of an individual person, which is largely determined by their biology.

Thus the failures and successes of any given group of people are related largely to this biological background, rather than by historical accident, oppression, resources, and so on.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Race is only limited to skin color.

Rebuttal: That's just ignorant. Forensic scientists can determine a person's race with a strand of hair, a bone fragment, or even a single drop of blood. And anyone with two functioning braincells can tell an albino black from a white. Skin color is completely irrelevant.

~

Argument: I know plenty of (Blacks/Arabs/Jews/etc) who are (smart/honest/nice people/etc), you can't generalize.

Rebuttal: You get better results by making decisions based on the **general rule**, not the exceptions. If you build a house, in a **flood zone**, it won't help you that the site isn't ALWAYS flooded. I'm concerned with results, not people's feelings.

~

Argument: Why can't we all just get along?

Rebuttal: Yeah, why can't the lion just get along with the

gazelle? Why can't the bulls be friends instead of competing for mates? Why can't the ants just **share** their territory with the other insects? I guess the world is a tough place to be for dreamers, huh? Once you get your head out of the clouds and come down to **earth**, we can discuss **reality** instead of feel-good fantasies.

~

Argument: Non whites perform poorly because of racism in our institutions.

Rebuttal: Our institutions are actually discriminating against whites: affirmative action, equal opportunity, generous welfare, support for immigrants, paid housing for asylum seekers, etc. Whites have no access to these government programs. Liberals like you who create these programs are responsible for the racism against our people, in our **own countries**. They have **much** to account for.

~

Argument: Whites are privileged because they have access to more natural resources.

Rebuttal: The places richest in natural resources and fertile land are Asia, southern Africa, southern America... all areas that are poor and backward. Whites mostly live in harsh climates, which are relatively infertile and poor in natural resources. It's funny, you said the opposite of the truth.

Rebuttal: Japan is a resource poor area, but it's very wealthy. Many third world country (Zimbabwe, Brazil, etc) are very rich in natural resources (minerals, oil, wood) and yet are very poor and backward. Where did you get that idea?

~

Argument: Blacks perform poorly because of historical slavery/oppression.

Rebuttal: Slavery has been practiced in every society in the history of mankind, it's not something that was done only by

whites to blacks. Enough of the guilt trip!

Rebuttal: The blacks who come from Africa, who's ancestors where never enslaved by whites, perform just as poorly as the others, and often even worse so. I guess whites must have enslaved them **telepathically** then?

~

Argument: Non-whites perform poorly because whites are racist and discriminate against them.

Rebuttal: Entire countries with no whites perform just as poorly - is our racism magically seeping across the ocean to oppress them there?

Rebuttal: Even if racism and discrimination were real, why would that matter? Why couldn't they do whatever we're doing to succeed? It's always the white's fault with you somehow, isn't it?

Rebuttal: Then why do some non-white groups like east Asians and Jews do BETTER than whites, then? I guess the Asians and Jews must be discriminating against us then. That seems to be your logic.

~

Argument: You're being racist.

Rebuttal: **Everyone** is racist - we **all** understand that there are different kinds of people, and we treat them differently. It's just that **some** people are comfortable with that and accept it as part of life, and others feel guilty and are in denial.

Reply: Maybe everyone YOU know is racist, but not me.

Rebuttal: Well, you're against white pride, but you sure don't mind Latino pride or black pride! You support affirmative action! So you treat different races according to different standards, just like me.

Reply: Well, that's not racism!

Rebuttal: Oh, I understand now, it's only racism when people you disagree with do it. I think everyone understands your definition of racism now, thank you. (move on)

~

Argument: It's ignorant to say blacks commit more crime - most serial killers are white.

Rebuttal: I'd rather have 50 murders by one insane white serial killer, than 5000 murders and rapes by 5000 impulsive blacks. Wouldn't you?

Rebuttal: Most murders are still done by blacks - of course they rarely reach serial killer status since they get caught right away because of their botched crimes.

Rebuttal: Then I'd better move to the black ghettos, I'd be a lot safer than in this serial killer infested white neighborhood! Which **planet** are you living on?

~

Argument: We're all the same. All of our differences are because of social conditioning/ the environment/nurture.

Rebuttal: You have it backwards. Our environment and our society is the result of our biological nature. When black immigrate to a white country, they still behave like blacks, even 10 generations later. When whites go to Africa, they still behave like whites and create white societies. Your theory is totally divorced from reality.

Rebuttal: That's a nice theory. But it's been tried about a thousand times, and it fails every time. Program after program to shower failures in money and attention, and their situation has only gotten worse. I'm not interested in theories when all of reality contradicts them.

Rebuttal: If we're all the same, then why did different people create completely different societies? If we're all the same, why do blacks always create chaotic and backward societies, and why do Asians always develop complex and well organized societies?

End with: This is just a convenient excuse to spend millions on minorities while neglecting the white majority, “since they’re already more successful”.

Resist saying: Twin studies show that genetics account for much of our behavior, including intelligence and success.

~

Argument: Humans have 99% of their genes in common.

Rebuttal: Yeah, we also have 95% of our genes in common with a chimp. There’s also a fraction of a percent of difference between a man and a woman - that doesn’t make gender a “social construct”. And it doesn’t take a degree in molecular biology to figure out racial differences - if you’d leave your university office a little you’d understand the concept just by interacting with all the people who are “just the same as us”.

~

Argument: We’re all the same/there’s only one race, the human race.

Rebuttal: That’s a beautiful, feel-good sentiment. It’s unfortunate that all of history and all of reality contradicts that idea. It’s unfortunate that the immense majority of people don’t feel that way, never felt that way, and will never feel that way. It’s unfortunate, but it’s how things are. And if you prefer to ignore reality and focus on how things “should” be instead, then it’s no wonder that your policies will never work in real life either.

DIVERSITY

A healthy society is one in which everyone works together for common goals and heading toward a common ideal. Diversity in skills and abilities is good, because it allows specialization and thus greater cooperation. But if the people have diversity in the goals and values, then there will be conflict over what to do and thus less cooperation.

Since people of different races and cultures have different outlooks on life, different values and principles, as well as different ideas about where they want society to go, then mixing those people together will always generate conflict and violence. The only possible way to resolve it is by genocide of one group by the other, either by violence or assimilation. Thus, diversity is an unstable situation which will inevitably be stabilized by the destruction of all the peoples except the victor in the struggle. We want to avoid this conflict and bloodshed, and preserve our people (and don't wish to see other people come to harm either), so we oppose enforced diversity, instead allowing all peoples to remain separate in their own societies, which will better reflect their natures and attitudes.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Diversity is a strength!

Rebuttal: No, diversity is a great weakness. Which group is stronger, a close-knit family, or a group of strangers who speak different languages? This stuff is so obvious it's almost painful to point out. Do you even **think** before you say these things?

~

Argument: What about all the ethnic restaurants?

Rebuttal: We should sacrifice our culture, our nation and the future of our nation so that we can eat authentic Chinese and Mexican food? We have a different set of values it seems. And besides, anyone so inclined can, you know, **follow a recipe**.

~

Argument: The immigrants enrich our culture.

Rebuttal: They're not enriching our culture, they're just replacing it with their culture. Our religion, our values, our interests and our history are being taken out of schools, governments and businesses so as to not "offend" immigrants. (Sarcastic) I feel culturally enriched already. How about white people learn about their **own** culture instead? That's what's needed right now.

~

Argument: Having many diverse people allows us to learn more about other cultures.

Rebuttal: I've never learned **anything** about anyone's culture by talking to immigrants. Most immigrants know little or nothing about their culture anyway, beyond their language and habits, and if they **do** they sure aren't straining to educate **us** about it. If you want to learn about foreign cultures, just read a **book**. You'll learn more in an hour than in a **lifetime** of living besides immigrants.

~

Argument: It's unfair to keep people of foreign cultures away - we're all human after all.

Rebuttal: Our ancestors fought and worked hard to provide us with the nation we have now. It is "unfair" to trample on their sacrifices and give it all away to people whose own ancestors did not work as hard. If you worked all your life to give your children a better future, wouldn't **you** turn in your grave if they gave it all away to charity and remained in poverty instead?

~

Argument: Even if diversity is bad, we still need to accept asylum seekers, or they'll get killed in their country.

Rebuttal: We are **not** responsible for the problems of foreign people. We're not **gods** who fix everyone's problems. We should do our best to fix our **own** problems, and others should do the

same. Asylum seekers **will** cause problems in our nations, and accepting them will not solve the issues in their home country. When a good man has a problem, he doesn't flee, he tries to **fix it**. If their government is oppressive, they need to topple it.

~

Argument: Even within the same race, no one has the same outlook on life, so homogeneity is impossible, even if it's desirable.

Rebuttal: We need a society with common values, common ideals and common historical references. A society where people have a common bond of blood. You think that's impossible? Visit Japan. Visit China. Visit Saudi Arabia. Not only is it possible, but we **had that** before the liberals opened the flood gates of immigration and started to **dismantle** all of our cultural norms. Well, it's time to get to work, repair the damage you've done and **reclaim** what we once had.

~

Argument: Immigrants are good for the economy, they do the jobs we won't do.

Rebuttal: It's funny how all the jobs immigrants do were done by whites before the immigrants arrived here. As long as there is a **single** unemployed white man, there's is absolutely **no** justification for accepting migrant workers. And if no one wants to wash dishes or pick up the trash, then we'll just have to raise the pay until someone does it.

~

Argument: Even if immigrants have different values, eventually they'll assimilate and then we'll all be the same.

Rebuttal: People of different races have no interest in integrating with us, and even if they wanted they couldn't do it. **When** is it that blacks [in the us] will integrate? When will the **Jews** integrate? Will this integration thing take 500 more years? Maybe 2000 years? Integration just doesn't happen, and can't happen, because different people are genetically distinct, and

show different behavior and values based on their heredity.

~

Argument: What's so bad about blending all together and forming one race? That way conflict will disappear forever!

Rebuttal: Maybe you'd like to blend the gazelle and the lion together too, to prevent conflict between them? Why not wipe out all life on earth, that's the surest way to eliminate all conflict forever. Conflict is a part of life, and it's not going to stop.

Rebuttal: The Japanese aren't going to blend in with other people. The Jews aren't going to blend in with other people. The Chinese aren't going to blend in with other people. The Muslims aren't going to abandon their faith and blend in with an amorphous humanity. No. What you're really thinking of is that **whites** will disappear, but everything else will be pretty much the same as it is now. That's genocide.

~

Argument: We just need to learn to compromise, then we'll all be able to work together!

Rebuttal: Compromise is a great way to make sure **nobody** is happy. I won't be happy with living in a country that's half Islamic republic, half national European state. And neither will the Muslim. So why not **let** the Muslim live in his 100% Islamic republic, and we can form the kind of nation **we're** happy with? In real life, the **weak** compromise, the strong just impose their will. Compromise is always the first step to letting someone **else** have their way.

~

Argument: By having different values clash together, we'll end up with the best of all cultures!

Rebuttal: Our culture is a reflection of our own nature. It's not something we can change arbitrarily in the name of "progress". Liberals hate our culture, so they want to throw it away and replace it with some strange mix of African voodoo,

communism, zen Buddhism or whatever. No thanks.

~

Argument: Immigrants just come here for opportunities they don't have in their countries. They're hard workers who contribute to society.

Rebuttal: If immigrants could make a valuable contribution to society, they would have made that contribution in their **home country** and pulled it out of it's misery. Immigrants come here because they want an **easier**, more **comfortable** life. An able, hardworking man looks at the problems around him and fixes them. We have no benefit to gain by accepting people who flee from their problems in search of an easier life. This country used to be wilderness, and we **transformed** it into the civilization we have now, we didn't flee to a more comfortable nation.

~

Argument: America/France/wherever is a nation of immigrants

Rebuttal: A nation is an ethnic group, regardless of whether they're "immigrants" or not. Mexican immigrants don't stick together in cohesive communities because they're all immigrants, they stick together because they're all Mexican. Cliches like "America is a nation of immigrants" are completely disconnected from practical reality, and are **not** valid excuses for letting ourselves be displaced in our land and dispossessed of our future.

~

Argument: Whites have been fighting among each other for ever! Being in an all-white society wouldn't end conflict.

Rebuttal: Nothing will **ever** "end conflict". Conflict is a part of nature. Wherever there is difference, there will be conflict. Whites have fought over smaller differences in language and culture before they were exposed to different ethnic groups. But in order to maintain order **within** a single nation, it must have homogeneity in it's ethnic makeup and basic culture. You're confusing wars between homogeneous nations with ethnic conflicts

within those nations.

~

Argument: Crime isn't as bad as you think. It only seems bad because the media harps about it to scare people. In reality crime is going down (FBI statistics, etc).

Rebuttal: Crime is going down? Just when I was a kid, I used to be able to leave my bike unattended with no fear of having it stolen – we all know that theft and violent crime is a much bigger part of our lives now than it was for our parents and grandparents. You don't need crime statistics to know that.

Note: You must not get into a discussion of why those statistics are flawed or deceptive, use a common sense example to compare the old days where people trusted each other with today.

JEW

Jews are a big problem in white society. They do not feel like they belong in our society, yet they hold highly disproportionate numbers of positions in banking, the mass media, government and big business. They favor each other in all business, and generally do what is good for the Jews, at the expense of the host society.

Jews are a very ethnocentric (racist) people, who don't like to marry outside their group, and who have genetic tests in Israel to maintain the genetic purity of their race. They don't want or care about what is good for us. And very often, they push destructive ideologies and social tendencies on their host to weaken them (like communism, feminism, pornography, prostitution, degenerate entertainment, etc).

Ultimately, when different people occupy the same territory or political jurisdiction, there will **always** be ethnic conflict over the limited resources and political influence. The **only** way to prevent this conflict and the eventual disappearance of one of the two groups is geographic and political separation.

Note: This is obviously a very difficult subject. The reason is that, while the Jewish problem is simple to understand and the evidence is overwhelming, we cannot present much of that evidence during the debate. Remember, to be effective, we have to rely on what the audience already knows. And the audience doesn't know exactly how many of our institutions are controlled by Jews, they don't know communism was a Jewish plot, they don't know anything about the Talmud, they don't know about the attack on the USS Liberty, they don't know about the Rothschild, the Warburg, about Baruch Goldstein's massacre and the praise he still receives. None of the rebuttals presented here involve in-depth knowledge of the Jews. Instead, you must focus on simple and universal ideas (see the section on ethnic nationalism for the basic position to use) and occasionally support it with facts that everyone knows. Here are the helpful facts that you can reasonably expect most white people know about the Jews:

- The Jews were expelled from many countries in Europe
- They were involved in banking and money changing from biblical times
- Jesus was killed by rabbis and Jewish mobs
- Israel is oppressive to Palestinians, enacting an ethnic cleansing
- Jews are demanding endless compensation and damages, yet we all suffered greatly during WW2
- They don't like mixing with gentiles and look down on intermarriage
- Orthodox Jews are openly hostile to non Jews
- They tend to be cheap/greedy/vulgar
- Kosher slaughter is cruel to animals
- They have laws to keep an ethnically pure state (you couldn't go and become a Israeli citizen)
- They complain loudly about gentile nationalists

Most people know these things somewhere at the back of their heads, because they experienced it in their own lives, saw it on the news, or simply because it's part of the Jew's own propaganda. When you take all that and present it together, along with a simple reason why they should be removed (ethnic nationalism), it is very hard to argue against. That won't stop them from pulling the classic lines that follow.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: That's just antisemitism.

Rebuttal: Antisemitism is the natural response to **semitism**.

Note: This does not really advance the debate or get people on your side, but it makes you look confident, and forces the opponent to make a new argument which you can rebut more produc-

tively. Avoid, of course, defending yourself (“I’m not an anti-semite”) or playing with definitions (“What is antisemitism?”).

~

Argument: You’re paranoid, Jews don’t control everything.

Rebuttal: A **single** Jew in a position of power is already a problem, because they are hostile to our interests. Are you saying that there’s not even one Jew in politics, banking or the media? Then you must be blind.

~

Argument: That’s a nutty conspiracy theory.

Rebuttal: Is it a “nutty theory” that Jews were expelled from European countries many times in history? Is it a “nutty theory” that Jews are demanding endless reparations for things long past? Is it a nutty theory that Israeli Jews are killing off Palestinians while maintaining an ethnically pure state? Explain more in detail what parts of this is a nutty conspiracy theory.

~

Argument: Jews contribute so much to society (Einstein, Freud, Marx, Spielberg, Charlie Chaplin, etc).

Rebuttal: Bees contribute a lot too with valuable wax and honey, but you don’t want a beehive in your house. The Jews are not like us, they don’t like us, and they don’t **belong** in our society. If they’re so paranoid about us wanting to “holocaust” them, why don’t they just leave? Why do they **insist** on living with people they fear and hate? They must be getting more **good** out of it than they’re letting us know.

~

Argument: Many whites do bad things too, in banking and the mass media.

Rebuttal: So you agree that Jews are overwhelmingly present in these fields, and do bad things, but you want us to **tolerate** it just because a few whites act as accomplices? Where’s your moral

fiber? Where's your sense of **justice**?

~

Argument: Jews have a history of being oppressed, it's normal they're defensive.

Rebuttal: Yeah, Jews have historically been kicked out of every country they lived in. Yet they insist that **they're** completely blameless, and that it was the evil **non-Jews** who hated them for absolutely no reason at all. You can't make this stuff up.

~

Argument: They have a right to protect the interests of their people and preserve their culture.

Rebuttal: Yes. If a group of non-Jews went to Israel and became prominent in banking, the media and politics, they would have every right to oppose it. And so do we.

~

Argument: You're talking like a Nazi.

Rebuttal: You've been talking like a commie since the beginning, but I wanted to keep things classy. So much for that.

Rebuttal: Oh, here we go, yes, I'm a "Nazi who wants to gas 6 million Jews". Anything else you want to get off your chest before we move on?

~

Argument: What about the Holocaust?

Rebuttal: When two ethnic groups occupy the same space, conflict is inevitable as they compete for resources and political power. The end result will inevitably be the eventual removal of the loser in the struggle. The only way to avoid this is separation. But people like **you**, who **insist** on keeping rival ethnic groups enclosed together, are the direct cause of these unfortunate events.

~

Argument: Israel is our greatest ally in the middle east/ Israel is America's greatest ally

Rebuttal: We don't **need** allies in the middle east - we don't have anything to **do** with the middle east. Leave the middle east **alone**. We have enough problems at **home** without going out and bombing the world.

~

Argument: Israel is just a puppet of the USA, not the other way around - that's like the tail wagging the dog.

Rebuttal: Really, Israel is a puppet of the USA? What exactly has the USA to **gain** by genociding the Palestinians? What does the USA have to **gain** by keeping Israel genetically pure? What does the USA have to **gain** by being an ally to the **one** country hated by all it's neighbors? No, if the USA is telling Israel what to do, they clearly **aren't** listening.

~

Argument: What does it matter if Jews control XYZ? It would be the same if Irish or Catholics owned it - all they care about is profit anyway.

Rebuttal: Okay, according too your logic, you think it would be just fine if **scientologists** owned much of the media, and banks, and had key posts in the government? You think it would have no effect **whatsoever** on the programing on television, who can get loans, and what laws get passed? Is this what you **really** believe?

~

Argument: We need the Jews, they hold such important positions, we couldn't replace them.

Rebuttal: (*Sarcastic*) Don't worry, I'm sure we can manage to find somebody willing to sacrifice themselves and accept jobs as financial executives and government bureaucrats.

~

Argument: You're just jealous of their success because you're a loser.

Rebuttal: When a gazelle is eaten by a lion, does it also envy the lion's success? When you get an flu, are you jealous of the flu virus's virulence? When you get out of the lake covered in leeches, do you wish you'd be more like those successful leeches?

~

Argument: We whites just need to stick together and we'll do well too - we can't blame the Jews for sticking together.

Rebuttal: If we're going to stick together and win the struggle against the Jews, why not just get them to all leave for Israel? What advantage are we getting by keeping them here? **They** sure don't bother keeping a population of gentiles in their country if they can help it.

~

Argument: Jews are smart and talented, that's why they are over-represented in all these fields.

Rebuttal: So **what** if they're smart and talented? If a tiger is hunting you down, do you say "well, the tiger is fast and strong, so it's normal if he eats me"? I'm telling people to wake up and do what's GOOD for themselves, and **you're** justifying the successes of our competitors! Whose side are you on here exactly?

~

Argument: The Jews may have influence, but they don't CONTROL the mass media/banking/etc

Rebuttal: You can say that the president has "influence" over the government, but he doesn't **control** it either. What difference does that make? **None**. If the one who owns, or the one who manages an institution is **hostile** to us, that institution cannot help but have harmful policies. **All** of our institutions should be owned and managed by people who feel a bond of kinship with our people. Anything else is folly.

~

Argument: It's not ALL the Jews, just a small minority of Jews who are the problem. Most Jews are good people.

Rebuttal: Jews as a **whole** are competing against us for the resources and political influence of our nation. Even if your competitors are "good people", it doesn't make them change sides. A good person works to promote the interests of his family and his people. The question is, do we want **our** good people to prosper, or **their** good people?

Argument: Judaism is just a religion. Anyone could convert - it's not an ethnic group.

Rebuttal: Anyone can convert and become "God's chosen people"? That sounds like a good deal. But if Jews form a religion, you should really go tell that to all the those atheist Jews who nevertheless identify as Jewish. It seems they never got the message that they're not Jews anymore. You should also tell all those parents who insist their boys marry a Jewish girl to insure the children will be Jewish according to Talmud law. Since it's just a religion, the kids will just be able to convert later after all. Look, forget this nonsense that Judaism is only a religion. The Jews certainly don't act like it's a religion, so we'd be fools to believe it.

Rebutal: The Jews are perhaps the most intensely ethnocentric people on earth. It would be hilarious if they ended up not being a race in spite of their belief to the contrary, but that's irrelevant. What **matters**, is that they **behave** as if they were an ethnic group, and that is enough to justify separation between us and them.

WHITE GENOCIDE

All populations on earth are exploding, except for whites who are disappearing fast. Our birthrate is low, and our countries are being flooded with non-white immigrants against the will of the population. The logical result of this is the extinction of the white race. Since this is being enforced by government policies and encouraged by other ethnic groups, it is a calculated genocide.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Whites are doing fine, they're the wealthiest people on earth.

Rebuttal: A man with cancer isn't "doing fine" if he has money and an iPhone. Our population is decreasing, and our lands are being flooded with non-whites, and you think money and trinkets make it all okay? You need to get your priorities straight.

~

Argument: When races mix, you get the best of both worlds, the children are more beautiful, healthier, etc

Rebuttal: Oh, so you basically want to breed humans together to create a superior master race, and eliminate all others?

Note: Don't argue complex scientific principles to counter this dumb claim. When liberals thoughtlessly start arguing in favor of eugenics and ethnic cleansing, call them on it.

~

Argument: The earth is overpopulated anyway, it's good that the birthrate is going down.

Rebuttal: The birthrate isn't going down - **whites** are disappearing. We're the only ones who are not having children. If the solution to overpopulation is to wipe out a whole race, why do you insist it has to be us? That's pretty sinister - whose side are

you on exactly?

Reply: I'm on nobody's side, I'm just being objective.

Rebuttal: Oh, you're on nobody's side? Then nobody should listen to your advice, because you obviously don't care about them.

Reply: I care about everybody equally!

Rebuttal: Then you should be particularly concerned that the whites are disappearing from the face of the earth - but you don't seem to think it's a big deal.

~

Argument: We'll all be one race eventually anyway, there's no point in trying to preserve our race.

Rebuttal: Humanity has existed in one form or another for over a million years. If we're not one race by now, I don't see why we should become one race in the near future. I'm not concerned with science fiction speculation about the distant future, I'm concerned with reality as it is **now**.

Rebuttal: When a white and a black have kids, you don't have one race - you now have **three** races: whites, blacks and mulattoes. Mixing doesn't get rid of different races, it just creates more and more small variations. All this creates MORE conflict and ethnic tension. Yay! Your insane biological experiment is backfiring spectacularly and we're going to be seeing a lot of violence because of it. Hell, we're **already** seeing a lot of violence if you open your eyes.

~

Argument: It's good that whites will disappear, they're the scourge of the earth/they deserve it.

Rebuttal: Here we see the fundamental nature of liberal thought. I'm glad you finally explained your position in simple terms. Let me repeat it in case someone missed it. You think whites are a **scourge**, and deserve to be eliminated. Now let me ask you this: do you think people like you are going to work for

our best interest when you get in leadership positions? Or are you going to undermine our people in any way that you can?

~

Argument: There's nothing we can do about it, so let's not worry and just do our own thing.

Rebuttal: Maybe there's nothing YOU think you can do about it. But we're not all so soft and demoralized. Rather than selfishly doing our own thing alone somewhere, we need to get together and work for social progress.

~

Argument: So what do you care, you won't be here when it happens anyway.

Rebuttal: I care because I'm worried about the life my children will lead. I care because I respect the sacrifices our ancestors have made for us. I care because I think we are a source of good in this world and I don't want the earth to be plunged in darkness. Evidently none of those things have occurred to you.

~

Argument: Don't be so pent up about these things, just relax, take it easy!

Rebuttal: You're the kind of person who tells his kid when he gets home all beat up: "relax, take it easy! They'll get tired of beating you up eventually!". When we're in trouble, it's not the time to "take it easy", it's the time to roll your sleeves and **fix** the problem. When your toilet tank breaks and water is leaking in your house, do you "take it easy"? When your plane is crashing into the ocean, do you "take it easy"? Only people who don't care about anyone or anything are "relaxed" when terrible things happen.

~

Argument: We were immigrants too, once, and we were not so kind with the natives either.

Rebuttal: Yes, and did the natives just lay down their arms and let us displace them? By god, NO! They fought with heroic bravery to resist us. We lost **thousands** of lives fighting against them over hundreds of years. The natives committed blood-curdling atrocities, and we sometimes used subterfuge - all to determine the winner of the struggle for dominance over the American continent. The natives had will, they had energy, they had the instinct to survive - and so did we. In the end, our will and ferocity proved greater. But **now** what's happening? We're just letting ourselves disappear without putting up even the **semblance** of a fight! What **happened** to our will to live?



Argument: We can't keep the immigrants out, that would violate their human rights.

Rebuttal: Bringing immigrants against the will of the population violates OUR civil rights. Are you saying our civil rights are less important than the civil rights of people who aren't even citizens of our country?

Reply: How does it violate our civil rights? I don't understand.

Rebuttal: Mixing people of different ethnicities in the same area or political jurisdiction will **always** result in conflict and violence. Intentionally plunging people into an atmosphere of violence and conflict obviously violates their rights.

Reply: No, that's not how human rights work, blablabla

Rebuttal: So for you human rights defends **foreigners** against "discomfort" and "having their feelings hurt", but it doesn't protect **whites** against violence, displacement and death? If that's what human rights are, it seems more like a weapon to destroy us than anything else.

WHITE PRIDE

Whites have done many great things in history: civilizations like ancient Greece, the roman empire, renaissance Europe, great inventions like the car, telephone and computers, and artists like Bach and Michelangelo, and so on. We have made great contributions to humanity, and have much to be proud of. It's normal and natural and healthy to acknowledge and honor the achievements of our ancestors. If we don't respect our ancestors, and our people, we can't respect ourselves either, and we can't do what is best for ourselves and our children.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: It's dumb to feel pride for things you've never done yourself.

Rebuttal: It's dumb to feel proud when your children do well in school? It's dumb to feel proud that your father is a self-made man? No. Well adjusted people are happy when their people do well, only sociopaths are indifferent to the achievements of their own group.

~

Argument: The white race has always oppressed others and done terrible things. That's nothing to be proud of.

Rebuttal: You're more interested in putting people down than anything else. Someone builds a cathedral and you say "he cheated in school once, that's nothing to be proud of". Everyone has done bad things - the fact that you're completely focused on that alone shows you have a hostile agenda.

~

Argument: Our achievements are only because we exploited other people.

Rebuttal: Who was exploited to build the cathedrals? Who was exploited to write Bach's concertos? Who was exploited to

invent the steam engine? You're insane.

~

Argument: Those inventions and industries of white people are wrecking the environment.

Rebuttal: Oh, so if you think those inventions aren't worth the damage, I assume you don't ride in cars, you don't use a computer, and you don't use industrial products? Oh, you DO? I guess you think the benefit outweighs the problems then. And anyway, who do you think can **fix** these problems? Nobody but the whites seem to **care at all** about the environment.

~

Argument: If it wasn't for Arab mathematicians/Jews like Einstein/Chinese alchemists, we would not have attained our great achievements.

Rebuttal: So according to your logic, the inventor of the gear should be credited with the invention of the clock? The creator of the symbol for the number zero should be credited with quantum physics? The discoverer of gun powder should really be honored for the development of the M-16, or maybe even the Apollo rockets? What kind of backward thinking is that?

~

Argument: The world would be better off without the whites.

Rebuttal: So basically, you'd really prefer if all the people here and their families were wiped out. You'd think the world would be a better place. Yes, wipe us all out and replace us with Saudis and Somalians, then everyone will dance and sing in happiness forever. Your hatred for white people is very disturbing.

~

Argument: You sound like a white supremacist.

Rebuttal: You're right. People who cheer for their football team are Giants supremacist too (substitute local sports team). And people who identify with humans rather than chimps are

“human supremacists”. What are you then? I guess you must be a (Muslim/black/female/victim) supremacist. Because you think they’re without fault and always take their side.



Argument: All those innovations of the white race are nothing compared with their history of oppression

Rebuttal: Oh, no! We have to feel bad about our history of oppression now! We’re oppressing the Africans as we speak by sending them boat loads of food, water and medicine. We oppressed the colonies by introducing them to the rule of law, public sanitation and modern technology. We oppressed the blacks by bringing them over to America to live in comfort and safety while the rest of Africa was dying of malaria and eating each other. I don’t know why, but I don’t feel even a twinge of guilt. All these “oppressed” people seem better off now than they used to be, for some reason. That’s a very strange kind of oppression, don’t you think?

CHAPTER V - MISCELLANEOUS

GENERAL ATTACKS

There is no specific topic in this section, which will cover general arguing tactics of liberals. These will come in endless variations, of course, but if you've ever seen a liberal arguing, you've heard them all already. This is their bread and butter - they'll use these attacks no matter what you're talking about, or even if it doesn't even remotely apply to the conversation or to your behavior. Think of this as default liberal tactics - what they say when they can't think of anything else.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: *Rolls eyes* It's (current year) already! Get with the program.

Rebuttal: *Rolls eyes* You're against slavery? It's 1776 already! get with the program. What? you're against burning witches? It's 1575 already! Get with the program. (add more if you want). Right and wrong have **nothing** to do with the date, or what others are doing around you. Don't be a lemming/sheep.

~

Argument: Your argument is too simple, it's dangerous, black and white, just to manipulate people/ It's seductive to think in simple terms, but dangerous...

Rebuttal: You don't want the debate to be explained in simple terms, because then people would realize that your ideas are fundamentally destructive. Your argument, in simple terms is this: "whites are evil, and we should be destroyed, and all our resources should be distributed to non-whites instead" or "women are innocent oppressed victims and men are evil oppressors, and everything would be great if women decided everything all the time". But it doesn't sound so good now that it's explained that way, now, does it? People who talk in obscure terms are usually hiding something. Honesty is always expressed in simple terms

anyone can understand.

~

Argument: I thought we had evolved beyond that kind of thinking.

Rebuttal: Yeah, maybe other species will evolve like this too, maybe squirrels will stop having babies and give all their food away to others, and let other species occupy their territory without putting up a fight. That's the next step in evolution in your mind: extinction. I think I'll stick to evolution which makes us more fit for survival myself.

Note: It doesn't matter if they word a similar argument without using the word "evolve", just go for it. You can say "that's progress for you, huh? Extinction?" instead of evolution.

~

Argument: You want to go back to the (1960's/1930's/1620's/etc)? Stop clinging to the past.

Rebuttal: That's the difference between you and me. You have nothing but **contempt** for our history and our ancestors, while I have a deep respect for them. Liberals **renounce** our heritage and head blindly into the abyss. We are informed by **thousands** of years of tradition, ready to face the future keeping in mind the lessons of history.

~

Argument: You need to be more tolerant.

Rebuttal: What is tolerance? Do you tolerate **love**? Do you tolerate **health**? No, you only tolerate **bad** things. You tolerate the dentist drilling in your teeth. You tolerate the burning sun while crossing the desert. You tolerate **evil** things. **Why** would you tolerate evil or painful experiences, if no good comes out of it later? You **shouldn't**. That would not be a virtue, but simply **weakness**. When I have a rock in my shoe, I don't tolerate it, I remove it. When people behave badly, we shouldn't tolerate it, we should **correct** their bad behavior. That's how we'll make social

progress.

~

Argument: You're just ignorant. You wouldn't think this way if you went to university.

Rebuttal: It indeed requires a long training, and a period of isolation from the normal world, to be able to twist your mind into thinking it's a good idea that your own people should be destroyed, that morality is evil and oppressive, that blacks only fail because of white racism and that all of this is justified with platitudes like "diversity is strength". I'm not as flexible as you - I just use common sense, and judge things according to what is good for my family and my people.

~

Argument: You're a hater / Why the hate?

Rebuttal: Ah, the magic word, "hate". We all know that only bad people have "hate". We know that people who have "hate" are mentally ill, that they are "dangerous". Liberals, on the other hand, have none of that "hate"; they have only infinite love for everybody. They accept everybody just like they are - they don't judge. Sure, they may have **vicious contempt** for conservative Christians who promote traditional values, but that's different. Sure, they may think white people are responsible for **all** the world's evils and should be **destroyed**, but that's not hate of course. Sure, they may **gloat** when nationalists are imprisoned or killed, but that's just innocent fun. The only **real** hate, is when white people want to protect their interests. We understand.

~

Argument: If we only loved one another, we could fix all the world's problems.

Rebuttal: Emotions don't solve problems, actions do. The people who sit around and try to "feel" their way to a better world haven't accomplished a god damn thing, and never will. Love for everyone is too weak to motivate anyone to action. Love for you family can motivate you, love for your people can

motivate you. Vague, generic “love” - nobody sacrifices time and effort because of that.

~

Argument: Try love instead of hate.

Rebuttal: People who have no hate have no love either. If you love your family, you hate anything that tries to harm your family. If you love your people, you hate those who would do harm to your people. Hate springs from love like water springs from a well. Those who are incapable of hate are dead inside.

~

Argument: (Tells story related to personal experience) (Ex: When **I** was in school, we all worked together regardless of race and things were wonderful)

Rebuttal: What **I’m** concerned about isn’t specific events or situations, I want what is best for my people **in general**. I want what works for most people most of the time. Not what I selfishly think is best for **me** and **my friends** and screw the rest of society. You think “I managed to make this work that one time, so if others can’t they can burn for all I care”. I have more empathy than that.

~

Argument: (Generic personal attack)

Rebuttal: (Amused face) Oh, personal attacks. I guess we’ve reached the point where you don’t have any more arguments, then. How embarrassing. We can move on then, don’t worry. (Then, if they attack you again later, you can just say “Ho, you’re out of arguments again? I understand”)

Rebuttal: Cool story bro. As I was saying...

Rebuttal: (Look at the audience shrugging, smile and say...) well, I guess I’m a racist/homophobe/etc... (look at the liberal) what were we talking about before you derailed the conversation?

Note: The pattern here is to ignore the attack and actively

make the liberal look bad for insulting you. It's better not to scold him for his bad behavior, because that might be perceived as you being affected by the insult. You need to give off the feeling of being superior, like an adult and a brat.

~

Argument: *Interrupting you*

Rebuttal: You're afraid of what I have to say? You're afraid that people are agreeing with me?

Reply: No, of course not.

Rebuttal: Then stop interrupting me, it's very impolite, only uneducated people do that. We each get our turn when talking, that's how the adults do it.

Note: This is a classic scolding. This is very authoritative. Here I add a negative association ("only uneducated people do that"). You can add social pressure to scolding too ("nobody likes people who interrupt"). If they then complain ("You can't tell me what to do") just ignore them ("huhuh") and move on to your next point. You shouldn't scold the opponent often, ideally only once in the discussion when they display their worst impertinence.

~

Argument: (Making ridiculous false statements) (Example: Men have always oppressed women)

Rebuttal: (repeat what they said) This is what you believe? (Get into the details and the implications, and just leave it at that without commenting)

Example: You believe that ALL men, have ALWAYS oppressed ALL women? This is what you believe? Let me get this straight. You think that since the beginning of time, men have conspired with each other to keep women in servitude, and women have just accepted this for thousands of years, all the while men and women married, lived together, raised kids and grew old together. Ok, I understand your position.

~

Argument: (Raising their voice and getting emotional)

Rebuttal: Stay calm... It's all right.... If this is upsetting you, we'll stop here, ok? (Paternalistic, dominant attitude - like you're comforting a little girl after beating her at checkers)

Note: Never get dragged in a shouting match. Jump on them when they start shouting and characterize it as a show of weakness - because it is.

~

Argument: (Gibberish you don't understand, or mumbling)

Rebuttal: (Once they're done, just ignore what they said and keep explaining your position)

Note: This should be your default response when you don't have anything to say because the liberal doesn't make any sense. If you didn't understand, the audience didn't either. Don't ask the liberal to repeat himself. That's submissive, showing like you're interested in what they have to say. You can also scold the liberal for mumbling or for not making coherent statements, and explain how to articulate better to humiliate him. This is only appropriate when they have a distinctive habit of mumbling.

Argument: That's not true.

Rebuttal: (Say a typical platitude and rebut it)

Note: When a liberal flat out rejects your point without giving an explanation or a cliché, simply be amused, act as if you're reading the liberal's mind and tell the public what the liberal is thinking - then rebut it as usual. For example, after you explain your position on nationalism, the liberal says "that's not true, that's just radical nonsense". Look at him and say "oh, let me guess: why can't we all just get along?" and then give your rebuttal. When the opponent fails to make an argument, he gives you the opportunity to make the argument for him - take it! And make him look like a fool like he deserves. It doesn't matter if

your cliché isn't 100% spot on appropriate, as long as it's vaguely plausible.

~

Argument: (Implies the audience agrees with him)

Note: Of course, we will use the same tactic during the whole conversation as well - it is imperative to get people on our side. And it is much easier for us to succeed in this, since the liberal will probably be attacking the audience (white people) with his arguments (and if not, trick them into doing it!), while we will be defending and praising the audience. But to truly prevent him from claiming public support, we have to corner him into declaring his hostility to the public. Then we can remind the public of his hostility whenever he claims that people are smart enough to agree with him, or whatever. Thus when the opponent starts gathering public support this way, you must quickly move the argument in a specific direction. After he spouts a cliché, give the rebuttal and elaborate that this is what is good for white people, because you are supporting white people. Ask him "what side are **you** on, exactly?". He cannot say that he is supporting whites, obviously, otherwise he would have to explain why his insane liberal ideas are good for whites. He will reply with some variation of the classic "I'm objective, not on anyone's side, only concerned with the facts" cliché. This cliché is addressed in the section on white genocide - smash him with all you've got! Stay on this point as long as you can. After that, it will be very dangerous for him to start implying he has support from the audience.

HISTORICAL QUESTIONS

It is important to know the truth about important historical phenomenon like the holocaust, American slavery, colonialism and the crusades because those things are being distorted by our enemies to shame and guilt us into submission. The problem, however, is that studying history is an academic exercise that we must do for ourselves - it is not practical to start educating people on subtle historical distinctions when confronting hostile liberals who play on the memes spread about by television and Hollywood.

For example, the holocaust is a ridiculous myth. But it's a myth that is very strongly charged emotionally, and everyone's been brainwashed by movies like "Schindler's list" into believing the liberal's devious propaganda. Thus it is better to avoid these subjects before you set yourself up as an authority figure in the group. You cannot correct someone's misconceptions unless they respect and trust you. But this does **not** override the general imperative to maintain a position of strength vis-à-vis the liberal. Thus we must learn to strongly punish liberals who fall back on historical references like these and teach them to avoid the subject entirely. This must be done without looking weak or annoyed.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: This kind of thinking killed 6 million Jews.

Rebuttal: Your kind of thinking killed 40 million whites. Ever heard of Stalin?

Reply: That doesn't have anything to do with my views!

Rebuttal: Exactly. I'm glad you said it first.

Note: If the liberal doesn't get the message and continues the attack after that ("Well, the Nazis believed all the same things you do"), just continue mirroring his statements until he gives up ("The communists were real serious about "equality" and

“taking down the privileged” just like you”).

~

Argument: You don’t believe in the holocaust?

Rebuttal: Listen, for the benefit of this argument, I’ll grant you that **6 trillion** Jews died in the holocaust. The real historical lesson is that, when two people with distinct blood, culture and heritage share the same territory and political jurisdiction, it is **inevitable** that they will come in conflict over resources and power. That can only ever be resolved in violence. You can be assured that if the tables were turned, the Jews would have done the same to the Germans. It’s people who **insist** on mixing people in multi-ethnic states that are ultimately **responsible** for such unfortunate events. Your policy of **diversity** is responsible for the holocaust, and it’s going to cause a lot more violence in the future too.

Note: Questions about the holocaust must be handled with care. Always remember that the worst case scenario, the thing that must be avoided at all costs, is getting dragged down into a discussion about gas chamber doors, cremation oven burn rates or population statistics before and after the war. This will fly miles above the head of the public. The power of the holocaust mythology is in the witnesses - what people think of when they’re reminded of Auschwitz is the poor Jewish woman crying while explaining her story. When scientific facts and cold logic meets human emotion, the emotions win every time. The two previous arguments show two ways to handle such discussions. The first avoids the question all together, while the second deflects blame on the liberal without addressing the details of the events. You **must** teach the opponent to avoid bringing up these complex historical issues.

~

Argument: It was people like you that owned slaves.

Rebuttal: Slavery was an institution in every society in history, from Rome to china, from ancient Egypt to native Americans. The first to abolish it on moral grounds was **us**. And yet in-

solent anti-whites have the audacity to guilt us for slavery? If it wasn't for us, there would still be slavery today **everywhere**! Anyone who **truly** dislikes slavery must **applaud** the white civilization, for our noble act in abolishing it. If you hate whites so much, why don't you go live in Africa, where slavery is **still** being practiced to this day?

Note: This is particularly tricky, because we of course are against slavery as much as anyone else (more, in fact, for historical reasons). But it would be unwise to defend yourself from these types of accusations by proclaiming your hate for slavery. It's a defensive move, and would be perceived as submissive and weak. But we cannot attack directly either, since we agree with the position of the liberal in this rare case. But the liberal is being very impertinent and must be punished harshly. We have no choice but to change the subject - without appearing to change the subject.



Argument: Colonialism is proof of the white man's evil nature.

Rebuttal: Here's how the world would look without colonialism: In Europe, we would possess all the advanced technology and industrial capacity that exists today, while the rest of the world would remain stuck in the middle ages - or prehistory. Africans would not have metal tools, or the wheel, and would still be eating each other. Human sacrifices would continue as before in south America. Your precious "human rights", "equality" and "democracy" would be **completely** unknown concepts outside of Europe. Sharing our knowledge with the world was "evil"? The spirit of discovery and adventure was "evil"? Taking the land and resources we **needed** for the welfare of our people was "evil"? Promoting human dignity and the rule of law was "evil"? What is **good** to you then? You think the cannibals living in mud huts are good and virtuous people? Only someone with blind hatred for Europeans could think something like that.

Note: Here we can address the facts to a certain extent, because people already know the basics. All we're really doing is re-

framing them in a positive light to absolve our ancestors of phony guilt.

~

Argument: Yeah, I know you law-and-order types. In Germany the trains ran on time while people burned in ovens.

Rebuttal: Public order and the rule of law are the **hallmarks** of European civilization everywhere and since the beginning of history. Because of law and order we can feel **safe** walking the street at night. Because of law and order we can do business confidently. Because of law and order we can have enough **stability** to plan ahead. Because of law and order we have common standards to help **understand** each other. You think **anarchy** is more desirable because you'd be allowed to do whatever you want? That's like a child wishing his parents were gone so that he could eat as many cookies as he wants. Get rid of law and order, and you've gotten rid of most of what makes our lives worth **living**.

~

Argument: Fascism brutally oppressed it's people. No one would want to live in that kind of society.

Rebuttal: Oh, so you want to talk about oppression? How about Stalin, Pol Pot and Mao, who killed countless millions based on the same principles of "equality" and "abolishing privileges" that you're espousing?

Reply: I'm not in favor of communism/totalitarianism, I want democracy.

Rebuttal: Everyone knows Hitler was popularly appointed in fair elections and enjoyed immense popularity. So it's obvious you really don't care about democracy; your definition of "oppression" is everything that limits degeneracy, everything that promotes the interest of white people, everything that is traditional and everything that places spiritual values above materialism.

Reply: No, Hitler oppressed people by putting them in camps and killing them. That's real oppression.

Rebuttal: We're talking about **World war 2** here. **Everyone** was putting people in camps and killing them, including your precious democracies. That's what **always** happens in wars - death and displacement. Maybe you'll argue next that democracies don't wage war either? The fact is that everyone committed atrocities in WW2, and you're just picking and choosing who to blame based on whose policies you don't like. You really think that putting people in a camp is worse than vaporizing cities in a nuclear Armageddon or firebombing unarmed civilians?

Note: We have little choice but to rely on a subtle fallacy here, because the historical truth is so at odds with media brainwashing. Normally these kinds of arguments degenerate into bickering over obscure historical details - and since the public's mind is filled with lies and misconceptions, they will just ignore the arguments and side with what they "know". We must impose a simple, but different view which doesn't rely on obscure facts.



Argument: The middle ages were a backward time were people were ignorant and oppressed by violent tyrants/Thank the heavens for the enlightenment, before that time we truly lived in dark times.

Rebuttal: People who want to justify the problems of today always do so by saying "stop complaining, it was much worse before". Yes, our high-school graduates can barely read and write and don't know their history, but it was worse before. Our politicians are corrupt and don't care about the people - but don't complain, it was worse before. Liberals have created this mythological time where our people were dirty, ignorant savages and now present themselves as heroes who saved us from such a state. Our people were **never** dirty, ignorant savages, and anyone who implies so has nothing but contempt for our ancestors.



Argument: Rome, the greatest empire of all time, was a multi-ethnic society.

Rebuttal: The Romans conquered all they encountered, en-

slaved them and brought them back home as servants and workers. This is what created this “multi-ethnic” society. Then the slaves were freed according to roman customs, and the Roman empire collapsed. If diversity was such a wonderful thing, then Rome would still be here today. Our society will suffer the same fate as the Romans if we continue on this disastrous path.

~

Argument: The ancient Egyptians were highly advanced, and they were an African civilization.

Rebuttal: Oh, is this the whole “black Egyptians” nonsense? Let me explain the theory for those who aren’t aware. Blacks created high civilization, had the most sophisticated engineering knowledge, the subtlest philosophy, the most admired culture, the most successful trade, and at some point they left Egypt, crossed the Sahara and started living in mud huts and eating each other instead. Any other profound historical facts to share with us?

Note: Don’t bother trying to prove that Egyptians were white. Just ridicule this, it’s a fringe theory and people will respond well to you rejecting it.

~

Argument: The Chinese and Indian civilization developed great complex societies without any influence from whites.

Rebuttal: They did indeed develop advanced civilizations. They had rigidly hierarchical societies divided by castes, where the superior had power of life and death over the lower classes. They had systems in which powerful men had hundreds of wives. They had strong traditions, and little innovation. They were sophisticated, and very different in nature and character from our European civilization. The Asians are smart, organized and disciplined, but they are still very different from us and their societies reflect those differences.

Note: Again, there is no use in talking about the Aryan invasion, Alexander the great or red haired mummies in china. This

historical attack is not really strong though, and so there is little need to attack the liberal viciously. He's just trying to confuse you with a subtle strawman, making it seem like you argued that all non-whites are dumb savages who can't do anything. Praising Asians while emphasizing their great differences is a good way to diffuse this.

CHRISTIANITY VS PAGANISM

Our movement, for the moment at least, is split roughly evenly between people who dislike Christianity and promote other beliefs, and devout Christians who see Christianity as being in line with all of our beliefs. This division is presently the greatest source of internal conflict in the nationalist movement, and it is important that it be resolved soon, so that we may present a united front and a strong ideology to our opponents. Division will be exploited to ridicule us to the public.

I am not a christian personally, and used to think that Christianity was an obstacle to returning to traditional values. But I've since noticed that the enemy is relentless in attacking Christianity whenever it can, even if the great majority of protestant and catholic churches promote the same liberal cultural Marxism as the rest of society. This is because, ultimately, Christianity is intimately tied to our identity as white Europeans. Attacks on Christianity are, indirectly, attacks on whiteness in general. Implying our ancestors were foolish or evil cannot help but sap our own confidence and weaken our identity. Thus while I understand and even agree with many of the criticism directed at Christianity, and while I do not subscribe to the theological system itself, I cannot tolerate people defaming our ancestors and defend Christianity whenever it is attacked.

I will thus not give any argument for attacking Christianity and it's history, or it's less constructive features. I will focus on the arguments of atheists and neo-pagans (both liberal and nationalists) who put down our traditional faith. Many of these arguments are less aggressive than the ones in other chapters, because they are directed at fellow nationalists who can see reason rather than open enemies of our people.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: Christianity spread only by the fire and the sword.

Rebuttal: (*Sarcastic*) Yes, the early Christians were converted by force, and yet they still preferred to die rather than to deny

their faith. And the missionaries working all over the world really operate by killing people until the locals accept Christ. No, that's not how things happened. Yes, some barbarians were forcefully converted at some points in history. But what is the point of focusing on that, if not to try to undermine our traditions and our history?

~

Argument: Christianity was a Jewish ploy to confuse the goyim and destroy the roman empire.

Rebuttal: The roman empire was destroyed by it's multi-ethnic makeup and increasing moral degeneracy. After the roman empire collapsed, it was Christianity that united Europe into a new civilization and re-established traditional virtue and morals. Christian values are the anti-thesis of Jewish values, which is why the Jews have always been so hostile towards Christ. If Christianity was just another version of Judaism, and served their interests, they wouldn't be doing everything they can to undermine it.

~

Argument: Christianity is a middle eastern religion which is not compatible with European culture and values.

Rebuttal: You're saying that Europeans adopted, for over 1500 years, a religion which did not represent their culture and values? And that the middle easterners, on the other hand, rejected Christianity almost completely even though it represented their culture and values and instead embraced Islam? That makes no sense.

~

Argument: Christians oppressed pagans, so it's evil.

Rebuttal: Don't confuse the religion of Christianity with the acts of **some** institutions and political powers controlled by individual Christians. Most of the evangelism done through the ages was completely peaceful. It's true that some institutions, like the Templars, committed atrocities against pagans. It is **also** true

that pagans waged wars against Christian lands, as the Danes to the English. The Christians believed that if all Europeans were converted to Christianity, it would greatly reduce the incidence of these fratricidal wars.

~

Argument: Christianity is misogynist and patriarchal, while pagans worship “the goddess” and respect women.

Rebuttal: Radical feminists who hate humanity love harping about the evil christian patriarchy. Feminists believe that Christianity is **in the way** of their plan to turn us all into **androgynous freaks** who don’t reproduce or form healthy long term relationships. Well, I’m glad to say that they’re **right**. Christianity defends the traditions that protect and guide us. Feminist neopagans respect neither men **or** women - they merely hate our civilization and wish to destroy it by promoting cultural Marxist subversion.

~

Argument: Christianity is slave morality. “Turn the other cheek”, “love thy neighbor”, and so on, all promote a passive mindset that is harmful to our people.

Rebuttal: **Christian** men stopped the moor invasion. **Christian** men stopped the mongol invasion. Christian men conquered the whole world. And today, we’re flooded with foreigners and immoral filth, and it isn’t the pagans and the atheists who are resisting - it’s in large part the traditionally minded Christians. It’s the rejection of the spiritual and the obsession with material safety and comfort that’s creating generations of **passive cowards**, not Christianity.

~

Argument: Christianity is just another version of insane cultural Marxism. “don’t judge, lest ye be judged”, “may he throw the first stone, he who has not sinned”, and so on. We can’t restore traditional morals while people believe this stuff.

Rebuttal: There are over 30,000 verses in the bible. You can

pick and choose quotes on any subject to promote the most insane policies. But these verses certainly didn't prevent our **ancestors** from enforcing strict moral principles, punishing criminals and defending the interests of our people. It's only **today**, when corrupt preachers get promoted by the Jewish media, that these idiotic ideas are presented to us. And this nonsense is certainly not preventing **most Christians** today from strongly disapproving of degenerate social trends that the cultural Marxists are promoting.

~

Argument: We cannot free ourselves from the Jew's influence while worshipping a Jew on a stick and reading Hebrew scriptures!

Rebuttal: You can't be a nationalist while ridiculing our ancestors and showing nothing but contempt for their beliefs and values. You're doing nothing except **undermining** white people's sense of identity and ethnic pride, exactly like what the Jewish media is doing. **If** there are pernicious Jewish elements in Christianity, we can identify them and **remove** them. But an ally of Europeans would not viciously attack our culture and traditions.

~

Argument: Christian priests molest little boys, they're no saints.

Rebuttal: There is no doubt that some spheres of the clergy have been infiltrated by homosexuals. This is a grave problem, and **must** be addressed. However, we can address the problem from the point of view of righteous Christians who want to clean up their institutions, or from the point of view of hostile mudslingers who want to weaken our culture and confidence. It is probably a good idea to demand from priests that they be married and have children to prevent such infiltration in the future.

~

Argument: If we have a christian society, we won't be able to have dissenting views anymore, we'll have the inquisition and people will burn for heresy.

Rebuttal: Tolerating people who promote destructive ideologies is what led us to our present state. We need some basic standards, and **some** control over what ideas get promoted or else we open the door to things like cultural Marxism, satanic churches and the homosexual lobby. Is there a danger that such a control will be too strict and stifle thought? Yes. But that problem is not **quite as bad** as the danger that our culture and values will be undermined and that society will implode. Our people are the most creative of all, and that creativity needs to be channeled into positive things like art and helpful science.



Argument: People don't believe in Christ anymore, they've moved beyond that.

Rebuttal: The vast majority of white people worldwide describe themselves as Christians. But the relentless promotion of materialism by the mass media is eroding people's spirituality and destroying our traditions and culture. What we need is not to go even further in that direction and reject God altogether, but to do whatever we can to reverse the damage and bring back the strength of our faith.



Argument: How can we have a moral society if Christians believe that faith alone is enough to grant salvation?

Rebuttal: This is a doctrine espoused only by a minority of Christians. Catholic and Orthodox Christians strongly believe in the importance of good works in order to attain salvation.

Rebuttal: Faith alone may be required for **salvation**, but a man of faith will understand the truth in God's laws and know to keep to them. It is impossible for habitual sinners to truly have faith in their salvation.

Note: This is perhaps the hardest question to answer. "Sola Fide" is a doctrine which basically says that all sins are forgiven when we accept Christ and have faith that we are forgiven. It is not a part of Orthodoxy, and is a Catholic heresy; thus it is only a

part of some protestant denominations. “Sola Fide” rejects the idea that our “good works” are necessary to forgive our sins and grant us salvation. While this may have an aspect of truth, and it’s possible to justify it to some extent, there is no doubt that it is a completely insane doctrine to promote in society. What complicates things is that it is the foundational doctrine of protestantism, one of the three schools of Christianity - and thus rejecting it violently as “unchristian” would infuriate the protestants. There is no easy or universal answer. A simple theological way to resolve the conflict would be to say that while faith alone is enough to have our sins forgiven, it is difficult to have faith in our forgiveness when we feel guilty ourselves. Thus good works, and avoiding sin, are necessary to attenuate our feeling of guilt. This absence of guilt strengthens our faith and brings us salvation. But making subtle theological arguments in a debate is not a good idea.

~

Argument: The “original sin” is just meant to make us feel guilty, it’s like the holocaust myth. It guilt us into inaction.

Rebuttal: Christ sacrificed himself to have our sins be forgiven. Thus Christians do not share in the guilt of the original sin at all. Of course, we inherited our fallen nature from this sin, but we can rise above it through faith and good works. A Christian’s acts in his current life alone will bring him salvation or damnation.

~

Argument: Paganism is the true European religion, it’s more traditional.

Rebuttal: Paganism is older, of course, but to say that it’s more traditional implies that there are huge contradictions between the customs and beliefs of the pagans and of the Christians. Christians and pagans have most of the same holidays, believe in God and lesser spirits (angels, daemons, saints, heroes and lesser gods), believe in Judgment in the afterlife and hold mostly the same virtues in esteem: piety, courage, self-sacrifice, honor, temperance, industry and so forth. If you think the pagans were

peace-loving new age tree worshipers or hard-core social Darwinist, you're wrong.

~

Argument: There was no historical Jesus. There is no proof of his existence. All the documents have been proven to be forgeries.

Rebuttal: There is no proof of a historical Moses or Krishna either - that doesn't phase the Jews or the Hindus. There is no proof that life emerged from inorganic chemicals in a "primordial soup" either - that doesn't seem to phase evolutionary scientists. We're not Christians because we were convinced by historical proofs of this or that event. We're Christians because we recognize the beauty and grace in the holy scriptures. We're Christians because we're moved by the story of Jesus. We're Christians because we love and respect the traditions of our ancestors, and recognize that we derive strength from those traditions.

~

Argument: Christianity is just a version of the mystery cults of the pagans. All of it's symbolism is astrological and existed before. Therefore we should dismiss it.

Rebuttal: Christianity is the eternal religion of our people, and the fact that we practiced it before Christ himself, albeit in different forms, only confirms that. It would be absurd and insulting to suggest that our pagan ancestors were damned simply because they lived before Christ. Those whose hearts were open to the truth received the light of wisdom and practiced this wisdom even in pagan societies. We should dismiss something because it is a 5000 year tradition rather than a 2000 year tradition? That seems only a stronger reason to maintain the practices that are so intertwined in our people.

CONSPIRACY THEORIES

The world is a big, complex and strange place. The truth is often stranger than fiction. And who really knows how historical events really developed behind the scenes? After all, those in power have always conspired to maintain and increase their power. Important political events rarely if ever happen by chance. And in some cases figuring out the details of these conspiracies can help to understand the current world in all its complexities.

That being said, there is little point in discussing highly esoteric theories about past historical events in public, especially during a heated debate on simpler subjects. The average listener is put off and confused by these things. And ultimately, they are irrelevant to the big picture: most of the problems in the world can be traced to specific people with faces and names, and those are the people who need to be held responsible. It's irrelevant if aliens, lizards or the Illuminati are behind the Jews. Bringing up these things serves no constructive purpose whatsoever, and must be stopped before it will derail the discussion and confuse the audience.

We need to relentlessly emphasize the concrete problems people can perceive, and offer concrete solutions they can understand.

ARGUMENTS

Argument: 9/11 was fake, done with holograms/ CGI/ missiles.

Rebuttal: Look, I don't care if 9/11 was done with magic and leprechauns, or aliens from mars. What I **am** concerned with however, is that 9/11 wouldn't have been possible if the air force, the airport security and our secret services had not **allowed** it to happen. We don't need to talk about shadowy conspiracies and bizarre technologies - we know which companies provided airport security, which companies were doing maintenance and security at the world trade center, who owned and insured the buildings against terrorism, and where our middle-east intelli-

gence comes from. Let's focus on things we can do something about.

~

Argument: JFK was assassinated because he wanted to disclose aliens/the Illuminati.

Rebuttal: JFK was a pawn of the system and he was replaced by another pawn of the system. We can't know for sure why he was killed, and it makes no difference anyway. JFK was promoting all the things that are destroying us now, he was a traitor. I really couldn't care less why or how one of our enemies gets killed.

~

Argument: It's not the Jews who are the problem, it's the Zionists/the Illuminati/Reptilians/Aliens/Freemasons/13 families/Satanists/etc

Rebuttal: When there is someone beating you up, do you stop defending yourself because there might be someone else controlling him? Of course not. The Jews are competing with our people for our resources and for political influence in our own nations. This cannot be tolerated. Once we have dealt with this and restored justice, it will be pretty obvious if there was someone else pulling the strings in the shadows. The possibility of hidden problems doesn't mean we should ignore overt problems.

~

Argument: We're being prayed upon by spiritual parasites (reptilians, demons, whatever). If we just wake up, we can become free!

Rebuttal: We're being prayed upon by **physical** parasites. And we will only get rid of them by appropriate action in the real world. Once we are rid of them and healthy again, we will be in a much better position to take care of all of our other problems, if any. And once good people are in charge of the mass media, "waking" people up will be much easier. So let's set aside talks of things we cannot hear or see, and focus on the very real problems

in front of our eyes. Invisible problems have no solution, and lead only to despair.

~

Argument: It's the CIA that's behind JFK/911/fake moon landings

Rebuttal: It doesn't make an inch of difference what the CIA does or how powerful they are. What matters is, whose side are they on? Whose interests are they serving? Are they serving **our** interests? If not, then they're just another enemy who's trying to displace whites and replace them with others. Once we determine that a group of people are hostile, then it really doesn't serve any purpose to get into the details of their activity, unless for strategic reasons.

~

Argument: Secret Nazi's escaped to Argentina and are now causing all our problems.

Rebuttal: Was it secret Nazi's from Argentina that opened our borders to the third world? No. Is it secret Nazi's from Argentina that own all the mass media and flood us with hostile propaganda? No. Is it secret Nazi's from Argentina that de-industrialized the west? No. So **if** some Germans really did escape to south America, **and** in the unlikely event that they're up to no good, they're clearly a very **minor** concern compared to our main problems.

~

Argument: We're being prepared for population reduction because of peak oil/global warming/food shortages/Nazi eugenics

Rebuttal: The only population that's being reduced is the white population, everyone else seems to be exploding. So who is it exactly that's "preparing the world for population reduction"? It sure isn't us. And it seems that the goal of "population reduction" isn't a lower population either, just a population with less white people.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt in my mind that a revival of ethnic nationalism in our people is the only light of hope for our survival. Even if a small but courageous band of ingenious whites managed to wrestle control of the government, without popular support they could not govern effectively. Thus it is paramount to continue spreading the seeds of a revolution in consciousness. There are signs that we are at a tipping point - people are leaving the traditional media in droves and alternative media outlets, which promote a very different picture, are skyrocketing in popularity.

But the most powerful tool for effecting change in the minds of our fellow whites is our own voice. Written words are so abstract, they do not seem real. The internet, even with its images and videos, is so distant and artificial, it does not seem relevant to our lives. But the people around us, their faces, their words, their voices - that's real. Humans are desperately worried about their acceptance in the pack, because this acceptance is essential for survival. This prime concern makes us very attentive to the opinions and attitudes of the people around us. This also makes most people afraid to voice their own opinions, as it exposes them to the risk of being rejected by the group. This is the dynamic that is used to keep white people down - they are afraid to support their own interest, because they are convinced that no one else shares their concern and that they will be stigmatized for speaking out.

But this same dynamic can also be exploited to effect a dramatic turnaround. Make no mistake, the **overwhelming** majority of whites are concerned about the waves of hostile immigrants flooding into their country. They are also horrified at the degeneracy being promoted on television and movies. They are silent because they believe they are alone and isolated. That is where we come in. When people feel safe from being rejected or bullied for agreeing with us, they will support us.

By talking freely and openly about the issues that truly concern us, we are changing the atmosphere, the frame of reference. We are creating an environment in which it is “safe” to express nationalist feelings. And as one, two and three people begin to step forward and make supportive statements, the group understands that that is the new group norm. Now it is the liberals who fear speaking out for fear of being rejected. The whole situation was quickly turned around.

This book was written to help nationalists gain the confidence to engage in this important work without fearing the attacks of the liberal defenders of the system. In any circle of friends, workplace or public gathering, there will be some who will feel compelled to object to your ideas. Some will object reflexively, without real thought or belief, while others will be fervent fanatics. In either case they must be chastised for their destructive views, in order for the rest of the group to accept the new paradigm.

We **must** engage in this low level activism of words. We **must** normalize these views and establish dominance over culture. We **must** stigmatize and ridicule the liberal **filth** which is destroying our civilization! May this book grant you the confidence you need to speak out with full trust that you will dominate all naysayers. May this book sharpen your eyes to see through the bluffs and the fears of our opponents.

May this book forge your tongue into a sword for our people!

APPENDIX A - REWARDING THE OPPONENT

While, most of the time, there is no cause to reward a liberal, especially if he is not a potential ally, doing so will show dominance when the occasion presents itself. There is only one occasion where reward is appropriate: when the liberal concedes a point or agrees with you on something significant. In that case, you should make a special note of it and genuinely praise him for it. Note that this should be a true reward, not a rhetorical insult. Thus he must truly feel good about it. For example:

Nationalist: ... children need to be raised by a man and a woman, it's inappropriate to let them adopt kids.

Liberal: I agree that a normal family is ideal for raising kids, but some homosexuals could really raise kids well.

Nationalist: (warm voice tone, no sarcasm or aggression) I'm glad we can agree on basic things like that. Yes, a normal family is the ideal. It may seem basic but these days it takes a perceptive person to realize this, and it takes courage to say it in spite of political correctness.

Liberal: Eh, thank you.

Nationalist: (Still with the warm voice tone) Let's go one step further and ask "why do homosexuals make worse parents most of the time?". Because they have abnormal habits which are a result of mental illness. That is a universal trait of homosexuals. Now, we both agree that it's irresponsible to allow the mentally ill to adopt children, right?

Liberal: Gays aren't mentally ill... Homosexuals are just like you and me, it's just a sexual preference. (Back to his normal cliches)

Nationalist: (Back to normal voice tone, no more warmth) Oh, there we go again... (Give your rebuttal)

What is the point of this? Why not just keep hammering the liberal? After all, he didn't say anything truly praise worthy. But after the relentless assault he's suffered previously in the debate, this short window of peace will seem like a breath of fresh air to the opponent. Subconsciously, unless he is very strong, he cannot help but yearn for more reprieve from your aggressive replies. He will want your approval again. Doing this several times can, in some cases, "train" him to agree with you more and seek your praise. The public will understand this as submissive behavior and will perceive you as the authority figure in the discussion.

If the liberal opponent is a potential ally, this technique could potentially bring him to your side over several discussions.

But remember that the technique only works if you can really make the enemy feel relieved and peaceful. He must not feel attacked in any way. Thus hints of sarcasm or overt domineering will not bring the effect you want. Examples of what NOT to say when trying to praise the opponent:

"See... you can be reasonable too, sometimes! Keep it up" (This is an attack, not a praise)

"Good, you're making progress, you're learning" (This seems like a praise, but is obviously an attempt to be paternalistic and will be met with hostility)

"That's the first smart thing you said today" (This is actually a praise, but it's combined with ridicule, and so is ineffective)

Effective rewards are praising ("that's a good point"), making a positive association ("you're like a war hero, but who's fighting for the enemy side... I wish someday you join up with the good guys *smirk*"), apologizing ("I guess we're not so different - sorry for being so hard on you before... I'm just so concerned about these things, you know, I get passionate...") agreeing (*nodding* "Yeah, you nailed it on the head for this one, I agree 100%") and sharing your experience ("I'm excited to explain these things, you know... I'm so worried about all these things, and I **want** things to improve. I hope I can be eloquent enough to help people learn the truth"). Note that all of these rewards are given from a completely genuine attitude.

The trick is to stop your positive attitude **instantly** once the liberal makes the first comment that displeases you, and return to your normal way of arguing, as if you had never praised him or apologized. The liberal will feel this like a bucket of cold water after your previous warmth, and the public will be impressed with your control of the situation.

This is a rather difficult technique and thus is entirely optional - that's why it's in an appendix.

APPENDIX B - DEVELOPING NEW ARGUMENTS

You may have to develop new rebuttals if you encounter platitudes not addressed in this book, or if you expect to debate on very specific topics that you want to focus on. This section will contain both tips to help you create these arguments, and guidelines for judging on the quality of your creations.

THE CREATION PROCESS

First, establish clearly what argument you want to confront with your rebuttal. It can sometimes help, if you are confused or lack inspiration, to detail the liberal argument much more than they would in real life, and try to determine the assumptions and premisses behind it. The more material you have, the easier it will be to make a good attack on it.

Your first reflex should always be to look for a way to quickly destroy their argument with a well formulated example or an appeal to common sense. This is especially easy to do when their argument is obviously nonsensical, as in “Diversity is a strength”. Ponder on the rebuttal I give for this cliché. I describe a scenario that people can visualize, and this quickly demonstrates that diversity is not a strength. I then proceed to point out how absurd this idea is, but it’s just to put salt in the wound - the opponent is already injured by the aggressive crushing of his argument.

Remember, the purpose of our reply is to punish the opponent, to make him feel bad. But we must still **appear** to be simply engaging in argument. Thus the best attack is simply demonstrating the opponent’s foolishness or other flaws, without pointing them out ourselves necessarily.

If it is not possible to quickly crush the argument, then think about the topic at hand. Ask yourself “what is **our** position on this issue? What is the **truth?**”. Rather than address their argument directly, we will instead oppose our ideas to contrast with theirs. Formulate our position in the simplest possible words.

Now you must adapt this formulation of our position to the situation at hand. Incorporate the terms the opponent has used, but change their significance. Add evocative examples that resonate with your public. Even if your position is simple and remains unchanged, it must seem appropriate that you ignore the opponent's statements and explain your own ideas instead. It must sound like a direct reply, even though it does not logically address anything he has said.

Finally, try to find a way to incorporate subtle (or not-so-subtle!) attacks on the liberal's position, or his character weakness. If this cannot be incorporated in the body of your reply, just make an extra comment before or after.

ASSESSING YOUR MATERIAL

Read your rebuttal and ask yourself the following questions:

First, is the rebuttal simple to understand? This requires that it is stated in simple terms, not using philosophical jargon. It also means it should not refer to studies, statistics or historical events the public is unlikely to be familiar with. Lastly, it should not be very long and convoluted. Simple, and to the point, that even a 10 year old child can grasp.

Second, does it make the liberal feel bad? This requires that the he feels attacked, rejected or ridiculed in some way. The opponent should be looking for ways to attenuate this pain. If things go well, it will result in more compliant behavior. Otherwise, he might become emotional and stop the conversation, or get angry and attack you. In either case, this is favorable to you as it makes you appear more dominant and in control. Of course, it is not advisable to directly insult the opponent himself or act gratuitously in any other ways, or else you will appear vicious rather than dominant. Your attacks must be directed at things he says, and his positions. There should always be a way out for him, by abandoning his position. If he slips out of your accusations this way, it will make him appear submissive anyway.

Third, will the public be on your side? This requires that you argue for their interests, and from their perspective. Our posi-

tions are extreme, and most people are afraid of extreme positions because they are risky in our politically correct age. Thus your positions must be explained in a way as to make them seem normal and universally accepted by straight white people (which is often the case anyway).

Fourth, what is the opponent most likely to reply to your rebuttal? You must be ready for that as well. In most cases, he will have to reply with a cliché that you are already familiar with. But in other cases, he can point out a logical flaw in your rebuttal. This is fine, but you must be ready. If you find that there is an obvious answer the liberal can give you, be sure to include it and formulate a rebuttal to it also.

EXAMPLE

Argument: You can't just **ban** fast food! People have the right to eat whatever they want!

First step (Clarify the argument): What is the liberal saying here? First, it would be a bad policy to ban unhealthy food. He justifies this by saying that people have a right to the freedom to ingest anything, even unhealthy foods that will make them sick and kill them. He is also implying that companies have the right to sell unhealthy food. What are the implications of this? Well, first, that freedom to indulge in pleasure is more important than the duty to keep ourselves healthy. Second, it implies that there are no social consequences to what we eat, and is thus a personal choice and not subject to public policy.

Second step (Fast rebuttal): Can we destroy this in a simple and efficient way? Perhaps by exaggerating his argument slightly, making it obviously destructive: "If people can eat whatever they want, why not make rat-poison cookies and sell them to children? That's fine too, right? Or why not just make meth and other hard drugs legal, while we're at it? It's people's choice if they want to destroy their bodies, after all...". Or perhaps by taking a very manner of fact approach: "Actually, we could ban fast food quite easily. Just pass a law that forces restaurants to eliminate soft drinks, fried foods and sugar from their menus. A few

months and everyone would start getting more healthy". But these are not that strong. Let's proceed to a more in-depth rebuttal instead.

Third step (Our position): What is our position on this issue? All that matters to a nationalist is, what is good for our people? We want our people to be healthy, strong and happy. If they eat junk food all the time, it will make it impossible to have a healthy society, so this must be prevented at all costs. Education is good, but it's cruel to have all this temptation to make people stray from the right path. So fast food restaurants must not be allowed to advertize, to be present everywhere and to sell anything. These things must be restricted for our common good.

Fourth step (Adaptation): Now to adapt that position to the situation. We can start by reversing his statement: "Our people have the right to be **healthy**!" Then we'll elaborate what this implies: "If it's necessary to remove temptations from the environment and some products from the market to guarantee people's health, then that's a sacrifice we must make".

Fifth step (Attack): By looking at our analysis of the liberal's position, we see he thinks freedom to eat whatever we want is more important than health and duty. This can easily be framed as a sign of weakness. "There are more important things in life than eating cheeseburgers and drinking soda"

Putting it all together, we get:

Argument: You can't just **ban** fast food! People have the right to eat whatever they want!

Rebuttal: My people have the right to be **healthy**. There are more important things in life, than eating cheeseburgers and drinking soda. We all have the **duty** to take care of our health, and if it's necessary to remove temptations from the environment and some products from the market to guarantee people's health, then that's a sacrifice we **must** make. By removing all the poisonous things we're being offered as "food", our people will become stronger and happier.

Now we need to verify that the rebuttal satisfies the verifica-

tion questions.

Is the statement easy to understand? It uses no complex concept, statistics or science of any kind. Anyone can understand this and sympathize with it.

Will the opponent feel bad because of this rebuttal? We do attack him and imply that he thinks eating fast food is important. This makes him look soft and superficial, but only very slightly. If we want to make this more painful, we'll need to add more punishment. "We've got a health **disaster** on our hands. You want to do nothing about this? Maybe drug people with **more** pills? Let's take **responsibility** here and do something that will make a real difference."

Will the public be on our side? Mmhh, this is a bit harsh on people. Many may feel attacked, since they are not very healthy themselves and feel bad about it. We need to sympathize with them. "We all want to make the right choices, but when we're surrounded with temptations, it's hard to be disciplined. Let's make this easier on all of us."

What might the opponent reply to our rebuttal? He is likely to say that we need to focus on education ("People will make the right decision if they know the facts"). There might be fringe answers, like saying that being obese doesn't matter, as long as we abolish "thin-privilege" and promote "fat-acceptance". But those are going to be easy to address. Or he might resort to a generic cliché and change the subject ("that's socialism" or "You're a fascist who wants to impose his views on people"). None of those need to be addressed. But the first one is a great opportunity to smash the opponent, and if he falls into the trap we need to have something ready ("Everybody knows drinking soda is bad for us, it's not a question of education. In fact you just don't want to make any kind of personal sacrifice for the common good.")

So the corrected version will look like this:

Argument: You can't just **ban** fast food! People have the right to eat whatever they want!

Rebuttal: My people have the right to be **healthy**. We've got a health **disaster** on our hands. You want to do nothing about this? Maybe drug people with **more** pills? Let's take **responsibility** here and do something that will make a real difference. Look, we all want to make the right choices, but when we're surrounded with temptations, it's hard to be disciplined. Let's make this easier on all of us. By removing all the poisonous things we're being offered as "food", our people will become stronger and happier.

Reply: It's not necessary to outright ban it! If we just make a information campaign, people will understand.

Rebuttal: **Everybody** knows drinking soda is bad for us, it's not a question of education. In fact you just don't want to make any kind of personal sacrifice for the common good.

This would be an effective rebuttal. If you practice with this process enough, you will improve your ability to make arguments up on the fly, and adapt to even very unusual situations. But since most of what typical liberals will say is already addressed in the book, this process is mostly included for the sake of completeness, as well as to help you with theoretical understanding of this strategy. One last purpose is that you will likely change the rebuttals of this book to adapt them to different situations, or just to better fit with your personality and style of speaking. By being familiar with these guidelines, you reduce the chance of "breaking" the arguments as you adapt them.

APPENDIX C - TROUBLESHOOTING

Since this is a practical guide rather than a book on theory or ideology, there is always the possibility that you will run into problems as you start to apply the techniques in your daily life. This section will try to address the most likely issues in advance.

Question: I'm arguing with this liberal at work, and whenever I make a point he cites historical examples or points out scientific studies that contradict me. I don't have enough knowledge to counter him on the spot, he's very knowledgeable.

Solution: The problem here is that you're getting sucked into his rhythm, into his frame. Don't debate him on his territory. You don't even know if his references are legitimate. On the contrary, this is a great opportunity - when the opponent makes complex points, or demonstrates intimidating knowledge about history or science, reply by sticking to your simple points and relentlessly reaffirming them. When he gives specific examples of the contrary, say you're only concerned about the general rule. When he brings up studies or statistics, reject them and reaffirm common sense instead. Remember how liberals on television ignore and reject all the numbers and the counter examples of the conservatives and attack their position with vague generalities instead. Reverse the technique on your scholarly co-worker.

~

Question: I don't know how to bring up these subjects with my friends and co-workers. I don't want to seem weird, or obsessed with these things.

Solution: First, you're thinking too much. Don't try to create some perfect opportunity where you control everything, that'll never happen. If people complain or say negative things about you speaking out, then **you** correct **them** ("No, we need to talk about this, this is important, sometimes we have to discuss other things than sports and gossip"). If you really need an excuse to talk about these important nationalist ideas, then just bring up news items and discuss them. Then you can add your point of view about it and get a conversation going.



Question: I argued with a liberal, and things went well. He conceded some points, and I lead the discussion well. But a few days later, we talk again and now he's pretending like that conversation didn't happen! It's like I'm back to square one.

Solution: This is normal. You should expect this. It just means he's a dedicated liberal, and won't change his position easily. Maybe he has a lot to lose, or maybe he's afraid of social consequences. It really doesn't matter. What does matter is that people witnessed all this and this will affect them positively. Just keep talking to your social circle, and if the liberal speaks up and repeats the same points, just repeat your same rebuttals. It will only make you look stronger and more confident to argue your point against an opposition and defeating it. Just don't bother trying to convince that one liberal - he's beyond reason.



Question: I'm surrounded by gays, feminists and liberal academics in my social circles. These people are beyond hope. What can I do to promote nationalism in spite of that?

Solution: Well, first I would try to leave such a toxic environment, as it must be quite bad for your mental equilibrium. But if that's not possible, find some hobbies or other activities where you can meet new people. Volunteer, join a church, start a club, join a class. Anything where you will be in close contact with people and you can get to know each other. Get to know the other people during the activities, and at the end propose going out for coffee, beer or food (depending on the age group and the time of day). You can always do street activism with signs and stuff, but since no one knows you, it'll be a lot less effective. The technique in this book is oriented around winning over social circles in spite of objections by liberals within that circle.



Question: I've been asked to do a formal debate in university. Can I use these techniques there?

Solution: Yes and no. This book was never meant to serve as a guide to winning formal debates. In principle, a formal debate will let you bring and present studies, statistics and will have a academic public who will look down on aggressive attacks. Thus your basic approach needs to be based on the facts. But on the other hand, many of the liberal's normal weapons will be disabled also, because of time limits. He cannot interrupt you. He cannot easily change the subject. He is less likely to straight out call you a racist or a fascist (thought it's by no means impossible!). But universities, of course, are largely liberal establishments these days and you can expect a fairly hostile reception. Keep the techniques in this book in mind as a response if things start getting out of hand and the tone stops being "scholarly".

~

Question: I often talk to my friends and family about these things and try to convince them, but I can't get through to them! It's like they don't trust me when I bring up facts, and they don't listen closely when I talk. It makes me so frustrated!

Solution: This is a very unfortunate situation, and there are no easy solutions. This is because the root of the problem is that those people around you don't **respect you**. This may sound harsh, but ask yourself this question: what are the negative consequences they have to fear for making you angry or frustrated? Will you stop hanging out with them? Will you stop sharing your resources with them? Will you scold them and make them feel bad for violating your expectations? If people have nothing to fear by trampling on you and ignoring your will, then they will eventually learn that they can do it with impunity. Remember, you need to be respected to be heard. And you need to be feared to be respected (I'm not encouraging you to threaten people here. Don't be silly. Just don't let people step on your toes. If you feel frustration, then you need to say **something** to the people making you feel frustrated.)

~

Question: I really want to advocate for our people, but I keep hesitating... I'm scared that people will look down on me. I'm

scared to get fired. I worry that there might be legal consequences. I know that those things are insignificant, but I can't help what I feel, it's paralyzing me.

Solution: There's no magic solution here. No one is as brave as they'd like to be - I'm certainly not. But there is one thing that helps me. It's a quote by a classical author:

“Self-control is the chief element in self-respect, and self-respect is the chief element in courage.”

-Thucydides, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*

The way I understand it, courage will grow as our self-respect grows. If we see ourselves as small and weak, then we instinctively shirk danger and are paralyzed when we have to take chances. If we see ourselves as strong, we are instinctively confident that we will be able to overcome obstacles, and our pride keeps us from backing down.

Thucydides also observes that our self-respect grows when our self-control grows. The more we have our life under control, the more discipline we have, the more pain and suffering we know we can endure in order to accomplish our duty, the greater our self-esteem will be. That is simply because we are then truly great men.

So the way to attain courage is to work on getting your life in order. Keep a schedule, eat a healthy diet, exercise, get all your chores done efficiently, stop useless time-wasters like video-games and television and drop bad habits like smoking, drinking, taking drugs and watching porn. If this sounds like a mountain, it's because it is. If we change our habits, we will change our mind also.