

Revolution For Dummies

By Ben Vinyard

Revolution is eternal. This is a work in progress, a living document designed to be a flexible strategy, subject to change with more research and greater understanding. I don't have the psychic ability to fill in specific dates and details because it is impossible to predict with any accuracy the changing social and political landscape. I am not a soothsayer. I can't tell you what's going to happen on February 8th, 2007. If we can't recognize what this country looked like two years ago how can we expect to recognize what it will look like two years from now? This document should, instead, be thought of as a schematic diagram for The Revolution. We no longer live in a world where one musket equals one soldier or one broad axe equals one warrior. In ancient times this type of direct revolt had a fair chance of success. We live in modern times, with modern technological advances in weaponry and surveillance. What is needed is a hypermodern strategy.

REVOLUTION FOR DUMMIES

I. POWER

Our movement is a bit like the six blind men feeling an elephant. The first touches the side and thinks it must be a wall; the second touches the tusk and thinks it must be a spear; the third touches the trunk and thinks it must be a snake; the fourth touches the leg and thinks it must be a tree; the fifth touches the ear and thinks it must be a fan; and the sixth touches the tail and thinks it must be a rope.

*So the disputants rail on in ignorance
Of what each other mean,
And prate about an elephant
Not one of them has seen!*

I have always been a big believer in the Completion Backwards Principle. In certain chess positions, for example, particularly the endgame, sometimes instead of calculating by brute force it is better to visualize where you want to place your pieces and work your way backwards to a satisfactory solution. Given that our ultimate goal is the 14 Words, "We must secure the existence of our people and a future for White children," and that a secure White homeland is a prerequisite for that achievement, we can work our way backwards and begin to find the direction of our desired results.

What is essential for these events to come to pass is the acquisition of political power. The issue of debate is how to acquire that power. The first believes we should vote a staunch White Nationalist ticket; the second believes in a direct explosive attack of political violence; the third believes all our efforts should be towards building a pro-White media; and the fourth believes we should pack our bags and migrate to a new location. So we log onto internet message boards and rail on in ignorance of what each other mean...

During my conversations with fellow racialsists, friends, co-workers and men on the street I discovered people tend to be of the nearly unanimous opinion that power is distributed from the end of a gun barrel, a viewpoint even Hitler didn't share. In Mein Kampf he writes, "For, in the long run, government systems are not held together by the pressure of force, but rather by the belief in the quality and the truthfulness with which they represent and promote the interests of the people."

Since Mao Tse-Tung's maxim that, "Power grows from the end of a gun," is held in such widespread belief let's assume for a moment that it's true. If political power derives solely from force then it would be a mathematical constant that could be calculated as easily as counting the number of bullets in your cartridge box. It would be a concrete object, like Kubrick's monolith in 2001: A Space Odyssey, and the possessor of power would be the one who somehow manages to obtain the obelisk and hold it in his hands.

If this view is correct then our path is clear: we can only hope to stop the genocide of our people either by A) the voluntary self-restraint and good will of those in power; B) a change in ownership

of the obelisk, either through the democratic process, regicide or coup d'état; or C) the blood-soaked destruction of conventional war, in which I include the more likely strategy of guerrilla warfare.

But consider this: George W. Bush does not point and have cluster bombs come out of his fingertips. Instead he gives an order to someone, who gives an order to someone else, who gives an order to someone else, and on down the line. So it would appear that political power is not the result of force, but rather the result of obedience.

II. OBEDIENCE

The relevant question then becomes: why do men obey? One of the major reasons has to be the fear of punishment. No one wants to go to jail and be cellmates with Snoop Dog or Funk Diddy, and no one wants to have a permanent red flag on their record and be blacklisted from securing gainful employment or decent housing. Note that it is not the punishment itself that is the cause of obedience, but rather the sometimes irrational, sometimes very rational, fear of punishment. Punishment by the ruling power is not intended to coerce the citizen to come into compliance with the command, but instead to instill the fear of punishment, and therefore submission, in his fellow subjects.

Another reason for obedience may be direct economic or social reward. The fear of punishment is less important for the ruling group's army of underlings. A Congressman or a Senator might get drunk and kill a girl with his car or write a series of bad checks, but all he has to do is present his Get Out of Jail Free Card and not only can he land on Free Parking, he can still pass Go and still collect 200 dollars. He gets paid for his service to the regime. For him tyranny is profitable, not only through financial gain but also through social status. There's more prestige in being a paid Cabinet member than being paid to build cabinets. With the multiplication of government jobs and government handouts more and more people, even if they are opposed to the regime, may find it in their own self-interest to submit, to comply and to cooperate.

Other reasons may be force of habit or indifference. We may feel a moral obligation to obey, because this is the greatest country on the face of the Earth, gaddummit! We may believe obedience is the most expedient solution because there's no better system; it's for the common good of society; and besides, we believe it helps protect us from undesirable, anti-social people. While the laws may not be perfect we feel a moral sense that things like killing and stealing are wrong and that most laws are basically good so we conform to accepted norms. Or we may feel those in power are the legitimate rulers therefore it is our duty to obey. Also, there is patriotism. We all need to believe in something. With the absence of faith, ideology or a sense of purpose we seek to fill that void of an empty existence vicariously, so we identify with the ruling power and experience their triumphs and their tragedies; we wave our made-in-China American flags and root for their successes the way we root for our favorite football team. For many of us we are disillusioned, we are exhausted, we are apathetic and we would just as soon pass the responsibilities of self-determination up the hill to a greater authority.

Yet men don't always obey. Everyday someone runs a red light or robs a bank or cheats on their taxes. Even at the highest levels obedience is not obligatory. Leaders of White Nationalist organizations may give a smiling nod of understanding at a study conducted by Richard Neustadt, who documented presidential limitations in his book *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership*. Neustadt analyzed the Truman administration and the Eisenhower administration and found the pattern usually went something like this: half of a President's orders can be safely ignored; if he asks about his orders a second time he is told, "We are looking into it, Mr. President,"; if he asks a third time, and he only asks a third time on the most important issues, he is given at least part of his original suggestion. As late as 1958, Eisenhower, a former military commander, was still "shocked and surprised that orders did not carry themselves out." Unlike a bullet which must necessarily be spent from the chamber of a gun unless the bolt is jammed, the predictability of obedience in a given situation is less certain. Obedience is a mathematical variable.

III. SOURCES AND LIMITS OF POWER

The obvious, unstated fact is that neither the Puppet King, George W. Bush, nor his puppet masters are superior in strength or wisdom. They are not imbued with superhuman powers. The source of their power comes from outside their mortal frames. By virtue of our willing participation

the members of our society lend authority to the power holders and grant them access to vital human resources and the special skills and knowledge associated with that manpower, as well as military capabilities, financial resources, control of the economic system, property, natural resources, administration and bureaucracy, police, prisons, courts and not least the ability to impose punishment. Since our opponents are dependent upon these external factors, it is elementary that our objective, in military terms, is to cut off the supply lines to these sources of power.

The rule of the masters may be violent and arbitrary by fits and starts, but on the whole it is considerably limited by the barriers of society which arrest the aggressions of tyranny. The Constitution, while a noble document, is not enough to control a ruler who does not wish to be controlled. Likewise, elections, constitutional measures and judicial decrees are meaningless if the ruling group is not willing to abide by them. Nevertheless, there are boundaries to a ruler's power. These broad boundaries of the ruling group's power potential are determined by the degree to which established social groups and institutions have the ability to act independently and wield effective power outside of the formal political framework. Traditional institutions such as the family, the church, local government bodies, voluntary organizations and political parties are pillars of power in the overall structure of society and the distribution of power amongst them diffuses the power capacity of the rulers. The extreme condition in which every institution is subordinate to a centralized State does not exist. Therefore the rulers must keep such social groups reasonably sympathetic to their policies and procedures so they don't withhold the sources of power which those groups control and which the rulers require, especially in times of crisis.

It is important to mention that intentionally destroying a pillar of power because it is perceived to be collaborating with the enemy is a grave mistake. To destroy an institution such as Christianity or the labor unions without replacing them with something that is equal or greater in power works to the advantage of our enemy. Christianity had no problem cooperating with National Socialist Germany and until recently had no problem with segregation in the churches. The relevant point is not that these institutions are presently working against us-they most certainly are-the relevant point is that removing those pillars of power capable of resistance aids our enemy in centralizing their position of power, making our percentages of victory less likely or perhaps even impossible. Those that are hell-bent on destroying Christianity are forced to reconcile with the incongruity that this also serves jewish interests. The reason for our enemy's interest in undermining Christianity, besides the age old jewish hatred, is in the same vein as their interest in undermining the family unit or cultural and nationality groups or their shameless promotion of "equality," not out of a moral preference for equality but due to their desire to weaken those groups capable of limiting their power. We have become a mass of atomized individuals. Without groups and institutions with whose members we can consult, from whom we can receive support and with whom we can combine for action we are unable to act together and cannot unite to make a significant protest. We are left only with our own personal impotence to oppose the organized forces of oppression. Under such conditions every man naturally stands alone and he is trampled under foot with impunity. Modern man-isolated and an alien in this world-is overcome by a profound feeling of powerlessness and can only gaze at the approaching catastrophe as if he were paralyzed.

IV. COMBAT STRENGTH

Our conflict is not between two clear-cut groups of fixed composition and predetermined military strength. It would be a rare occurrence if either the belligerents or the opponents included the entire population or group of people whom they purport to represent, however both sides are dependent upon a variety of support from vast numbers of people from various factions of the society. The wider population, if sympathetic, may provide specialized assistance, funds, facilities, supplies, take less dangerous symbolic actions of support or provide fresh volunteers for more militant action. Correspondingly, the attitudes and activities of the masses affect the behavior and morale of the public officials, police and military that carry out the repression. A change in attitude could possibly lead to a change in government policy or even to a change in government. In the end, it will not be the professional revolutionaries who determine the outcome of the battle-it will be the respective population.

Another source of impact from outside the defined group may come from foreign aid. An influx of Arab petrol dollars, for instance, would go a long way in oiling the machinery of the movement, but

all foreign financial assistance must come with a Surgeon General's warning slapped on the side that we must not allow our core values to be co-opted by a foreign body's political agenda. The expression of world opinion through public statements or pronouncements by international organizations, political intervention by world leaders, economic boycotts, embargoes, diplomatic representations or severance of diplomatic relations may be influential on occasion but are, however, most often ineffective.

If we wish to take stock of our total combat strength we need also, of course, to estimate the degree of participation of those who wage the actual struggle: the ones who refuse to work in a strike, the volunteers who disobey laws in a civil disobedience campaign, the people who refuse to pay taxes, who protest in the streets and who leave boycotted goods on the shelf. If their active involvement is strong, then the movement is strong. If their active involvement is weak, then the movement is weak. On the other side of the field, the opponent group's relative strength relies on active participants such as administrators, civil servants, soldiers, police, members of the penal system and others, who, though they may not be directly involved in the conflict at any given point in time, are nevertheless agents of the adversary that carry out their policies and countermeasures. When information is not passed up the chain of command, when orders are not relayed clearly to subordinates or when responsibilities are not executed efficiently on a widespread basis, then our opponent's relative power position has been significantly weakened.

Unreal appearances of strength are never lasting. Membership organizations who would try to convince us they have 2000 members when their actual membership is closer to 200 are not being advantageous to anyone for any reason. On a similar note, efforts to pad membership numbers with individuals who are soft on ideological matters may, in fact, weaken the movement if they are sought at the expense of undermining the prerequisites of power. Furthermore, that unreal strength won't be available when called upon to act. It is the assessment of genuine strength that is the crucial element in determining the course of the struggle.

V. QUALITY VS. QUANTITY

There should be no disappointment that membership numbers are low. Our numbers would be even lower in the case of a violent rebellion. The simple truth of the matter is people, even racially conscious people, do not tend to sign up for long term campaigns, but instead tend to turn out for specific demonstrations or events. If fairly large numbers are to be assumed for a particular plan of action then we must come to the realization that quality will suffer in the face of quantity. The common man is incapable of understanding what we stand for and will be unintelligent of our stated goals and our strategy. He will not be acting out of an overwhelming belief in our creed but for his own self benefit. This is not to say that we should allow ourselves to be represented by people wearing costumes that scream social incompetence. Dressing up in 1930s Nazi uniforms has about the same amount of impact on the general public as dressing up like astronauts or Klingons. The image presented by the White Nationalist actor is more important than the numbers of persons comprising that image. There is a complex relationship between quality and quantity. The degree of quality varies with conditions. As an illustration, when Kroger went on strike their chances of success were high, there was a form of financial assistance available to them, there was no chance of severe repression by the police or the military, strikebreakers are rare or nonexistent nowadays and there was no provocation to violence. Their objective was quite limited and they did not pose a serious threat to their opponent while the duration of the strike was not likely to last long. Under such conditions it is acceptable to "get away with" a lower overall quality. A higher quality, however, should be preferred for accepting those committed to the long term struggle. When the chances of success are small, which they are; when repression may be severe, which it is; when the enemy provokes violence, which they do; when the objective poses a serious threat to the opponent's position of power, which it does; and when the struggle may be a lengthy one, then high quality in the movement becomes more than a matter of degree, it becomes imperative. Large numbers are needed to affect change, but those numbers can only be obtained by maintaining, not lowering, our standards of the movement. Quality is a contagion. It grows and it multiplies.

When we speak of quality in our members there are two overriding traits that stand out above all others: lack of fear and the willingness to persist despite repression. We must cast off our fear of acting independently and our fear of the economic loss, physical injury, imprisonment and death

which may follow as a result. Cowardice is impotence. Our cause cannot survive if it is reliant on people who fear death and therefore have no power of resistance. Cowardice and courage mix together like fire and water. Fear is the product that is purchased out of an assumption of relative weakness. When a people who are accustomed to tremble and befool themselves finds the courage of their convictions, has confidence in the right and the strength of the cause and are willing to risk the dangers of pursuing victory honorably then their accumulated bitterness will burst forth with an irresistible force.

VI. FEAR

Fear plays an important role in maintaining the oppressive regime; if there is a great fear amongst the subjects then, like a whipped dog, even minor sanctions will produce conformity. It is to be embedded in the minds of our folk that fear does not contribute to the cessation of cruelties, it contributes to their continuation. There should be no shock or dismay at repression-it is the result of our enemy's recognition that we are a serious threat to their regime. As our campaign continues we can anticipate our civil liberties will be even further reduced. There will be a point in time when it is necessary for us to violate Jewish law and reassert our rights to freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. At such a moment the characteristics of boldness and persistence will become indispensable for the prolongation of the movement. Bravery should not be considered a moral virtue, but rather a practical requirement.

There is no greater coward in the movement than the person who refuses to become active under the pretense they are a mere foot soldier and are just biding their time and keeping a low profile until the Day of the Rope begins. They are so afraid of losing their job working the graveyard shift at Wal-Mart, cleaning toilets in high-rise office buildings or changing cum-covered bed sheets at the Motel 6 that they won't attend a demonstration, yet they would have us believe they will be standing shoulder-to-shoulder with us during the Racial Holy War. As long as the majority of those supposedly on our side hide behind anonymous user names on internet message boards those few who stand up for their race are at a high risk of public exposure and a high vulnerability to punishment. There are two kinds of people on the internet: those won't use their real name because they are concerned about the safety of their job and the welfare of their family and those who use their real name because they are concerned about the safety of their job and the welfare of their family. If we can pry the keyboards from their cold, dead fingers and get a fraction of those 35,000 Stormfronters out of their Comfy Chair and into the streets, to pay more attention to activism than to their post count, then the situation would take a sudden turn. There would be less exposure and the chances of being singled out for punishment would be disproportionately reduced. Consequently more people would be willing to participate. We must keep in mind that a change towards fearlessness and self-confidence is not a curtain to be dramatically drawn; it must come across by inches and degrees. Think baby steps. Low-risk, confidence-building public activism is a means of shedding the layers of fear. Understandably, certain camps will become less afraid than others. The magnitude to which the participants have become fearless will determine the specific type of action possible. If we push our supporters too far and too fast they will lose their nerve midway across the bridge and the bridge will collapse.

Promoting the idea of an underground resistance is the worst thing that ever happened to our movement. For starters, there is no underground resistance, but the most important single objection to this concept is not only is it rooted in fear, but it contributes to fear. It contributes to paranoia and finger-pointing and reinforces the belief that victory is unattainable. To deal openly and honestly is to operate from a position of strength. Only small, insignificant entities believe violence is their only alternative. Secrecy and conspiratorial behavior might seem like a reasonable approach under present circumstances; however the consequences of the courage involved in open action strikes especially hard at the heart of a system characterized by the instillation of terror and submissiveness in its subjects. Serious attempts to maintain secrecy allows the sensation of fear to spread-fear that plans will be discovered, fear that leaders will be captured, fear that the organization will be broken, fear that key members and masses of followers will be rounded up and imprisoned. The spirit of the resistance will be dampened and potential supporters deterred. Instead of demonstrating to our enemies and to our kinsmen that repression is powerless, fear permeates the movement. Degeneration and demoralization proliferates. Arguments in favor of secrecy seem to assume that it is not too difficult to keep government agencies from finding out exactly what it is that is to be kept secret. While it may be possible to

keep certain subjects secret for some time, it is likely that sooner or later the police will learn not only the general intentions but even the most microscopic details of the plan as well. Modern electronic devices will be used in addition to the time-honored traditional methods of opening the mail, wiretapping, informants, police spies and undercover agents. Moreover, their use will be seen as justified by the public at large. Openness as simply an assertion of moral principle has little relevance. We are not concerned with the moral righteousness of our manners, but with the psychological, social and political effect of our behavior. A movement that is overly security conscious will need to reduce the number of people who plan and execute the key policies, while overall numbers will be reduced by the alienation of partisan persons and sympathizers who naturally distrust secret political organizations, especially in what is perceived to be a liberal democratic form of government. In the struggle to obtain freedom we must behave like free men, and free men do not engage in secret, underground movements.

VII. LEADERSHIP

From our leaders we demand a stricter standard. Their responsibilities include working out a strategy and tactics, negotiation, promoting discipline, maintaining morale, serving as a spokesman for those who are less articulate, recruiting participants for the campaign, preparing volunteers for action and training those volunteers for specific and immediate tasks, offering solutions and organizing the implementation of those solutions. These organizational skills include publicizing the facts and grievances of the case at hand or generating cause-consciousness, promoting sympathy for the group and its aims, informing the public of our intentions and our plan of action and mobilizing financial resources and manpower. When new sympathizers and supporters appear, it will be necessary to show them how to help the movement in specific ways and to incorporate them into other active groups. Leaders need to be able to make decisions under pressure, cultivate support and accumulate resources such as food, energy and medical supplies for cataclysmic conditions right down to office equipment such as fax machines and photo copiers for everyday use. A cautionary note is the accumulation of resources must not be allowed to become a goal unto itself.

An effective network of communication is needed between the various branches and levels of the organization. If police measures and government control of communications and transportation systems makes such communication difficult or impossible, then the planners must determine in advance the points and issues on which opposition will be launched and exactly how this will be accomplished. A pyramid of leadership must be formed with two or three or more ranks. Successive stages of leadership to replace immediately arrested leaders must be provided in advance and participants prepared to act without leaders in times of severe repression. The fact that the movement still continues and still grows despite the passing of elder statesmen like Dr. Pierce and Pastor Butler and the arrest of key leaders like Matt Hale and Chester Doles is a testament to the durability and fortitude of our movement.

It goes without saying that leadership and organizations must not be corrupt. There's no need to explain the mistrust that's created from leaders who are involved in embezzlement or the misappropriation of funds. Avoidance of leaders or others who have testified on the witness stand or informed on fellow White Nationalists is mandatory. They are the vile spleen of the movement. The argument if you do nothing illegal you have nothing to worry about is insufficient. We are all guilty under Jewish law. Case in point: Chester Doles, who might have been guilty of a technicality under Jewish law, but who violated no Aryan law. Aryan law states the right to bear arms shall remain unfringed. Also, leaders who run away and hide in foreign countries rather than face their persecution, with the idea of leading from the shadows, cannot be accepted. Followers cannot be asked to accept risks which their leaders are unwilling to undertake. Those who are leaders today must accept the fact they won't be leaders tomorrow. Central leadership will expectedly be discredited in the Jewish press, imprisoned or...otherwise removed. It might not sound fair, but those who would propose to lead must ride under the black flag, meaning they give no quarter and they ask no quarter.

VIII. THE FINAL SOLUTION

So let's discuss possible resolutions to the conflict. After all, the burning question is how we will achieve victory and the type of victory we hope to achieve will influence our grand strategy. Of course, I suppose a case of complete conversion in the hearts and souls and minds of our enemies

is conceivable but more than likely it is laughable to suggest they will be so emotionally moved by the courageous suffering of our resisters or so intellectually persuaded by the rationality of our arguments they will voluntarily concede their positions of power. No matter how polite and humane our efforts we cannot expect our opponents to lay down arms and submit meekly. Power dies hard.

Another type of conclusion would be compromise or negotiation. While I think this idea would be unpalatable to most White Nationalists we must not forget that negotiation will be an important instrument in the many campaigns along the way. It should not come as a surprise if a satisfactory solution is not arrived at by negotiation. Negotiations are rarely, if ever, resolved on the objective merits of the debate. The silent-but mutually understood-fact behind every case of negotiation is the relative power positions of the negotiators. Each side fully understands what the other is capable of if no agreement is reached; therefore we should not make appeals with no force behind them. We will not be subject to compromise, however. Once the demands are set they are set in granite and should be kept unchanged, not raised or lowered with fluctuations in the chances of victory. Changes in demand lower credibility. Often it will be the case that our opponent refuses to negotiate. He may demand, for example, that we give up all plans for direct action, or, if the action has already begun he may declare he will not negotiate until all action is called off. We will refuse to be intimidated or sidetracked by such tactics. It is not the negotiations themselves that are the important thing; it is the effort at negotiations. The effort serves other purposes. We should make, and be seen to be make, every effort at settlement before launching direct action while keeping in mind that negotiations are not a substitute for open struggle just as talking is not a substitute for war.

If the ruling group is neither converted nor are they willing to accommodate our demands victory can still be achieved against the will of the adversary through coercion. If the defiance is so widespread and massive that it becomes impossible for either the social, economic or political machinery to operate, then the tyrants, though they still may hold their offices and declare their original intentions and have an unfavorable image of our resistance group and say nasty things about us, will find they have had the ability to act effectively or impose their objectionable conditions taken away from them.

I would think the type of conclusion that would be universally agreed upon would be the complete collapse of the enemy regime. When conditions produce the power structure to disintegrate, when the bureaucracy refuses to obey its own leadership, when police revolt and troops mutiny, when the population repudiates the rulers and denies their right to govern, when they withdraw their support and allegiance, the regime simply crumbles.

IX. POLITICS

To clarify, what we are talking about is not sedition, it is liberation. We are a political party, legally speaking, and what we do is not different than what the Democrats do in uncertain terms. The Democrats are not seeking to "overthrow" the government, though in fact that is exactly what they are doing when they ask you to vote a Democratic ticket instead of supporting the current regime. What we are seeking is liberation and political power. Espousing our goals loudly, firmly and long enough does not make them come to pass. Neither does simply living White and acting White. These things are admirable, but they are grossly inadequate in achieving our liberation.

There is no short-term political solution. If Billy Roper or David Duke were elected President by write-in vote tomorrow it wouldn't necessarily help us much. Our enemies are not in the habit of letting people not under their control get elected into office. I doubt the vote would be counted correctly to begin with and if Billy Roper were elected he would either be ineffective because of non-cooperation, get impeached immediately or most likely not even be allowed to serve. Trying to declare martial law would backfire before it was even announced. The most that could hope to be gained would be to create a more inductive atmosphere for us. It is the system that is controlled by our enemies; it is the system that has become corrupted; it is the system that must be changed if we are to achieve victory and liberation.

As we move forward and progress we can expect politicians to seek concessions. A candidate will appear who will be tough on immigration or share our views on affirmative action. We must be careful not to sell ourselves short on our goal. While every toe-hold we gain is good for us we can't

allow our forces to be fooled into thinking we have achieved some sort of lasting victory, for we have not. If our goals can't be stated freely, honestly and openly then that is a strong indicator we are not ready for a political solution. However, running candidates, particularly local candidates, can be a good source of propaganda and fundraising. It is a realistic, achievable goal and every small success we gain there will be helpful. Worse is not better, worse is worse.

X. VIOLENCE

It is inevitable that some groups or individuals will want to resort to violence, but violence is incompatible with our strategy. Not only in the short term, by giving us a black eye in the courtroom of public opinion and bringing more repressive measures against us by the regime, but also in the long term when we might wish to seek the aid and sympathies of the wider population and the international community. For us the renunciation of violence is not a matter of principle but rather a matter of policy. Not to say that we should back down when violence is brought against us or that we don't have the right to defend our life and our property, it is just that we are, effectively, a civil rights group. As much as the term leaves a bad taste in our mouth we are the niggers of the Civil Rights Movement.

We are not disclaiming violence with a wink-wink and a nudge-nudge, either. What is needed is not hot blood but cool heads. The strategic reason for our decision is that it is unwise to attack the enemy at their strongpoint. Our opponent's usual means of repression have been designed to deal with violent disobedience and violent revolution. They prefer we use violent action. So much so they will deliberately seek to provoke the rebels, either by severe repression designed to break our discipline or by the use of spies and agent provocateurs. To quote Napoleon, "It is an approved maxim in war, never do what the enemy wishes you to do, for this reason alone, that he desires it." Truthfully, violent revolution is not what we have been doing. The only real course of action we have been pursuing is nonviolent political defiance. We are not assassinating government officials and we don't have small bands of renegades attacking military installations. A violent attack against military or police forces would only reinforce-not disrupt or destroy-their obedience patterns. Not to mention that most people won't go in for this sort of thing. To attack our enemies militarily is to attack their strength and it is a poor general who engages the enemy at their strongest point.

XI. STRATEGY

Whether in war, chess or revolution the key strategy can be summed up in one simple phrase: "Concentration of strength against weakness." Our actions should be concentrated on the weakest points in our enemy's case, policy or system. Strategy should be phased in such a way as to score a series of minor gains (or to secure a single victory) in the most accessible sector rather than trying for a cluster of major objectives at the same time. Focus should be placed against the certain political, social or economic pressure points which are representative of the general conditions so they may, simultaneously, serve as a springboard for us to sound off against the bigger issues of our discontent. Let's be honest with ourselves, the markers we mentioned earlier-the degree of commitment, the willingness to act, the ability to persist despite punishment, the degree of discipline and the degree of fear-indicates the movement is weak. What is needed, therefore, are campaigns against issues some may consider meaningless and un-revolutionary, but issues that can hardly be disputed by our enemies or the Pod People. Low-risk confidence-builders. The more ridiculous the enemy's policy the better for us. The more symbolic of the overall disease the better for us. Only rank beginners can be checkmated in four moves, so we play to accumulate small advantages. This is not being moderate in our aims, but it is the maximum utilization of our combined forces against the weakest link in the chain. Tackling a subject that is too vast for our meager resources is not very clever. A particular goal should be singled out and concentrated on with the full brunt of our organization and the full brunt of our movement rather than blanketing the public with a quilt of grievances, otherwise the non-thinking community will become confused in the morass of complaints. Small victories are all we can realistically hope to achieve right now and are the only way to add weight to our side of the scales until the balance is tipped in our favor. By simply reading the signposts of commitment, participation, persistence, discipline and fearlessness our leaders can evaluate when the indicators are high enough to enable us to enter the next phase of the campaign and struggle for larger objectives.

Our enemies are not omnipotent and we make a mistake in our propaganda when we display them as such. I can't think of any effective war-time propaganda machine that consistently reports enemy victories and allied failures day in/day out. There's a fine line between informing the public about the crimes against our race and appearing defeatist. Constantly hearing about how many niggers raped a White girl today, uncontrolled non-White immigration and more hate crime laws passed against Whites can grow wearisome and, inadvertently, give the impression our enemies are unbeatable. It can be argued we haven't had many victories to report on until now; however, there are weaknesses inherent in the system that can be exploited. When we search for the soft spots to plot our battle campaign around we might consider these factors as a possible Achilles' Heel: the requirements of the regime's past policies might limit its ability to implement conflicting policies; the system may become routine in its operation and less able to adjust to new situations; personnel and resources already allocated for other existing tasks will not be readily available for new tasks; subordinates, fearful of displeasing their Jewish masters, may not report accurate or complete information; the present ideology of multiculturalism distorts their view of reality and it may cause inattention to actual conditions and needs; as the ideology erodes the myths and symbols of the regime may become unstable; deteriorating efficiency and competency of government agencies due to excessive controls, red tape and affirmative action may make the system's policies and operation ineffective; intellectuals and students may become restless in response to rigid restrictions and harsh doctrines; racial and cultural differences may become more acute; the power hierarchy is always unstable to some degree-individuals do not remain in the same position in the ranking but may rise or fall or be removed entirely; and also, with so many decisions made by so few people mistakes of judgment or action are likely to occur.

The progressive development of the movement should be a phased campaign characterized by the staged introduction of new methods of action. Variation in tactics is important in order to provide variety, interest and especially newsworthiness to the campaign. Sticking to or specializing in only one or two methods, for example demonstrations and fliers, will result in failure. When a particular method is common it becomes stale and predictable and our enemies will learn how to react most effectively. Already the Jewsmedia reports the same repetitious story after a flier distribution with a quote from the Southern Poverty Law Center and a local resident who threw the flier in the garbage. At demonstrations they keep us less visible to the public eye than a Hollywood movie star's adopted third world children. An assortment of tactics should be used involving different fronts, groups, time periods, methods and other factors. After certain time periods or after certain political events unfold, the bulk of the responsibility for a single campaign may be shifted from one group to another, or different roles may be assigned to particular groups, with the most dangerous tasks, involving the most daring methods, assigned to groups with exceptionally high discipline, skill or training, while other important but less dangerous tasks are undertaken by groups more typical of the general population. We should seek to employ the methods we can in a way that takes the initiative (as opposed to merely responding to the initiative of our enemies), that are creative and keeps the enemy off balance. We should be the ones who decide the time, the issue and the course of action while, at the same time, anticipating the eventuality the regime may seek to seize the initiative by declaring a state of emergency. A good example of originality would be the truck drivers who stalled their rigs on the California highway a few months ago to protest high gas prices. That may not necessarily be an act we want to emulate, but the point is it was creative, it was unexpected and most importantly it was a realistic, achievable goal. The problem is there was no follow-up. There was no battle plan for the campaign to keep the issue in the scope of the TV viewer's limited attention span. The story made national headlines, the regime didn't know how to respond, but as quickly as the episode happened it was just as quickly forgotten.

Everything we do-every event, every flier-creates polarization. The bad news is it creates polarization against our viewpoint. The good news is that's exactly what we want. We want people to get off the fence and choose a side, even if that side is opposed to ours. For the first time the individual is asked to think about and forced to decide how he feels about a particular topic. Human nature dictates he will initially adopt what he perceives to be the majority opinion. There is a time lag in changes in people's perception which can only be corrected by constant repetition of behavior. If our views are correct then one by one, inch by inch, they will be moved towards our side. The process will seem agonizingly slow at first after which shifts in opinion will spread rapidly like a fever until a tipping point is reached and finally our position will come to be understood as

stating the obvious. Since initial polarization does not work in our favor it is a mistake to do a hit-and-run demonstration against a single subject matter without a consistent planned phased follow-through. We have done more harm than good. Not only have we created negative polarization we have also added the repression that comes on top to the list of grievances.

Local activity should be highly stressed but this should not be confused with an everybody-do-everything-they-can approach. Though some dividends may result here and there in a willy-nilly fashion from that method, it lacks focus and wastes valuable energies. As our numbers grow stronger there will be some degree of that technique, which is why it is important for local organizers and those groups we have a loose association with to understand our strategy and each phase of the campaign. Above all the plan should be flexible and our calculations should foresee and provide for a next step in case of success, failure or-the most common case-partial success.

XII. PUBLIC EDUCATION

A phased campaign means one that is separated by different methods of activity. Roughly, the overall struggle can be divided into three overlapping phases. They are public education, mass non-cooperation and physical intervention. The methods of activism should be thought of as our weapon's system. However, studying a catalogue of methods is not enough. The cause and effect of each method and how it relates to our strategy should be recognized. For instance, fliers for such general objectives as "Love Your Race," "Wake Up, White Man," or calls for Aryan Unity or Brotherhood are ineffective. The issue must be definite and capable of being clearly understood and within the power of the opponent to yield. Campaigns must be launched with a specific list of grievances and specific proposals for a solution.

In physics there are two states of being: bodies at rest and bodies in motion, or the static and the dynamic. The methods of activism are the static features of our movement. While activities such as strikes and boycotts are beyond our means at this point in time they will play a relevant role in our future. We are unmistakably in the educational phase in which we attempt to persuade the public to accept our point of view and be moved to action by things such as parades, vigils and protest meetings. Though not all methods are valid for us they may include public speeches to students, religious sermons, private letters to a certain person or body declaring a particular viewpoint or declaration of intention, private letters to deliberately or otherwise become public knowledge, open letters, letter writing campaigns, floods of letters addressed to government officials, petitions, internet petitions, group or mass petitions for economic or work-related charges or protesting a law. We may seek declarations from well-established mainstream organization and institutions, noted scholars or government officials or signed public statements. We may make declarations of indictment or intention, like the Declaration of Independence, for example.

The objective of the first phase is to communicate with a wider audience in order to influence the opposing group so that we may gain sympathy and support from third parties and gain converts, members and assistance. Persuasion is the aim. For this purpose we may post leaflets; spray-paint symbols and slogans; adhere stickers; display signs; post proclamations; pass out fliers, pamphlets and books; create our own publications and procure their distribution; circulate news sheets; build internet sites; where possible submit articles and advertisements in mainstream newspapers and journals; produce records; and create our own media of radio and television.

Selected representatives may meet with the officials (or their representatives) who are predominately responsible for the injustice and seek consideration or adoption of a new policy or measure, often with prepared documents or petitions. Other means of group representations could be satirical awards presented to opponents in order to publicize grievances; mock elections in which votes may be collected in a special polling place, by house-to-house calls or on the internet; group lobbying in the sense of personal visits to a parliamentary representative by his constituents in an effort to influence his voting. This may take the form of a small group in moderate numbers lobbying on several occasions or mass lobbying focused on large numbers for a specific date. Or there may be picketing, which is largely associated with strikes and boycotts, but focal points can be embassies, consulates, courts, legislatures, government departments or school boards; and there can be vigils which are more solemn than picketing.

Symbolic public acts should be motivated by or arouse deep emotions, for instance: the display of flags and symbolic colors, the wearing of ribbons, badges, armbands and considerable variations

on the theme. Prayer and worship conducted in a certain place or on a certain day can express moral condemnation or political protest. Other symbolic public acts can be the delivery of a symbolic object to the official or office associated with the grievance; the destruction of our own property, for example the burning of goods from Wal-Mart or products made in third world countries or a bonfire of National ID cards or draft cards. There can be symbolic lights, torches, lanterns and candles carried in protest parades; the public display of pictures of resistance heroes or persons who otherwise symbolize the objective of the moment; symbolic sounds such as bells and sirens, booing and hissing or heckling sounds; symbolic reclamations of land like protesting disputed use or ownership of a territory or planting seeds or trees. Signs can be erected where there have been none or old street names can be replaced with new ones, for example replacing street signs that honor Martin Luther King. And of course, the oldest, simplest and most profound symbolic gestures are flipping people off or mooning them.

Pressure can be placed on individuals, for instance, following officials, camping outside their house, etc., or taunting officials with ridicule and insults. Fraternization can be useful. By becoming personal friends with soldiers or police it is possible to convince them the regime is unjust or to persuade the soldiers or other agents of repression to reduce the efficiency with which they carry out orders or, eventually, to mutiny and refuse to obey. Fraternization through personal contacts can help to provide information about the regime's plans.

Drama and music can be effective in and of themselves or in the form of humorous skits and plays. Other uses of music can be singing during an unwanted speech, singing national or religious hymns or singing while engaged in a march, civil disobedience or some other act of opposition.

There are many types of processions: marches (whose duration may vary from an hour or two to several weeks), religious processions, pilgrimages, motorcades and parades-distinguished from the march in that the point of termination does not have intrinsic significance. Other variations of parades are the zig-zag demonstration or snake-like parade, the French style demonstration or hand-in-hand parade and the centripetal demonstration, which are parades starting from many points and meeting in the center.

Even the dead have propaganda value by honoring a hero from the past or remembering those who have recently died. Political mourning uses the same symbols for the death of an individual as for expressing political dissent and regret over events and policies by flying flags at half-mast, the ringing of funeral bells, etc. Besides homage at burial places we can consider memorial services and funerals for persons killed by non-Whites or by political opponents in the course of the struggle as ways of honoring the dead. Mock funerals can also have significance, for instance a mock funeral procession for the Constitution of the United States.

Public assemblies of protest or support, from open air meetings to small local meetings, are an invaluable means of activism. As most of the people attending such meetings are already agreed on the need to protest, speeches are usually of secondary importance. It may also become necessary for camouflaged meetings of protest-more and more relevant under current political conditions. These are protest meetings organized under the pretense of quite innocent purposes, such as sports, amusement, art or religion, a social affair or a banquet.

Symbolic withdrawal and renunciation is used when a delegation walks out of a conference, assembly, meeting or discussion before it has been adjourned; when a speech is greeted with silence; when there is a moment of silence for the dead; or when honors are renounced, for example, returning war medals, resignation from prestigious societies, and renunciation of titles of honor, medals and honorary offices. Or by simply turning one's back.

XIII. MASS NON-COOPERATION

The basic idea is simple: if enough people refuse to cooperate with the regime for long enough a period of time the empire will weaken and collapse. Mass non-cooperation involves the deliberate defiance of existing social, economic and political relationships. The social refusal to carry on normal relations with persons or groups may take the form of social boycotts against workers who refuse to participate in a strike; the refusal of shopkeepers to sell to a selected individual; excommunication from the church; or interdiction from the church in which there is a punitive suspension of religious services in a given district. Ostracism may even be expressed by wives refusing sexual relations with their bellicose husbands. Non-cooperation with social events may

include the cancellation of sporting events, the boycott of the cinema or corporate refusal to attend certain social affairs such as receptions, banquets, parties, concerts, etc. Students may refuse to attend classes or social disobedience can be brought about by breaking factory regulations, disobeying ecclesiastical orders or violating standard forms of speech, dress and behavior. The withdrawal from the social system may be indicated by resigning membership from a particular body, staying at home during working or shopping hours or, in extreme cases, sanctuary might be sought in a place where the individuals or groups can't be touched without violation of religious, moral, social or legal restrictions.

Economic measures are more common. There is the consumers' boycott, rent refusal, refusal to rent, a national consumer's boycott of Israel or Mexico, an international consumers' boycott; a workmen's boycott, a producers' boycott, a suppliers' and handlers' boycott, a traders' boycott, a lockout and a merchants' general strike. Holders of financial resources can withdraw bank deposits; refuse to pay fees, dues and assessments; refuse to pay taxes; refuse to pay debts or interest; and can exert economic pressure by severing the opponent's sources of money such as salaries, appropriations, loans, investments and credit.

The strike is more specific. Examples are the demonstration strike when work is stopped for a predetermined short period—a minute, an hour, a day or a week; the lightning strike; the farmers' strike; the prisoners' strike; the craft strike by workers of a single craft; the professional strike by salaried or self-employed persons of a single profession; the establishment strike which involves one craft under one management; the industry strike; the sympathetic strike in which workers withdraw their labor to support the demands of fellow workers; the detailed strike where workers stop work one-by-one; the bumper strike in which only one firm in the industry strikes at a time; the slowdown strike; the working-to-rule strike in which workers observe the rules and regulations so meticulously as to retard production; the limited strike where workers refuse to work beyond their required working hours; the selective strike where workers refuse to do certain types of work; the stay-in strike where workers remain at the workplace until demands are granted; the generalized strike where several industries are struck simultaneously but the strikers constitute less than a majority; and the general strike which is a widespread stoppage of labor in an attempt to bring economic life to a standstill. Legal proscription, contractual obligations or presidential decree to prohibit strikes can be bypassed by calling in sick or the formal submission of resignations. Finally, when the workers strike while management, businessmen, commercial institutions and small shopkeepers halt their economic activities, the effect is an economic shutdown resulting in economic paralysis.

Citizens have alternatives to obedience to the political system. They can reject authority; refuse to recognize the regime as legally or morally legitimate; boycott legislative bodies; boycott elections; boycott government employment and positions; boycott government agencies and other bodies; withdraw from government educational institutions by homeschooling; boycott government-supported organizations; refuse to assist enforcement agencies; refuse to accept appointed officials; refuse to dissolve existing institutions; be reluctant and slow to comply; refuse to comply with laws where there is no immediate, direct supervision or enforcement; disguise their disobedience, for instance immediately re-opening banned newspapers or banned political parties under new names; an assemblage can refuse to disperse; they can sit down in the street, road, ground or floor and refuse to leave voluntarily; refuse to cooperate with conscription and deportation; or they can protest illegitimate laws with civil disobedience in a deliberate, open violation of particular laws, decrees, regulations, ordinances or military or police institutions.

Actions by government personnel can consist of selective refusal of assistance by government aides, blocking of lines of communication and information, stalling and obstruction, general administrative non-cooperation, judicial non-cooperation, deliberate inefficiency and selective non-cooperation by enforcement agencies and, in the advanced stages, mutiny. Constituent units of the government such as local, provincial or state governmental bodies can refuse to cooperate and engage in quasi-legal evasions and delays while international government actions may be changes in diplomatic representation, delay or cancellation of diplomatic events, withholding of diplomatic recognition of elections, severance of diplomatic relations, withdrawal from international organizations and conferences, refusing membership in international bodies or expulsion from international organizations.

XIV. PHYSICAL INTERVENTION

The final phase of the struggle, from our standpoint, may seem like a million light years in the future in a galaxy far, far away, but if successful victories are likely to occur at a more rapid pace because the disruptive effects of physical intervention are harder to tolerate or withstand for a considerable amount of time. A sit-in at a lunch counter or in a bank lobby disrupts more immediately and completely than, say, picketing or a consumers' boycott. It is precisely for this reason speedier and more severe repression may be a first result, but that doesn't necessarily spell defeat. The methods of intervention may take on a psychological aspect, for instance a court case where the defendants turn the tables on the prosecutors and use the trial to publicize their beliefs, programs and indictments of the established order; or the methods of intervention may be characterized by physical interference created by warm human bodies, for instance by sit-in; stand-in; mill-in; pray-in; a freedom ride; raids where volunteers march to designated key destinations and demand possession; air raids to bring leaflets, food or gifts to the population or to bring supplies to break a blockade; invasion by a group of volunteers to deliberately and openly enter a forbidden area; physical placement in the path of a vehicle such as a bulldozer or tank or between a policeman and the object of his pursuit; physical obstruction by large numbers of people; or occupation by people who have been ordered to leave their land. Direct intrusion may also take the form of overloading facilities like government departments, businesses or social services by a deliberate increase of demands for services; conducting legitimate business, such as bank transactions, as slowly as possible; interrupting a meeting, a church service or other gathering; guerilla theater as a disruptive means of interfering with speeches, lectures or the normal proceedings of some group or institution; expropriating and utilizing land which by statute belongs to someone else, with the intent of producing a de facto change of ownership; or the overloading of administrative systems by making an excessive number of enquiries, suggestions and protests. Economic intervention such as the buying of strategic commodities on the world market for the purpose of making them unavailable to the enemy or the deliberate dumping of commodities at below standard prices are most uncommon and unlikely because of the enormous expense involved.

Certain steps must precede others so that it may be possible to adopt more radical forms later. When we speak of lemmings we are talking about a people who are unaccustomed to self-determination or responsible self-rule. It is common today to place nearly complete reliance on the formal constitution, legislation and judicial decisions to establish and preserve political freedom; it is also common to assume only the intentions, acts and policies of a dictator are responsible for a dictatorship. To unloose the Pod People with newfound political power without allowing them to first take the necessary steps in learning self-determination would be somewhat of a disservice. The customs of an enslaved people are part of their servitude. In Machiavelli's *The Prince* he compares the situation to an animal raised in captivity that is unable to fend for itself when released into the wild. It naturally becomes the prey of the first person seeking to restore it to its former condition. "For it was neither the name nor the rank of dictator that made Rome servile, but the loss of authority of which the citizens were deprived by the length of his rule." If the White man is to truly awaken from his slumber then he must see the world through new eyes. He must seek to establish new social patterns by refusing to obey the various social customs, rules, regulations, practices and behavior patterns that have subjugated his liberty. To develop internal strength we might create alternative social institutions such as academies and unions, create alternative communications systems and our own media, use selective patronage in supporting pro-White businesses, create alternative markets, alternative transportation systems and alternative economic institutions. During the final days, in the endgame, if we still haven't achieved a negotiated transfer of power then a civil disobedience campaign against even the most neutral laws is likely to occur and finally, a dual sovereignty or parallel political institution to form the creation of a new government. In such a case where we have taken all the necessary steps and still not attained a satisfactory outcome then we will speak of courage, we will speak of daring, we will speak of sacrifice and we will call on the people opposed to the Jewish policies to speak to them in a language they will understand.

Years ago I heard a copy of a speech by Louis Beam in which he likened our enemies to an octopus with their Jewish tentacles squeezing the life out of every aspect of Aryan culture. The analogy made sense to me then. However, I have come to believe our cause isn't as much fighting an

octopus as it is moving an elephant. We've all heard the story of the boy who snuck backstage at the circus and was amazed to discover the only thing constraining the elephant was a small piece of rope. The trainer explained the elephant was raised in chains he couldn't break and as an adult still believes psychologically he doesn't have the ability to set himself free. For those of us in the audience it's not too hard to see the obedience of the elephant is not compulsory and with his might he could easily unfetter the rope of authority that binds him. Now all we have to do is convince the elephant.