New domestic social controls take effect from 24 March 2020 in Australia in light of
COVID 19 = Corona Virus December 2019

This will not affect REVISIONISTS because most have lived in splendid isolation for decades on
account of having the courage critically to think for themselves, which is so upsetting for those who
seek total control over the BATTLE-OF-THE-WILLS
and VALUES CLARIFICATION processes.
The asking of any question about anything at all is
dismissed as “upsetting”, being an expression of
hatred, Holocaust denial, antisemitism, Nazism,
racism, etc.
The asking of questions is a threat to those who
have thus legally locked up vital moral-social-legal
topics because they fear TRUTH liberating
individuals from lies that are killing their soul.
Now all this is nothing new in human history
because war plans are nothing new, nor are mass
social scapegoating.

Remember how during WWI and WWI Germans
were defamed and demonized, which carried over
after 1945 through the “not-to-be-questioned
Holocaust-Shoah narrative” where the homicidal
gas chamber lie became a legally protected lie”?
Such fraudulent legal protection of TRUTH follows
the pattern of any past blasphemy law, especially
as illustrated in The Donation of Constantine.
So, the advice sold by the shonks is: Do not ask
questions that upset the dominant narrative – just
follow your feelings and slip into hedonistic
inversion and self-destruct – just shut-up!
Obviously, individuals who have the courage
to make use of their own understanding, will find it a
great challenge to continue to speak out in the
forthcoming days-weeks-months – for the sake of
TRUTH – HONOUR and JUSTICE!

Wikipedia: A Disinformation Operation?
Published: March 2020; Languages: AR, DE, EN, ES, FR, NL, PL, RO

Wikipedia is generally thought of as an open,
transparent, and mostly reliable online
encyclopedia. Yet upon closer inspection, this
turns out not to be the case.
In fact, the English Wikipedia with its 9 billion
worldwide page views per month is governed
by just 500 active administrators, whose real
identity in many cases remains unknown.
Moreover, studies have shown that 80% of all
Wikipedia content is written by just 1% of all
Wikipedia editors, which again amounts to just
a few hundred mostly unknown people.
Obviously, such a non-transparent and
hierarchical structure is susceptible to
corruption and manipulation, the notorious
“paid editors” hired by corporations being just
one example.
Indeed, already in 2007, researchers found
that CIA and FBI employees were editing
Wikipedia articles on controversial topics
including the Iraq war and the Guantanamo
military prison.
Also in 2007, researchers found that one of
the most active and influential English
Wikipedia administrators, called “Slim Virgin”,
was in fact a former British intelligence
informer.
More recently, another highly prolific Wikipedia
editor going by the false name of “Philip Cross”
turned out to be linked to UK intelligence as well as several mainstream media journalists. In Germany, one of the most aggressive Wikipedia editors was exposed, after a two-year legal battle, as a political operative formerly serving in the Israeli army as a foreign volunteer.

Even in Switzerland, unidentified government employees were caught whitewashing Wikipedia entries about the Swiss secret service just prior to a public referendum about the agency.

Many of these Wikipedia personae are editing articles almost all day and every day, indicating that they are either highly dedicated individuals, or in fact, operated by a group of people.

In addition, articles edited by these personae cannot easily be revised, since the above-mentioned administrators can always revert changes or simply block disagreeing users altogether.

The primary goal of these covert campaigns appears to be pushing Western and Israeli government positions while destroying the reputation of independent journalists and politicians.

Articles most affected by this kind of manipulation include political, geopolitical and certain historical topics as well as biographies of non-conformist academics, journalists, and politicians.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Wikipedia founder Jimmy Wales, a friend of former British Prime Minister Tony Blair and a “Young Leader” of the Davos forum, has repeatedly defended these operations.

Speaking of Davos, Wikimedia has itself amassed a fortune of more than $160 million, donated in large part not by lazy students, but by major US corporations and influential foundations. Moreover, US social media and video platforms are increasingly referring to Wikipedia to frame or combat “controversial” topics. The revelations discussed above may perhaps help explain why.

Already NSA whistleblower Edward Snowden revealed how spooks manipulate online debates, and more recently, a senior Twitter executive turned out to be a British Army “psyops” officer.

To add at least some degree of transparency, German researchers have developed a free web browser tool called WikiWho that lets readers color code just who edited what in Wikipedia.

In many cases, the result looks as discomforting as one might expect.

---

WikiWho / WhoColor
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Panic Pandemic –
Why are people who should know better buying the Covid19 hype? Exaggerated or invented, the true danger Covid19 poses is shutting down our sense of reason
Catte Black, 16 March 2020

The only certainty about the ‘novel’ virus is that a great deal of nonsense is being talked about it by people who really ought to know better, and a great deal of opportunism is being displayed. From Netanyahu grabbing the chance to postpone his corruption trial to Hollywood starlets claiming they have ‘tested positive’ (surely not a sad and cynical attempt to up their profile), this bandwagon is seething and teeming with those trying to seize their moment of fame or get rich or stay out of jail or just join in the mayhem

It’s cool to be nCoV-positive now. Maybe that’s why such inordinate numbers of famous people are staking their claim to it.

ISIS are apparently a bit worried about nCoV also and is allegedly sending out travel advisories to its jihadists.

Yup, that’s a real thing, right there. Really happening. Definitely.

Meanwhile, the propaganda is relentless, and there’s a variety for all tastes.

If you like your fear porn vanilla you can read all the articles based on total speculation that tell you millions will die if we don’t demand martial law and vaccines. (Speaking of vaccines, the as-yet-untested Covid19 vaccine is going to mandatory in Denmark, and in the US the manufacturers will have legal immunity should it cause any ill-effects).

If you are of a more sceptical turn of mind well, how about nCoV as bio-weapon? Plenty of juicy stuff on that topic also.

And scientists and science journals are not immune. There’s no shortage of people with PhDs willing to talk nonsense with a sciency spin in order to convince the more inquiring proles that the governments are correct to invoke emergency powers and get that untested vaccine cranking out asap.

Look at this beauty. Written by a team of MDs and other ‘experts’ and appearing in The Lancet, it is about the most naked example I have seen to date of pseudoscience being used to inflate the perception of nCoV as something other than what it is.

The purpose of the article is apparently to find some sort of barely rational reason for estimating the nCoV case fatality rate to be higher than it actually is by a factor of ten.

Here’s the ‘reasoning’ it offers:

However, these mortality rate estimates are based on the number of deaths relative to the number of confirmed cases of infection, which is not representative of the actual death rate; patients who die on any given day were infected much earlier, and thus the denominator of the mortality rate should be the total number of patients infected at the same time as those who died.

They actually suggest with a straight face (though they don’t say why) that in order to get a ‘real’ figure for case fatality we need to count deaths as a percentage only of those who became infected at the same time as those who died.

So, if on Day One of a hypothetical new disease, two people get it and one dies, this would be a 50% case fatality ratio.

Sure, no problem. Common sense and statistics agree with that.

But what if from Day Two to Day Ten inclusive 198 more people get it and none of them die?

Well, according to the normal method of assessing CFR that would be 200 cases, one death, and a CFR of 0.5%

But with this brilliant new method, it would still be a CFR of 50% – because we are only allowed to count the cases who got sick on the same day as the fatality. And only two people got sick that day, of whom 50% died.

You see the corrupt genius of it? It’s a statistical nonsense that crucially gives permission to any would-be stats compilers in the WHO or elsewhere to overestimate the CFR of this bug, or indeed any other subsequent alleged ‘killer’ virus.

If you doubt this is the point, then read the article. This is just what the authors do, having the total gall to claim the ‘real’ CFR for nCoV is anywhere up to 20%, based solely on this crazy new way of figuring out the stats.

Which will look great in future headlines, and help pave the way for public acceptance of a total fascist dictatorship.

If you ever doubted that corruption is now endemic and all our institutions – political, legal, medical – are stacked with yes-men and jobsworths or fools prepared to put their names to any junk proclamation that might get them a raise or save their professional skins, just think of this article. Written by alleged world-class ‘experts’, published in the Lancet, and nothing more than a word salad of contradictory nonsense and meaningless
conclusions designed to promote a political and propagandist point. It even at one point acknowledges the probability of many many subclinical or symptom-free carriers of this supposed virus. But while the authors satisfy some dormant scrap of conscience by alluding to it they don’t draw their readers’ attention to the concomitant fact this lowers the case fatality by quite a way. In fact they allow themselves to sort of imply the opposite, because that is the level on which such people work: **Notably, the full denominator remains unknown because asymptomatic cases or patients with very mild symptoms might not be tested and will not be identified.** This is just one example of the forest of disinformative, hysterical, fog-bound garbage being poured on our heads about this so-called pandemic. That this is part of a coordinated and massive attempt to instil worldwide fear and enact worldwide population-management methods is now undeniable.

What is nCoV19? I honestly do not know. The more the fear porn ramps up, the less certain I become of any aspect of the narrative surrounding it. We are definitely all being discouraged from questioning its virulence, discouraged from referring to its official fatality and case numbers, which do not correlate with the level of fear we are being told is appropriate. There is certainly a massive and multifaceted attempt to fudge and inflate those numbers to bring them in line with the ‘response’.

This brings us back to our revelation that **good old Wikipedia have** been downgrading the CFR of the Spanish Flu. It’s hard not to see this as part of the same process. The actual death rates just aren’t high enough. So talk them up, play pea and thimble games with the stats, and do some Memory-Holing so that the 1918 pandemic suddenly has a very similar CFR, allowing your tame media to make all the right comparisons in their op eds and editorials, pointing out how many millions died back then despite it only having a fatality ratio of 2.5%

They seem aware of the discrepancy, and are making efforts to prevent people researching it. The WHO are warning people not to read “too much” about the disease in order to protect their mental health. In a write up on the recommendations, the **BBC says this:**

*There is a lot of misinformation swirling around – stay informed by sticking to trusted sources of information such as government and NHS websites.***

Whether this virus is as imaginary as some are saying, or entirely real, it’s being hyped to a point beyond any connection with reality, and not just in the media. It’s a multi-pronged assault on our minds right now. Allegedly reliable and authoritative medical professionals are just as likely to talk propaganda at you as some government minister or media halfwit.

Even in the alt-media, many have stopped thinking and gone full deer-in-the-headlights, devoting their websites to recycling government talking points and urging those same governments to lock down their citizens. How bizarre is it that outlets who were – just weeks ago – warning against trusting anything that comes out of the mouths of our ‘masters’, are now prepared to surrender entirely to official narratives and official ‘safe-keeping’ – and for a virus which, even if totally real, has killed about 7,000 people – or around 7% of the numbers who have died over the same time period – of the current flu.

Yes, that is a real statistic. **Check it out.** And no, don't tell me it's "not a fair comparison" because the flu is ‘always’ here and nCoV is new. All you do by that is display your unthinking foolishness. Flu viruses are RNA viruses that mutate all the time – which is why you can catch ‘the flu’ over and over again; You’re catching a different strain, a ‘new’ variant. Just like nCoV it needs to travel by infection routes. And just like nCov it has to start small. But unlike nCov it has already managed to kill around 100,000 people since Jan 1 this year. So let go of that particular piece of nonsense, ok? Do the alt-media types backing these **extreme quarantine** and self-isolation notions think the anti-assembly laws, **mandatory vaccines** and other **special powers** will all just vanish once this crisis has subsided (because all pandemics eventually do go away)? Do they think the de facto martial law will be temporary?

Do they think we can just ask nice and everything will go back to the way it was? (assuming, of course, the entire system hasn’t morphed into the Hunger Games due to global financial meltdown and mass poverty, because we all basically signed off on closing down what remains of our economy. Are they thinking at all, or just reacting? The panic is now seeding itself and doing the propaganda work for those who set it off, and an obvious and very very alarming agenda is being rolled out right behind it. It’s never been more important to stay alert, sceptical and objective. We’ll keep trying to do that – and you should all do the same.

---

*https://off-guardian.org/2020/03/16/panic-pandemic-why-are-people-who-should-know-better-buying-the-covid19-hype/**

Stunning insights into the Corona-panic by Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg.

*https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=18&v=p_AyuhbnPOI*
Did the Talmudic-Marxist death dialectic of win-lose win World War Two?

Did the German idealistic Hegelian life-giving dialectic of win-win lose World War Two?

Holocaust-Shoah education defames the German Volk!

-------------------------------------

Nerling: An antisemite is not someone who does not like Jews, but someone the Jews don’t like;

Kosky: Well, so I’m Jewish, as you know, and I’d like to say you are a big antisemite, Mr Nerling!

Nerling: That’s what I thought, and that fits into the definition I just gave you.

-------------------------------------

Fredrick Töben reflects:

TRUTH IS A DEFENCE IN DEFAMATION LAW, BUT NOT IN BLASPHEMY LAW!

Whenever Legal Protection is extended to some Myth or Legend, without TRUTH being a solid defence against individuals who refuse to believe in specific Myths or Legends, then such particular Legal Protection assumes the structure of a Blasphemy Law:

A blasphemy law is a law prohibiting blasphemy, where blasphemy is the act of insulting or showing contempt or lack of reverence to a deity, or sacred things, or toward something considered sacred or inviolable. Wikipedia

Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, 1975, is such a legal instrument because it was specifically designed to protect the “Holocaust-Shoah” narrative from any open debate or investigation.

Anyone who dares to challenge the ever-changing “Holocaust-Shoah” narrative is immediately defamed by the following weaponized words: articles of faith:


That the “Holocaust-Shoah” narrative is specifically defamatory of Germans is evident when focus is cast on how the “re-educated” and defeated Germans of World War Two have still to toe the victors’ line by prosecuting their own people for “Holocaust denial”, for example 92-year-old Ursula Haverbeck. Her only crime is to ask the basic and fundamental question:

‘If Germans did kill six million Jews, then where are the bodies/remains to be found and where is the murder weapon, the alleged homicidal gas chamber?’

So, never ask a fundamental question that any enquiring and curious mind automatically formulates:

‘Show me or draw me the murder weapon, the homicidal gas chamber!’

Asking such probing questions is designated to be blasphemous by those individuals who are propagating this to-be-never questioned assertion because a factual investigation would reveal the truth of the matter!

No individual nor group of individuals is beyond critical analysis of their individual and collective forms of behaviour.

Why? Because in any society individuals have MORAL, SOCIAL and LEGAL duties to fulfil/perform and are thus subjected to critical analysis – a normal state of affairs. It is a nonsense to propagate the mindset that cries out against such process with: Don’t be judgmental! Why? As soon as we observe any form of behaviour, then our value system categorises such behaviour as acceptable or unacceptable.

When individuals and groups extract themselves from such a normal evaluative process on grounds of “hurt feelings”, then “playing the victim” usually forces critical thinkers to ask: Cui Bono – in whose interest is it to silence critical evaluation of their behaviour.

In matters “Holocaust-Shoah” censorship is the rule, and in the following article from 2008 Melanie Phillips clarifies why she rejects such legal censorship protection.

-------------------------------------

From AI 2008 archives

Holocaust-denial law and the attempted extradition of a man for publishing antisemitic material

Updated: 22:06 AEDT, 6 October 2008

Later this week, a London magistrates’ court will hear a bail application in an extradition case which should be ringing alarm bells.

A German-born Australian citizen, Fredrick Toben, was arrested as he passed through Heathrow by British police acting under an EU
arrest warrant issued by the German authorities.

The Germans have accused him of publishing antisemitic Holocaust-denial material on his Australian website.

The train tracks at Birkenau.

There is no doubt that the views expressed by Toben, a notorious falsifier of history who was previously sentenced to nine months' jail in Germany for breaching its Holocaust-denial law, are vile. He says, for example, that there is no proof that Hitler systematically exterminated the Jews and that Auschwitz was merely a 'transit camp'.

As a Jew, I am acutely alive to the vicious potential of denying the Nazis' attempted extermination of the world's Jews. Such lies are used to whip up hatred against the Jewish people by effectively accusing them of fabricating claims of genocide. There is no question that this not only denies the historical evidence of Hitler's 'Final Solution', but also subjects Jews round the world to further hatred and persecution. Holocaust-denial is, indeed, a modern form of Jew-hatred.

But, through gritted teeth, I have to say that I am totally against the extradition of this man and appalled at the political and legal developments that have brought these moves about.

There are two fundamental issues at stake here. First is the threat to the principle of freedom of speech. Second is the erosion of Britain's power to uphold its own historic commitment to that principle.

Freedom of speech is a bedrock of our society. Sure, it's not absolute; but we limit it only in the most rare of circumstances where it poses a direct threat to individuals, such as inciting or encouraging people to violence.

For similar reasons, we also outlaw incitement to racial hatred. But we draw a distinction, for example, between inciting hatred of people for what they inescapably are, which we rightly treat as a crime, and inciting hatred of their views, which we see as part of the cut and thrust of a liberal democratic society.

That's why there was such uproar over the new crime of incitement to religious hatred. It's because of this respect for debate that this country has never criminalised Holocaust-denial.

Odious as it is, it is an interpretation of history - and one which in any event defies easy categorisation.

True, it's an interpretation that used to stir up hatred against Jewish people. But once you argue that it should therefore be made a crime, there's no end to it.

After all, you could make exactly the same point that the current vilification of Israel and the denial that it is the victim of aggression in the Middle East has led to an upsurge in violence and prejudice against Jews worldwide.

Even more fundamentally, classic English literature is stuffed with anti-Jewish stereotypes and attitudes. But no one would suggest that expressing such opinions about Israel should therefore be made a crime, or that such literary classics should be censored.

In a free society, the proper antidote to the dissemination of lies is the expression of the truth. The arch Holocaust-denier David Irving was jailed for this crime in Austria. Did that expunge his poison? Of course not; if anything, it helped him pose as a martyr.

What was more effective was surely the destruction of his ideas in a British courtroom when he chose to bring a libel action - which rebounded against him by discrediting his claim to be a 'historian' and ending with his denunciation by the trial judge as a 'pro-Nazi polemicist'.

That is the British way of doing things. But what is so disturbing about the Toben case is that we may be forced to become accomplices to a view which is inimical to our own.

If Toben is extradited, this will mean that Britain will be treating as a criminal suspect someone who is accused of behaviour which is not regarded as a crime in this country.

That breaches an ancient principle of our law - which we so regrettably junked when we signed up to the European arrest warrant.
Moreover, it is not just foreigners but British citizens who in theory can now be arrested in the UK and extradited to a country which accuses them of committing a crime there which is not treated as a crime here.

This is part of the attempt to create a 'corpus a European body of criminal law, which is in turn a key element of the EU vision of a unified super-state whose inhabitants all subscribe to the same principles.

But we do not. Both Germany and Austria have a very particular reason for criminalising Holocaust-denial. Given their appalling history, they are understandably terrified that it will help bring about a revival of Nazism.

A wax figure of Adolf Hitler is pictured in a mock bunker at the German 'Madame Tussauds' in Berlin.

They are entitled to reach such a conclusion and enshrine it in their own law. But equally, we should be entitled to say that we don't share this view. By signing up to the European arrest warrant, however, we have removed that most precious privilege.

Even if Toben is not extradited - and there is a view that the wording of the Extradition Act may provide him with a loophole - the EU arrest warrant remains a threat to our liberties.

Its scope is dangerously imprecise. Under its terms, people can be extradited to a country which accuses them merely of 'racism and xenophobia'. But these prejudices are notoriously difficult to define.

Indeed, those who object to the EU arrest warrant and the EU project itself as an attack on national sovereignty are themselves routinely accused of xenophobia.

David Irving was jailed for three years for a speech he made denying the existence of gas chambers at Auschwitz.

It is surely not fanciful, therefore, to imagine an Orwellian scenario in which such people may themselves be extradited and prosecuted - for warning against the very abuse of power that may put them in the dock.

Holocaust-denial falls into the category of 'hate-crime' which has become such a fixation among Left-wingers and an article of faith within the EU. These zealots appear to believe that hatred and prejudice can be expunged from the human heart through the exercise of the law.

Like other utopian fantasies, however, far from ushering in a new era of tolerance and enlightenment, this creates the very illiberalism it purports to oppose.

More and more arrests and prosecutions are taking place against people who are deemed to offend against 'hate speech' - simply because they are preaching Christianity, denouncing immorality or even, in one consummately ironic case, scrawling on a wall 'Free speech for England'.

And all this against the background of the campaign by certain Muslims who seek to outlaw even the term 'Islamic terrorism' in order to shut down debate about that particular threat.

This sinister encroachment of hate crime into English law has little to do with preventing harm and more to do with an abuse of power. And the EU has put rocket fuel behind it.

It is this erosion of fundamental liberties and denial of national differences at the heart of the EU project which is behind the current alarming rise of neo-Nazi parties in countries such as Austria - which jailed David Irving for Holocaust-denial.

It is not bigots like Fredrick Toben who pose the biggest threat to our freedom, but the EU and its incendiary doctrine of nation-denial.
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'We're victims of fraud': Investigation reveals Dead Sea Scrolls at Museum of the Bible are fake

The Museum of the Bible has said it's fallen victim to fraud after an investigation found Dead Sea Scroll fragments it has displayed in an exhibit are phony.

The museum in Washington DC funded researchers to test its collection of Dead Sea Scroll fragments after scholars expressed growing concern about the authenticity of some of the fragments since they were put on display in 2016.

"After an exhaustive review of all the imaging and scientific analysis results, it is evident that none of the textual fragments in Museum of the Bible's Dead Sea Scroll collection are authentic," concluded Colette Loll, founder and director of Art Fraud Insights, in a detailed report about the findings.

"Moreover, each exhibits characteristics that suggest they are deliberate forgeries created in the twentieth century with the intent to mimic authentic Dead Sea Scroll fragments."

The investigation began after experts were worried that the museum's collection weren't real since all were bought after 2002, when suspected counterfeits entered the market.

In 2017 Museum of the Bible sent off five of its Dead Sea Scroll fragments to be tested for authenticity. Results showed they were probably modern forgeries.

The new investigation revealed the other eleven fragments are also fake, with the primary reason being that they were made of ancient leather instead of "tanned or lightly tanned parchment", according to National Geographic.

National Geographic added: "Testing showed that the forger soaked the fragments in an amber-coloured concoction, most likely an animal-skin glue. "The treatment not only stabilized the leather and smoothed out the writing surface, but it also mimicked a signature, glue-like feature of the real Dead Sea Scrolls."

Museum of the Bible CEO Harry Hargrave said: "The Museum of the Bible is trying to be as transparent as possible. "We're victims, we're victims of misrepresentation, we're victims of fraud."

Loll has commended the Museum of the Bible for its honesty and for removing the collection. "What Museum of the Bible is doing is extremely important in the museum world. "Usually, items that are determined to be fake are quietly removed from display and transferred to the euphemistic 'study collection.' Museum of the Bible has opted to be as transparent as possible with its collection of Dead Sea Scrolls - from the interim gallery labels, to the public announcement of the results of the research and the subsequent release of all of the associated research materials.

"This data can now be used for comparison to other questioned fragments. What a tremendous contribution to the field." The museum held a two-day academic conference on the testing of its Dead Sea Scroll collection on Friday and Saturday. There will also be a public event on Sunday.

slippery slope can become,” Smith wrote. “Amazon must not renew it for a second season. “By blurring the line between fact and fiction, Hunters muddies the historical record, disrespects those who perished, and provides ammunition to those who seek to deny the truth of the Holocaust,” he also wrote.

If the filmmakers “had taken the time and trouble to listen to some real experiences,” he added, “the flashbacks to the Holocaust in the series could have been real things that happened to real people, rather than the fantasies of scriptwriters.” * https://www.jpost.com/Diaspora/Head-of-Spielbergs-Holocaust-foundation-tells-Amazon-to-drop-Hunters-620923

Lessons from the ancient philosophers to help improve our lives today

Marie Robert, Sun 16 Feb 2020 02.00 AEDT Last modified on Mon 17 Feb 2020 03.18 AEDT

Wise words: ‘Epicurus encouraged us to acknowledge every bit of happiness in our lives, to cherish the people and things we love, and to savour every opportunity.’

Illustration: Eva Bee/The Observer

We are meant to have desires and should worry less, said Aristotle, while Epicurus cautioned that most of the stuff we think we want won’t make us happy.

Four hours spent wandering the aisles of Ikea for nothing. My boyfriend and I had long since stopped talking. I was ready to slap the next person who uttered a Swedish word. As I pushed my heavy cart into another room full of boxes I took a deep breath and fought the urge to cry. Thank God for philosophy, I thought to myself.

I first got interested in philosophy as a teenager. It was on the curriculum at my high school in Paris, but its image was pretty crusty – philosophers were greybeards who wrote convoluted sentences and looked as if they might need a good wash, right? But when I was 16, a teacher gave me a copy of Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* and I was struck by one phrase: “That whereof we cannot speak, thereof we must remain silent.”

Suddenly, a whole world opened up to me: a world where we had the right to think and speak, but also to admit our own ignorance – to experience a sense of wonder. Ever since then, I’ve been fascinated by the question of how to apply the lessons of philosophers to improving everyday life – starting with my own.

Cut back to my disastrous Ikea trip. The day had started so well, full of careful list-making and planning. On most days I can wax lyrical about the dangers of consumerism, but once I actually entered the mind-boggling labyrinth of the Ikea store I was grabbing things left and right, filled with an insatiable need to buy things. Pot plants, cushions, spot lighters, a stuffed crocodile. By the time I had paid the £278.50 bill, I was filled with a deep sense of self-loathing. What happened?

I could blame it on Ikea’s clever merchandising. Or perhaps I had simply failed to restrain my desire for shiny new stuff. Baruch Spinoza would have a different answer. He believed there is no need to punish yourself for having desires; in fact, it’s beneficial to have them. According to his work, *Ethics*, all people contain an essential kind of energy, composed of desires, wishes and passions. But you don’t just wake up in the morning full of them. Desire reveals itself through certain situations – when browsing lampshades, for example. And once awoken, it sets your thoughts alight.

The wisest people are not necessarily the most disciplined

So should I hold off buying anything? For Spinoza, being ethical doesn’t mean swearing never to buy another tchotchke. The wisest people are not necessarily the most disciplined. They are the people who can come to a true understanding of the world around them, of what drags them down and what lifts them up. Ethics is really about trying to understand your passions and what drives you. Listening to your deepest self is the best hope you have.

Now before hitting the shops, I sit down and think about what I’m actually looking for – not just the objects I need, but what I want from them. Comfort? Excitement? To feel more at home in the space I inhabit? A few moments of reflection usually unearths a desire I wasn’t aware of, and means I make better choices.

Another area in which philosophy has transformed my life is my approach to health. The weekends of my 20s were roller coasters of feeling young, invincible and ready to party one minute, then enduring vile hangovers the next. A period of sanctimonious clean-eating and sobriety would ensue. During one of these phases, living off essential oils and self-care clichés, I’d finally feel virtuous. But inevitably the wheels would come off. Promising I’d have “just one drink” with friends would end several bottles of wine later and at 2pm the next day I’d be hating myself, yet again.

Aristotle, who had a lot to say about self-esteem, helped me break out of that cycle. In his book *Nicomachean Ethics*, he tried to answer the
question: “What is the best way for humans to act?” Getting wasted every Saturday night might not be the answer, but he would still want us to think of it as an experience to draw wisdom from. He said that every moment in your life, even the embarrassing ones, can be used to gain a deeper understanding of yourself. That’s a pretty comforting thought, and helps explain why Aristotelian ideas have survived 2,500 years of humans feeling guilty.

**For Aristotle, virtue** doesn’t mean depriving yourself of the “bad” things; it’s more about giving yourself the possibility of being happy. In everyday language, being “virtuous” can mean being upright, in a juice-cleansing kind of way, but learning to be good is ultimately about being more in harmony with yourself.

He talked about a meditative, wise kind of happiness that comes when you’re able to find courage, balance and serenity. A journey to Aristotelian happiness won’t come through taking extreme action or eliminating all carbs after 6pm. Virtue comes from living, which ultimately is made up of lots of tiny day-to-day experiences. It is only by patiently wading through daily life, making thoughtful decisions as often as you can, that you will make progress. If you can learn from your Sunday morning hangover, the next time you go out you will remind yourself that after three glasses it’s probably time to switch to water. And eventually, making that choice will become ordinary. As Aristotle said: “We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence, then, is not an act but a habit.”

**Epicurus said most of what we think we want is superfluous**

Philosophy can seem like a pretty heavy subject, encouraging us to dwell on weighty life questions 24/7. In fact, it is often telling us the opposite – that we should worry less. I reflected on this over the holiday season, surrounded by family and friends compulsively checking their phones. In the midst of what was meant to be a festive weekend of relaxation, they were chained to an endless stream of news alerts, under the pretext they had to “stay up-to-date”. Epicurus would disagree. A lot of people today associate the Greek philosopher, born in 341 BC, with luxury or hedonism, but Epicurus's teachings were really more focussed on simplicity. He encouraged us to acknowledge every bit of happiness in our lives, to cherish the people and things we love, and to savour every opportunity – like the chance to spend two days with loved ones, sans updates on Donald Trump.

Epicurus said we should work to fulfil our essential needs but also realise that most of what we think we want is superfluous. Really, our needs are remarkably simple. Nobody requires a constant stream of notifications on their phone to survive. We may think we are bettering ourselves and the world by staying informed, but while the media shows us an endless list of reasons to be afraid, we have no control over most of what we read about. Being consumed by it does not make us more virtuous, altruistic or deep-thinking. It makes us unable to be present in the moments we have been given to live and to connect with others. Philosophy helps to remind us that sometimes wisdom comes from knowing less. Whereof we cannot speak, we must put our phones on silent.

**Modern dilemmas that philosophy can help**

1. **To lie or not to lie**

Philosophers believe in the pursuit of truth. So what should you say when your granny gives you the world’s most hideous jumper for your birthday? Telling her what you really think would break her heart. Thankfully, according to John Stuart Mill, you don’t have to be honest at any cost. Sometimes a white lie can have utilitarian value. Thanks, Gran.

2. **Mending a broken heart**

OK, there is no real cure for heartbreak except, perhaps, time. But Immanuel Kant’s scepticism about romantic passion – he favoured a deeper and more rational kind of love instead – reminds us that infatuation isn’t everything.

3. **Sticking to your fitness goals**

Friedrich Nietzsche’s concept of “the will to power” is the intellectual equivalent of your most upbeat workout playlist – a shot of utter bravura to defeat even the strongest feelings of inertia.

4. **Dealing with incomprehensible in-laws**

You love your partner, but talking to their family feels like signalling to aliens. There’s a reason you don’t understand each other. Ludwig Wittgenstein argues that every group of human beings has its own unique culture and code. If you put in the time to learn their particular language, you’ll soon be able to communicate fully.

**Marie Robert is the author of Keep It Together: Philosophy for Everyday Emergencies (Scribe, £9.99). Buy it for £8.39 at guardianbookshop.com**

*This article was amended on 16 February 2020 to correct the spelling of the name of John Stuart Mill.*

A year after the shootings that left 51 Muslim worshippers dead in Christchurch, experts have warned that hate crime and xenophobia are on the rise in New Zealand. While the attacks at two mosques led to an outpouring of support for the Muslim community, it also inspired far-right nationalists and anti-immigration campaigners to be more active online and offline, say Muslim leaders, activists and experts.

A survey by online safety agency Netsafe found online hate speech increased in New Zealand last year, with about 15 per cent of adults targeted in the 12 months to June last year.

The numbers were similar in Australia, where 14 per cent of more than 3700 adults surveyed were estimated to have been targeted by hate speech online in the year to August, according to a report from Australia’s eSafety Commissioner.

After the mosque attacks, Labor senator Penny Wong warned that the normalisation of hate speech and extremist views in Parliament was making democracy "more fragile". And comments by former Senator Fraser Anning that included that "the real cause of the bloodshed" in Christchurch was "the immigration program which allowed Muslim fanatics to migrate to New Zealand in the first place" prompted a bipartisan censure motion in the Senate over his "inflammatory and divisive" words.

Meanwhile, around the world "hate is moving into the mainstream," warned the head of the United Nations last year, with social media and other modes of communication being "exploited as platforms for bigotry". "Public discourse is being weaponised for political gain with incendiary rhetoric that stigmatises and dehumanises minorities, migrants, refugees, women and any so-called 'other',' said UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres.

The coronavirus pandemic has, unsurprisingly, exacerbated the problem, prompting a European human rights watchdog in March to urge a clampdown on fake news and hate speech on social media.

But what are we talking about when we talk about hate speech? Is hate speech against the law? And why is it so controversial?

**What's hate speech?**

Hate speech can be a confusing term, defined differently in different contexts. In its strategy for dealing with hate speech, the United Nations says there is no international legal definition, and what is considered hateful is disputed. But for the purposes of having a plan of action to counteract it, the UN describes hate speech as "any kind of communication in speech, writing or behaviour, that attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of who they are." The speech is directed at a person's "religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, colour, descent, gender or other identity factor".

It’s 26 years since a bulletin on a Rwandan radio station called for violence against the nation’s Tutsi ethnic minority. “On the day when people rise up and don’t want you Tutsi any more, when they hate you as one and from the bottom of their hearts … I wonder how you will escape,” it read. This broadcast and others like it were extreme examples of hate speech, and an estimated one million people were murdered in the ensuing genocide in 1994. Three people who ran the radio station are serving 30-year prison sentences, in part for inciting genocide.

"[T]he Holocaust did not start with the gas chambers, nor did the genocides in Rwanda, Srebrenica or Cambodia start with mass killings," said the Antonio Guterres said on World Genocide Commemoration Day in December. "They were all preceded by discrimination, hate speech,
incitement to violence and the dehumanisation of 'the other'”.

Social media platform have their definitions too. "We do not allow hate speech on Facebook because it creates an environment of intimidation and exclusion, and in some cases, may promote real-world violence," reads Facebook’s community standards policy. Facebook defines hate speech as a direct attack on people based on "protected characteristics" (including race, ethnicity, gender identity and serious disease or disability) and it details the kind of "hate speech" content it will remove.

Professor Katharine Gelber from the University of Queensland prefers the term “systemically discriminatory speech” because it highlights the idea that there is an element of discrimination to hate speech. “Hate speech is an act of discrimination like any other – except with words,” Professor Gelber says. "While anyone can be the target of hateful language, hate speech is different," she says. "To cross the line between hateful language and hate speech it needs to be capable of enacting discrimination in the context in which it is uttered.”

How does hate speech do damage?

First, there are the consequences – what follows from it. Ever since the Rwandan genocide, a major aim has been identifying the early warning signs of mass atrocities. Dehumanising a population – the Tutsi minority were referred to as "cockroaches" on local radio and elsewhere – is typical of tropes in speech that can lead to violence.

Then there are what academics call “constitutive harms” – where the speech is intrinsically harmful. “Just by saying the hate speech, you have harmed people,” says Professor Gelber. "They are placed as ‘lesser than’. They have powers taken away from them.”

Hate speech has been found to lower the self-esteem of those against whom it is directed, cause psychological distress, prevent people from wanting to socialise and sometimes degrade physical health. Research also suggests that, over time, hate speech can strengthen negative stereotypes.

Professor Gelber and Professor Luke McNamara, co-director of the Centre for Crime, Law and Justice at UNSW, examined interviews with 100 members of minority ethnic communities in Australia in 2015 who had experienced what they regarded as hate speech. Interviewees spoke of fear, victimisation, restrictions on freedom, blows to self-esteem and the sense that others were leaning on deep-seated power imbalances to vilify them.

When told by a student to “go where you belong”, a study participant said this: "I know that I’m different from them … and I’m hurting, I feel that I’m living here and I’m [earning] my livelihood here, my family is here but I’m not in their [good]will.”

Are there laws on hate speech in Australia?

A patchwork of state and federal laws cover most, but not all, types of hate speech, even if they are not named "hate speech" laws but more often "vilification".

In the mid-90s, the federal Labor government amended the Racial Discrimination Act to include section 18C under which you can be sanctioned if you “offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate” another person due to their race, colour or national or ethnic origin (religion, sexuality and gender are not included). Section 18D allows exceptions where the speech is reasonable and made in good-faith for academic, artistic or other public interest contributions.

Those who breach this civil law may be the subject of a complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission, which attempts to come to an agreement between the vilified person and the vilifier. On rare occasions, the matter may end up in court.

In 2000, the commission found that German-born Australian Fredrick Toben had racially vilified Jews by arguing on his website that the Holocaust did not happen. Nine years later, after two court proceedings, Toben was sentenced to three months in prison for being in contempt of court by refusing to take down the material.

In 2011, a Federal Court judge ruled that two articles by conservative media commentator Andrew Bolt – headlined “It’s so hip to be black” and “White fellas in the black” – contravened section 18C.

In 2016, former federal senator David Leyonhjelm filed a complaint with the commission after he was labelled an “angry white male” in an opinion piece in The Sydney Morning Herald and The Age. His complaint was rejected, in part because the terms “white” and “male” were not considered terms of denigration by the commission.

A Western Australian court delivered the state's first sentence under its criminal anti-vilification laws in 2011 with a three-year jail term for a man who posted online a video of himself insulting a Jewish man.

In Victoria, three far-right extremists who staged a mock beheading in protest at plans to build a
mosque were convicted of a criminal offence and fined $2000 each under Victoria’s racial vilification laws in 2017.

A parliamentary committee has been reviewing Victoria’s anti-vilification laws since September amid a push to widen the 2001 Racial and Religious Tolerance Act to include hate speech targeting people for their gender, disability, sexual orientation or gender identity, as well as internet harassment.

In NSW, in 2018 criminal offences of serious vilification that had been located in the Anti-Discrimination Act were amended and added to the Crimes Act to deal with “publicly threatening or inciting violence on the grounds of race, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, or intersex, or HIV/AIDS status”.

Federally, critics of the proposed religious discrimination bill, which looks to protect employees from being fired for expressing their religious views, are asking whether the proposed laws could actually protect some forms of hate speech.

Why is hate speech so controversial?

Banning dangerous language means limiting free expression. Hate speech may degrade people’s basic dignity, prevent a victim from being the social citizen they want to be and, in some extreme cases, cause violence. But opponents of hate speech laws would say free speech is vital to democracy and the contest of ideas, and the effects of hate speech are overstated.

Free speech is already barred in a range of contexts. In Victoria and NSW, using offensive language in public can be a crime. In some countries, including Indonesia, blasphemy is a crime; in Germany, Holocaust denial is barred; in South Korea, most speech supporting or criticising political candidates or parties is barred in the months leading up to an election.

“Where do governments draw the line? It depends on the government,” Professor Gelber says.

In the United States, the Supreme Court has ruled that hate speech is protected by the Constitution’s first amendment, which states "Congress shall make no law … abridging the freedom of speech".

In Canada in August, the editor of a controversial Toronto newspaper was sentenced to a year in jail after being found guilty of two charges of wilful promotion of hatred against women and Jews. The Ontario court judge said the editor had depicted women as inviting rape, described Jews as drinking the blood of Christian children and denied the Holocaust.

Meanwhile, seven out of 10 Australians surveyed in research commissioned by Australia’s eSafety Commissioner said they would support more laws to stop the spread of hateful content online, while eight out of 10 wanted social media platforms to do more.

One out of seven said they had experienced online hate speech and people identifying as LGBTQI or as Indigenous experienced it at more than double the national average rate.

"We’ve reached a tipping point societally," said eSafety Commissioner Julie Inman Grant, who commissioned the research. "Technology is becoming integrated into our everyday lives … and people are tired of the negativity, they’re tired of the targeted hate."

– with Caitlin Fitzsimmons, Noel Towell and wires
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How to argue with a racist: Five myths debunked - 16 March 2020

Racism can be debunked with facts and science.
Stereotypes and myths about race abound, but this does not make them true.

Often, these are not even expressed by overt racists.
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For many well-intentioned people, experience and cultural history has steered them towards views that aren’t supported by human genetics. For example: the assumption that East Asian students are inherently better at maths, black people have natural rhythm, or Jews are good with money. Many of us know someone who thinks along these lines.
Dr Adam Rutherford, a geneticist and BBC presenter, says "Racism is being expressed in public more openly today than at any time I can recall, and it's our duty to contest it with facts."

Here's how to debunk five racist myths with science and facts.

**MYTH 1:**
**The DNA of white and black people is completely different**

**FACT:** All humans share almost all of their DNA

The primary pigment in human skin is melanin. It's used to protect us from the sun. It absorbs the sun's ultra violet rays before they can destroy folate, one of the body’s key vitamins. Many genes are involved in the biochemical pathways that result in melanin production. Natural variation within these genes is the root cause of the spectrum of skin tones that humans have.

So, the biggest genetic difference within the human race is between white people and black people, right? Wrong.

Firstly, all humans share almost all the same DNA - a fact that betrays all of our recent origins from Africa.

Secondly, there is more genetic diversity on the continent of Africa than in the rest of the world put together.

Two people from different tribes in Southern Africa will be more genetically different from each other than a Sri Lankan, a Māori and a Russian.

We might categorise people as white, black or brown, but these visual variations don't accurately reflect the genetic differences - or rather similarities - between us.

**MYTH 2:**
**There is such a thing as 'racial purity'**

**FACT:** "Racial purity is pure fantasy"

We think of certain areas, lands or peoples as being isolated - either physically or culturally - and these boundaries as being insurmountable.

But this is neither what history, nor genetics, tell us. In fact, no nation is static.

"People have moved around the world throughout history, and had sex whenever and wherever they could," says Dr Rutherford.

Sometimes these are big moves in short times.

More often, people are largely static over a few generations - and that can feel like a geographical and cultural anchor.

"Nevertheless, every Nazi has Jewish ancestors" says Dr Rutherford, "Every white supremacist has Middle Eastern ancestors. Every racist has African, Indian, East Asian ancestors, as well as everyone else."

"Racial purity is pure fantasy. For humans, there are no pure bloods. Only mongrels enriched by the blood of multitudes," he says.

**MYTH 3:**
*Germany for the Germans*, *Turkey for the Turks* (and other variations)

A 1972 protest in the UK calling for an end to immigration

Some people experience a lot of angst about migrants and refugees coming to their country, a phenomenon that has been experienced in many places around the world of late.

Among recent examples, the shooting rampage last month that started in a shisha bar in Hanau, Germany, was motivated by a far-right doctrine to expel or murder immigrants.

Those on the far right have long expressed anger in the form of epithets: "Germany for the Germans", "France for the French", "Turkey for the Turks" and "Italy for Italians" have all been used as anti-immigration phrases by far-right groups.

"Go back to where you came from" is an offensive phrase that resonates all over the world.

In truth, countries like Germany, France, Turkey and Italy have had immigration throughout their history. In fact, just about everywhere has.

The British Isles, for instance, have become home to migrants since they separated from the continent around 7,500 years ago.

Before the French took over in 1066, that part of the world had been invaded by Vikings, Angles, Saxons, Huns, and dozens of other smaller tribes and clans.

And even before that, the Romans ruled, which in their turn came from all over the intercontinental empire, which reached as far as sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East.

Earlier still, around 4,500 years ago Britain was populated primarily by farmers, who had migrated from Europe across what was continuous terrain between the Netherlands and East Anglia.

On the basis of DNA evidence, we think they may have been olive skinned, with dark hair and brown eyes.

And before them there were hunter-gatherers, who had even darker skin.

So, when political parties or even racists say: "France for the French", or "Italy for the Italians" and talk about "indigenous" people... who do they actually mean?

**MYTH 4:**
*A genealogy test can prove someone is 100% white*

You carry DNA from only half of your ancestors dating eleven generations back

Genealogy and ancestry fascinate us - and racists in particular.

Websites like Stormfront are frequented by white nationalist, white supremacist, and anti-Semitic members who forward theories for Holocaust-denial and are obsessed with population genetics.
They use mainstream genealogy tests, like those offered by Ancestry DNA, to "prove" they are 100% white or non-Jewish. However, the logic is flawed. DNA can tell you some interesting things about family history - and it's very useful for identifying close family like lost siblings or biological parents - but its powers are profoundly limited by fundamental biology.

Over time, descendants start to shed the DNA of their actual ancestors, and the amount that vanishes builds up over the generations to be huge.

You carry DNA from only half of your ancestors dating eleven generations back. So it is possible that you are genetically unrelated to people you are actually descended from as recently as the 18th Century.

"You are descended from multitudes, from all around the world, from people you think you know and from more you know nothing about," says Dr Rutherford, "you will have no meaningful genetic link to many of them."

**MYTH 5:**

**Black people are better at running than white people**

Usain Bolt's apparent easy wins seemed to fuel this erroneous idea

The last white man to compete in a 100m final at the Olympics was in 1980. Since then, black athletes have dominated the modern era of sprinting. This has fuelled a commonly held belief that people of African descent have an advantage at the sport because of their genetic ancestry.

"Maybe there are probabilistic predictions one could make about ethnicity and sporting success based on genetics," says Dr Rutherford, "but they would be weak at best."

In actual fact, the genetics of sporting success are wickedly complex.

There are a myriad of factors in physiology of physicality, including the size of your heart, the efficiency with which you absorb oxygen, and muscular recovery, says Rutherford.

And these are relatively well understood phenomena which do have a genetic basis. But there are other physical traits (such as flexibility and co-ordination) which are less well understood.

On top of that, there's the psychological dimension: determination, concentration, and risk-taking, for example.

We do know that people who are good at explosive-energy sports tend to have a higher proportion of "fast-twitch" muscle cells, that process energy more quickly.

The genetics that underlie this involve a gene called ACTN3.

Studies have shown that elite athletes in power and strength sports are more likely to have copies of the R-type of ACTN3. The research indicates the gene occurs in a higher proportion of African Americans (96%) compared to white Americans (80%). That does give a slight, population-wide advantage to African Americans to take place in explosive-energy sports - but it doesn't come anywhere close to explaining the difference between the number of African American sprinters and white competitors.

If it just came down to that gene, you might expect to see six black elite sprinters for every five white runners.

Adam says this is a simplistic analysis, but still a good example of how genetics don't align with racial stereotypes in sports.

This piece has been adapted from the BBC radio programme How to argue with a racist, and presented by Dr Adam Rutherford.


**Is Jewish Racism Jewish supremacism? This topic is not covered here – why not?**

**-----------------------------**

**Martin Heidegger tells the TRUTH:**

*The Jews, with their marked gift for calculating, live, already for the longest time, according to the principle of race, which is why they are resisting its consistent application with utmost violence.*

---

*When you can't figure it out, ask a philosopher.*

*Timeless Wisdom for Modern Dilemmas*
Sometimes a book comes along that changes the way we think. Sometimes a book comes along that changes the way we act. Sometimes a book comes along that changes the way we think and the way we act. Such a book was *Hellstorm—The Death of Nazi Germany, 1944–1947*. That masterpiece by Thomas Goodrich changed forever not only how we would view World War Two, but it changed how we would view the world itself. For the first time since it happened, because of one bold and breath-taking book, the scales fell from our eyes and we were finally able to see free and unfettered what the abomination called World War Two was really all about. Swept forever into a dark, dirty corner was the filth and disease of seventy years of Jewish mendacity, seventy years of Jewish lies about the so-called “Good War” and the so-called “Greatest Generation,” seventy years of Jewish mendacity about who was bad and who was good. Suddenly, overnight, replacing those lies was an honest, impartial, unbiased, but driving, relentless, and utterly merciless account of the fate that befell Germany in 1945.

As incredible as *Hellstorm* was, is, and will always remain, we now know it was only half the story. While the bloody obscenity that was World War Two was being acted out against a largely helpless German population by as evil a cast of creatures as ever haunted any hell anywhere, a similar horror show was taking place on the far side of the globe. And what is revealed in Tom Goodrich’s latest book, *Summer, 1945—Germany, Japan and the Harvest of Hate*, is a story so savage and sadistic as to numb the senses.

While some of the events described in *Summer, 1945* will be familiar to readers of *Hellstorm*, many will not. Clearly, the author did a vast amount of new research for this new book since much material is previously unknown, especially regarding the contributions of the “Greatest Generation” to its already ghastly list of war crimes against Germany. In fact, what was previously revealed about the Americans in *Hellstorm*, horrific as it was at the time, was only the faintest foretaste of what was to come in *Summer, 1945*. For example...
European Jews in Germany and Poland was on a psychopathic scale beyond belief. Well over a hundred thousand German men, women and even children suffered brutal deaths in these nightmarish torture pens. One might have imagined, and one would have certainly hoped, that after Hellstorm nothing more could have possibly been added to this perfectly hellish script of torture—victims buried alive, women forced to lay with and kiss rotting corpses—but one would have imagined wrong. Those few who survived these demonic camps, where dying was a thing to be postponed, not hurried, could no longer be called human. Of virtually all German men and boys who somehow survived to reach home, it was noticed all had their reproductive organs destroyed beyond repair.

But horrific as the so-called “peace” in Germany was, perhaps the greatest revelations for readers of Summer, 1945 come in the war chapters devoted to Japan. From the first page forward we readers, especially we Americans readers raised on the mythology of the “Dirty Jap,” will find our world of make believe turned upside down and inside out. Winners do write the history. And never was this more apt and terribly illustrated than in the case of America’s victory over Japan.

One of the greatest lies to emerge from WWII and survive for over seventy years intact, is the one we have been told over and over ever since December 7, 1941, viz., that the Japanese soldier was a mindless, murderous automaton, that he would never surrender, that he would always fight to the death, that he “lived to die” for the Emperor, that suicide was his second nature, and so on. There is no truth to any of these fairy-tales. Such a revelation as I have just stated here should not have come as any great surprise to anyone when they think about it, but it did come as a great shock to me and it will to everyone else, I am sure. When one has been told a “truth” such as this about the “robotic” Japanese soldier, a truth told for so many years from so many sources, one simply believes it as totally, completely and mindlessly as that night follows day. After reading a few pages of Summer, 1945, however, it will be very clear to everyone that never there was a greater falsehood.

While reading what the opposing sides thought, in their own words, it is quickly clear that emotionally there was no appreciable difference between what a Japanese eighteen-year-old wanted and what an American eighteen-year-old wanted. First and foremost, both wanted to live. Both wanted to survive the war so that each might return home and marry that girl they loved so much, to have kids, to get a good job, to buy a car, to raise a small garden, to play in the backyard with pets. The problem for the Japanese was that Americans were taking no prisoners. From the very first battle on Guadalcanal when frightened young Japanese began walking forward with their hands held high to surrender muttering the only English word they knew, “Mercy, mercy,” US Marines began mowing them down . . . all of them, not just an isolated few here and there . . . all of them. In countless testimonies, it is readily apparent that Japanese soldiers in hopeless situations would have gladly surrendered, by the thousands, if only they could. The hatred was so great, however, and the propaganda so virulent following President Franklin Roosevelt’s orchestrated attack at Pearl Harbor that American soldiers, sailors and airmen were simply taking no prisoners, nor did the folks back home or their commanders want them to.

“You will take no prisoners, you will kill every yellow son-of-a-bitch, and that’s it,” yelled a marine colonel as he and his men were about to land on one island.

Thus, the manufactured belief after Pearl Harbor that the Japanese always fought to the death and never surrendered worked perfectly into the deep desire of Americans to kill the “sneaky Japs,” kill them all. And so, with no option now but to fight fanatically to the death, the Japanese did. And thus, it was a case where propaganda became a self-fulfilling truth.

Added to the merciless murder of helpless enemy soldiers was the torture and mutilation the Americans inflicted on those who were merely wounded. Ears, noses, fingers, toes, and other body parts were cut off the dead and dying for souvenirs; heads were hacked off and their “cured” skulls then sold to sailors or sent home to friends and family members; even Roosevelt received a letter opener carved from a Japanese arm bone.

“This is the sort of gift I like to get,” beamed the US president proudly.

The few Japanese who were in fact saved for interrogation were kept alive only as long as their information was useful, then they too were shot, bayoneted or pushed from flying aircraft.

Another falsehood that has existed as fact for the past seventy years is that the US military conducted itself properly during the occupation of Japan and helped the defeated nation gently back to its feet during peace. Again, nothing could be further from the truth. From the day they arrived, the Americans took ruthless control of what little remained of the destroyed nation. Women, children and the elderly were thrown into the streets and forced to shift among the ruins as best they could. At every available opportunity, Japanese men suffered humiliation and degradation and many were slapped, kicked and beaten in public “for fun.” All Japanese were treated like third-class citizens for years. Starvation stalked the land even before the conquerors arrived but though the Americans had a surplus to draw from food was denied to the people, just as it was in
Germany. As a result, it is likely that millions perished during the first years of occupation. It was noticed that starving children were smaller in 1946 than they were in 1936.

Additionally, just as in Germany, rape reared its filthy head in "peace." From the moment American troops came ashore on Saipan and Okinawa—two Japanese islands with large civilian populations—rape of females, and sometimes rape of males, began. And just as in Germany following its surrender, the violent sexual assaults in Japan continued unabated for years. No one in power, from General Douglas MacArthur down, was concerned in the least about the despicable, plague-like crime. Indeed, MacArthur was much more concerned with censoring the news of rape from the outside world than stopping rape in Japan itself. Goodrich estimates that over a million Japanese women and children were raped after the war.

There are many other shocking revelations that might be lifted from this blistering book but then, after all, this is only a review of the book and not the book itself. Readers will have to discover the rest of this startling, riveting read for themselves. Truly, *Summer, 1945* is aptly subtitled, “the harvest of hate.”

In closing, a few final thoughts on the author himself. Anyone who has read anything by Tom Goodrich knows that he is a passionate man who writes with great power, strength and scope. It is a trademark that sets him apart from others. But his books also reveal the inner writer; a writer within who displays a large heart and soul. One senses early in a book that Goodrich actually cares about his subjects. There is, of course, the larger focus of each book, the “big picture,” but Goodrich never loses touch with the small, the fragile, the seeming insignificant, the all-but-forgotten. A touching example is offered in *Summer, 1945* when a Japanese adolescent, whose face has been melted beyond recognition by the atomic blast at Hiroshima, makes plans to kill herself rather than be chained for the remainder of her life to the face of a monster. Just as the child is about to commit the final act, she overhears in the next room her anguished father quietly discussing his daughter with her mother. Sadly agreeing that the child’s face is indeed hideous beyond belief, the man then states with both pain and love in each word that he loves his girl so much that her life, not her looks, is all that matters to him. Stunned, never imagining that anyone could ever love her again with such a terrifying face, the words of love were startling to the child, so startling that she suddenly realized that although death would indeed release her from a life of pain and shame, such a selfish act would only add to the heartbreak of her father. The girl matures to womanhood when she decides then and there to accept her fate, deal with her problems herself, and simply be thankful for the love that still blesses her life when so many others are now bereft of all.

Generally, to reach an honest and accurate understanding of an event such as World War II, one must be so dedicated to the truth that they are prepared to plow through days, weeks, months, and years of dry, sterile material filled with tedious facts, figures and stats. Few of us have the time, patience or stamina for such research. Thankfully, there are those like Tom Goodrich who do have what it takes for the long haul. Ultimately, it is the "long haul" that delivers the details of history from which comes what we know as truth. Without our history, without our truth, we are nothing as a people. That’s why our enemy is so determined to hide or distort our history; it is also why people like Tom Goodrich are so determined to retrieve our history. Discovering the truth of our history, even after decades of propaganda and lies, is what will ultimately set us free. These two books—*Summer, 1945* and *Hellstorm*—have gone a very long way toward setting us free. And this is what makes Thomas Goodrich’s writing style so special. Almost in spite of ourselves, we sense the truth in his words. We, the readers, are drawn into a Goodrich book before we hardly know it. Truth is like that, like a strong magnet. A day or two later, when one emerges from the book—one “emerges” from a Tom Goodrich book, they never “finish” something that stays with them forever—they feel like they are different people; they have been to places that they never knew existed; they have gone to worlds that they were not supposed to go; they have gained knowledge and understanding that they were never meant to gain. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is an uncanny writing ability. We call it genius.

*Summer, 1945—Germany, Japan and the Harvest of Hate* has already taken its place with *Hellstorm* as one of the all-time most memorable and important books ever written, not just on World War II, but on history in general. If that sounds biased, that’s because it is. We White Nationalists are extremely fortunate to have one of the world’s finest and most dedicated historians fighting on our side. People like Thomas Goodrich are why we are winning and why our victory is just a matter of time.

*Summer, 1945 and Hellstorm* can each be purchased at Amazon.com, Barnesandnoble.com, Booksamillion.com, and through the author’s website at thomasgoodrich.com. For faster delivery, order each book separately via the author’s paypal at mtgoodrich@aol.com ($20 US / $25 Abroad) or order both books together as one ($40 US / $50 Abroad)

VIDEO: Cops break up outdoor prayer meeting for violating NYC mayor's social distancing executive orders
Chris Field, March 19, 2020
'Those who do not follow this order are subject to arrest'

BELAAZ @TheBelaaz

VIDEO: NYC Sheriff in front of 770 - the Chabad Lubavitch headquarters in Crown Heights, urging crowds to disperse amid the coronavirus outbreak. #StayHome

New York City has a ban on crowds of 50 people or more, but that didn’t stop a large group of Jewish faithful from coming together for prayer.
Then the authorities were called — and the people were sent packing, the New York Post reported.

What happened?
According to the Post, a large Jewish prayer group gathered outside the Chabad Lubavitch headquarters in Brooklyn late Wednesday. The facility closed Tuesday night for the first time ever, the paper said, citing the Times of Israel.
But the closure wasn't going to stop dozens of faithful Jewish men from gathering outside the site to pray.
Not long after they had gathered, officers from the Sheriff's Office arrived to break them up.
A video tweeted by Jewish media outlet Belaaz shows several Sheriff's Office vehicles outside the headquarters and the Jewish attendees leaving their gathering.
An officer can be heard over a loudspeaker saying: "Attention! Attention! Under the authority of the mayor’s executive order No. 99 and No. 100, you must disperse, you must disperse. Those who do not follow this order are subject to arrest. Please disperse. Thank you."

What executive orders?
New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio issued executive orders No. 99 and No. 100 on March 15 and 16, respectively. The orders limit crowd size and give law enforcement the power to break up large gatherings.
Both orders are in effect for up to five days.

Chris is the Deputy Managing Editor of TheBlaze. You can reach him at chris.field@blazemedia.com.

Demonizing Daniel:
We Shouldn’t Trust Jews Who Oppose the Muslim Invasion of Europe
March 14, 2020 / 0 Comments / in Featured Articles / by Tobias Langdon

How’s that for gratitude? In 2006 the Conservative MP Daniel Kawczynski was one of the grovelling goys who staffed an All-Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism and who listened with entirely straight faces as Britain’s richest and most powerful racial minority pretended to be powerless and persecuted victims. When the Inquiry was complete, those goys urged that even more censorship and surveillance be imposed on Britain to defend Jewish power.

Consorting with racists
And who was the chairman of the Inquiry? Why, it was the Labour MP Denis MacShane, who was working hard for Jewish interests in London even as he ignored the White working-class girls in his Yorkshire constituency of Rotherham being raped, tortured and prostituted by Pakistani Muslims. In other words, the Inquiry into Anti-Semitism supported by Daniel Kawczynski was both deeply fatuous and tragically ironic. But Kawczynski’s goy-grovel and dutiful service for Jewish interests in 2006 counted for nothing in 2020, when Marie van der Zyl, President of the Jewish Board of Deputies, loudly condemned his “decision … to speak at a conference [in Rome] featuring far-right European politicians” and demanded that he be disciplined by his own party for appearing with the “anti-semitic” Hungarian prime minister Viktor Orbán and other racist opponents of Muslim immigration.

The Jewish Chronicle backed the Board with a pungent editorial, which said that “by consorting with racists, Daniel Kawczynski sends a clear message that he believes their ideas are legitimate and respectable.”
Kawczynski was duly forced into a humiliating “apology” by an “official warning” from the Conservatives, but his critics were not satisfied. As one headline put it: “Jewish and Muslim groups condemn Tory ‘slap on wrist’ for MP who attended ‘festival with fascists’.”

**What’s best for Jews?**

You can see there how Jews and Muslims act as “natural allies” (the exact words of Jewish anti-racists like Dr Richard Stone) against the interests of Whites and Christians. The Board of Deputies and the Jewish Chronicle still plainly believe in that Jewish-Muslim alliance, but a minority of other Jews now think that Muslim immigration into the West is not in the best interests of Jews. And in fact Kawczynski’s “festival with fascists” was addressed by a famous Israeli academic, the yarmulke-wearing Yoram Hazony (called a “gatekeeper” by VDare), and was partly sponsored by an Israeli think-tank called the Herzl Institute, whose Star-of-David-bearing logo was on prominent display throughout.

Yarmulke-wearing Yoram Hazony

In other words, it wasn’t a “festival with fascists” at all. Of course, the Board of Deputies and Jewish Chronicle didn't mention any of that Jewish involvement in their condemnation of Kawczynski. They were being dishonest, but Yoram Hazony returned the favour when he defended Kawczynski in an article at Quillette entitled “The British Conservative Party Should Stop Cancelling Conservatives.” Hazony and his co-author didn't mention the prominent Jewish criticism of Kawczynski, because they didn’t want to draw attention to the central Jewish role in censorship and “cancel culture.” But another Jewish academic, the sociologist Frank Furedi, wasn’t dishonest like Hazony. He openly named and condemned the Board of Deputies in an article entitled “The witch hunting of Daniel Kawczynski”:

Almost overnight, Kawczynski, a respected MP, was transformed by his media and political detractors into the incarnation of xenophobic evil. Very few mainstream commentators and politicians were prepared to stand up to the powerful campaign of vilification directed against him. Very few even asked the question, ‘What did he actually do?’. Instead, the very fact that some media outlets branded him ‘far right’ was enough to condemn him.

Kawczynski’s alleged crime was that he attended a meeting of fascist European politicians who apparently are in the business of promoting anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. In the words of former Tory Party chairman Lord Pickles, who serves as the government’s ‘special envoy on post-Holocaust issues’, Kawczynski brought ‘comfort’ to ‘racists and extremism’. Pickles claimed Kawczynski had ‘let fellow Conservatives down’. It is worth noting that Kawczynski himself is not accused of saying anything remotely racist, xenophobic or anti-Semitic. In the eyes of his persecutors, his crime was that he attended a conference with questionable people. In other words, he is guilty by association.

But who is he guilty of associating with, precisely? Some of his persecutors have alleged that he mixed with well-known anti-Semites and therefore he helped to legitimise anti-Semitism and racism. Marie van der Zyl, president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, carelessly waded into the discussion, asserting that the Tories ran the ‘serious risk of the public assuming that they share Kawczynski’s views’, unless, that is, they made an example of him. The Guardian and the Independent echoed this sentiment, implying that Kawczynski’s guilt was beyond debate....

It is a shame that Marie van der Zyl and her colleagues at the Board of Deputies have such a shallow grasp of what anti-Semitism actually means. Even worse, at a time when anti-Semitism is on the rise in many parts of Western Europe, crying wolf about it trivialises the seriousness of the threat faced by Jewish people today. If anyone should apologise as part of this sordid, concocted controversy, it should be Eric Pickles and Marie van der Zyl. (The witch hunting of Daniel Kawczynski, Spiked Online, 10th February 2020)

Myself, I would trust Frank Furedi as far as I could throw the famously rotund Eric Pickles, but I have to give him credit for naming and attempting to shame the Board of Deputies and for noting that Pickles is “the government’s ‘special envoy on post-Holocaust issues’”. Furedi didn’t explicitly conclude that Jewish organizations play a central role in censorship and “cancel culture,” but he certainly supplied evidence for others to reach that conclusion.

Dedicated shabbos-goy and pie-eater

Eric Pickles

It’s also interesting that Furedi himself seems to have attended the anti-immigration conference in Rome, because it would surely have horrified him during his days as leader of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), a Trotskyist groupuscule that argued for the “rejection of all controls on immigration.” Furedi’s former underlings in the RCP have continued to argue for open borders at venues like Spiked Online, but it appears as though Furedi may no longer believe that open borders are a good way to combat the anti-Semitism that so obviously and deeply concerns him (see his words above).

Viva Italia! Viva Israel!

Anti-Semitism also deeply concerns the Italian politician Matteo Salvini, who had been scheduled
to appear at the conference with Viktor Orbán and Yoram Hazony. Salvini didn’t appear in the end, but his views were fully represented there. After all, Salvini strongly opposes Muslim immigration and just as strongly supports Israel. Here’s a translation of part of a speech he made at the Italian Senate proclaiming his love of Israel and blaming anti-Semitism in Italy on Muslim immigrants:

The anti-Semitism of the right, neo-Nazi, neo-Fascist, or of the American/European white supremacist, is our enemy. Similarly our enemy is the anti-Semitism of the left, like the Islamists, like this definition of the modern anti-Semitism, like the red-green alliance. … we are also more concerned with the anti-Semitism that is accepted in some institutions … [like] a European Union that denies its Judeo-Christian roots. A European Union that labels Israeli products produced in disputed territories. A UN which in 2018 dedicated 27 condemnations of Israel in security resolutions, and one against Iran, and not even one on human rights in China and Turkey …

The enemies of Israel are the enemies of civilization and peace. The friends of Israel are the friends of liberty, rights, progress, and peaceful co-existence among peoples, and I remember as one of my greatest satisfactions when, after the meeting I had with Bibi Netanyahu, in a press conference, the Israeli prime minister said, “I have met a friend of Israel.” I am honored, I am honored to be that. And I will fight with all my strength, in all forums inside and outside of the institutions, so that our children and your children never re-live the errors and horrors of the past. Whatever [unintelligible] source or political justification they might have. Long live Italy. Long live Israel. (Matteo Salvini’s Complete Speech on Israel and Jew-Hatred, Gates of Vienna, 22nd January 2020)

I dislike Salvini’s use of the historically baseless term “Judeo-Christian” (Giudeo-cristiano in Italian), which was devised in the United States in the 1940s to serve Jewish interests (in another sense, “Judeo-Christian” is a legitimate term in the study of early Christianity). But I don’t think Salvini is a shabbos-goy like Daniel Kawczynski.

After all, Salvini said “Long live Italy” before he said “Long live Israel.” I think that a true shabbos-goy would have put Israel before Italy.

Nevertheless, Salvini’s praise of Benjamin Netanyahu is a useful warning, just like Daniel Kawczynski’s attendance at the supposed “far right” conference in Rome. We should keep a careful eye on Jewish and Israeli involvement in pro-White, pro-Christian political movements, because those movements might turn out to be not so pro-White and pro-Christian as they appear. Jews like Yoram Hazony and Marie van der Zyl are not really on opposing sides, because Yoram and Marie are merely supplying different answers to a single all-important question: What’s best for Jews?

Pretending that Jews had no role in Muslim immigration
*https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2020/03/14/demonizing-daniel-we-shouldnt-trust-jews-who-oppose-the-muslim-invasion-of-europe/

---

The Sydney Morning Herald

Labor calls for review of terror list to catch right-wing extremists

By Anthony Galloway, March 14, 2020 — 11.45pm

The federal Labor opposition says Australia’s register of terrorist groups must be urgently reviewed in a bid to catch right-wing extremist organisations that have so far evaded the list.

Labor’s home affairs spokeswoman Kristina Keneally says the government should review the terrorist-list criteria.Credit: Alex Ellinghausen

Labor’s home affairs spokeswoman Kristina Keneally wants the Morrison government to send the criteria for the terror list to Parliament’s powerful intelligence and security committee for a wide-scale review to make sure it is “fit-for-purpose”.

The United States and Britain have listed extreme right-wing groups as terrorist organisations but Australia has not put any on its proscribed list — although Australian intelligence and security agencies have been monitoring the escalating threat.

The call from Labor comes after the head of Australia’s domestic spy agency ASIO, Mike Burgess, warned small cells of right-wing extremists were regularly meeting in suburbs around Australia to “salute Nazi flags, inspect weapons, train in combat and share their hateful ideology”.

An Australian earlier this year was stopped from leaving the country to fight with an extreme right-wing group on a foreign battlefield after authorities received a tip-off from ASIO.

Home Affairs Minister Peter Dutton has previously said the government would list right-wing extremist groups if the advice from ASIO recommended it.
The definition of terrorism in Australia and the UK is similar but British authorities can list a terrorist group if they make threats "for the purpose of advancing a racial cause" or a group "glorifies" extreme violence by sharing images or symbols on social media. The "glorification" criteria was one of the justifications used by the British government to list right-wing extremist group National Action after it posted tweets and images about the murder of British Labor MP Jo Cox and the Orlando nightclub attack.

A senior government source said there was no evidence a lack of reference to race in the Australian definition was stopping the government from listing right-wing groups, as these groups could be captured by the "ideological" criteria if they were committing violence or making threats. As New Zealand marks the one year anniversary of the Christchurch massacre, Senator Keneally told The Sun-Herald and The Sunday Age ASIO's warnings about right-wing extremists seemed inconsistent with the fact no right-wing groups were on the terror list.

"It may be that the criteria for listing organisations in Australia isn't fit-for-purpose when it comes to right-wing extremism," Senator Keneally said.

"For example, the definition of terrorism in Australia and the UK is similar but with a stark difference: the UK definition of terrorism explicitly extends to violent acts or threats made for the purpose of advancing a racial cause. "The Australian government and all federal parliamentarians must now take the terrorist threat of right-wing extremism seriously and respond. The Morrison government could begin this work by referring Australia's terrorist listing criteria to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security for review.

"Our job as parliamentarians is not to play politics or engage in culture wars over such issues, and the PJCIS does neither. Keeping Australians safe is too important for that."

Senator Keneally also said the government should consider establishing a "hate crimes database" similar to that used by the FBI to track racially motivated violent extremists, as well as dedicated police units to investigate right-wing extremist threats similar to those in the US and Germany.

A spokesman for the Department of Home Affairs said security agencies actively review which organisations should be listed. "It is the Australian government's longstanding practice not to comment on any consideration of the possible listing of terrorist organisations under the Criminal Code," the spokesman said.

Listing an organisation on the terror list would criminalise any membership or association with the group. The decision to proscribe a terrorist organisation lies with the Governor-General, on the advice of the government.

Terror law expert Nicola McGarrity, a senior lecturer at the University of New South Wales, said she didn't think the inclusion of a "racial" motivation would achieve much. "The categories of 'religious', 'political' and especially 'ideological' motivation are so broad that they are likely to capture any of the world-views of far-right extremists," she said.

Kristy Campion, a lecturer in terrorism studies at Charles Sturt University, said there had been an increase both in Australia and overseas of extreme right-sentiment in recent years.

"Around the world you can observe an increase in violence or advocating of violence, that being said you can also observe an increase in thwarted plots," Dr Campion said.

"What we tend to see is an attempt to participate in political processes first. After that failure, we see them starting to stockpile weapons.

"We don't often see groups explicitly advocate terrorism. Often it's more implicit."


---

**Exploring The Spectrum:**

Dr John Ott documentary on the health effects of light

* [https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=BOUA8UAEAdY](https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=BOUA8UAEAdY)

---

**60 Minutes:**

How far would you go to protect your family? Ben Batterham was charged with murder after a home invader he chased down, died; some called it a RACE HATE MURDER!


---

**Remember Der Volkslehrer Nikolai Nerling vs Barrie Kosky?**

Australia’s Barrie Kosky has a German passport but he openly states he despises the German Volk: Nikolai Nerling, a primary school teacher, gives a lesson in what it means to be a courageous, upright and honest German who loves his German Volk.

His aim is to relieve his German people of the guilt-complex imposed upon them after World War Two. He hopes that his German Volk will rediscover its
rich cultural heritage, but deliberately disconnecting from anything arising out of the “Golden Twenties” era. The interview with opera director, Jewish Australian-born Barrie Kosky, reveals the divide that exists between Kosky’s unappetliche-unpalatable attitude towards the German people, which he rejects, and Nerling’s love for his German people – deutsche Volk.
How anti-Semitic is Germany?

Wednesday 12 September 2018

Introduction – [Translated from the German - FT]

.... however, not all Germans are so open...... most anti-Semitic incidents come from the right, predominantly propaganda offences and sedition, bullying and hate speech increasingly originate from the Internet.

Nikolai Nerling is a primary school teacher who was dismissed from his teaching position because of "hate-videos and Holocaust conspiracy theories". The case created nationwide headlines.

As Der Volkslehrer, he runs his own populist national propaganda channel on YouTube. His antisemitism is poorly disguised. The interview lasted a total of 40 minutes. We only show excerpts here.

Interview

Barrie Kosky – Mr Nerling, you agitate almost daily with self-produced videos on your YouTube channel, instead of the government, against foreigners, on the other hand, anything politically further left than you. What is your motivation for this?

Volkslehrer – I would formulate it differently. I would say that I am acting for something, namely for international understanding for peace, and for freedom and, above all, for a free German people and a free Germany.

K – And what is a free Germany and a free German people for you?

V – For me, in particular, it is important that we Germans can live as we want to live, and at the moment this is unfortunately not guaranteed. That means, yes, for instance, a lot of music is played on the radio, which is not German. In other countries a quota applies, and here it seems to me to be completely arbitrary. In my view, there are many other things that are not good for us Germans, which oppose German life in Germany.

K – If you say we, what do you mean?

V - By We, I mean those who call themselves German and who want to be German as well.

K - And how do you describe being German?

V – What does it mean to be German?

K – Hmm...

V – The point is that you love your country, love your people, that you like to live here, and that you don't feel bad when you say I'm German. It is something quite fundamental because many have, or let's say many see themselves as Germans, always connected with a guilt complex, and this is something from which I would somewhat like to liberate the Germans... just to be happy again and confidently say I am a German, and that’s what I also want to be.

After 3 minutes....

K – Where do I in your view belong to Germany?

V – You must know that. You need to know.....

K – No, I’m asking you. What you say is that there is a very specific definition of what is German and what is Germany. You have articulated this, but you say that one does not belong to this definition – one is not actually German, nor does one belong to this country.

V – Well, that's easy. Do you love Germany, do you love the German people - deutsche Volk?

K – I don't use words like German people - deutsche Volk. For me it's an unsavory thing. I'm very glad and happy to get my German passport. I
love living in Berlin, I love my German friends, and I love my opera house. And I am actually – I take it as a great privilege to get a German passport, and many people have a problem to get a passport at this time, but you are not responsible for defining what Germany means to me.

V – I didn't say that. I said who loves the country and who feels as a German, and if they have a German passport – I presume a personal ID – then you are a citizen of the FRG. But, of course, you are not a member of the German people - deutschen Volkes. You don't like the word, but this also disqualifies you as a German. A German says: There is a German people and I am part of it.

K – Hmmhm-in our film we are talking about antisemitism. In your opinion, with which Jewish stereotypes do you agree?

V – Jewish stereotypes – money hungry, for example, that kind of thing?

K – You can tell me what stereotypes there are.

V – Well, stereotypes basically help to order the world, and of course there are stereotypes that have no validity. I would also say, for example, the dumb blonde – there are many blonde women who are very smart – a term which was manipulatively introduced, and so I like to evaluate such stereotypes. As far as Jewish stereotypes are concerned, clearly there are also many, the Jewish banker....

K – There are also hundreds of thousands of non-Jewish bankers. ...

V – Well, I mean this is a stereotype, and then you can just look at it – the big banks... yes, who are the directors? And there is an exponentially high proportion of Jews on the boards, which is exorbitantly high in comparison to the general population.

After 6 minutes...

K – When is one a Jew hater?

V – When a Jew says to someone he is a Jew hater.

K – Only then?

V - I would say that is relatively reliable, because only when a question is asked about the influence of Jewish people in the financial sector or in the media or wherever, this is interpreted as being antisemitic, or even the term antisemitic is used. Well I would say anti-Judaic, and that's why you can actually say that if a Jew labels someone antisemitic, then he is one. An antisemite is not someone who does not like Jews, but someone the Jews don’t like.

K – Well, so I'm Jewish, as you know, and I'd like to say you are a big antisemite, Mr Nerling!

V – That's what I thought, and that fits into the definition I just gave you.

After 18 minutes...

K – Do these Jewish German artists and poets and all these Jewish elements belong to German culture until 33. Do they belong to German culture or not?

V – They worked here as cultural creator. If I look at the partial influence they had in Jewish theatre, Jewish films – about Jewish music I cannot say much because I am not a great connoisseur of music – then I would say that it did not necessarily benefit the Germans. It was very often something nefarious and indecent, and just as the much-hyped Golden Twenties period, which was also influenced by Jewish theatres and cinema – that was something not necessarily advantageous. That's why I always wonder...

K – You don't know what the advantage was?

V – Yes I want...

K – ...because it brings – yes of course – I know it brings many rich wonderful dimensions to German culture.

V – Rich, you mean money?

K – No, I mean rich in ideas.

V – When women start smoking and going out to nightclubs, there to while away the nights instead of sitting at home, and caring for children and family. That is no enrichment, in my view.

After 40 minutes

K – I just want to say, because we are coming to the end of the matter, that I am now finished, that I thank God that the majority of Germans are not like you – thank God!

V – Yes, and unfortunately the majority of the Jews are just like you!

* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ns412D2KbBM

* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HV9nKvGnq6Y

March 14, 2020

* https://volkslehrer.info/videoarchiv/corona-conto-holocaust

CORONA CONTO HOLOCAUST

23 March 2020
Nachdem Frau Merkel zur Nation gesprochen hat, biete ich Euch hier meine Einschätzung zur Situation.

* https://volkslehrer.info/videoarchiv/corona-commentar

-----------------------------

DIE SELBSTGEMACHTE KATASTROPHE
- zu den Buschbränden in Australien –
von Rigolf Hennig

Wochenlang tobten schwerste Buschfeuer in Australien, wie sie bisher noch nie beobachtet wurden in einer fast kontinentalen Ausdehnung vor allem im Westen und Süden. Diese bedrohten inzwischen auch die
Millionenstädte Melbourne und Sydney. Entwarnung kann trotz zwischenzeitlicher Regenfälle bislang nicht gegeben werden.

Natürlich war es nur eine Frage der Zeit, bis der Klimawandel als Ursache ausgemacht war, und der ist angeblich vom Menschen verursacht durch eine Überproduktion von CO2. Prompt schloß sich die bis dahin - wegen der gewaltigen australischen Kohleförderung - zögernde australische Regierung dieser Lesart an und schwor Abhilfe.

Indes dient die gegenwärtige Hitzewelle in Verbindung mit dem CO2-Schwindel zur Vertuschung haarsträubender Vorgänge als wahre Ursachen.

Der bekannte Buch- und Filmemacher Gerhard Wisnewski läßt den Australier Max Igan von der Webseite „The Crow House“ auf dem Video https://youtu.be/3WuS3hV-jCI mit dramatischen Meldungen zu Wort kommen:

Schon vor den Bränden war aufgefallen, daß weitflächig und vornehmlich im Süden des Erdeits Bäche und Flüsse versiegen, die dort über die Zeiten regelmäßig geflossen waren. Diese speisten sich aus Quellen, die sich wiederum als Grundwasserleitern aus den riesigen arthesischem Becken der Nordterritorien speisten. Diese arthesische Becken füllten sich alljährlich wieder durch die wie ein Uhrwerk verlässlichen und massiven Monsunregen.

Seit einigen Jahren bauen allerdings Privatfirmen gewaltige Dämme, die, vom Steuerzahler finanziert, das Wasser zum Zwecke der Ölförderung in Frackinglöcher (frackingwells) ableiten.

„Fracking“ bedeutet „Aufbrechen“, was mittels gewaltiger Wassermasse hydraulisch geschieht. Das Wasser wird hierbei u. a. mit giftigen Kohlenwasserstoffen unter dem Namen BTEX versetzt.

Um Platz für die Dämme und Wasserbecken zu schaffen wurden großflächig Bäume gerodet und der Boden planiert.

Wenn Bäche und Flüsse versiegen, dann vertrocknen Buschwerk und Bäume und werden leichte Beute der Flammen.

Es hat in Australien zu allen Zeiten Buschbrände gegeben, mit denen die Australreaker als Ureinwohner gut zurechtkamen und diese sogar zu nutzen wüßten, aber noch nie im jetzt gegebenen Ausmaß.

In den gefährdeten Gebieten sind größere Evakuierungen vorgesehen und das Militär soll eine Rückkehr der Menschen verhindern.


Igan fordert die Australier angesichts des Versagens der Regierung zur Selbsthilfe auf: sie sollen die Dämme zerstören und die Flüsse in ihre ursprünglichen Betten zurückleiten.

Versagt hier der Staat und macht gemeinsame Sache mit kriminellen Gesellschaften zu Lasten der Umwelt und der Bevölkerung?

Die Vorgänge in Australien sind durchaus vergleichbar mit den riesigen Brandrodungen in den Regenwäldern des Amazonas und sonstigen Tropenwäldern weltweit.
Meanwhile, it is obvious that national differences among peoples is a fact:
1. Spaniards buy wine; 2. Germans buy toilet paper; Italians buy condoms ...