

17 "Jewlie" 05. Hail D.R.! Thanks for the cogent considerations of "Jewlie" 11th. This summer is speeding by, as oldsters would say, but I think that the perceived 'speed' factor is not due to the slowing-down of my alpha-wave cranial camera, but to the quantity of events & information I am receiving & processing. Events appear to be accelerating, not only increasing, along major themes, & in certain directions on such fronts as economics, demographics & politics. On the homefront here in this ZOG-homeland, the poor are indeed getting poorer, the rich richer, & the middleclass are joining the ranks of the underclass. It's an 'income' thing: a rich drug-dealer is really in the same class as rich crooks with college frat experience. In the Jew Ass Oy Veh, class has nothing to do with quality. As The Protocols of Zion state: all things must become "a matter of numbers." The bootlegger heirs to elder Joseph Kennedy climbed the social ladder on barrels of illegal booze & criminal jooz, as their American success story. I mentioned to a former girlfriend, who had long associated with people I would call 'rich', that her friends expected the perks of aristocracy without providing their fellow citizens with any form of responsible leadership. The "noblesse" comes with the "oblige", I said, for those with rights, but no duties, are parasites, while those with duties, but no rights, are slaves. That's why she is a 'former' girlfriend. Ha! I had such values long before I read Veblen's "The Theory of the Leisure Class", which basically describes ostentation Uber Alles, including behavior & possessions 'expected' of people who wish to belong to such a class. Brits are especially class-conscious, & I've heard many say that "work is the curse of the drinking class." How true!

In my late teens, I decided that my best course of action was to reduce my contributions to the ZOG ("the system" as I perceived the beast at that time) on a + zero minus basis. I would reduce my + to zero, as much as possible, & I would seek to enhance the minus factor by anti-ZOG words & deeds, to the best of my ability. The bonus would be to encounter like-minded people & collaborate with them. Covington describes this latter task as "a steep hill". My experience has been that the 'hill' is not so steep as it is slippery, whenever I have tried to work with ostensibly like-minded people. This means that I slide back down to Square One, myself, pretty much where I began. I do not see this as a defeat, so much as I see it as a duty & a process & a worthwhile project which may not be concluded, with any visible results, in my lifetime. The trick is to get as much benefit from the ZOG, while putting the least in, as we both know.

In your analysis of the ZOG's use of military 'special ops' thugs, stand-off weapons, & what remains of mass army slave-thugs, I note a pattern described by military strategist Liddell Hart, in which the primary target of war becomes the enemy leaders & decision-makers, rather than enemy manpower, materiel, factories & fortifications. Hart describes the chaos created by the Ludendorff offensive of World War I, in which small units of German shock troops penetrated Allied lines with the intention of attacking Allied H.Q.s & communications. Suddenly, the connection between military brains & the body of troops was severed, with ensuing panic, chaos & retreat, in the face of what appeared to be a major offensive, the success of which was principally achieved by the small units of shocktroops, who were equipped with lots of grenades & light, automatic weapons, to maximize their firepower. As I recall, Hart described his firsthand experience of this new type of warfare, which the Allies had already tried with their abortive tank offensive. The combined ops of the World War II Blitzkrieg was a beefed-up & better-directed strategy of target-selection & rapid penetration of enemy defences. Once again, the battles were victorious to the offensive rather than the defensive, like the contest between armor & projectile, whereas, in WWI, the advantage was ^{first} to the defender.

The sort of warfare advocated by Liddell Hart & his proponents boils down to 'assassin-warfare', as I would call it, in which small forces are used to destroy &/or capture the small number of enemy decision-makers &/or those who convey their decisions to troops at the front. This objective indicates the important role of spies & traitors inside the enemy decision-making apparatus, who gain their objectives by stealth, instead of surprise attack. In my own experience, I have seen the efforts of many undone by the work of very few strategically-placed enemy agents in positions of leadership, just as we have witnessed the masses of asses duped into fighting against their own best interests by a similar few in our U.S. wars.

As you say, Saddam took the U.S. tactics & weaponry into account by letting them in without much of a fight, so they could be picked off in detail, once they occupied. I foresaw that likelihood before the U.S. attacked Iraq, not that it takes genius to know that a nearby enemy can kill a soldier with a variety of crude weapons, even a well-aimed brick or stone. The problem with occupation is that the enemy is close, by definition. Even total surveillance by satellites with instant communication cannot protect occupiers from roadside bombs & boobytraps or