

29 DEC 05. Hail Johnny! It was great to get your letter of 21 DEC. I'm happy to receive requests for information. I guess we could say that I enjoy having a 'captive audience', so I'm almost like a teacher in a compulsory course, where students are required to attend. Ha! Well, my advice is always to make the time serve you, instead of you serving the time, without benefit to yourself. As I said to other gulag-residents, on the outside there is very little time for studying or learning, or teaching! I wish I'd been able to witness your encounter with the bible-banging boob, who thought he was giving, but wound up receiving your excellent impression of the "Christ-Cult of The Jesus-Eaters" who "eat his flesh & drink his blood" in their own words in their cannibal or communion services. Some Christers claim that those words are "merely symbolic." I reply that your statement would get you burned at the stake in a Catholic country, for "Transubstantiation" supposedly occurs when the priest blesses the ostensible bread & wine, thereby transferring Jesus' soul or substance into the bread & wine, so it becomes his body & blood. I say that The bloody 30 Years' War was fought about "symbolic" (consubstantiation) & "real" qualities touted as Jesus' body & blood, so the issue is not trivial. Since I'm Aryan & not Asiatic, I take words at common face-value, & under no circumstances will I agree to eat at a cannibal feast, either real or symbolic. Excuse me for gagging at the thought! The Christinsane stole this theory of "transubstantiation" from Plato, as I recall. "Substance" was also "soul", & I don't know how much wine Plato & his cronies had to drink when they thought this up: Let's consider a table. How do we know it's a table? We know because it has form, dimension, color & solidity. If it is made of wood, it also has odor. After another big swig of wine, let's imagine that these qualities are all removed, so the spot on which the table stood no longer has any characteristics of a table. (Hic!) Well, the wine was much superior to the thinking which accompanied it, but let's (hic!) continue: We have allegedly removed every quality of the table which we can detect with our 5 senses, so we can't see, feel, taste or smell the former table. Unless we were to pound the table, we would hear nothing, either, but since there is nothing to be felt, there is nothing to pound. But Plato (hic!) would insist that "the table remains in substance", because (hic!) substance 'supports' (hic!) the other qualities of the table! By definition, "substance" can not be detected with the 5 senses, so this is what Christ-eaters blabber when they talk of "transubstantiation". This topic would be dangerous if the people who prattled about it were ever sober, for "substance", that is "soul", allegedly supports the physical qualities of all people & things, &, according to Jesus-juicers, SOULS CAN BE TRANSFERRED! If a "soul" or "substance" can be transferred with a combo of mumbo-jumbo & abra-cadabra, as in Christinsanity, & if a god's soul can be transferred into edible objects, then we could, allegedly, transfer the soul of a table into a living person! Home Depot had better watch out! This would also put Dr. Frankenstein out of business, for we could also transfer one human soul into the body of another living person! Of course, being what one eats is common amongst non-Christian religions, for some cults claim that the killing & eating of a brave enemy transfers his bravery into the person of the eater, which points to a similarity between Christinsanity & Voodoo, which have currently combined in Santeria, whose santos or saints are really Voodoo loas or gods, as occurred with many other Pagan gods who were converted into Christian saints. In short, Santeria is as kosher as any other form of Christinsanity! Since "substance" & "soul" are the same, then we could claim that a person is now our "bread & wine." Dracula would love that! So would Hannibal the Cannibal. Some beliefs are actually forms of mental illness which are codified & inculcated. As one correspondent wrote: one kook is a nutcase; a kbook group is a cult; & a maniacal mob is a religion. It's all a matter of numbers, as it says in The Protocols of Zion. Imagine if there were such a cult as "Judeo-Christianity": jews could baptise or naturalize pork as beef, thereby making pork kosher! If nasty old Yahweh is a drag, they could baptise him as Dagon & have themselves a big orgy. If Jesus is too wimpy, he could be baptised into Yahweh & go around smiting everyone who offended him & his followers. Used car dealers could make fortunes selling Hondas baptised as Rolls Royces. Of course, some people would say, we'd have to be crazy to believe such things, & they'd be quite right! In conclusion, Christian = Crazy. End of story.

Well, I guess Yule in the Hole is better than no Yule spirit at all, for Yule is strength & cheer, which is just what you need, & all the rest of us. Again, I say Good Yule & Happy New Year! Wassail! Few people know what that means.

In regard to meanings, a windjammer is a sailing ship, usually with more than one mast, & usually with square sails, which are called "square-rigged". A landlubber is anyone who is ignorant about ships & the sea, with no proper vocabulary. On ships, walls are bulkheads;

2)

floors are decks; doors are hatches; a kitchen is a galley, &c. Sailors just do that to be tricky, to fool the landlubbers. Ha! Left is port & right is starboard. It's a different language, even though it sounds like English. Modern vessels use many of the same words, but not so many terms for knots! To be contrary, sailors calculate speed in knots. 45 knots is about the same as 50 miles per hour. That was the cruising speed of The S.S. United States, a steam turbine-powered ocean liner. It could go faster than that, but its actual speed was top secret. Imagine a floating city cruising along at, say, 60 mph, which is a mile a minute. I never got to travel on the S.S. U.S., but I first went to Europe on The Queen Mary, from New York to Cherbourg, France. If I recall correctly, it took her (ships are always "she") 2½ days to cross the Atlantic Ocean. She was pretty fast in 1964, but her steam turbines were built in 1936, & an engineering officer told me that they were as good as the day they were built. The Queen Mary was retired, & now sits in Long Beach, if I recall correctly. My family has had quite a few seafarers, ship owners & ship-builders, originating as they do from The Orkney Islands, the Hebrides & Scotland. Maybe that's why I have travelled more sea miles than air miles on this planet, having gone around the world by sea.

Yes, the ZOG 'jewstice' system is scary, for 'evidence' can be made to 'prove' anything, & 'witnesses' can just lie outright. Having lived overseas, I have come to respect the Anglo-Saxon system, which is adversarial, at least in theory. In theory, the defence attorney is supposed to defend the defendant; the prosecutor, also an attorney, is supposed to prove the guilt of the defendant. The judge is supposed to be like an umpire, who is the trier of law, whereas the jury are the triers of fact. If all these people of the court are doing what they should be doing, I would not feel that I was a victim of injustice, BUT, I have seen courts corrupted by collusion, when I was in Canada. I have seen trial judges in cahoots with the prosecutor or the defence attorney. I have even seen the judge give testimony to the jury! I have seen juries who could not distinguish live witnesses from dead ones, on the witness stand. In the U.S.A., my courtroom experience was in small claims cases, which I won because I had proper evidence showing what I had paid for items in question. I also won a couple of quasi-judicial hearings for unlawful dismissal on my part. The idea is to be brief, be focused, be polite & be factual. Use the indirect approach: that is, do not seek "justice", whatever that may mean, but win the case! Court hearings are no place for emotional displays & denunciations. Testimony must be given as answers to questions by attorneys, judge or jury. Even if a witness or defendant lies under oath, a good attorney can obtain the truth in cross-examination, whether he is for the defence or for the prosecution. I have seen it done many times. Obviously, proper testimony cannot be obtained if the "fix" is in, so the proper questions are not asked of the defendant or the witnesses. Imagine a murder 'trial' in which the prosecutor never asks questions about the murder! I usually hire female attorneys, since they can't be Freemasons, & the Anglo-Saxon justice system is definitely corrupted by Freemasons, who are in cahoots. In those cases, judges do not judge; defence attorneys do not defend & prosecutors do not prosecute, all of which I've witnessed in Canadian courtrooms.

In White-ruled Rhodesia, Central Africa, I was a British colonial civil servant, assigned for a time to The Ministry of Justice, Law & Order, under the rebel regime of Ian Smith. The court proceedings were very British, with judges wearing white wigs. I attended a murder trial concerning a White man who had murdered a young female train passenger in her train compartment. The defendant requested a trial by judge, rather than a trial by jury. He was a stupid oaf, & his own worst enemy in court. The judge concluded that "the defendant's memory is too selective for credibility. Therefore..." the judge pulled a black handkerchief from a drawer & placed on his head, on top of the wig... "I find the defendant guilty of murder in the first degree, & I hereby sentence him to death by hanging." The defendant was hanged within a week. That was old-style British justice. Punishments also included caning, & we had a judge called Old Six & Six, for his sentences were usually 6 months' hard labor & six cuts with the cane. It all sounds like life in Victorian England, but this was going on in the 1970s. I saw the autopsy photos which showed, in color, the signs of the terrible beating the defendant had given the young White girl; after killing her, he raped her, & claimed he'd been drunk, but not so 'drunk' that he couldn't remember important details!

In Canada, I did research on thought-crime trials & war crime trials. One of the accused war criminals was deported from Canada & murdered in Zionist Occupied Germany, before a trial. One fellow won his thoughtcrime trials in Canada, but has been deported to Germany's ZOG-gulag along with other accused thought-criminals, while historian David Irving sits in an Austrian ZOG-gulag. All these victims of Zion have been accused of Holohoax-denial, & it is unlikely



3)that the zoggies will let them submit ANY evidence in defence of their positions. In the land of CANZOG alias Canada, it is official in thoughtcrimes cases that "truth is no defence!" I have seen that declaration on official transcripts. Jury-tampering is common in North America, along with jury-selection by professional jury selection firms! The former British empire, including the USA, Britain, Australia, New Zealand, et al. recognize case law in all those countries. Thus, cases & legal precedents are cited, that is, used from the USA in Canada & Australia, Britain & vice versa. One thoughtcrime defendant in Canada should have had his trial eliminated by British precedent, for the thoughtcrime law under which he was charged had been abolished decades ago by the British Parliament! Instead, the CAN-zoggies had the defendant pay for two entire trials, both of which went to The Supreme Court of Canada. On the second trial, the law was abolished by The Supreme Court. So much for legal precedent! This is called "selective justice", another way of saying "injustice!"

In the case of the jew abortionist, Morgenthauer, in Toronto, a Jew York jury-selection firm was allowed to pick a jury favorable to abortion, which was then illegal in Canada. The jew declared that he would break the law, which he did. At the end of his trial, the jury nullified the abortion law, under which Morgenthauer was tried, so he was found "innocent". The selected jury concluded that the law was the crime, not the jew's abortion practice! The case stood, & was not appealed. Obviously, the ZOG's fix was in.

In Louisville, KY, a jew lawyer ritually-murdered a girlfriend in front of his current girlfriend. I just arrived there after the case had gone to trial. As I recall, the jew's name, as reported in the newspapers, was Ignatow. At the murder trial, his former girlfriend who witnessed the torture-murder of Ignatow's other girlfriend testified as to what she had seen, but the jury ignored her testimony, completely! Ignatow was asked if he had committed the murder. He said he had not done it. He was found innocent of the crime. Later, new residents moved into Ignatow's house in Plainview, a suburb of Louisville, KY. In their replacement of the carpets, they found a trapdoor in a closet. In the compartment beneath the trapdoor, they found a metal container, in which they discovered the blood-spattered photos of the murder victim, at each stage of her torture-murder, which was conducted in terms of a list of sadistic procedures which Ignatow followed, according to the eyewitness's testimony! There would appear to be no doubt that Ignatow did indeed murder the girlfriend, just as his witness testified, but Anglo-Saxon justice forbids "double jeopardy", which means that no one can be tried again for the same crime, if he is found innocent the first time, UNLESS that person is White! The news reports on the Ignatow Case mentioned that all he could be tried for is perjury, that is, lying under oath, but not murder! If he'd been White & his victim Black, you can imagine how the ZOG would exert themselves to retry Ignatow, until a well-packed jury found him guilty! ZOG knows.

I have seen Black African trials in the tribal trustlands in Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe. They were very democratic! The tribal chief would preside as judge, just as Anglo-Saxon judges preside in place of the king, but everyone took part in the trial under African justice, even passersby who had no knowledge of events. Some would testify about alleged events, & all present would give their opinions. The chief would listen to everyone, as long as he could stay awake, & usually, he found in favor of the majority, although he was officially absolute as judge, jury, prosecutor & defender, all rolled into one. Under colonial rule, however, chiefs were not allowed to try cases resulting in the death penalty. The remarkable thing about an African murder case, in which a Black killed another Black, was that there appeared to be no attempt to lie nor to mitigate the crime. One case featured a wife who murdered her husband by dumping cattle dip (with arsenic!) into her husband's beer, at the suggestion of a male visitor who said, basically: "Why don't you poison your husband so I can bed down with you?" The wife stated plainly that she'd done exactly that, with no attempt to claim "he made me do it", or "I was drunk at the time & I did not know what I was doing," &c.

In Europe, as I understand, they have an "inquisitorial system of justice", which resembles the African system to a surprising extent. People can make speeches in court. There are no trial transcripts, as a Frenchman told me, so I cannot imagine how one could appeal a verdict, without testimony from the previous trial! I have seen many cases of editing & rewriting Anglo-Saxon trial transcripts, which make such documents invalid! Anything goes, when the 'fix' is in. Don't let the zoggies grind you down. All the best, as always, & ORION!

*Eric*