

4 SEP 06. Dear Michael: Many thanks for your letter & enclosures of 29 AUG 06! I was quite impressed with the speeches of the British & the Romans prior to their battle, in which superior training & weaponry won the day for the Romans, although the British scored points for eloquence. Who would expect to find timely information in Tacitus? A correspondent sent me the little paperback, which is instructive in regard to Roman globalism of that time, which we may compare to Jewish globalism of our time. Tacitus admits that Rome was run for the benefit of the rich. The Roman republic became less & less popular as Rome's empire became more & more populous. In the end, the legions who still marched under the SPQR banner were no longer Roman, & Rome had long before ceased to be a republic. The same holds true for the U.S. empire, which retains its symbols, but not the substance which the symbols represented. What gives a government legitimacy in the eyes of the governed? This question occurred to me while on patrol in Rhodesia. We had guns, which is a strong basis for legitimacy, but so did our opponents. We had uniforms & badges showing our affiliation with the regime, & so did the rebels. Our regime affiliation meant that we could provide aid or mete out punishment to the local residents. The rebels lacked transport, so they could provide punishment, but not aid. Because of terror tactics, the locals supplied the rebels with food which they could not carry. Part of my job was to locate food caches & relocate kraals from which the food had come. The Romans would have understood such tactics, despite our living in The Space Age! In other words, my forces were no more legitimate in the eyes of the people than were our opponents.

So, part of perceived legitimacy lies in symbols of the past, in addition to people's identification with such symbols. The U.S. empire has been pushing the envelope in regard to people's identification with symbols associated with its past. The U.S. flag, "& the republic for which it stands," are morphing into the irrelevant status of the Romans' SPQR, The Senate & People of Rome, as I understand it to mean. With the advent of empire, the senate was bought & sold. The republic was on 'hold' & a god-emperor was officially in charge. Romans like Tacitus made no bones of the fact that Rome was a slave empire, that free peoples were deemed free-roaming cattle, suitable for round up. Slave kingdoms were incorporated into the Roman Empire on a tribute-paying basis, to help fund the legions & the extension of Roman government. Rome was an entity capable of infinite expansion, like the British Empire et al. If Rome had had modern transportation & communication, it could have been much larger, but there were fatal flaws, as with all empires. Rome was like a bubble which grew thinner as it grew larger. One writer opined that Rome fell, for lack of Romans. Another noted that Rome's civilized methods of military conscription caused Romans to become shorter, since the tallest men were chosen for military service. We have seen the dysgenic effects of modern warfare in Europe & America over generations, since the fit go to war & the least fit remain at home to breed more of same. "When will we ever learn?"

In regard to legitimacy, a mestiza was asked by NPR jewsradio to comment on the Confederate flag controversy in a southern state. She said: "This has no meaning for my people." Nationhood has been partially defined as people who live in a territory with a shared history. If millions & millions do not share that history, symbols of legitimacy lose their validity. Apparently, this is what ZOG wants. This means reliance on mercenaries, rather than "citizen soldiers" of the former republic. When I was in the U.S. Army, U.S. citizenship was the prerequisite for military service, as it was for voting. Now I understand that military service is a way for aliens to earn their U.S. citizenship. How would aliens qualify for security clearance? ZOG only knows.

I'm drafting the covering letter for the addresses you gave me. In it, I shall briefly address the following points: (1) When I interviewed Warden Bill Armontrout of MO State Penitentiary in the 1980s, he said that the foremost problem in U.S. prisons was race, but AIDS was coming up fast. He admitted that race was a problem because ZOG INSISTED ON MIXING White & non-White prisoners. It is sane procedure to separate two men who are fighting, but ZOG puts them together! (2) Forced integration of celling is complicity in murder, as well as felonious assault, on the part of prison authorities. (3) Selecting White prisoners for victimization is a hate crime, on the part of prison authorities. With my letter, I shall include copies of The Color of Crime news release (enclosed) & WA state-sponsored terrorism, which I shall demand that they investigate, as is their duty, in their capacity as public officials & news reporters, in the public interest. If you have further suggestions, please let me know.

If The 14 Words mentioned any group other than White, would they still be banned as "criminal"? All the best & ORION!

*Eric*