

DAMNED IF YOU DO, DAMNED IF YOU DON'T: THE BATTLE TO MAKE THE WORLD SAFE FOR HYPOCRISY

by E. Thomson

Maybe we can blame the British, initially, for our Judeo-American burlesque version of their smug hypocrisy, which is now the subject of the Abu Graib Prison show trials. Some of us can remember the similarities these trials have with the trial of Lt. Calley, the lowest ranked officer which the U.S. military held accountable for the Mai Lai Massacre of civilians during the illegal conflict known as "The Vietnam War".

Since when did atrocities in war become "illegal"? Since war is about killing people and stealing or destroying their living space and property, it seems that war, itself, is an atrocity. Clearly, some atrocities are 'more equal' than others, and some perpetrators are also. This situation has not usually been so, as we can gather from our reading of history and our own memories. Can we find out when, how, why and where this silly feather appeared to decorate the helmet of the God of War?

During the U.S. Civil War, atrocity propaganda played an important role, beginning with "Uncle Tom's Cabin". "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" touted this genocidal, nation-destroying bloodbath as a 'holy war', so as to inflame the Union's conscripts against the 'satanic' rebels. The intention was, of course, to turn these slave-thugs, er, soldiers, into righteous killers. The use of religion to inflame violence, conquest and killing is a very old story, and we need not consider it in this essay. Historically, those who claim allegiance to a religion of 'love' and other-worldly loyalties exceed the hypocrisy of which Jesus accused the scribes and the pharisees. The promoters of Judaism lie, but they are not so hypocritical as are the promoters of Christianity who are both liars and hypocrites. In general, Jews lie to non-Jews, but not to each other, whereas Christians lie to everyone, including themselves. This is the danger of hypocrisy. In the film, "Lawrence of Arabia", a French diplomat says: "A liar knows where the truth is hidden, but a hypocrite can forget, and so believe the lie."

As I recall, the first victim of a victor's travesty of justice was the Confederate officer in charge of the infamous Andersonville prison camp, Wirz. His Union prisoners fared no better than did Confederate prisoners in Union custody, since sanitation was abysmal, supplies and shelter not much better, and disease was rife. Confederate prisoners' dead and dying were not given the publicity, nor the shocking photos accorded Andersonville, whose prisoners suffered from shortages owing to Union General Sherman's "March to the Sea". Allied aerial bombardment denied German concentration camp prisoners the means of existence, also, in the last years of World War II, so they resembled the Union prisoners of Andersonville. In fact, it would be possible, if not likely, to switch the photos from one century to the other, along with the propagandists' caption, "Gassed victims."

War is vicious, and anyone who conducts war is a possible target for vengeance, but to cast warfare in a guise of legality is plain hypocrisy. Yet, legality in war does exist, or did, when wars were declared. This legality was based on treaties, such as those of Geneva and The Hague. Every country whose government signed these accords agreed to conduct war in certain ways, and not in ways deemed 'atrocious' or counter-productive. Atrocity propaganda was used as a weapon of mass armies, in lieu of pay, as were medals which were given largely in lieu of money or property, to a country's slave-thugs. Until World War II, such treaties were still honored in the breach in regard to waging war upon civilians. Civilians were also forbidden to wage war upon uniformed troops, so as to prevent the atrocities concurrent with guerrilla warfare. Perhaps these treaties came about because Europeans had learned what happens when they are not mutually-agreed upon by the opponents in war. These treaties were no longer binding upon their signatories when the other side violated them, or did not recognize them in the first place, as with the World War II bombardment of civilians, who were defined as 'military targets' in terms of enemy morale and war production capabilities. World War II also sanctioned guerrilla or partisan warfare, provided these civilians or soldiers disguised as civilians fought for the Allied victors, and not for the other side! Enemy soldiers who fought against these heretofore illegal combatants were charged with 'war crimes' if they were on the losing side, but I am getting ahead of the subject.

British General Fuller described the inherently vicious nature of 'democratic', that is, mass warfare, which is stimulated by propaganda that is often false, and which remains in the minds of the public, long after it is no longer appropriate to the public's interests. After World War I, former Prime Minister Lloyd-George apologized to the postwar German government for the British atrocity propaganda, which included calumnies of the "Huns'" alleged policies of mutilating young women and children, gassing Serbs in gas chambers and making soap in "ca-

daver factories". Such atrocity propaganda hoaxes resurfaced in World War II, without subsequent apology on the part of the Allied liars, whose peoples have come to believe these lies, thanks in large part to the Zionist-fostered deluge of anti-German hate propaganda that erupted from the 1960s to the present. I took a young German through The World's Biggest Bookstore in Toronto, Canada, which permitted us to make a videotape of their "World War II" section. In my fractured German, I told him and the tape recorder that my family and I lived in California during World War II, from beginning to end (if it ever ended, that is). We had very little opportunity to receive anti-German propaganda, aside from news on the radio and the local newspapers. Being poor, working folks, my parents had to save up to go to the movies, where we could see Hebrewood's depictions of "Nazis" (usually portrayed by nasty-looking jews) and of "our gallant Soviet allies". As a child, I found such kosher classics as "Casablanca", and two other wartime films, whose titles I forget, quite scary, largely because they were in black and white. I have since seen colorized versions which look downright cheerful! As I recall, my parents could only afford to see 4 World War II propaganda movies, because of their limited income, from 1941 until 1945. I vaguely remember one which starred Charles Laughton as a ghost. The two others, whose titles I forget, were about World War II espionage, starring Alan Ladd, and "our gallant Soviet Partisans" which starred a very jewish-looking Gregory Peck. Until the 1960s, these propaganda films were largely shelved, until they were supplemented and exceeded in ferocity by a great new wave of Zionist propaganda aimed not only against Germans, but also against Whites, including their former allies of World War II. As I told my German interviewer, "The Germans are being taught to hate themselves, and to love everyone else, while everyone else is being taught to hate the Germans." I also stated that the anti-German hate propaganda was never so virulent nor so ubiquitous when we were actually at war with Germany, as it now is, in alleged peacetime! The Talmud warns that "a lie kills three people: the one who tells it; the one who is lied about, and the one who believes the lie." Stay tuned!

In my family's wartime propaganda consumption I omitted books and magazines, because we had no money to buy them, and no time to read them at the library. We were thus P.D. or propagandistically-deprived! This didn't matter, of course, since we were just wage-slaves who had to keep our mouths shut, anyway. In many respects, we enjoyed the 'freedom of information' accorded civilians in Britain, Germany and the USSR during World War II. We even had to make our own soap, from saved up bacon grease, due to wartime rationing. As a child, I learned how soap was made: no fat, no soap! I therefore wondered how the amazing Nazis had been able to render fat from emaciated corpses depicted in Allied atrocity propaganda. Then, while reading the Nuremberg Military Tribunal and/or International Military Tribunal transcripts, I found the alleged Nazi formula for "soap": meat and bones. Well, it is said that jews have a great aversion to soap, so their error is understandable, but any Goy would know that meat and bones make SOUP, not soap! I don't think jews or Nazis would wash themselves with soup, so the burden of proof lies upon the liars.

The Allied show-trials perpetrated against the Germans at Nuremberg were the nadir of hypocrisy, as thinking people would know, for everything we accused the vanquished Germans of doing, with possible exceptions of gas chambers and soup-making, we also perpetrated during and after the war. The only difference was that the Allies (pronounced All-Lies) 'won' the war and the Germans lost. Churchill and "Stalin" were no less vicious, but they were more honest when they advocated the slaughter of all German leaders and subordinates on a 'reprisal' basis, rather than a 'trial' basis. The figures of 50 to 100 thousand were discussed, as I recall from reading, but jews had already entered the matter, for on March 24th, 1933, London's Daily Express ran the headline: "Judea Declares War on Germany", which Samuel Untermyer of The World Jewish Congress so stated. Below the headline was a picture of Hitler standing before a panel of rabbi-judges, in a courtroom, as defendant!

Thus it was, with jewish direction, that the Allies 'tried' Germans for "war crimes" and "crimes against humanity", under which were included "plotting aggressive war" and "waging aggressive war", which meant planning attacks on a contingency basis, as all competent military organizations must do, and being the first to attack, as President Bush has advocated. Acts of war without declarations of war were also deemed "crimes", punishable by death or imprisonment. So these legal precedents were created, largely by the Judeo-American regime, that chooses to ignore them, unless it appears expedient to 'try' lower-ranking U.S. soldiers on this basis. As we know, Germans who said that they followed orders were executed by the Allied kangaroo court at Nuremberg, so it suddenly became imperative for the lowest-ranking soldier to distinguish 'lawful orders' from 'unlawful orders', at all times.

German soldiers' paybooks or Soldbücher were carried with them at all times, unless they were ordered not to for specific operations, and those were extremely rare, as I understand. Unlike the U.S. dogtags, these booklets listed crimes for which a German soldier could be summarily punished, that is immediately, without trial, such as rape and looting, along with other crimes which no German officer could rightly order subordinates to do. In wars, German soldiers knew what was forbidden. Surprisingly, rape and looting were common on the part of U.S. and British troops, and Soviet atrocities made the Mau Mau look civilized! These criminals sat in judgement of the defeated Germans. I said to my U.S. Army commander in a brief exchange that the Nuremberg precedents which we created would come back to haunt us. In small ways, they have, so I was prophetic. I made that remark in 1961, before Mai Lai. If U.S. officers and/or politicians are ever captured by "illegal combatants", they may be tried and executed in terms of these precedents. As the defeated Germans said: "The only war crime is to lose!"

Military establishments have tried and convicted their own members for acts which would be crimes under civilian jurisdiction. These are usually minor crimes, for war itself would be deemed the worst of crimes in civilian terms. In war, killers are honored. In peace, they are punished. Then there are punishments for violations of military rules, such as sleeping on duty or deserting one's post, improper use of military equipment, &c.

There is also the procedure of scapegoating in order to score propaganda points, via military tribunals. To be brief, I shall address only figures in U.S. military history, such as Admiral Kimmel and General Short of FDR's Pearl Harbor set up, Lt. Calley and the Abu Graib defendants. In the case of the Pearl Harbor Scapegoats, Roosevelt kept them uninformed about Japanese war plans which targetted their commands. These officers served to provide FDR with an alibi, just in case certain facts, now known, were revealed at the time. In the military, everyone is expendable. That's what they are paid for. In the Pearl Harbor case, the defendants were accused of 'dereliction of duty', but in the others, the defendants were accused of criminal acts, and of obeying 'unlawful orders'. Dereliction of duty may be construed as a criminal act of omission, but obedience to unlawful orders implicates those who gave the unlawful orders, as well as those who carried them out. Why would a superior officer or person in charge choose to give an unlawful order? I have been both a soldier and a bureaucrat. Soldiers are just armed bureaucrats, for the most part. They live for pay and pension, so they never, ever want to risk their careers. As a high-ranking officer or bureaucrat, I would not risk taking the initiative to conceive any order on my own, unless such an order were given in the context of superior orders, IN WRITING! In the civil service, we always wanted to be 'fire-proof', that is, having our rears and careers protected by adequate documentation from our superiors. This procedure would also apply to Mai Lai and Abu Graib, and I suspect that the scapegoating has gone only to the level at which no written orders were given.

This raises serious questions about the supreme stupidity of the lower ranks, as well as the supreme hypocrisy of the U.S. Commander-in-Chief and his Zionist masters. If unlawful orders were given, they must originate from the top of the U.S. command structure, for all military establishments do require accountability on the part of their commanders for the doings of their subordinates, all the way down the chain of command. If someone gives orders on their own, without approval from superiors, the superiors have to know about it, pronto! That is their job. Just imagine an admiral not knowing where his aircraft carrier is heading, because the sailor on watch altered course on his own!

Then we should consider the stupidity and arrogance of the ZOG, itself. Who, for example, made digital cameras available to the lowly 'grunts' and allowed them access to the Internet? Why would they take pictures of things which make good atrocity propaganda -- for the enemy? Why did the ZOG not denounce the Abu Graib pictures as "fake"? With computer technology, that is easily done. In the case of The Dachau Massacre of the SS guards by anti-White Indians under the command of Lt. Bushyhead, General Patton sought to cover up the atrocity by burning all incriminating photos in his wastebasket, but one mestizo kept his, and has published them in a confession entitled "Day of the Avenger" (Death to the Whites!). It is said that "truth will out", but the truth about Abu Graib is still fresh and hot. The U.S. sheeple appear too dumb to understand what these pictures mean to people who already dislike the U.S.A., so the propaganda damage has been done. The persecution of ZOG-thugs who obeyed orders will likely serve to demoralize members of the U.S. forces, who may now take orders with due care and suspicion. My advice is to insist that such orders be given in writing, with appropriate signatures. A good soldier owes that to himself, and to his country's reputation. DOWN WITH THE ZOG! P.S.: Chertoff looks like Osama bin Laden with a shave. Compare the photos & collect the reward.