

P.C. NIGGERBALL by E. Thomson

It is talmudically ironic that India has its sacred cows & America has its sacred Indians. The latest example occurred on NPR jewsradio, when sports commentator Frank Duford expressed his 'shock' & indignation over the use of "Indian" names by sports teams. Such team names as "Indians" & "Redskins" were obvious, but not so obvious were the use of generic names such as "Savages", "Warriors"& "Braves", over which Amerasians have no known monopoly, unless they are insistent that so-called Indians have a copyright on such terms. If that were the case, then the Indians would have the dubious title of being the world's only savages, &c. They do have copyright, I'd think, on such specific names as Cherokee, Commanche, Apache, &c. which are actual tribal names, so they should sue the jew-owners of those teams straight away, as well as any such team owners who might not be jews.

Duford claimed that "Redskin" referred to fresh scalps taken by Whites, & not to the so-called Indians. If he were correct, then terms such as "Redman" would apply only to those who were scalped & bleeding. Of course, Duford is wrong, since "Redskins" was a term used by Whites & non-Whites in reference to "Indians", who referred to Whites as "pale faces", "White eyes," & to Blacks as "buffalos", as in "buffalo soldiers". I recall an office building in Cali, Colombia, which was named "Edificio Piel Roja" (The Redskin Building). Yes, Hymie, "Indians", who are mostly mestizo, as in North America, also exist in Latin America, but in Latin America they are still considered targets, rather than sacred cows. In Mexico, the definition of "Indian" was a person who (1) Lived in a village, (2) Did not speak Spanish, & (3) Wore sandals, rather than shoes or boots. "Indian" had little or nothing to do with one's biology. As a guide to some Mayan temples said, "We are no longer Mayans, but mestizos (Eur-asians)." The jewsmedia are promoting these allegedly "pro-Indian" tidbits in order to (1) Stir up anti-White sentiments among non-Whites & (2) Further glorify the "sacred Indians".

Since I am of Scottish/Norwegian ancestry, would I not have cause to sue teams using names such as "Highlanders" & "Vikings". Hey, what's good for the Injuns must be good for us Nordic savages, warriors, brave-berserkers, pirates, &c. Avast there, or I shall sunder thee with my legal claymore! Well, as we know, Whites are not deemed sacred by ZOG, so I'd suggest the "un-P.C." sports teams call themselves "Rednecks", "Honkies", &c., if their Black team members would not object. Blacks have their warriors, who can be brave & savage, so they might contest the Redskins' claims to those words. Such a deal for the lawyers that would be!

Young sheeple are being indoctrinated with anti-White, allegedly pro-"Indian" myths: (1) That "Indians" were always the victims who were almost universally wise, brave & "noble". (2) Whites were always the opposite. (3) Whites brought syphilis (The Great Pox) into the Western Hemisphere: According to archeologists, pre-Columbian native skeletons show syphilis lesions, & according to historians, syphilis was unknown in Europe until the return of Columbus, whereas "small pox" was well-known. The Whites infected the "Indians" with deadly smallpox & the "Indians" infected the Whites with deadly Great Pox (syphilis). Neither people had natural immunity for the other's endemic diseases, so in diversity was death for both peoples. (4) The Whites allegedly introduced scalping <sup>to</sup> North America. As I understand, both peoples practiced

that bloody, savage custom in North America. The White fur traders may have traded in all types of "pelts", along with their "Indian" counterparts, but, as savage & bloodthirsty as Whites have been, to their fellow Whites, I have never heard of such "coup-counting" in bloody, savage Europe, nor in equally bloody, savage Asia & Africa. If scalping was a "White tradition", why was it limited to North America? Perhaps the "savage" land caused the Whites to become more savage than they were. Ha! I think, however, that Whites learned scalping from the native host people. (5) An entirely new (to me) myth has appeared, & is being taught by ZOG: That Whites were cannibals; that the Spaniards roasted the hapless natives at the stake in order to assuage their hunger, as well as their religious fervor. The Anglo-Whites were allegedly no different in their diet of native flesh, along with corn, potatoes, turkeys, &c. This accusation is a new one on me! (6) The Whites "exterminated" the "Indians". Well, their tribes are being resurrected all over North America, usually in connection with casino permits, so the "extermination" of the "Indians" looks like the alleged "extermination" of the jews: more & more of whom are becoming "survivors" as time passes. Only fools & cowards would accept these blatant fictions. I mean, YOU, Whitey! Yes, YOU!

Duford picks a point out of Jewish lore when he said that the Whites stole the "Indians'" names in order to use them against the "Indians'" self-respect. Well, when the jews stole the Arabs' title of "Semites" in order to insult Arabs as "Anti-Semites", would this not be similar? Not so, in my own experience. The "P.C." crowd deem previously 'kosher' cultural artifacts as "racist", that is, demeaning to non-Whites. If one deems Amos 'n' Andy "anti-Black," then Laurel & Hardy must be deemed "anti-White". Both comedies made their characters out to be bumbling buffoons, but as a long-time viewer of both shows, I never felt that the one promoted "Black inferiority" & the other "White inferiority", nor did I think that Blacks or Whites could therefore not be taken seriously. When I first encountered the now "streng verboten" story of "Little Black Sambo", I appreciated the smartness & skill of the Black boy who not only escaped the tiger, but turned him into butter for his pancakes, as I recall. The major error of the story was that Black boys could be found in Africa, but not tigers! We could republish the story as "Little White Honkie", which would portray his swiftness & cleverness in racing a White tiger around his apartment building, until the tiger became a mass of warm, white margarine, for use on the White boy's tortillas. Of course, there are no such tigers in American cities, any more than in Africa. A Black fellow had not heard of "Uncle Remus' Stories", he said, because they were deemed "racist". I recited my recollection of "The Fox & the Tarbaby" to his amusement (the Tarbaby being today's Iraq), & I likened it to Aesop's Fables, so if Uncle Remus is "racist", so is that ancient "Honkie", Aesop! I also mentioned that the rabbit is deemed to be a clever creature in Black African folklore, & it was the rabbit which fooled the arrogant fox in the story. Now, if it had been a black rabbit & a white fox or vice versa, we might attach racial symbolism thereto, but the story portrayed B'r'er Rabbit as white & the Fox as red, as I recall, so the hebes can take their "P.C." & eat it with their gefilte fish. Oy veh! DOWZ! & ORION!