

The New Fascism

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism is a political movement that has emerged in the 21st century. It is a form of authoritarianism that seeks to restore a sense of order and national identity. It is characterized by its emphasis on hierarchy, discipline, and the rejection of liberal democracy.

The New Fascism (1)

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, and thank you for inviting me to address your meeting.

My name is Alexander Baron. (2) I am a subscriber to the Libertarian Alliance and to the Christian Council for Monetary Justice, among other things, but I am here as a private individual and in my capacity as an independent researcher.

I've been doing research into the so-called Jewish Question for a number of years, and into a number of other and at times related subjects.

Most researchers have the benefit of a university education; I don't, and sometimes this can be an asset rather than a disadvantage, because, I haven't been taught how to think, or rather how not to think, so I have a tendency not to see the Emperor's new clothes. I'm sure you're all familiar with that fairy tale, it was once popularised as a song in which a monarch, a king, ordered a suit of clothes from a couple of swindling tailors, and, appealing to his vanity, they gave him what they said was an invisible suit that only intelligent, wise and noble people could see. Obviously there was nothing there, but the King being as vain as he was gullible, put this invisible suit on, and went out on parade, and none of his subjects dared to tell him that he had nothing on, until a small boy who didn't know any better had the temerity to point out that the King was stark naked.

By refusing to see the King's or the Emperor's new clothes, and at times by seeing things other people don't see, or pretend not to see, or rather wouldn't see, I have made myself some very powerful enemies. These powerful enemies, vested interests, are as ruthless as they are ugly, and they have tried to destroy me on several occasions, but to date they haven't been able to shut me up. Not quite.

If I were talking to a less enlightened audience I might have already been dismissed as a crank, but being who you are, and being yourselves at times subjected to similar pressure from powerful vested interests, often masquerading as public opinion, you will each and every one of you know what I am talking about.

These people and the powerful vested interests they represent, often unwittingly, are the new fascists. It may seem strange for me to call them fascists, because that is exactly what they call their enemies, including the BNP. They have what they call a no-platform for fascists. Fascism, they say, is such a terrible evil, that fascists must not be allowed to communicate their views to the public, and they must be stopped, by whatever means necessary. Not by whatever legal means, but by any means, which can include murder.

It remains only for them to brand as fascist anyone they don't like in order to silence that person or group of people. And indeed, at times they even brand each other fascists.

Writing in their book *THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY: A Critical History (1919-1957)*, Irving Howe and Lewis Coser made the point that "Anyone during the war years who disagreed with the Communists from the left could expect to be called an 'agent of Hitler'. Frequently informing to government agencies against left-wing dissidents, the Communists contributed to the corrosion of civil liberties from which they themselves were to suffer in postwar America." (3)

And indeed we have seen that happen here in Britain. After the Second World War the United States went through what has been labelled, rightly or wrongly, the McCarthy era. We didn't have McCarthyism in Britain, not as such, people weren't blacklisted and hounded out of their jobs on account of their communist affiliations, but we have, certainly since the late sixties, seen an enormous erosion of civil liberties in Britain. The most precious of these civil liberties is that of free speech, because without the right to communicate, the right to put across one's point of view, everything else is lost.

We have in this country seen people who have been accused of the most heinous of crimes, mass murder, often terrorist or terrorist-related. We pride ourselves on the fact that however heinous the crime of which somebody is accused, he, or she, will have the right to defend himself, herself, or themselves, the right to put a point of view, and to relate facts as that person or persons see them. However much we or the world may disagree with them. This free speech for the accused is coupled with an extensive system of appeal against conviction going right up to the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords, and though this system is far from perfect, it does often, get it right eventually, as the Guildford Four, the Birmingham Six and many others who have been wrongly convicted of heinous crimes, will readily attest.

It is not so much ironic as sick that ordinary people, such as those who make up the hard core of the BNP, are adjudged by the loony left and increasingly by the establishment, to have less right to be heard than people who have been convicted, rightly or wrongly, of the mass murders of innocent civilians. But that is another example

THE NEW FASCISM

of the sick society in which we live, and the way the rule of law and democracy have been perverted by those who have the temerity to pretend that they are defending both the rule of law and Parliamentary democracy from the fascist menace.

The BNP is portrayed by the media for the most part as a group of extremist bigots, foaming at the mouth race-haters, Hitler worshippers, ad nauseum, and skinhead thugs who, ostensibly, make up the bulk of its membership. My experience as yours is somewhat different. Certainly there are skinheads in the BNP, but just because a man is short of hair doesn't mean that he is short of brains. In fact I find it rather ironic that the so-called "anti-racists" who are forever carping on about the fallacy of stereotyping an individual on account of his race or culture apply the same stereotype unthinkingly to their perceived enemies. But as I said, these people are the new fascists.

The most odious of these new fascists is a man named Gerry Gable. And his kind. Gerry Gable is a Jew, that is he is a racial Jew, though he is not a practising Jew and some would argue, and indeed I would argue, that he is not a Jew in any meaningful sense, anymore than somebody of Christian origin is a Christian. I was myself raised in a nominally Christian home; my parents didn't go to church even once a year, and I never saw either of them praying, but they considered themselves Christians. By the same token, Gable considers himself a Jew, but for Jews, or for a certain type of Jew, this racial affiliation is extremely convenient because it enables them to appeal to tribal and other loyalties in their campaign of ever-increasing repression. Often with great success. When I refer to Gable and his kind, I don't mean necessarily other racial Jews, I mean his fellow travellers Jew and Gentile.

I would like here to give you a few examples of how Gable and his kind have perverted the rule of law and how absurd some of his and their nonsense has become. As well as fascists and *racists* - real and imagined - other people from across an increasingly broad political spectrum have been targeted by the new fascists, or as they are often known today, the practitioners of the doctrine of political correctness. We've seen attempts to deny platforms to *sexists*, whatever that means, to certain religious organisations, most notably in Germany the Scientologists, and even to *homophobes*, that is to people who have the temerity to recognise homosexuality as a perversion and to publicly state so.

We've even, ironically, seen the likes of Mr Gable denied a platform. In the 1970s, students of the Palestinian Diaspora exercised their political clout at campuses across the country, and as a result of this, at North London Polytechnic a motion advocating free speech for both Jews and Arabs was defeated. No platform votes [for "Zionists"] were taken at Essex, Swansea, Bangor, Dundee Universities, and at Middlesex, Coventry and Teeside Polytechnics. (4) Zionism is equated by the most of the far left with the most vicious forms of so-called *racism*, and thus, even the likes of Gable can be silenced occasionally by this sort of tyranny.

Before the rise of the BNP, the premier racial-nationalist party in Britain was, for many years, the National Front. The Front was unthinkingly branded fascist by most people on the left, and of course by Gable himself. In 1991, Gable contributed a grotesquely inaccurate essay to a book called *Neo-Fascism in Europe*, in which he referred to the National Front's ideology as that of "a decentralised economy and state..." (5) Now, as fascism advocates a centralised economy and a centralised state under the control of a dictator or of a small, dictatorial elite, by this definition the National Front was an anti-fascist organisation. As indeed it was, it had a thoroughly democratic structure, and it rejected the leadership principle of National Socialism and Italian Fascism.

The Front's main heresy was, in Gable's eyes, that it preached white racial integrity, something that he finds deeply offensive due to his unconditional hatred of the society he holds responsible for the historic persecution of his race. Final Solution, *gas chambers* and all.

Other organisations and individuals have been smeared by Gable as fascists for various reasons. I was smeared as a fascist because I published - and continue to publish - documented *exposés* of Gable and his kind. As some of you will know, I brought a legal action against Gable in connection with these allegations, and when he was required to state particular facts on which me accused me of sympathy with fascism, he claimed that I had associated with and continued to associate with a man named Mark Taha, who Gable has also branded a fascist and anti-Semite. When I demanded particulars of Mr Taha's alleged fascist sympathies, Gable pleaded two facts in support of them. One was that in May 1991 Mark Taha had attended a meeting in Kensington Library, and that this was a fascist meeting that only fascists would attend. (6) The other was that in 1986 he had written a letter to a fascist newspaper, *The Flag*, that this letter was published by *The Flag* and that this was evidence if not proof positive of Mark Taha's fascist sympathies.

I obtained a copy of this letter, and I was taken aback when I read it, to put it mildly. As well as being an obsessive letter writer, Mark Taha is a boxing fan, and for some reason which totally eludes me, he was a supporter of a certain Frank Bruno, who doubtless most or all of you have heard of. In 1986, *The Flag* published some comment

THE NEW FASCISM

about Mr Bruno's pugilistic skills, or lack thereof, and Mark Taha wrote to the paper expressing a contrary opinion.

His letter appeared under the heading *Wrong about Bruno*, and read as follows:

AS A fight fan, may I say that I think you exaggerate in your article on Frank Bruno.

Most of his opponents were, I admit, pretty lousy - but 'none remotely up to the top flight'. What about former, and not too distant, world champion Gerrie Coetze, who I watched him demolish in half a round!

Mark Taha,
EALING.

I kid you not, Mark Taha was branded a fascist by Gerry Gable on the grounds that seven or eight years previously he had written a letter to a newspaper in which he defended a black boxer - and a miscegenist at that - against a charge of being second rate.

I'm sure that if my case against Gable had gone to trial, that the jury would have found this rather amusing, to say the least. But I don't, and I am sure that like me you acknowledge that there is a serious side to such nonsense. What this means is that anyone and everyone can be smeared as a fascist, Nazi, *racist*, anti-Semite, ad nauseum, and denied free speech or, in Mr Gable's imminent dystopia, any speech or any freedoms at all. If that sort of guilt by association can be used to brand a man a fascist, then anyone can be branded a fascist, and no doubt in due course everyone will be.

How does Gable and how do his fellow travellers get away with such nonsense? Well, Gable gets away with it because he's a Jew. Or more accurately, because he calls himself a Jew, and he also calls himself an anti-fascist, and in the struggle against fascism, and the struggle against eternal anti-Semitism, anything goes.

The truth is rather different though, the truth is that if it weren't for obnoxious Jewish hatemongers such as Gable, there would be no such thing as organised anti-Semitism in the modern world, not in any meaningful sense. And far from being any sort of anti-fascist, the likes of Gable are in the forefront of the fascist movement, for it is him and his kind more than any other who are destroying what remains of civil liberties in Britain and throughout the world.

Due largely to the misnamed anti-fascist movement, and Organised Jewry, and their ugly fellow travellers, we have seen increasing hysteria in this country and everywhere else over something called *racism*. The result of this has been the total destruction of free speech on race issues, except for permissible opinions, the sort Gable and his kind permit. We have also seen increasingly repressive so-called race relations legislation. Some of this legislation has been used to suppress the truth as well as to promote an insidious political agenda.

One area in which the truth has been suppressed is that of World War II, in particular the so-called Holocaust. I've no doubt that most of you have expressed a certain amount of skepticism over the scale of suffering of a certain minority in World War II, and perhaps of the existence of gas chambers. I certainly have.

I started reading Revisionist literature in 1980. Like most people my first inclination was to dismiss it as Nazi propaganda. Anyone who doesn't do so risks being branded an anti-Semite or a lunatic forthwith. Of course, we all know that the Nazis had an enormous lie machine; they even had a special office at Erfurt, World Service, which disseminated anti-Jewish propaganda worldwide. But the Nazis were neither the only liars in history nor the most proficient, and after studying Holocaust Revisionism for many years I have concluded, as have many other people, that we have been told far more lies about the Nazis than by them.

When I began reading Revisionist literature I quickly became convinced that the gas chambers were an enormous lie, that there were none at all. Now, after many more years of research, I am not so sure, though even to voice such a mild opinion in Germany today is to risk imprisonment. Denying the officially sanctioned truth is illegal. Of course, truth does not need and has never needed laws to protect it. (7) And it is not truth which has been protected by the anti-Revisionist laws, it is lies: Allied lies, "anti-fascist" lies, Zionist lies, and Jewish lies. And I would like here to give a very specific example, the Dachau gas chamber lie.

When Dachau concentration camp was liberated by the American 7th Army at the end of the war, one of the first things the victors did was send in the film and TV cameras. And one of the first things they filmed was the Dachau gas chamber.

In September 1945, the London *Daily Mail* published a gory photographic collection called *Lest We Forget*. (8) Page 50 of this book includes a photograph of the Dachau gas chamber captioned *GAS CHAMBER EXTERIOR...DACHAU*. And on page 51 is a pile of corpses captioned *SOME OF THE GASED...DACHAU*. Many

lurid testimonies were given about the gas chamber at Dachau. It is now conceded that there were no gassings at Dachau. For example, the *Encyclopedia Of The Holocaust* tells us that "In 1942 a gas chamber was built in Dachau, but it was not put into use." (9) This means that the photographs taken at Dachau by the American 7th Army and exhibited to the world as proof of the alleged extermination of the Jews was a lie.

That being said, in 1963, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, that most perfidious of organisations, published a pamphlet on the Dachau gas chamber. (10) And in 1976, the South African Jewish Board of Deputies called successfully for a ban on a Revisionist pamphlet in that country, a pamphlet called *Did Six Million Really Die?* This ban was effected primarily by the use of such bogus testimony. In 1978, the two men largely responsible for the ban, two leading Zionists: a lawyer named Arthur Suzman and his co-racialist Denis Diamond, published the results of this ban as *Six Million Did Die*. On page 122 of this book are two photographs captioned: *Victims of the Dachau gas chamber lie piled to the ceiling in the crematorium.*, and *Bodies piled high in the Dachau crematorium.* (11)

In December 1995, I published a documented *exposé* of these lies, and to make sure the authorities would sit up and take note, I mailed it out to police stations. (12) And for good measure I published a second edition in May the following year. As a result of publishing this satirical but thoroughly documented pamphlet, I was raided by the Organised Crime Group. Because the Attorney General lost his bottle I never did find out the names of the individuals who lodged the complaints about it which led to the raid. There can be no doubt though that Organised Jewry was behind it, even though a prosecution would have caused them severe embarrassment and exposed them to the people of Britain as the world's master liars. Such is the arrogance of these people that they believe that anyone who has the temerity to expose their lies should be thrown into gaol, and, to a great extent, since 1945, they have got their own way.

There are some people who say that none of this is relevant, that we in Britain shouldn't concern ourselves about what happened or didn't happen to the Jews or to anyone else in World War II. I though happen to be of the opinion that it does matter, because as George Orwell said in his novel *1984*, who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.

The lies of World War II are, as I am sure you know, used to this day by the enemies of freedom, and by the enemies of Western Man, as a big stick with which to beat us over the head. The Gerry Gables of this world control the present because they control the past. As to the future, if they have their way, there will be no future, not for freedom, and certainly not for Western Man.

Gable and his fellow travellers portray the Revisionist Movement and the far right generally as some sort of Machiavellian conspiracy of skinhead thugs funded by the evil empire of capitalism, which is rather ironic really, because that is what they are: a Machiavellian conspiracy of thugs and liars, and some of them are very well funded indeed. The far right does not for the most part have big financial backers, and members of far right and so-called far right organisations such as the BNP are made up largely of ordinary working people.

The oft' reiterated claim that the BNP is a threat to democracy and freedom is yet another irony, and I would like to share an anecdote with you which illustrates this perfectly. One day in September 1997 I called in at my solicitor's office, as I am wont to do, and found the poor man running around in hysterics. My solicitor is a Labour Councillor and he is also active in the anti-censorship movement. Part of his anti-censorship activities involves the monitoring of legislation, and in this connection he had recently received a discussion document that had been issued by the Home Office.

This document was a draft code of practice for intrusive surveillance; it contained a number of recommendations, the gist of which is that under the proposed legislation, police officers, Customs officers and other state employees, would be able to plant listening devices (bugs) at will without warrant and subject to no democratic control whatsoever.

My solicitor wrote a letter to the Home Office itemising his objections to this proposed legislation. His comments included "This draft code would be suitable for the Gestapo, because even secret policemen in a dictatorship have to obtain permission from their superiors before undertaking intrusive surveillance...[without] legally enforceable protection for the citizen...an Orwellian Police State will develop." He signed the letter "Yours against tyranny, Cllr E Goodman"

He gave me a copy of this letter and told me to post messages all over the Internet and to inform as many like-minded people as I could, which I duly did. This was not the first time the powers-that-be have attempted to pass such a law; some time prior to this a more overt attempt was made, and it was resisted successfully. This was a covert attempt. Where were Gerry Gable, Anti-Fascist Action and the Anti-Nazi League when Home Office bureaucrats were attempting to sneak through this fascistic piece of legislation? The answer is that they were nowhere to be seen. A few days after this, members of the Anti-Nazi League made their contribution to freedom,

THE NEW FASCISM

and to the promotion of tolerance and harmony by beating up the 63 year old John Tyndall and his wife while the BNP's leader and Mrs Tyndall were on their way to the Party's 15th anniversary celebration. And of course if they had their way, the BNP would not only not hold meetings, but would not exist at all.

It is not the British National Party that is the threat to freedom in this country or anywhere else, but the BNP's enemies, and the people at the Home Office and in other government departments who are quietly legislating freedom out of existence. These people are the real fascists, and they are the ones we should all be opposing.

Yet another irony is that all these organisations and individuals who are destroying what is left of freedom, are doing so not simply in the professed cause of combating fascism, but in the guise of protecting minorities, children, the environment, or in the broader sense, of promoting the common good. But do they in fact protect anyone? Do they promote tolerance? Or understanding? I think not. The evidence is that wherever there is a real problem, these people actually make it worse. There is no more instructive example of this than the so-called race problem.

In the 1920s and 30s, in the United States, there was very little in the way of what is today euphemistically referred to as multi-racialism but what BNP members call race-mixing. If you were white, you did not fraternise socially with blacks, by and large. And if you were black, likewise you minded your own business and kept with your own kind. Although the detrimental effects of segregation have been greatly exaggerated, it is an unfortunate fact that blacks, by and large, had rather the worst of it, certainly in the Deep South.

It is also true to say that there has never existed in Britain the type of petty bigotry and racial intolerance that one finds in the Deep South, except in Northern Ireland and one or two pockets on the Mainland where Protestants and Catholics - two white groups - hate each other to High Heaven and don't mind showing it.

To hear some of these so-called "anti-racists" mouthing off you'd think we were living in Nazi Germany. This is not the case, at least not as far as race issues are concerned. There are no Jews being dragged screaming from their houses and thrown onto bonfires, or into *gas chambers*. There aren't, by and large, groups of men riding around at dead of night dressed in white sheets and burning fiery crosses on the black folks' front lawns.

Economically, things are different too. There is certainly an underclass in this country, as there is everywhere else. But poverty and misfortune are an equal opportunity employer. Anyone who doubts that should take a walk around Central London sometime and count the numbers of people, many of them young kids, selling *The Big Issue* or begging on the street. Most of them are white. There is no great economic divide in Britain or anywhere else now based solely and exclusively on race.

Yet we've seen race riots in this country over the past ten or twenty years, something that never used to happen in the Deep South at the worst of times. Why? Why has the race problem been getting worse? Is it the evil *racists* of the BNP? I think not. The fact is that most race problems are manufactured by the people who claim to be combating them, because they have a vested interest in promoting hatred and intolerance in order to generate work for themselves and to justify their miserable existence.

There is no better example of this than Gerry Gable and his Searchlight Organisation. Among other things they have used *agents provocateurs* to incite the less intelligent members and supporters of far right groups to hatred and even violence. And here the name Ray Hill in particular springs to mind. (13)

So how do we combat the growing menace of the new fascism and the new fascists? There are three things we must do in this concern: we must expose them; we must purge them from positions of power; and we must restore the rule of law.

We must expose the new fascists: the Gerry Gables and Searchlights of this world and their fellow travellers for the rats and lowlife they really are. We must expose them to a wider public, and we must expose them to opinion makers and social policy makers. Frankly I despair of exposing Gable and his gang to the opinion makers, in particular the media, because they know what he is, but by and large they don't care because like Gable himself they are motivated primarily by ideology rather than by truth, decency and other such quaint old-fashioned virtues.

We should not despair though of exposing such people, because they fear exposure above all else. They fear exposure so much that they will go to the most extraordinary lengths to prevent their enemies from communicating with the public, as can be seen in the hysterical campaign against the BNP and similar organisations, and in their wire-pulling behind the scenes to make Holocaust Revisionism a criminal offence. I would like to propose that their well-worn and boorish slogan "No free speech for fascists" should be amended to read "No free speech for fascists equals *carte blanche* for liars." We must ensure that these liars, the world's master liars, do not have *carte blanche*, and that their lies and poison are challenged every step of the way.

I said earlier that these people have a vested interest in promoting hatred and intolerance in order to generate work for themselves and to justify their existence. We have to destroy this vested interest, and the best way to do that is by taking the profit out of it. In practice this means scaling down government interference in our lives, in

THE NEW FASCISM

particular the abolition of that obscene quango the so-called Commission for Racial Equality, and all these other bodies which are dedicated to the destruction of Western Man and his democratic institutions.

These organisations are publicly funded, so it should be possible, eventually, to bring about their demise. Much of the race industry is funded privately, by tax exempt bodies such as the Rowntree Trust. There is little or nothing that can be done about them in the short to medium term, but they are staffed primarily by academics, and academics in the so-called social sciences are first and foremost followers of fashion. When the mood of society changes, they will too.

The third thing we have to do is restore the rule of law. I mentioned earlier my solicitor's letter to the Home Office concerning intrusive surveillance and how he likened this legislation to the powers of the Gestapo. In Nazi Germany, the rule of law went out of the window. The far left consistently blame this on the mythical disease of *racism*, and of anti-Semitism. Hitler, they say, scapegoated the Jews and unified Germany against them.

This is a crass over-simplification, but it does contain a grain of truth. The grain of truth is that repressive laws come into being first and foremost with the professed aim of restricting the activities of an unpopular minority, and are then quietly extended to the rest of the population. I found an amusing example of this in *Searchlight*.

The December 1992 issue reported the case of a Jewish journalist in Berlin - an anti-fascist journalist, of course - who was charged with exhibiting the symbols of organisations which defy the constitution.

As some of you may know, in so-called democratic Germany, exhibiting the swastika, the symbol of the White Race, is a criminal offence. One can imagine the howls of outrage that would greet Yasser Arafat if the new Palestinian Authority were to outlaw the Star of David.

So what was the crime of this German-Jewish journalist? She sent a fax to another journalist which included an SS symbol, presumably for use in an article. This fax was then intercepted!

Gable's magazine was of course outraged that an anti-fascist journalist and a Jewish one at that could have been charged with such an offence. But whose fault is it that displaying the swastika is a criminal offence? And is the law to be applied only to Gentiles? I wonder too if the Nazis ever intercepted faxes.

There are of course far less amusing examples. Another unpopular minority are drug barons. There are, so we are told, men who amass vast fortunes out of dealing in heroin, cocaine and other illicit substances. The menace to society caused by these thoroughly evil men is so great that, like the wicked fascists, they must be fought by any means necessary. The result of this has been a series of progressively more Draconian anti-drug laws and the death of financial confidentiality. The state now has virtually unlimited access to all our financial records. I needn't remind you that we have seen much furore in recent times concerning so-called Nazi gold. Swiss banks, among others, were said to have plundered the accounts of Jews murdered by the Nazis, and furious efforts were made to destroy banking confidentiality in Switzerland.

It wouldn't have occurred to these stupid people that the reason so many Jews were able to send their money out of Nazi Germany and to escape the Nazi murder machine was that there existed at the time banking confidentiality. So in effect, we in Britain are monitored more closely than were Jews in Nazi Germany. That's a frightening thought, or it should be. There is also a message here: next time Mr Goldberg, there won't be any survivors, because the state knows where you are and where your money is. That applies to each and every one of us. Today it's fascists, quote unquote, who are the enemy and the persecuted minority. Tomorrow it may well be that the boot is on the other foot. Who knows who will be targeted next?

For all the so-called "anti-racist" legislation we have in this country, when it suited the powers-that-be, during the Gulf War, we saw not a little Arab-baiting by the press. The rise of AIDS hysteria in the 80s was manipulated skillfully by the organised homosexual movement, but maybe they won't be so lucky next time. Certainly not if we have a few more Moslem MPs!

The new fascism threatens us all, each and every one of us. We must not allow the new fascists to destroy what is left of freedom by denouncing all and sundry as fascists, and by imposing a blanket ban on all those who oppose them, or on everyone whose ideas they, or some of them, find offensive. That way lies tyranny. These people are selling a stolen bill of goods. We must expose them and destroy the power they hold over us and over the Western mind. If we don't there is no hope for Western Man and, ultimately, no hope for the rest of mankind.

Notes And References

(1) This speech was delivered to a meeting of the Newham Branch of the British National Party at a public house in Plaistow on the evening of Wednesday, October 28, 1997. It is a much expanded version of a speech made to a meeting of the Chingford Branch the previous month, which, leaving aside my performance in the witness box at Southwark Crown Court earlier this year, was the first speech I have ever made. The Chingford speech was a very ad hoc affair, my having been called in at short notice. I didn't have much notice for this meeting either, but it had already been prepared in anticipation of a future invitation. I made several last minute alterations to this speech, and as it is printed here it is far from letter perfect, but this text certainly represents the spirit of it. Citations are included for the benefit of the reader.

(2) I had intended to introduce myself as an associate member of the Islamic Party of Britain, but decided against it on account of some of the decidedly anti-Islamic comments that were banded about prior to my being introduced!

(3) *THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST PARTY: A Critical History (1919-1957)*, by Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, with the assistance of Julius Jacobson, published by Beacon Press, Beacon Hill, Boston, (1957), page 418.

(4) *students' war on "Zionism."*, published in *Patterns of Prejudice*, Vol 11, No 6 Nov-Dec 1977, pages 23-4.

(5) *The Far Right in Contemporary Britain*, by Gerry Gable, is Chapter Twelve (pages 245-63) of the book *Neo-Fascism in Europe*, Edited by Luciano Cheles, Ronnie Ferguson and Michalina Vaughan, published by Longman, London and New York, (1991). This quote appears on page 256.

(6) In fact, Mark Taha didn't actually attend this meeting; he was viciously assaulted on his way in and was carted off to hospital. On the other hand, Gerry "anti-fascist" Gable did attend this meeting!

(7) That may sound quaint coming from a successful libel litigant, but there is a distinction. The individual who calls upon the civil law to defend his reputation is in a different class from the state which uses the criminal law to intimidate and bully the public and to make them tow the official line. For the record though I did not sue Gerry Gable for libel to defend my reputation - which I don't much care for - but because I believed I had been assaulted and seriously injured as a result of his libellous article. In a truly Libertarian world, libel laws would not exist.

(8) *LEST WE FORGET: THE HORRORS OF NAZI CONCENTRATION CAMPS REVEALED FOR ALL TIME IN THE MOST TERRIBLE PHOTOGRAPHS EVER PUBLISHED*, Introduction by George Murray, Compiled by the *Daily Mail*, London, (September 1945).

(9) *ENCYCLOPEDIA of the HOLOCAUST*, Editor in Chief, Israel Gutman, published by Macmillan, New York, (1990), Volume 1, page 342.

(10) "LETTERS TO MY DAUGHTER..." ...being a reprint of three articles appearing in the "MANCHESTER EVENING NEWS" on January 23, 24, 25, 1960..., by John Alldridge, Reprinted with a Postscript 1963, published by the Woburn Press, London, (1963).

(11) *SIX MILLION DID DIE: the truth shall prevail NEW EDITION WITH FURTHER FACTS*, by Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond, published by the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, Johannesburg, (1978). This is the second edition of this book, hence the subtitle.

(12) The full title of this pamphlet is *WHY BRITAIN'S POLICE AREN'T WORTH A JEWISH FINGERNAIL BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE GERALD KAUFMAN MP AND THE LEADERS OF THE ANGLO-JEWISH ESTABLISHMENT* The shocking truth about how public money is used to incite the murders of policemen with the approval of Gerald Kaufman MP, Bindman & Partners (solicitors), "Searchlight" magazine and the "Jewish Chronicle" newspaper.

(13) For irrefutable documentation on Hill, see *LIARS OUGHT TO HAVE GOOD MEMORIES: The True, Unsanitised Story Of "Searchlight" Mole Ray Hill with a critique of The Other Face of Terror*, by Alexander Baron, published by InfoText Manuscripts, London, (August 1994).

Published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing

**Distributed by InfoText Manuscripts,
93c Venner Road,
Sydenham,
London SE26 5HU.
England.**

ISBN 1 898318 14 X

Copyright Alexander Baron, 1998.