



Valérie Devon

Presents

Vincent Reynouard editorials

Let's rehabilitate racism
and let's liberate speech

Sans Concession tv
Editorials tv



In response to what Nadine Morano said: *"France is a white race country."*, François Hollande declared: *"The (French) Republic doesn't recognize race or skin color, she doesn't recognize community, she only knows free and equal citizen in rights and this principle is not negotiable and will never be. Therefore, I have asked to the Minister of Justice, Christiane Taubira, to prepare, before the end of the year, a text which will reform the Penal Code so that all racist or anti-Semitic inspirations are an aggravating circumstance for an offense whatever or whoever is the author."*

So, let's bet that the judges will be expected to go further in the Republican inquisition, in order to probe consciences on the lookout of evil thoughts. In this climate, naturally, public talks and writings will be further scrutinized at the slightest hint of bad thought, the perpetrators will be prosecuted for incitement to racial hatred. Therefore, France will continue its totalitarian drift in the name of anti-racism.

Part One - National Socialism and Totalitarianism

Here, some will scoff: *"A National Socialist who is against totalitarianism?! It's to believe that you know "Nazism" better than the "Nazis" themselves."*

Circumstantial reasons for Hitler's authoritarianism

I am sorry, but if the Hitlerians were at the beginning supporters of a totalitarian politic, it's because their country was on the verge of suffocation and that it was imperative to save it by building without being unhindered either by the opposition or bolshevik coup. I explained it already in recent videos, but I will add some complements.

Yes, at the beginning of the 30's, Germany was at the verge of suffocation. Commenting on a new Law Decree, which in June 1931, was imputing even more the public spendings to try to reduce the deficit, a German newspaper wrote: *"We really did what depended on us and even more than what was possible. And this Law Decree raises the question of what is possible and*

tolerable, in a way that can only cause, in this country, a response full of the most serious apprehensions but must be considered in the entire world in the most serious way."

The call was clear. Germany was saying to the world: *"We are in cessation of payment on the verge of collapse."*

At the end of 1932, the total deficit amounted to over 2 billion DM. While the unemployed numbered in the millions, since June 1931, the deadline to collect unemployment benefits had been extended. Between 14 to 21 days for an unemployed person without dependents, between 7 to 14 days for the unemployed having 1 to 3 dependents and between 3 to 7 days for the unemployed having more than 4 dependents. Let's add that one must have worked 30 weeks and not 26 to be eligible and that the duration of payment dropped from 29 to 20 weeks. As for the so-called family workshops, they were no longer eligible.

And why was Germany lacking money to pay the unemployed, to promote education, and to ensure a decent housing for the poor? Well, it's because Germany was bleeding herself to repay the debt interests and also to pay the astronomical reparations imposed by the Treaty of Versailles.

Invoking a Law Decree which was reducing the social benefits, a German newspaper wrote: *"This Law Decree can only be the beginning of the end of a system which wanted to build on a sickened economic life and heavily burdened by the war consequences the welfare state of which Socialist ideology is dreaming of."* At the time, whole families were left without anything to survive. Hence, a suicide rates on the increase, while a small privileged caste displayed a scandalous wealth.

The shopping streets of Berlin displayed a contrast between the misery of some and the careless wealth of others, in a decadent country. For these millions of humbles and forgotten, there remained only one hope: Adolf Hitler. Since the elections of 1932 the NSDAP was the strongest party at the Reichstag, as Hermann Göring recalled it in Nuremberg, if Germany would have then been a democracy, such as Britain or the US, the National Socialists would have already been in power.

Anyway, Germany's situation was so serious, her case so desperate, that at the beginning of January 1933, many newspapers called for a political truce and a national unity to save the country. Proof that at the time a large majority of Germans felt the impotence of parliamentarianism of getting the country out of stagnation, it was necessary to halt political life and create a public salvation committee around which people would gather. This public salvation committee, which halted the political life, the National Socialists set up after January 30, 1933.

In *Mein Kampf*, however, Hitler had warned (p.281): *"In the long run, the systems of governments do not rely on coercion and violence, but on faith in their merits, on the sincerity of the representing the people's interests and help provided for their development."*

I am, therefore, convinced that once the revolution was completed, the hitlerian regime would have relaxed. The National Socialist misfortune was, however, to never taste this stability which leads to this relaxation.

On its arrival, he had to face its enemies from within, especially the Communists and from 1937, war loomed on the horizon as was desired by the Anglo-American warmongers.

The true role of the Gestapo

I add the following: it is stated that under Hitler's regime, the Gestapo was monitoring everyone and if any criticism was expressed, people were arrested and mercilessly thrown into concentration camps. Personally, I'd like that this were true. Because, in the 30's, Germany had about 65 million inhabitants. 20,000 detainees represented, therefore, 0,031% of the population. If therefore, the Gestapo had monitored, tracked down and retrained any opponent they found, these figures would prove that the National Socialists were the most popular of history. Not even half a percent of opponents. The truth, however, is elsewhere.

Although, Hitler's Germany was a police state, the police were not everywhere and moreover, there were only tracking dangerous opponents. One could criticize the state without being thrown in jail. In Nuremberg, moreover, Hermann Göring recalled it (TMI,vol.IX,p.447): *"When, this opposition seriously hindered our constructive work, we naturally didn't tolerate it. When it was only harmless chatter, it was not taken into account."*

b) Les résultats du scrutin.


Le Reichsanzeiger du 20-8 a publié les résultats provisoires suivants du scrutin du 19-8.

Inscrits	45.474.157
Suffrages exprimés	43.530.232
Oui	38.363.195
Non	4.294.727
Blancs et nuls	872.310

Le relevé des votes par circonscriptions donne les résultats suivants :

A simple comparison demonstrates the veracity of this affirmation: On August 19, 1934, shortly after the death of the President Hindenburg, a plebiscite was held, in which the German people had to express their confidence or distrust in Adolf Hitler. Well, more than 4 million Germans expressed their distrust. We can therefore say that 1,5 year after his accession to power, more than 4 million Germans were opposed to the new regime.

Assuming that the terrible Gestapo ruthlessly hunted these opponents, and grabbed only 10% of them, to throw them in concentration camps, we would have had, therefore, more than 400,000 detainees in the camps. But, in March 1935, they were less than 10,000.



This is the proof that in Hitler's Germany one could oppose verbally the regime without necessarily being imprisoned. Besides, in his proclamation published the day after the plebiscite, did the Fuhrer call for these 4 million National Socialism regime resisters to be tracked down and quickly locked up? Absolutely not.

After thanking everyone who had helped him in his political struggle, he launched (**Bull, August 20, 1934, p.447**): *"It will be my duty and the duty of all of us to reinforce this national unity and to win by a grand struggle, resolute and tenacious, the last remnants of our people to the National Socialist idea and doctrine."*

It's clear: Hitler wanted to further improve the country's condition, in order to win over the last resistance. This was compliant with what he wrote ten years earlier in Mein Kampf (**p.281**).

This is why, one can be a National Socialist, without necessarily dreaming of tracking down and locking up all the opponents. The way I manage my channel demonstrates it. I will always be faithful to the doctrine of nonviolence according to which, one really defeats an enemy, when he becomes a friend.

Part Two - Let's rehabilitate racism

Similarly, one can be a racist - which means to believe in the existence of races and even in the inequality of races - and to want the good of his own, without despising others or wanting to enslave them and even less to exterminate them.

Black racism

"Dignified and proud, intelligent and laborious, may it grow and thrives forever, from one improvement to another, this white race so full of sap and generous vitality. To help her in her ascension there will never be neither too many workers, nor too much dedication."

Which racist wrote this sentence? Vacher de Lapouge, de Gobinau, Hitler ? No. Here is the text from the original document (**De l'égalité des races humaines,p.XVIII**). You will notice that it was actually a question of the black race. The author of these lines was indeed a black man. It was Antenor Firmin, a professional lawyer. A black "racist" -since he believed in the existence of the races- and who fought for the promotion of his own. But, he believed in the equality of human races. It was in the late 19th century.

Proof that one can believe in the existence of the races and believe at the same time in their equality. Another example.

"Other races than the Germans, pure white blood races, gained a fair reputation of beauty."

Who is the abominable racist who wrote this? Hitler at least... Well, no. Here is the original text. It was not the Germans, but the Abyssinians; It was not pure white blood races, but pure black "Negro". The author of the text was a black, Ismayl Urbain, converted to Islam. His letter, can be found in this brochure (**lettres sur la race noire et sur la race blanche,p.46**), published in 1839 and which reproduced an exchange of letters between him and a white, Gustave of Eichthal. The latter was a "racist". He not only believed in the existence of races (**p.14**), claiming for example that the black and the white belonged to "two different humanities", but also that to end the suffering of the black race, it would be necessary to "consider these two races as perfectly distinct therefore, as likely to be associated, but never brought together and mixed." He believed that "Black virtues" including the delicacy of their intelligence, should provide welfare to the old white world. He added that (**p.15**), in nature the two races "were a couple in which the white race represented the male and the black race the female."

We can see Gustave of Eichthal was an unequal racist. But far from wishing the extermination or enslavement of the Blacks, he wanted on the contrary to end their suffering and the antagonism between the two races, by associating them like in a couple, the black one being the woman.

Well, far from being offended, the Black Ismayl Urbain answered instead (**p.45**): *"I come now with your formula: the Black is the woman; formula which I adopt, because it seems to me to nicely summarize the reports of the white race with the black race."* And how did he justify this? He said: *"Black people, rather than absolute independence, which makes each individual responsible for all the weight of existence we prefer a humane and generous patronage that relieves them of concern for the future, of concerns for politics, rivalries and struggles of life, finally of what I would readily call with the Koran, the pains of humanity."* At the time, this

condition was that of a woman, especially in the middle-class couples. Ismayl Urbain finally declared (p.48) that the "colored races" (that is to say the yellow, the browns, the reds...) were "physically more beautiful, intellectually better organized" and seemed to him "morally called to a destiny greater than the blacks."

Some will answer me that this poor Black had been subjugated by the racism of the White. Maybe... But, that is not the issue. I just wanted to show that one can be racist and believe in racial inequality without wanting to enslave or worse, exterminate races estimated inferior.

Racism: dangerous subject

Certainly, racism is a sensitive subject, because it can lead to misunderstandings. When, for example, in 1848, in his book on the original diversity of the human races, this author thus concluded about the races (**La diversité originelle des races humaines, p.70**): "Each one has its distinct place in the creation, each one forms one of the branches of this progressive and uninterrupted chain which extends from the simplest mineral to the most perfect organized being." He gave the impression that the human race considered to be the lower was hardly different from the animal.

But, the following year, another author pointed out (**Histoire générale des races humaines, p.32**): "The day that he would be determined that the Negroes are one level higher than the monkeys, the legitimacy of their slavery would definitively be proven: one will soon extend the consequence to the Mongolian race."

It was undoubtedly true. In the French colonies, except for noble exception, slaves were handled as animals, so they were considered as animals, which, in turn, justified slavery.

In 1835, in France the slaver question was stirred up, a former settler summarized it as follows (**Tableau de l'esclavage tel qu'il existe dans les colonies Française, p.5**): "These slaves, young or old, man or woman are regarded as the property of a few men, their peers: these can sell them or transfer them to another as they please, with as little concern as if it were a horse, an ox or a bale of goods." (...) (p.6) They are put to this work like beasts of burden, by fear or by whippings. They do not receive wages, but as animals they share the same fate, food ration is provided to them that the master judges necessary for the support of their strength and the performance of their task." The author emphasized, that most of the time, any religious education was denied to them as well as marriage. And if a slave couple faithfully lived as in a marriage, they could be at any time separated or separated from their children... (p.7) "Because colonial laws do not consider slaves as persons, but as things, like furniture, that can be seized."

In 1866, in a book entitled "The Negro. The mulatto", a Frenchman who had lived in Brazil wrote (p.11): "I attended public sales by authorized auctions, of vigorous men, young women and sometimes very beautiful, bright children, graceful, intelligent, all, coming almost naked,

one after the other, on a table; (...) (...) sometimes I saw tears in the eyes of the unfortunate mothers separated from their children."

Freed men were not treated better. In his History of Haiti (p.105), Charles Malo explains that colored men were considered as public property, subject to the tyranny of their superior and treated as true slaves. (p.106) All occupations requiring some education were closed to them. And this ban passed from generation to generation without hope of ending.

And here as elsewhere, the more mediocre the masters, the more fierce they were. In an article published in 1788 and dealing with the customs observed in Santo Domingo, an author wrote (p.10): *"Woe especially to the unfortunate African that fate hand over to one of these beings with no education, whose destiny was perhaps to be themselves servants in their country. There is no pain that they must not apprehend."*

It goes without saying that for the people who, in one way or another, benefited from slavery, the "racist" position which consisted of considering Blacks as animals served as an excuse. However, I will note that the Bible was also invoked. In its response to Abbe Gregoire, who condemned slavery, an anonymous settler wrote (p.8): *"God embraces all men very differently: He admits these huge differences among them and that, in particular, of the freedom of slavery."* The author, then, quoted the Genesis.

But, let's forget this other justification on religious basis and let's only retain the one which compared blacks to monkeys. However, one would be wrong to invoke these extreme conclusions and actions of these strongest supporters of slavery to castigate racism. For I repeat, well understood, racism does not lead to these abuses.

What the well understood racism is

Let's go back to this author. Although a racist -since he believed in the existence of races- he stressed (**Histoire générale des races humaines, p.34**): *"Just find one negro educable the same way as whites to affirm the equal abilities in both races. These examples are not uncommon. Since the famous Muley Ishmael, Marocco's emperors found among the Negroes more than one clever vizier. Santo Domingo announced the names and acts of capable governors and happy soldiers. Abbe Gregoire and the missionary of Olderdorp have already compiled a huge library of Negroes writers."*

It is an undeniable fact, many proponents of inequality of races felt no hatred or contempt for others. In particular, they were not bringing peoples together, the ones considered the most primitive, like animals such as monkeys, for example.

Let's look at this text of a communication of a racist author, Sagot, since he believed in the indelible antagonism of the races. He stressed (**L'origine et la nature des races humaines, p.34**): *"The separation of the human kind into races did not erase any of the character of humanity, it breaks out in the moral faculties as well as in physical traits: intelligence, moral sense,*

reason and passions, knowledge of God, of good and evil, ability to experience a religious law that directs and fortifies man in his good inclinations, helps him to fight selfishness and inordinate passions, all that exists among all peoples, and any serious and partial observer finds it in any savage nation that he would really study."

Let's look now to the one who is considered as one of the fathers of the theory of unequal racism: Count Arthur de Gobineau. In his famous essay on the inequality of the human races, he wrote (p.73): *"No doubt to my eyes the races are unequal; but I don't believe that any of them is the brute beside it and similar to it. The least tribe, the coarser variety, the most miserable subgenus of our species is at least capable of imitation and I have no doubt that by taking any topic among the most hideous Boshimen, we can not obtain, not even of this subject, if he is already an adult, but of his son, at least of his grandson, enough sense to exercise a state or even a state that requires a certain degree of education."*

Such language may shock, especially today, but the meaning is clear: Arthur de Gobineau did not condescend to the race he considered the lower character of human being. Therefore, such a racist, if he is consistent with himself, will confer to all races the inalienable rights recognizes as human beings, primarily to be neither killed, persecuted, nor enslaved for his skin color.

A racist who refutes racist argument

I add that racist authors sometimes disproved the most common argument among advocates of racial inequality. Let's take for example, the book of François Souffret, published in 1892 and entitled: *"From the physical and mental disparity of the human races and its principles"* The author is a racist. He concluded (p.306): *"It is in the original and indelible disparity of the distinctive characteristics of the races that one need to look for the fundamental principle of the diversity of civilization."* But about the black race, he wrote (p.51): *"Since its appearance, this race hasn't raised any artistic or literary monument; and the state of its knowledge is entirely lower than that of the people of modern Europe. It is true that we do not encounter in Sudan either gigantic pyramids, or obelisks or hanging gardens or porcelain towers; no one heard of a great religious reformer who would have operated one of these revolutions, which changes the moral situation of the world; Negroes didn't, undoubtedly, have a Homer or a Phidias, a Eschyle or a Plato, an Aristote or a Leibniz or a Newton. But, I will not draw from these considerations the conclusion that the Negro is incapable of a great intellectual development There is temerity to denie his intelligence (...) We are too struck today by the role played by the white race. The Caucasian race has spread on both continents and founded the nations which occupy the highest rank in the history of civilized nations. (...) (p.52) But are we entitled to compare individuals from the work they provide in one day? Would we judge the value of the Germanic family or the Slavic family on what they have produced during the ten centuries of the Middle Ages? Gustavus Adolfus and Charles XII for giving a moment of brilliance to Sweden have not made of her a greater nation. The Anglo-Saxon race did not produce either poets or inventors during the Middle Ages either diplomats or navigators, either historians or astronomers or philosophers; she had no powerful fleet, nor colony.*

Stefenson, Shakespeare, Watt, Edison, Raleigh, Blake, Nelson, Cook, William Pitt, Canning, Macaulay, Herbert Spencer are great men who appear almost simultaneously. (...) I will only mention this example in modern history. I will only take one in antiquity. Remove two centuries of the history of the people who rose the highest in the arts, poetry, science, philosophy, history and tell me, after, in what the Greeks have prevailed over other nations? In what, today, are the descendants of the Dorians and Ionians superior to the Barbarians' sons?" And after a few other considerations, the author concluded (p.52): *"Who would dare say that Africa would not have in the future, still probably far away, one of these great revolutions similar to those that have changed the face of Europe? Has history not familiarized us with similar performances? Does she not show us Greece, shortly after Salamine, invading Asia and crossing the Indus; a Tyrian colony putting Italy to the brink of ruin; the Vandals, ignored by the world, traveling Europe and threatening Rome and Byzantium; Saudi about to flood the whole of Europe? History is there to show us the fragility and brevity of all empires, of all military or Intellectual dictatorships. Such a nation holding today the scepter, will tomorrow give way to another."*

In this video, it is not the purpose to discuss the value of that claim. All I wish to prove is that the racist concept, well understood, even when it is inegalitarian, still respects all the races on the grounds that all may arrive one day at the best.

Hitler's racism: an unequal polygenism

In all this, what did Hitler think? To answer this, let's open Mein Kampf first. Hitler wrote (p.380): *"Racist conception gave way to the primitive value of the various races in mankind."* Hitler was therefore a polygenist: he thought that mankind did not come from one single strain... He added: *"In principle, the racist conception sees in the state only one goal which is the maintenance of the existence of human races."* When Hitler spoke of maintaining the races, he was opposed to miscegenation. But, there was there no invitation to massacre anyone. Hitler wanted, on the contrary, that the races continue. He continued (p.381): *"The racist conception does not believe in their equality (the races), but rather recognizes on the contrary their diversity and their more or less high value. This knowledge confers the obligation, according to the eternal will which governs this world, to promote the victory of the best and strongest, to demand the subordination of the bad and the weak. At such, it pays tribute to the aristocratic principle of nature and believes in the value of this law up to the last step of the ladder of being."* Here again, it was not a question of exterminating or considering other like animals to justify their enslavement. The one who would become the Fuhrer, simply believed in the existence of a natural order, which, inevitably led the most capable to lead the less capable.

The dishonesty of the Prosecution in Nuremberg

In Nuremberg, the Prosecution was also much bothered to try to show that in Mein Kampf, Hitler would have advocated the extermination of the inferior races. On January 8, 1946 (TMI,vol.IV,p.542), a prosecutor said that Mein Kampf affirmed *"the right of the Germans*

under this [racial] superiority, to dominate and exploit other peoples to achieve their own ends." When one knows how France, Britain and the United States have used other peoples, this charge fell within the most shameless cynicism. But never mind.

The main extract cited by the prosecutor was the following, extract from chapter 11 of the first Mein Kampf book (p.256): *"If they had not been able to use the elements of inferior races, that they had submitted, the Aryans would never have been able to take the first steps on the road that led them to a more advanced stage of civilization and that without the help of some appropriate animals they can tame, they would never have been able to discover the mechanical power which allowed them eventually to do without these animals. Members of inferior races constituted one of the most essential preconditions for the creation of superior types of civilization."*

Here is this extract in its French translation published in 1934 (p.294). Indeed, Hitler was merely telling the History - according to him - of the birth of the so-called higher civilizations. He exposed no purpose for the future. The rest (of the book), besides, confirms that this was just a simple historical account. The rest, that the Prosecution in Nuremberg avoided reading, was: *"The saying: "The Moor has done what he was supposed to, the Moor can go." has unfortunately too deep a meaning. For thousands of years the horse had to serve man and help him in his work, thus establishing the foundation of a progress which, by producing automobile, makes the horse himself useless. In a few years, he will cease all activity, but, without his previous collaboration, man might have had great difficulty in reaching the point where he is today. Thus, the presence of men of inferior race was a precondition for the formation of superior civilizations; they made up for the shortage of material resources without which one can not conceive the possibility of progress. It is certain that the first human civilization relied less on animals than on the use of men of inferior race. It was only after the enslavement of conquered races that a similar fate reached the animals and not vice versa, as some may believe. For it was the defeated at first that was put in front of the cart; the horse came only after."*

Once more, it is not purpose here to discuss the validity of these views. The important thing is to note that for Hitler, with the advent of modern technology, the history of slavery was closed.

Here, I will be told that in the concentration camps and in the occupied territories, the National Socialists had restored slavery: no doubt, but the Reich was then engaged in a war of extermination which was imposed on him by the democracies. In such moments, the principles do not count anymore; one tries to save his country and his people. And in order to do so, Germany had to mass produce.

I add that in Hitler's mind the Aryans creators of civilization had not practiced slavery which would have been synonymous of extermination of the so-called inferior races. Because, shortly afterwards, in Mein Kampf he wrote (p.295): *"It was not by chance that the first civilizations were born when the Aryan met inferior peoples, subjugated them and submitted*

them to his will. They were the first technical instrument serving an emerging civilization. As a result, the path to be followed by the Aryan was clearly drawn. Conqueror, he submitted the men of inferior race and ordered them to their practical activity under his command, according to his will and in accordance with his goals. But, by imposing a useful activity, although arduous, he spared not only the lives of his subjects; perhaps he even gave them a better fate than what was assigned to them, when they enjoyed their so-called former "freedom". As long as he rigorously maintained his moral position of master, he remained not only the master, but also the curator of the civilization that he continued to develop. For this one was based exclusively on the Aryan capabilities and on the fact that he remained himself. As the subject (understand here the members of the inferior races, according to Hitler) began to rise and, as it is likely, got closer to the conqueror on a linguistic point of view, the partition which was separating master and servant disappeared. The Aryan gave up the purity of his blood and thus lost the right to live in the paradise he had created. He degraded by the mixture of races, lost more and more his civilizing faculties; eventually he became, not only intellectually, but also physically, similar to his subjects and indigenous, thus losing the superiority that his ancestors had on them. For awhile, he could still live on the reserves that the civilization had accumulated, then petrification did its work and this civilization fell into oblivion. This is how civilizations and empires crumble, giving way to new formations."

One could not be clearer: The Aryan had dominated the inferior races, but far from exterminating them, it had instead provided them access to civilization and even to mix with it, which ultimately caused its own fall. This is why, the political message that Hitler launched for this time was: *"Now that Europe has established a superior civilization, let's fight to preserve our racial homogeneity."* Hence, his rejection of thoughtless miscegenation...

In Mein Kampf, there was nothing more. Specifically, there was no call to enslave peoples or to exterminate them.

Hermann Rauschning counterfeit

This is so true, that in Nuremberg, to claim that Hitler had advocated the extermination of entire populations, the Prosecution was reduced to invoking a notorious fake, Hermann Rauschning's book (**The voice of derstruction**), published in English in the USA, in 1940, in order to agitate the war.

On February 8, 1946 (**Tmi,vol.VII,p.179**), the Soviet Prosecution produced the book and quoted this very famous passage in which Hitler would have said to Rauschning: *"We have to develop the technique of depopulation. If you ask me what I mean by depopulation, I will answer that by that I envisage the removal of entire racial units. And that's what I intend to do. That is, overall, my task. Nature is cruel, and that is why we can also be cruel. If I am able to send the flower of the German nation into the furnace of war, without the slightest regret of pouring out precious German blood, I obviously also have the right to exterminate millions of inferior races of beings which multiply like larvae."* I invite the viewer to see chapter 11 of the book, where you can find this extract.

Until 1936, Hermann Rauschning had served as governor of the city of Danzig. He was then close to Hitler. Then a violent rupture occurred and as a result Rauschning went abroad. From that moment, he contributed to the anti-Nazi propaganda claiming to reveal Hitler's secret and criminal goals. But, he was a vulgar swindler.

He claimed for example (p.77), that shortly after the Reichstag fire, Göring had revealed to various members of the party that he himself had organized the attempt. In Nuremberg, however (TMI,vol.IX,p.464), Göring had no difficulty in explaining why this claim was entirely false.

Also according to Rauschning (p.252), Hitler said about education of the youth: *"In our schools the youth will grow up, before whom the world will tremble. A violently active, dominating, intrepid and brutal youth that's what I wish. They must be all that. They must be indifferent to pain. There should be either weakness or sweetness in them. I want to see again in their eyes the sparkle of pride and the independence of a beast of prey."* In Nuremberg the Soviet Prosecution quoted this passage (TMI,vol.XIV,p.545) and asked Baldur Von Schirach if he recognized having raised the youth according to these instructions. But, here again, the defendant disputed the veracity of these comments reported by Rauschning: *"Hitler did not give the instructions that Rauschning says here, which would have been the basic principles of the education of the German youth."*

I will be told that the accused lied in an attempt to exonerate themselves. It's possible, but in these cases, it was necessary to organize a confrontation as a cross-examination.

On July 29, 1946, as the trial ended, the lawyer of the SS expressed this request. He leaned on the fact that the Prosecution had produced the work of Hermann Rauschning against the defendants. He claimed for a cross-examination to clarify arguing that the procedural rules allowed it. The President refused on the grounds that this rule did not apply to the persons who were in the United States. As if no airplane would cross the Atlantic during the week. The lawyer replied that technical difficulties should play no part in a trial of this importance. In vain, as his request was not taken into consideration and Rauschning never appeared at the court's bar.

Why this refusal, since the book of this individual was widely used against the defendant? The reason is obvious: already unmasked by the defendant Göring and von Schirach, the tribunal wanted to avoid a cross-examination for this witness, which would have been fatal.

The conclusion is obvious: to pretend to demonstrate the inherently criminal nature of Hitler's "racism" the Prosecution had been reduced to quote Mein Kampf out of context and to invoke an obvious false witness.

If, really, Hitler had promoted an exterminationist racism, even in peace time, propaganda would have been full of such publications. But, in Nuremberg, the Prosecution could not name any.

Racism in the Third Reich

On the contrary, I recall that in 1939, in Leipzig, a book appeared in three volumes written under the direction of a German traveler (**Die grosse volker kunde**). The first volume spoke of Africa and its peoples. Well, there was no racism (**p.253**). Peoples of Black Africa in particular were presented without hatred or contempt. They were shown with their traditional hairstyles, their warlike costumes, their medicine, their sacred art, their stone art, their music with various instruments, their breeding methods, their constructions... An advertisement for the book was published in February 1941, in the French edition of Göring's German magazine Der Adler. The book was presented as follows: *"Hugo A. Bernatzik shows us the life and current ethnographic characteristics of foreign peoples. He makes us see the natural beauty of some tall black women, the cute forms of the Chinese women, the admirable body of the Hindu temple dancers and the Pacific Ocean beauties; it gives us the opportunity to take a glimpse into the private life prevailing in the Arabs tents, in the tea tasting houses in Japan and in the clay huts in Africa..."*

And the "race of the Lords"?

Today, the anti-Nazi propaganda makes big fuss around the "race of the Lords". I readily admit that the Third Reich had its apologists for the "race of the Lords". But, within this heterogeneous party which was the NSDAP, they were certainly not in the majority.

Questioned in Nuremberg on the meaning he attached to the word "race of the Lords" (**TMI,vol.IX,p.285**), Hermann Göring said: *"I personally don't understand it, because this word (which, in French, become an expression) you will not find it in any of my speeches, in any of my writings. I think, if one is a Lord, one doesn't need to point it out."* And also (**TMI,vol.IX,p.688**): *"I have never said that I believed that one race was superior to the others, but, I insisted on the difference between the races."*

A few weeks later, the former labor Plenipotentiary, Fritz Sauckel declared (**TMI,vol.XV,p.72**): *"I personally never approved the statements made by some National Socialist speakers on a "superior race" or a "race of the Lords". I also never expressed such views. When I was a young man, I have traveled a lot around the world and in the US and in Australia, I have developed relationships with families that are among the best memories of my life [...] I have never taken for good the notion of superiority of one race, but, I considered necessary the equality of the rights."* This view was widely shared at the highest levels of the German government. I would also point out that the official guidelines about propaganda prohibited outrageous racism.

On July 23, 1934, at a large meeting of the Hitler Youth, Gauleiter Grohé reminded participants of the racist foundations of the German national unity: *"Hitler Youth, he said, should be aware that these bases are primarily community of blood and specific character of the German race. While defending this racist point of view, the German people does not consider other races as being inferior."*

Here, some will reply that it was contradictory with Mein Kampf. Certainly, and this proves that in the core of the NSDAP, even on racism, there was no general agreement: Polygenism or monogenism questions were left to the discretion of everyone, like those on the possible inequality of the races. The only consensus was based on the fact that the races were different and that it was necessary to refuse miscegenation to preserve the European civilization. There was nothing criminal here.

In Nuremberg, the former head of the Radio Department of the Ministry of Propaganda, Hans Fritzsche, declared plainly (TMI,vol.XVII,p.155): *"I have never represented or propagated the theory of the "race of the Lords". I avoided the term. I have strictly forbidden it to the German press and radio during the time I managed them. I also believe that the concept of the race of the Lords played a more important role in the anti-National Socialist propaganda than in Germany itself. I don't know who coined this expression. It has been publicly used, as far as I know, by men like Dr. Ley, who, I must say openly and explicitly, have never been taken seriously by anyone. In a tacit way, that concept played a big role with the SS because of its racially exclusive terms. But, the intelligent men, tactful and knowing somewhat the world, were careful not to use this term."* Soon after, he explained (TMI,vol.XVII,p.201): *"German propaganda - and I mean by that the German official propaganda - never preached racial hatred, but the theory of racial discrimination, which is quite different. But, I confess that there was a kind of German propaganda that went beyond this stage and preached a pure and primitive racial hatred."*

These quotations confirm that while some National Socialists could express racial hatred, this radical racism was not an essential hitlerism element. This is why I repeat: one can be a National Socialist without wanting to lock his political opponents in camps, nor despise and want to exterminate certain races. To speak and imagine this, it's not knowing National Socialism better than Hitler and his companions would have known it, National Socialism never was a bloc, late alone a block of hatred. Within it, there were quite different currents. To be National Socialist, it's to believe in the importance of racial homogeneity in the context of the sustainability of its culture. It's, therefore, to refuse the actual anti-racism and its corollary, a frantic policy of miscegenation, knowing that miscegenation will always exist, in every generation, since at the march of the empires, peoples meet.

This is why I fight for the rehabilitation of racism and free speech.

Part three - A hypocritical concept of "freedom"

Because, in our latitudes, behind the great hypocritical speeches hides a less noble reality: finally freedom of speech is reserved to the right-thinking.

The example of François Baroin in the Morano case

A recent blatant example of October 1, 2015. Questioned about Nadine Morano, the deputy François Baroin said: *"We are in a democracy and everyone is free to say what he wants to*

say." Everyone is free to say what he wants to say. Certainly, in France when you are going to express yourself no one asks you in advance what you are going to say, to stop you if necessary.

But, the freedom to speak - true freedom - is to be able to speak without fear of sanctions. For, it's the fear of sanctions which closes the mouths and, therefore, kills freedom of speech. In order to have this freedom, one must be able to speak without fear of punishment. Especially when it comes to expressing a personal conviction which, basically, engages only oneself. And, François Baroin admits that Mrs. Morano engaged only herself. *"Insofar as she is not a party leader, she only engages herself..."* Therefore, he should defend Mrs. Morano against any punishment. But, listen: *"furthermore, I believe there will be sanctions, the leader of the Great-East, which moreover is my region, requested that Nadine Morano no longer be in the department in a leading position. I can understand him and I will support him in this case."*

On one hand, therefore, François Baroin says that in a democracy, one is free to say what he wants, but on the other, he joins those who call for sanctions. And for what reason? Here it is: *"If there are rules of life in common, here we are in a context where the responsibility of an elected person, someone who leads a list who can contaminate all the other co-listed. This is the case for the regional elections, Philippe Richert, who is the president of the Alsace region, which we support, doesn't seem to be in a position to lead a list..."*

Yet, he says that Nadine Morano engaged only herself, i.e. she didn't splash any one. Therefore, the reason he invokes to justify the sanctions proves contradictory.

No freedom for those who break a taboo

Why this contradiction? Well, simply because in François Baroin's head, there is no contradiction. When he says: *"We are in a democracy and everyone is free to say what he wants to say." ...*

He implies: within the limits imposed by the taboo of our society. Indeed, every society has its taboos that one must not violate. It's so obvious that not only does no one talk about it, but also it is not felt as a hindrance to freedom. Because -especially at the collective level- freedom must serve the good. Use it to do evil, you abuse this freedom. And, the taboos are here precisely to protect us from social disasters. That is to say, from evil. Accordingly, breaking taboos is not to be free, it is on the contrary abusing freedom, an abuse which must be punished. The *"race"* has become a taboo; Mrs. Morano should, therefore, be sanctioned.

And she has been. On October 7, 2015, the promised investiture was eventually withdrawn. I will be told that, Mrs. Morano could have expressed her apologies. It's naive, because breaking a taboo deserves death (yesterday physical, today social). The culprit has no excuse, he can't plead his case, all he can do is to publicly condemn his actions before his execution.

Besides, here is what the Mayor of Nancy, Laurent Henart stated: *"Either she clarifies her positions..."* Here, I will be told: *"You see, Laurent Henart gives the possibility to Mrs. Morano to plead her case."* But, listen to some more: *"Basically, she withdraws what she said..."*

In short, all is hypocrisy with words used unduly: to clarify what she said means to explain what we wanted to say. But, in this case, it is not question to letting Nadine Morano explain what she wanted to say: it must be withdrawn, therefore she must regret and condemn her action.

As for providing an apology, it would have been useless. Social pressure is too strong, which is always the case with reigning taboos. We always come back to the same: in our latitudes, freedom of speech is only granted to the right-thinking, in other words: it does not exist.

Misunderstanding about freedom

Yet, some censors tell you otherwise. They will tell you that in France, one is free. And they are honest. Why? Because, in France, under the law nothing is forbidden.

Open this book (**Victor Alexandre, "Penser et agir"**), I admit, quite technical. The author points (**p.213**) out that *"the law by its nature, is ineffective: a law directs nothing, forbids nothing [...] the law fixes, for example in criminal matters, the rate of crime, it does not prohibit it."* This is undoubtedly exact.

Look at the penal code in the *"homicide"* section. The law defines murder and gives the price for it: 30 years imprisonment. But, it does not prohibit it. It never says that murder is prohibited. It's the same with scam, for example. The law gives the definition, then the price. Here again, it doesn't prohibit it. It leaves you free to swindle, but it warns you that if you are caught you will be punished.

Why? Simply because our Penal Code is derived from the revolutionary thought of 1789, a thought according to which, the citizen is free, totally free. But, to ensure the common life, society sets limits that must not be crossed or sanctions will apply. You are free to cross them, but you will be punished.

You may say that this conception of freedom is totally theoretical and that it's not in use in everyday life. Absolutely not. Listen to the lawyer who pleaded against me in Coutance, then in Caen in this case where I was condemned to one year imprisonment: *"We are not going to gag him, we are not going to cut his tongue, even less cut his head, but each time that he will cross the yellow line, well, he will be punished again, he knows the rules... That's his choice."*

The man says it: one will not gag me, I am free. He says it without blinking, while the Court sentenced me to one year imprisonment. Why? Because, the notion of freedom invoked by this lawyer is not what one has intuitively. I repeat: intuitively, freedom is the right to act

without fear of being sanctioned. But, the republic found a much more pernicious notion: I forbid you nothing, she said, you have the right to do anything, to say everything, but if you go through some limits set by the law, then you will be punished. Meanwhile, you are totally free. Free to cross them or not. T

his is what has allowed the lawyer to say this. Rape of the freedom of speech? he says, let's be serious; in France no one is gagged; no one is going to have his head cut; everyone can say what he wants, only if certain legitimate boundaries are crossed... A sanction falls, that's all... Reynouard is free... He can avoid crossing the yellow line...

But, since the "*yellow line*" is what I want to say, well, finally he is free to shut up. It's really about time to end this hypocrisy generating an even more pronounced totalitarian drift.

One hope: my Priority Question of Constitutionality

That is why, this summer, I have filed a priority question of constitutionality to the (French) Court of Cassation And for the first time, a QPC, which seeks the Fabius-Gayssot Act, was sent to the Constitutional Council. The previous five were rejected as "*lacking seriousness*". Indeed, they invoked the rape of the freedom of speech, thesis that the Justice had long been swept.

Why did mine not experience the same fate? Simply because it develops another argument. For more information I invite the viewer to read the interview that I have granted this week to the Weekly Rivarol.

Good evening.