

# Liberalism and Our Universities

By Shaun Walker

Liberalism is a strange thing. On the one hand, purely on a philosophical level, it has its attractions: just think how nice everything would be if every person on earth were compatible with each other; if everyone meant well; if everyone shared the same values; if there were indeed no differences at all between people that were even worth worrying about. Such a society would actually be quite nice to live in. Imagine a place where the educational system did not withhold facts from you because the teaching authorities did not like those facts. Imagine a place where it was safe to walk down any street, anywhere, anytime. Imagine a society where everyone was prosperous; where there was no exploitation of any sort. Imagine a society where everyone shared the same good standard of living. Imagine a society where everyone was always allowed to do their best, where there were no con-men, no people with any ill intent at all. Imagine that. Yes, that would be a nice society.

But as I said right at the beginning, liberalism is a strange thing. It holds up a seemingly nice ideal, but it fails to take into account the realities of the world. It is an illusion, built on what some people would like the world to be, rather than what is.

And this is why liberalism is all too often fatal — deadly to its believers and others unfortunate enough to be caught up in the dream world which liberalism creates.

One of the foremost examples of this sort of insanity was the case of Amy Biehl. Even though Dr. Pierce discussed her on a previous *American Dissident Voices* broadcast in September 1998, it is worthwhile to delve into the full details here again, as they reveal much about this social cancer called liberalism. For those listeners that don't remember, or who didn't hear that broadcast, Amy Biehl was an American girl who graduated from Stanford in 1989, and she received a Fulbright Scholarship to study in South Africa.



Stanford University

Amy was, by all accounts, a bright girl, born to a typical upper middle class American family. Blond, blue-eyed and pretty, she could easily have been the typical “California Blond” (although those are becoming rarer these days, but that’s another topic).

Instead, apparently through her parents, Amy became infected with the disease of liberalism. She became a member of the

National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.

In Amy’s world, there were no differences between the races; in Amy’s world, there were no horrible people, just people who had been misled, and who, once shown the truth, would become good at the drop of a hat. In Amy’s world, everything was fine and good, if only we worked at it hard enough. And so when she graduated from Stanford, she caused a stir by writing in chalk “Free Mandela” on the top of her graduation cap, bowing to the audience at an appropriate moment during the ceremony.

Within a few years, her dedication to the anti-Apartheid cause resulted in her move to South Africa, to start work helping the ANC prepare for the first all race elections in 1994. In Amy’s world, there were no bad Black people, only a few bad White people, and they too would likely change their opinion if they could only see how good Black people were.

With those liberal beliefs, Amy began spending more and more time in the Black townships of South Africa, hob knobbing it with leading ANC activists, helping to register voters, and generally trying to be the all round nice person that she believed everyone else was.

And, so it was that on the 25th of August, 1993, that the 26-year-old Amy was driving some of her wonderful Black friends to their homes in a township outside Cape Town. It is important for listeners to remember, that by this time Apartheid had been dismantled, the ANC was a legitimate

organization in South Africa, and their so-called 'armed struggle' had been formally stopped. There was, in other words, no reason for violence.

Amy's White face stood out in the township, and it was not long before her car came under attack by a large mob of Blacks. Stones were thrown which smashed the windscreen and side windows of her car. One of the stones hit Amy on her head, causing her to bleed profusely. Unable to drive any further, she stopped the car and staggered out, dripping blood in the road, to a filling station, perhaps there hoping to find help of some sort. None came; her attackers pursued her and continued throwing stones at the White woman, ignoring the Blacks in her car. They wanted to kill the White woman, not because of what she had done, but because she was White.

One of the attackers tripped Amy, causing her to fall. While lying on the ground, the crowd continued to stone her. One of the attackers drew a knife and plunged it into her heart, while she was lying barely moving on the floor. The knife was withdrawn, and then plunged further three times into her chest. By now her head had been smashed open by repeated blows with a brick. In the Negroes brains, the White woman had to die, and she did, begging for mercy, begging not to be killed. It was a pathetic, lonely and frightening death. Amy Biehl was murdered in a brutal fashion because she was White, not for any other reason. Her death symbolizes the reality check which always, always, destroys the liberal myth.

Now, one would think, this would surely be more than enough for most people. Surely, one would think, that this would be enough to teach even the most well-meaning person that there was something more in the world than the rosy tint which liberalism puts on everything.

But no, this is where the disease of liberalism really becomes gangrenous in nature. Amy's parents, Peter and Linda Biehl, then flew to South Africa to meet her murderers, who had in the interim been arrested. The famous meeting between the senior Biehls and their daughter's murders took place in 1998 before South Africa's infamous "Truth Commission," at which they were all granted amnesty for the murder of Amy Biehl.

Biehl Sr. read a poem to the Black youths who had stabbed and stoned his daughter to death, and then actually embraced these murderous scum.

They said this was Amy's "vision of forgiveness and reconciliation that we have honored."

The parents then started a foundation in Amy's name: a foundation — you guessed it — dedicated to helping Blacks in South Africa. The disease spread, outliving its victim. Today, there is even a school in New Mexico named after Amy, dedicated to what it calls 'social justice.'

Amy's parents have been paraded back-and-forth in America in a hand-wringing liberal fest, all trying to outdo each other in honoring the very misguided, liberal girl who was murdered because she was White.

Those of us, who are not liberals, stand back aghast. We cannot even contemplate forgiving the murders of one of our children, much less embracing them and then spending the rest of our days trying to help them. Hell no, most decent people would actually want revenge!

And now the thought enters our minds: What is wrong with people such as the Biehls? How could they have gone so far off the track that not only have they raised their own child to be openly anti-White, to be openly working against her very own interests, but now that this evil delusion has seen her brutally murdered, they carry on by pushing the same cause even further than before? Is there hope for these people?

Sadly, the Biehls are not alone. How many times have we seen liberals, when confronted with the obvious failure of racial integration, in schools, residential suburbs, in the workplace and elsewhere, dismiss these failures as being due to alleged "White racism."

The problem, these seemingly insane people tell us, is not racial integration, but rather that there is too little integration. We need more for this problem to be solved, they tell us, and always ignoring the fact that it might be the very 'medicine' which they prescribe which is the cause of the problem in the first place.

But it was not always like this. Liberals are the end result of 60 or 70 years of academic 'reeducation,' as carried out by the largely Jewish school of anthropology and sociology at our institutions of higher learning.

A hundred years ago, liberal academics were almost unknown. Academic study was based on academics, not on dreams of what the world should ideally be like. Take for example, the famous *Encyclopedia Britannica's* 11th edition, published in

1911, which was the product of the finest minds at the University of Cambridge in the UK. The 1911 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* is still today held up as the standard by which all encyclopedias are measured.

I would like to read verbatim, extracts from the entry under "Negro" in the 1911 *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

The encyclopedia is, by the way, online at:  
<http://77.1911encyclopedia.org/N/NE/NEGRO.htm>

This is what the White race's finest academic minds had to say about the Negro in 1911:

NEGRO (from Lat. *niger*, black), in anthropology, the designation of the distinctly dark-skinned, as opposed to the fair, yellow, and brown variations of mankind. . . . Mentally the negro is inferior to the white. The remark of F. Manetta, made after a long study of the negro in America, may be taken as generally true of the whole race: "the negro children were sharp, intelligent and full of vivacity, but on approaching the adult period a gradual change set in. The intellect seemed to become clouded, animation giving place to a sort of lethargy, briskness yielding to indolence."

We must necessarily suppose that the development of the negro and white proceeds on different lines. While with the latter the volume of the brain grows with the expansion of the brainpan, in the former the growth of the brain is on the contrary arrested by the premature closing of the cranial sutures and lateral pressure of the frontal bone.

This explanation is reasonable and even probable as a contributing cause; but evidence is lacking on the subject and the arrest or even deterioration in mental development is no doubt very largely due to the fact that after puberty sexual matters take the first place in the negro's life and thoughts. At the same time his environment has not been such as would tend to produce in him the restless energy which has led to the progress of the white race; and the easy conditions of tropical life and the fertility of the soil have reduced the struggle for existence to a minimum. But though the mental inferiority of the negro to the white or yellow races is a fact, it has often been exaggerated; the negro is largely the creature of his environment, and it is not fair to judge of his mental capacity by tests taken directly from the environment of the white man, as for instance tests in mental arithmetic; skill in reckoning is necessary to the white race, and it has cultivated this faculty; but it is not necessary to the negro.

On the other hand negroes far surpass white men in acuteness of vision, hearing, sense of direction and topography. A native who has once visited a particular locality will rarely fail to recognize it again. For the rest, the mental constitution of the negro is very similar to that of a child, normally good-natured and cheerful, but subject to sudden fits of emotion and passion during which he is capable of performing acts of singular atrocity, impressionable, vain, but often exhibiting in the capacity of servant a dog-like fidelity which has stood the supreme test.

Given suitable training, the negro is capable of becoming a craftsman of considerable skill, particularly in metal work, carpentry and carving. The bronze castings by the tire perdu process, and the cups and horns of ivory elaborately carved, which were produced by the natives of Guinea after their intercourse with the Portuguese of the 16th century, bear ample witness to this. But the rapid decline and practical evanescence of both industries, when that intercourse was interrupted, shows that the native craftsman was raised for the moment above his normal level by direct foreign inspiration, and was unable to sustain the high quality of his work when that inspiration failed.

Cannibalism is found in its simplest form in Africa. In that continent the majority of cannibal tribes eat human flesh because they like it, and not from any magical motive or from lack of other animal food. In fact it is noticeable that the tribes most addicted to this practice inhabit just those districts where game is most plentiful. Among the true negroes it is confined mainly to the Welle and Ubangi districts, though found sporadically (and due to magical motives) on the west coast, and among the Bantu negroids in the south-western part of Belgian Congo and the Gabon.

Pottery-making is almost universal, though nowhere has it reached a very advanced stage; the wheel is unknown.

A characteristic feature of the western culture area, among both negro and Bantu negroid tribes, is the belief that any form of death except by violence must be due to evil magic exercised by, or through the agency of, some human individual; to discover the guilty party the poison ordeal is freely used. A similar form of ordeal is found in British Central Africa, to discover magicians, and the wholesale "smelling-out" of "witches," often practiced for political reasons, is a well-known feature of the culture of the Zulu-Xosa tribes.

That was the opinion of academics then. By 1966, a mere 50 years later, the *Encyclopedia Britannica* had completely excised all references to Negro intellectual ability and lack of cultural achievement, and had contained only a physical description of Negroes, nothing more. The question which immediately springs to mind now is what on earth has happened to academia in the past 70 years? How could our finest academic minds go from telling such hard-hitting racial truths to saying nothing at all?

The cause of this turnaround is the exact same thing that led Amy Biehl to her death: an infectious social cancer has taken hold, and subverted the Western World, the disease of liberalism. And as you know, infectious diseases are caused by bacteria or a virus: a foreign antigen. And the virus which infected Western Academia, and which has

sapped it to its core, came in the form of a Jew by the name of Franz Boas.

Boas is the grandfather of modern anthropology and was the first to actively promote the idea that race did not exist and was merely a 'social construct' not found in nature. Boas' influence on the 20th Century ranks alongside that of his fellow Jewish tribesmen, Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud. As a professor at Columbia from 1899 to 1942, he virtually created modern anthropology, and the students he trained — almost all Jews — went on to spread his poison throughout the Western World.

Boas' students included the most famous names of modern anthropology: Frank Speck, who founded the anthropology department at the University of Pennsylvania; Edward Sapir, who developed the anthropology program at the University of Chicago; Alexander Goldenweiser, who started the anthropology program at the New School for Social Research; Leslie Spier, who started the anthropology program at the University of Washington; Melville Herskovits who started the anthropology program at Northwestern University; and Esther Goldfrank, who traveled with Boas to New Mexico in 1919 to conduct research among the Pueblo Indians. Boas strongly influenced the French Jew Claude Lévi-Strauss, who developed structuralism as a method of interpreting culture. Several of Boas's students went on to serve as editors of the American Anthropological Association's flagship journal, *American Anthropologist*.

In 1912, Boas published his most famous work — a study which claimed to show that the skull shapes of the descendants of European immigrants to the United States altered from those of the original immigrants. This study served to lay the foundation for modern liberalism's greatest pillar: that there were no real fixed different racial and ethnic types as far as physical characteristics went. It was the start of the 'nurture rules over nature' argument; an argument which was to form the basis of the attack on racial realism and science from then till now because Boas' argument claimed they changed according to environmental circumstances like climate or diet or even, he asserted, gynecological or swaddling practices.

Here was the start of the disease: the academic world had been infiltrated by a Marxist-sympathizing Jew who, with the aid of his network of fellow religionists, succeeded in turning the academic

world on its head and moving it from racial realism to racial fantasy.

Boas' influence cannot be underestimated: the environmental theory of racial development still holds sway to this day, and was most recently exemplified in the books *Guns, Germs and Steel* and *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*, written by the Jew Jared Diamond. Both these works, which are now being studied at universities and colleges across the Western World, claim exactly as Boas did, that environment alone determines racial achievement and not a race's inherent make-up.

It matters nothing that a 2002 study at the University of Pennsylvania showed that Boas had manufactured his findings and they were not supported by the measurements taken during the course of his original study. The damage had been done and that was the intention.

The disease entered the academic community, and from there it spread through society. Today, American students who are only exposed to these Jewish lies become in denial on the subject of race. Slowly but surely — over a period of decades — these Jewish infiltrators drove out truth in anthropology, in history, in sociology, and replaced it with their version. This liberal version is the impossibility of equality, mixed with malevolence, lies and intolerance for other opinions. This is all packaged up and called "liberalism."

Now it is ironic that most liberals are in fact the most intolerant of all people on earth. Listeners might know for example, the horror story of Ernst Zundel — imprisoned for over three years without trial, by the so-called liberal democracies of Canada and Germany. But Ernst Zundel is not the only case: thousands of German patriots have been imprisoned over the years for daring to think or write things with which the "liberal democracies" did not agree. This phenomenon is not limited to Germany either, but is widespread across all of Europe. They even have laws which state that truth is no defense, even if what someone says is the truth, they are still fined or imprisoned for saying it in public.

Even here in the USA, people are victimized for saying things which liberals do not like: people lose their jobs, their incomes, are railroaded out of schools and colleges as punishment for daring to dissent with the great liberal lie.

The liberal is, we can conclude, a seriously mentally ill person, who suffers from a schizophrenic condition. On the one hand, the liberal says everyone is equal, and there must be freedom for all. But on the other hand, if anyone dares venture an opinion with which they differ, especially on the topics of race or Jews, then those same liberals are the first to argue in favor of depriving that person of their civil liberties such as freedom of speech or association. In short, liberals appear to be quite genuinely crazy, and at the same time, their openly stated desires are tyrannical.

After so many years of studying liberals, we are forced to the conclusion that, with only a few exceptions, they cannot be cured. Their brainwashing has apparently caused some hardwiring within the brain to go haywire; and to bring any mental health to them will require them to actually disengage from the mental disease which has engulfed them.

Politically speaking, liberals have to be written off. And as terrible as it sounds, the only way we will be rid of the worst afflicted, that is the Liberal Orthodoxy, is when they immolate themselves on their own lies, similar to what happened to Amy Biehl. We must not waste our time trying to teach let alone recruit liberals. We must aim our recruiting efforts at the youth, at those people without a strong opinion either way and those that have similar beliefs as ours.

These are our target group, and there are millions and millions of them. We can break through the conspiracy of liberal lies. All we need is enough dedicated activists who are prepared to put all their available time and effort into saving their race and nation.

In this battle, each and every person who cares about their race's future, about the future which faces their children and grandchildren, has a holy duty to take up the challenge. Join with us in this holy quest.



Donations are needed to keep this program on the air. Please give \$20 today: Go to "Book Catalog" on natvan.com, then go to the category "National Alliance Membership and Support, then pick "DONATION."

The text above is from the *American Dissident Voices* program aired on October 15, 2005. A cassette recording of this broadcast is available from National Vanguard Books for \$12.95 postpaid. Send \$2.00 for a catalog to:

**National Vanguard Books**  
**P.O. Box 330**  
**Hillsboro, WV 24946**

**<http://www.natvan.com>**

or

**<http://www.natall.com>**