

Langford, Edward. 1965. This is a Republic, not a democracy! Let's keep it that way. Los Angeles: Noontide Press.

**THIS IS A REPUBLIC,
NOT A DEMOCRACY!**

Let's Keep It That Way



By **EDWARD LANGFORD**

///

With respect to
ROBERT WELCH

*who first popularized the slogan which has
been selected as a title for this little booklet*

I

Simple Definitions

If you were asked to define the term "republic" how would you do it? One might also inquire, how would you define "democracy"? That one would perhaps be slightly easier to answer.

A democracy, you would probably say, is a system of government under which the head of the government is elective, and in which those things which are the interest of all are decided by all. This does not mean to say that everyone is always consulted as to each and every measure to be decided upon, but at least the people who do the decision-making are elected by the great mass of the people, and in theory at least they are supposed to lay out a program of their intentions at the time of seeking election and to keep to this program after election to power.

Unfortunately, the failure of the politician to keep to his election promises is so frequent as to have become almost a by-word, and what is more, the great mass of the people seldom take a sincere interest in the really important measures of government, nor can they be expected to as their education and experience precludes this. Under the democratic system the candidates for power are consequently elected on a limited platform of issues which may be deemed to appeal best to the majority of the electorate, while they escape the obligation to commit themselves on the major is-

sues. In so far as this is true, the electorate have little or no influence over the course of action of the politicians, once the latter have by irrelevant or false promises gained power.

Nevertheless there is a great appeal in the idea of democracy. By its very nature it seems to promise everything to the masses, and to the professional politician who knows the rules of the game, it has much to commend it as an easy method of ensuring that the confidence of the majority can be maintained. Thus, to the professional politician it has a great appeal, but from an ideal point of view, *is it in fact the best of all possible systems of government?*

In recent years we have been told insistently that it is. We have been told, also, that our country is a democracy, and it has been implied that all republics *are* democracies. Yet here are two definite mis-statements, and they are mis-statements which are of the greatest importance to our future, and to the future of our children.

When the Constitution of the United States was drawn up it was described as a republic, and no mention of the word "democracy" was made. Is it true then that a republic is a democracy, and if it is not, then what exactly is the difference? At the back of our minds we all of us know that there is surely something different between the meaning of the words democracy and republic, but are we really sure what it is? We ought to be. So let us begin this simple but vitally important adventure into political science at this point. Is a republic necessarily a democracy?

II

Is a Republic a Democracy?

In the preceding chapter we considered the definition of the term "democracy," and found that the essential was the equal participation of all members of the state in the business of running the country, that is to say, the law-making, the law-enforcement and the executive management of day to day affairs. We hinted, also, at the fact that this did not always amount to much, particularly in the giant states of today, when individuals could no longer, as in ancient tribal times, participate personally in the law-making or policy decisions, but were obliged to elect others to act in their interests and, ostensibly, according to pre-announced policies. But what is the meaning of a "republic"?

The etymological root of any word always offers one of the easiest starting points to answer the question "What is?", and frequently proves to be one of the most revealing lines of enquiry. We find, etymologically, that the word "republic" derives from the latin *respublica*, that is to say "a commonweal" or "commonwealth." Now this is surely interesting. No mention here of the mode of government or of any electoral system. The word itself in ancient times merely symbolized the community of the people within the state. Here is an implication, it is true, that the people were all free, and that the signs of feudalism were absent. There is the suggestion that

no one person or group of people could claim to own the state. But there is no implication that the commonwealth or state should imply any particular system of government. Freedom is implied, but not democracy.

Thus, jumping into later times, to the year 1577 to be precise, in the period known as the Renaissance, we find the renowned Jean Bodin defining a republic in his work *De Republica Libri Sex* as being a state in which law was supreme, and which might be ruled even by a sole monarch, provided that that monarch was limited to the proper use of his power by the ancient laws of the land. Jumping again to the times of the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, we find frequent references to the "Republique Francaise, ruled by the Empereur Napoleon," yet no one tries to claim that the Republic of France was a democracy under Napoleon.

Poland, too, had its king, while still known as a republic, because the kings were elected. But this was not democracy, because there was no question of the participation of the people in the government. Invariably, the king was chosen from amongst the aristocratic elite. But he was not required to place before the people a program, nor to consult them on any decision, provided always that he adhered to the ancient laws of the lands and followed the proper channels of government as laid down by ancient law and custom. Poland was therefore a republic, ruled by a king, but was in no way a democracy.

Venice is perhaps one of the most famous and ancient of all republics. In early days there was a "great council" wherein all the heads of families might meet to express their views. After the closure of this council, with the expansion in size of the population of the republic, the power became vested in a numerically small and restrictive aristocracy, which in turn was dominated by an aristocracy within the aristocracy—which came to be known as the Venetian oligarchy. The system worked

magnificently, and from a small town built on wooden stilts amidst the reeds and mudbanks of a north Italian salt water lake, Venice became the Queen of the Seas, the richest and most prosperous, though virtually the smallest, nation in the world. Her ships sailed in all directions, and the happiness, honesty and wealth of her people became famous throughout the world. But more about Venice later.

Coming into more modern times, the first republic of importance was the United Netherlands. After the low countries had freed themselves from the rule of Philip II, the seven low country states formed themselves into the United Netherlands federation, and adopted a republican constitution wherein they appointed a "stadtholder" to whom large powers were delegated. Significantly, however, the choice of the stadtholder was not made by all members of the adult population, but only by a small body of burghers or leading citizens who alone were entitled to vote. There was still no trace of democracy in the United Netherlands, and the affairs of the seven states were happily and successfully entrusted to the senior citizens who in turn entrusted the major executive power to one elected leader. Thus the United Netherlands comprised a republic but was not a democracy.

It will be seen therefore that a republic can obviously incorporate a wide variety of forms of government, and is limited by two extremes only. On the one hand, a kingdom ruled by an absolute king who claims his authority from the concept of the divine right of kings, could obviously not be described as a republic, nor could a feudal state be described as a republic, since in neither of these states is it admitted that the "commonwealth" is a common property, for indeed the implication is otherwise. On the other extreme, a republic seems to imply the delegation of power, indeed the restriction of the exercise of power, to a chosen individual, often by a

chosen group of leaders. There is no mention, for example, in antiquity, of the participation of the entire people in the government of a republic. The leaders who rule, rule by virtue of having been selected for the leadership, they rule because they are considered to be the best men to make the necessary decisions, and often even the right to decide upon *who* shall rule is frequently restricted to those who are considered most capable of making this decision. The real essence of democracy, the active participation of the people in decision making, and in the affairs of government, is by no means a necessary condition in a republic.

III

Aristotle and Democracy

The word "democracy" derives from two Greek words, being artificially compounded therefrom. These words were "the people" and "rule," and the juxtaposition of the two Greek roots was intended to signify "the rule of the people," as distinct from any aristocratic or minority form of government.

The people may, in a democracy, rule either directly or indirectly, and as we have already seen, in early Teutonic and Keltic society, the mass of freemen, as distinct from the slave classes, met periodically to approve new laws, or to confirm the old. In the small city states of Nordic Greece, the freemen (again, as distinct from the slaves) were able to exercise direct influence on the course of government by appearing personally at public gatherings to elect new leaders or to decide upon public issues of major importance. Little delegation of authority was necessary, and since during the earlier period, at least, the kinship ties of the nation were close, considerable unanimity of opinion was possible. This however began to change as the barriers which divided the ruling Hellenic race from the slaves and helots, mainly of Mediterranean or Asiatic race, were lowered, and the numbers of the freemen, thinned by war, were augmented by the promotion of slaves who came to be known as "freedmen," enjoying the same status and political rights as the freemen. Here we wit-

ness a changeover in ancient Greece from a republic to a democracy. That is to say, from a political system which was dominated by the superior elements of society to a system which was dominated by the mass of society.

Aristotle divided governments into three classes, of each of which there was a good and bad form. The good government by a single person he called *monarchy*, and the bad form of single autocratic rule he named *tyranny*. Similarly, the good government of a few he named *aristocracy*, and the depraved form he dubbed *oligarchy*. As for the government of the many, the good government of the many he called a *commonwealth* or *republic*, and the bad equivalent he described as *democracy*. The fault of the depraved or bad forms of government, in his opinion, was that those in power act selfishly in pursuit of their own personal aims, instead of altruistically, for the good of the state or nation as a whole.

So it was that Aristotle, possibly the greatest of the Greek philosophers, came to describe democracy as a perversion of "polity," a perversion of "constitutional government." This perversion was, he considered, a grave error. Instead of a rule by monarchy and aristocracy he saw the rule of all the people.

Aristotle therefore restricted the use of the term "democracy" to bad popular government, and in fact he gave it an additional name "ochloracy" to distinguish it from aristocratic or oligarchic systems of government. By "ochloracy" he meant simply what the word connotes—"mob-rule," and certainly by his day the Athenian populace had come to comprise a majority of "freedmen," and the ancient freemen had become a diminutive minority. While Athenian popular rule as exercised by the freemen, had reached its zenith under Pericles, by Aristotle's time it had degenerated far, and so come to earn the scorn of this great philosopher.

Even democracies, as a bad form of government in Aristotle's view, had a less depraved and a worse state. The less depraved was that of an agricultural community, where he considered the citizens have not the time for political activity, and allow the law to rule. The worst form was that where the large population of the cities had the time to engage in political activity, and interfered without knowing for what reason they were interfering. This, he felt, allowed the evil elements amongst the politicians to take advantage of the credulity of the uninformed but politically-minded masses, with disastrous results.

Above all, however, Aristotle considered that the best form of government was that in which as much as possible is left to the ancient laws, and as little as possible to the will of the governor or political leader. Despite the complexity of modern civic life, there is a great deal of truth still in this viewpoint.

For proper government, Aristotle considered that the aristocracy must hold the reins of power . . . for the people were no longer pure and thus, by kinship, equal members of society. The people as a whole had now swollen to include the freed slaves, and where formerly a degree of natural equality of blood had existed, an inequality had sprung into being which, to Aristotle's mind, made full representation of all the people and full participation in government by all the people, a ridiculous concept.

How close is the parallel with modern times, and especially with our own country, the United States of America? Even in the eighteenth century, when our population was with the exception of the slaves, almost entirely north European in origin, and close ties of race existed, the fathers of our Constitution saw fit to build not a democratic but a republican system of government. How more important that we today, with the vast variety of races and peoples who inhabit the coun-

try in our time, should remember Aristotle's "ochlocracy" and learn from his wise contempt of mob-rule. Not all men are equal and not all men can vote with equal wisdom. Are we to be guided by the mediocre average intelligence of our multi-racial state, or by the talent of the superior elements? What business takes a vote on the opinions of the janitor and the doorman, when important decisions of finance or sales are involved? What is the hope for a nation which disregards the prime importance of talent and ability, when this is recognized as supreme in all walks of life and all forms of human activity other than political? Is the government of a country so very much easier than the management of a business, that we can place the policy making in the hands of the mediocre? Ours is a republic, not a democracy, let's keep it that way!

IV

The Rise of the Roman Republic

Rome sprang out of the Nordic nations, known as the Latins, who settled central Italy from north of the Alps. The Latin language, as also the ethnological character of the earlier and more pure Romans, was closely akin to that of the Celts, with whom they later fought many a long battle. In this they were similar to the original Hellenic Greeks, who were likewise a people close to the Celts, but who after having conquered Greece, had to fight off attempted invasions by their Celtic kindred who were following in their footsteps, and who endeavored to wrest their newly conquered land from them.

Like other Nordic peoples, the early Latins practised a form of constitutional monarchy—we might at a stretch call this a republic as their kings were frequently elected, and with the founding of Rome there was for a period of time a hereditary monarch. A few centuries before Christ, however, the hereditary kingship lost its power, and although the title of king was retained, as a priestly office (*rex sacrorum*) the republican form of government gained strength, and the effective power was entrusted to two elected consuls, or *praetores*, who held the *imperium*. They were elected by an assembly of the landholders or freemen, in the best traditions of the Nordic people, but the passing of laws and the choice of magistrates required the approval of the patrician sen-

ators. Slaves had no political powers, nor, originally had the plebeians or landless city dwellers who, while not slaves, certainly could not be classed alongside the land-owning freemen.

Under this truly republican system of government, wherein political power was restricted to landowning freemen, of true Roman origin, and denied to the immigrants, who could only become landless plebeians or slaves, the greatness of Rome emerged, until the greater part of the free world was not only dominated by Rome but benefited from the law and order that prevailed under Roman republican rule. The traditional liberties and laws of the Nordic Roman state were strongly entrenched and no senator or consul could change these laws, break them or go beyond them either within or without the natural provenance of his office. Law ruled triumphant, and the power of government, to be exercised only within the scope of the ancient laws of the nation, was wielded only by those of Roman lineage. No plebeian or person of non-Roman race could hope to become consul or senator . . . nor even, in the early days, a free land-owning farmer. This was the secret of Rome's strength. Even military service was restricted to those of Roman origin, to the landowning yeoman farmers, and plebeians could not bear arms for the defense of Rome.

But here was the seed of weakness that was to destroy Rome—after first giving Rome the crown of greatness. Having admitted persons of alien race into the streets of Rome, and onto the fields of the Latin lands surrounding Rome, Rome through those same wars which built up her greatness constantly generation after generation destroyed the pick of Roman youth, and Roman blood ran short, while plebeian blood and slave blood, safeguarded from the depredations of the battlefield, multiplied in its protected parasitic condition, until the numerical unbalance became crucial.

Then, when Rome found herself master of the known world, yet without sufficient Romans of true blood—and they had been few enough, indeed, when Rome was no more than a single, simple city—to fill the numerous executive appointments necessitated by such a vast overseas empire, the pressure from the ever-increasing multitudes of plebeians, and even slaves, began to exert itself.

While the old system worked, Rome's power and influence spread, and the name of Rome stood for integrity and honor. A Roman was a man respected, not reviled. Only patricians could sit on the council of *patres*, and to equalify for office a man had to prove his Roman ancestry through several generations. But with the depletion, through war, of the ranks of those who were Roman or even Latin by blood, with the dispersal, too, of those of true Roman ancestry, to posts of importance throughout the vast empire which Rome acquired, and with the rapid increase in numbers of the plebeians, swelled by constant immigration into Rome, now the capital of such vast domains, change was inevitable. The plebeians began to press for political rights, then for equality, and finally, by virtue of their numbers, for domination.

We all know what happened. Steadily the plebeians succeeded, and Rome, at the peak of her glory, passed from a republic into a democracy, citizenship was extended to all cities of her vast multi-racial empire, and dictators seized power, where none had been possible formerly, ostensibly owing their power to the support of the vast, ignorant electorate, who actually served only as their pawns. By virtue of the very deceit and corruption which was necessary to ensure their election by the vulgar masses, the inferiority of the new dictators, from a moral point of view, was ensured. Rome rapidly came to be despised, and became a symbol of all that was corrupt and evil. Men like Caligula, half-African

and half-Syrian, whose name has passed down to us over nearly two thousand years, as the very extreme of wretchedness, were able to seize the power once wielded with such loving care by the Senators under the republic, and the end was inevitable. The Teutonic nations from north of the Alps, members of that same purely European race from which the original Romans had sprung, strong in the wealth of their native morality, honor and patriotism, steadily pressed down upon Rome. Although vastly inferior in numbers to the mongrelized, plebeian-Roman population that now held sway, they stormed and destroyed the festering remnants of the once great Empire, and established the foundations of Medieval Europe, which under Teutonic leadership was to blossom anew and yet more beautifully, but yet which never really forgot the glory that had been ancient Rome.

V

The Decline of Rome

This erosion of power actually began with the appointment of Tribunes to look after the interest of the plebeians. At first the effect was mild and limited, and as such did little harm, although the Tribunes were elected annually. This was because the plebeians at this stage were mainly of the same Latin blood as the land-owning yeoman stock and the patrician rulers. Around the same time, the *lex Canuleia* permitted marriages between patricians and plebeians, which had hitherto been forbidden by law. Still, the plebeian ranks were mainly Latin in character, and little immediate harm was done—but the doors were being opened for the dysgenic flood that was to come, after the plebeian classes had themselves become mongrelized.

A hundred years later, in 367 B.C., the plebeians gained the right to elect a Consul, and here Robert Welch, in his generally excellent booklet *Republics and Democracies* unfortunately overlooks the racial significance of this bitter struggle—in the same way as he overlooks the significance of the present racial struggle in America. In 367 B.C. Rome was still on the upward swing, and continued so for many centuries. The Roman blood, even amongst the plebeians, had not yet been substantially diluted, and even in 367 B.C., when the plebeians won the right to elect a Consul, it was laid down that the

Consul so elected must himself be a patrician—must be chosen from that element of the population which was entirely pure in its blood. If it were democracy in itself, as Welch argues, that was evil, then from this point Rome would have begun to decay. But the reverse was true. Democracy has never been an out-and-out failure when exercised amongst pure Nordic or pure White communities. Equal rights for equal people is a feasible and workable political proposition, democracy only fails when introduced amongst a population which is racially, that is to say, inherently, unequal—or when a population practising a democratic system of government admits persons of other race into its ranks, and thus loses the close natural kinship and equality that makes democracy possible.

During this period of the expansion of Rome, a number of the wealthier plebeians were ennobled, but joined with the older patrician families in a tightly-knit and still racially-solid body, using the Senate and the Consuls as the main ruling institutions, the magistrates being appointed by them. But the conquests of the third and second centuries B.C. had effects which in the words of Pasquale Villari, the noted Italian historian, “sapped the very foundations” of the government. There was a vast import of “foreign slaves,” and “the whole structure of Roman society was altered, and the equality and homogeneity which had once been one of its chief characteristics was destroyed. The Roman nobles had not merely ceased, as in the old days, to till their own farms; they had found a means of enriching themselves beyond the dreams of avarice, and when they returned from the government of a province it was to build sumptuous villas, filled with the spoils of Greece and Asia, to surround themselves with troops of slaves and dependents . . . but the process was fraught with grave political danger owing to the peculiarities of the Roman constitution, which rested in theory on the ultimate sover-

eignty of the people, who were in practice represented by the city mob.”

Pasquali Villari continues: “Among the lower classes, contact with foreign slaves and freedmen, with foreign worships and foreign vices, produced a love of novelty which no legislation could check. Even amongst the women there were symptoms of revolt against the old order, which showed itself in a growing freedom of manners and impatience of control, the marriage tie was relaxed, and the respect for mother and wife, which had been so powerful a factor in the maintenance of the Roman standard of morals was grievously diminished.” In short, the family unit, which is the very essence of any sound racial hygiene, and has always been the pride and most cherished possession of Nordic communities at all times, was undermined, and interbreeding with the imported slaves and with the foreigners from Asia, Africa and all parts of the known world, began to accelerate. Fortunately, some of the slaves came from Europe, and in the subsequent history of Rome, Keltic, Teutonic and Hellenic freed slaves often played an important and noble role, for their blood was purer than that of the mongrelized Roman plebeian masses of the later empire. Yet the poison of non-European blood and the vices of the orient were there. A struggle for power between the mongrelized masses, no longer Roman in origin, developed, and “in this struggle the Roman republic perished, and personal government took its place. . . . but a far stronger resistance would have been opposed to the political revolution by the republican system had not public morals been sapped by the influences above described. Political corruption was reduced to a science for the benefit of individuals who were often faced with the alternatives of ruin or revolution; there was no longer anybody of sound public repute to whom, in the last resort, appeal could be made; and, long before the final catastrophe took place, Roman society had

become, in structure and temper, thoroughly unrep-
blican."

Once again, we find a parallel with the modern plight of America. We too are faced with an influx of aliens of different blood and lineage, of different race from that of our Nordic White founding fathers—an influx which the recent amendments to the McCarran-Walter act are intended to increase rather than restrict. The population of alien blood already within our boundaries is also increasing more rapidly than our own true White population, thanks to government subsidies which are closely parallel to the bread and circuses offered to appease the mob during the period of ancient Roman decadence. And we, too, started out with a kingship, which we improved into a republic, but are now trying to turn into a democracy. Already the results of this democratic revolution are the same as in ancient Rome. . . . political corruption has been reduced to a science, and personal government by corrupt dictators, capable of manipulating the vulgar vote, is already on its way. The more illiterate and the more mentally inferior voters that can be brought into the country, or can be enfranchised by the decisions of the Supreme Court, the more the corrupt politicians will rejoice, and the more impossible it will be for honest politicians to gain a majority. Time is running short. This is *still* a republic (if only just), and not a democracy. Let's keep it that way!

VI

The Venetian Republic

The world has seen few states more successful than republican Venice. Emerging as a small but independent nation in the ninth century, Venice adopted a democratic system of government, inspired no doubt by memories of the ancient Roman system.

The old *concione*, or general gathering, which originally elected the doge was, however, eventually replaced by an assembly comprising some four hundred and eighty members, representing the six divisions of the city, thus organizing the method of government more systematically than hitherto. This Great Council elected the executive leader, the doge, who had earlier been elected by the mass of the people direct, and systematized the entire form of government, ensuring greater continuity.

Then in the thirteenth century, came another change. The fourth crusade had given to Venice a monopoly of the trade with the Levant. As a result the population of Venice was growing rapidly, and a vast number of immigrants were flowing in, citizenship was undefined, and difficult to define, there being no adequate bureaucracy to keep check on the movements of people. Realizing the evils that could beset Venice if control of the city were to fall into the hands of a vast mass of foreigners who knew nothing and cared less for the traditions of the city or its overall welfare, the leading merchants resolved to form themselves into a close guild, ostensibly

for the purpose of ensuring the exploitation of the trade with the Levant, but also for the purpose of assuming real control of Venetian politics.

As a result of the establishment of this aristocratic oligarchy, the old assembly was abolished and a new Council of Ten instituted to advise and support the Doge. Membership of the council of Ten was to be limited to candidates who could prove that a paternal ancestor had sat in the Great Council. Thus only those of Venetian blood, on the paternal side, were eligible for membership.

The fact that this was not a very scientific form of racial discrimination, does not detract from the fact that here indeed was a decision to discriminate in favor of the indigeneous population against the multitude of immigrants, so many of whom were of completely different race, attracted to Venice from Africa, the Middle East and even further afield, wherever Venetian ships traded; and in fact for several centuries the policy must have been quite efficient, for although the ancient north Italian Venetian families might inter-marry with families of other European immigrants, who in physical appearance would be closely similar to themselves, there was little likelihood that any Venetian family of standing would allow any of its members, even if they wished, to marry Negro or Asian immigrants. So, the Republican system was instituted to replace the partially democratic system which had formerly existed, to protect the state from coming under the influence of the immigrant population, many of whom were non-European in race.

The moral is simple. While Venice remained a relatively pure racial community, a measure of democracy characterized its institutions, that democratic system being part of the ancient heritage of the north European peoples. But with the development of Venetian trading connections throughout the world, and increasing prosperity at home, Venice was in danger of being sub-

merged by its immigrant population of alien race, and was obliged to resort to a republican rather than a democratic form of Government to preserve sound Government. The record of history proves that their decision was correct. Venice survived and prospered, long after the mass of its population was lost in miscegenation, and became a mere rabble. The Government remained in the hands of the families of native European origin, even though the populace became mongrelized by African and Asian immigrants. To be sure, they committed a serious blunder in allowing the immigrants in at all, but in those days race science was unknown, and bureaucracies undeveloped, so that control would have been difficult to enforce. The fact remains, that the republican system of government preserved the prosperity and good government of Venice for centuries, when a democratic system would have resulted in a speedy introduction of misrule.

America today has the same problem as ancient Venice. Her prosperity means that people from all races throughout the world are anxious to migrate, legally or illegally, to this country, where they will shortly outnumber the original European population which they are already attempting to mongrelize. Fortunately this is already a republic. Let's keep it that way!

VII

Was Democracy Ever Successful?

When was the first democracy, and did it ever work?

We have already seen that democracy is a very ancient concept, and one of the oldest forms of government known. But *democracy has historically flourished only amongst the people of Nordic or pure-White Race, and has never succeeded for any period of time amongst people of any other racial type whatever*—at least not in any complex sophisticated form of society!

This is a big statement; but it is also a big fact—and one well worth examining and re-examining until we are personally quite sure that it is true. It is a BIG fact, and one which we must never allow ourselves to forget when discussing political systems. It is perhaps the biggest truth that this little book contains.

Anthropologists have divided the White Race into various sub-sections, of which the two leading varieties in history have been the Mediterranean and the Nordic races. The Mediterranean peoples were similar in features and appearance to the Nordics, clean, sharp-cut faces, with straight, thin noses, high foreheads and longish heads, but they were somewhat shorter and darker, with, we are told (and there seems little reason to disbelieve this) more emotional temperaments when compared with the more phlegmatic residents of northern Europe. The second great division of the White race

was the Nordic, who historically inhabited what is now Scandinavia, Germany, Holland, France, Belgium, Britain, and also conquered and settled France, Spain, Switzerland, Austria, large areas of eastern Europe and northern Italy—although their blood has since run thin in the latter countries.

It was these Nordic peoples who have since the earliest of recorded times practiced a form of moderate but successful democracy. Even before recorded history we have evidence that they had a similar elective system of government.

The standard pattern was that the Nordic peoples were divided into small nations comprising a yeoman farmer community; each yeoman farmer tilled his own ground and possessed equal rights to those of his kinsman neighbor. Matters of law and policy were decided at meetings attended by the heads of families, or by all adult males, and leadership was entrusted by popular choice to the most worthy members of the oldest known families. Amongst the Anglo Saxons the gathering was known as the Moot, but the same system prevailed in other Nordic countries, and even when the Norsemen settled Iceland in the eleventh century they took to Iceland the same representative system of government which their people had known from the earliest of times, so that Iceland today, which was spared the impact of feudalism, has the oldest continuous elected parliament in the world.

The origin of the word "moot" was the Old English or Saxon *gemot* meaning "to meet," and the Moot Hall wherein the moot was held, was the origin of the modern town-hall.

When nations came together or merged, the local Moots or gatherings became too large, and distances too great, to allow everyone to attend, and a Witane-gemoot, or higher Moot was formed, which was a national council or assembly, and was attended by chosen rep-

representatives from each individual local Moot.

We have said that the leaders were elected by the people, and this was almost invariably the case. The elections, it is true, were made from amongst the more ancient or noble families, families whose members had been held in high respect for generations, and no foreigner could qualify for election. The whole system was, in fact, a racial system, with the heads of the families participating in the Moots and electing leaders from amongst the oldest and most ancient, the racially most-pure of the nation's families. Great attention was always paid to lineage, and before Christianity it was taken for granted that the noble families were descended from the great heroes of the past, often from the Gods themselves, and the typical racial characteristics (of fairness and light colored eyes) were expected as a matter of course amongst all members of the leading families.

This democratic system worked extremely well amongst the Nordic peoples, and we find no traces whatsoever in early history of any discontent or dissatisfaction with it. Never was it heard that a nation revolted against itself, since if a leader were unsatisfactory it was possible for the people to elect another from amongst the same ancient and noble families. The simple fact was that the Nordic nations were each comprised of people who were kinsmen, people of the same race, and therefore there was the tie of blood and a natural genetic attachment to the same manner of living, an inborn similarity of attitude, which cannot be found easily amongst the mixed-race nations of today. The early Nordic peoples were devoted to the genealogy of their ancestors, and when they conquered another race the conquered people were allowed to survive only as slaves, without civic rights, and so did not disturb the kinship and inborn equality of the conquering peoples. Equality of rights and equality of political status was therefore possible for all free men, in the sense that the people, as

members of the same great family, as biological equals, *were equal*.

Equal rights for equal people was the belief amongst our ancestors. And equality was ensured for the freeman by keeping the nation genetically and biologically pure, and by allowing strangers of conquered race to live amongst them only as slaves.

That of course, is only a generalization, and it was the exceptions to this rule that slowly brought about the changeover from early primeval Nordic democracy to feudalism, and from feudalism to present day chaos.

The Nordic peoples, as we have said, did not remain content in their northern political paradise, but were inspired by the spirit of adventure and by the temptation of conquest and wealth to move eastwards and southwards. They also moved westwards, even, across the Atlantic, and Vikings discovered America in the eleventh or early twelfth centuries, but found it undeveloped and lacking in the rich spoils which were to be gained by exploration and conquest in the already thickly inhabited areas of the Mediterranean and eastern Europe. As the Germanic and Scandinavian peoples spread their domain over the whole of Europe, they found themselves extended as a conquering and ruling aristocracy, few in numbers, yet wielding power over vast masses of people, and with the significant change which resulted in the ratio of slaves to freemen (of conquering race) the elective element of the community became very restricted in number and in place of the old democratic system there came feudalism. Feudalism was, in essence, a distortion of the old freeman-slave society to cope with the vastly greater number of "slaves," over which the thinly spread Nordics found themselves ruling when they conquered southern Germany and Austria, France, Italy, Spain and even distant places such as Sicily and Cyprus—each of which received a new nobility from the northern lands. The conquering Nor-

dic freemen still kept the land, but now all regarded themselves nobles, since each found himself in possession of large domains. And to keep some degree of control over the vast subject slave or "villain" population, they decreed that these conquered races should not only be without political rights, but that they should be tied to the land, and should not be allowed to wander from one lord's estate to another—for if granted the right of mobility there would have been no controlling them.

Under this system, new territorial "nations" grew up which had no direct kinship value, and the serfs and bondsmen who comprised the lower grades of the nation—the slave grades—had little blood kinship with the nobles. The nobles, remembering their ancient community of race and origin, shared a feeling of unity with the nobles of the neighboring nations (with whom, they not only inter-married but, unfortunately, too often began to compete militarily), which they did not share with their own slaves. Thus, the age of feudalism, in many ways one of the brightest epochs of our race—certainly when studied from the point of view of the color, vitality and appreciation of art which developed under the patronage of the nobles—had its dark side. The old nation-state which had permitted democracy and equality of rights amongst the freemen disappeared. Instead feudalism represented a state of affairs where each freeman had so much wealth and power, such vast estates at his command, that he could no longer practice the ancient democratic way of life which was his earliest birthright.

The ennobled freemen still endeavored to keep up a semblance of their ancient right to elect rulers, and elected "kings" or "emperors" were still to be found in many areas, but, living so geographically distant from each other now, since each was surrounded by his own broad conquered lands, the old moots naturally tended to fall into decay. The Franks, the Teutonic people who

conquered northern France, still preserved an annual moot every year, but it was a shadow of the real force it had been earlier. Autocratic feudalism replaced the remnants of the ancient Nordic democracy almost everywhere, except in the northern homeland amongst the Nordic people who had stayed at home, who, while partially accepting something of the feudal idea which had grown up all over the rest of Europe, wherever their conquering relatives had settled, generally adhered to their ancient elective system. So, in particular, it was that in Iceland—so far removed from the mainland of Europe and without any conquered indigenous race—early Nordic democracy survived in its fullest and purest form, right up to the present day.

The final development of feudalism occurred in the central and northern mainland of Europe, where feudal lords eventually began to claim the divine support of God to rule, because of their racial or hereditary separateness from the mass of the people, and in Spain the aristocrats were described as having "blue blood in their veins" because the blood showed blue through the fair skin on their hands and body, while no such phenomenon appeared in the case of the darker skinned serf-classes. But these areas where the nobles continued to preserve their ancient democratic rights and, amongst themselves only (excluding the villains or slaves) continued to elect their kings and emperors, were properly described as republics—hence the Polish aristocratic republic, and the Holy Roman Empire of medieval Germany.

Then the democratic system which had worked well amongst the simple homogeneous and relatively pure Teutonic nations when they lived in northern Europe gave way to a republican, aristocratic system of government when the same peoples moved southwards and eastwards and conquered new lands already containing large numbers of alien inhabitants. Then it became nec-

essary and desirable to limit the democratic rights only to those people who were equal: to the few of pure race who survived as a ruling class only.

Thus it will be seen that a democracy has historically been possible only where all members of the society are biologically equal, and share a close kinship of interest which comes only from a kinship of blood. A republic is a system which, while elective, restricts control to the more capable elements of a varied and diverse, unequal society. The democratic form of government also requires a steady mind and a controlled emotional outlook, it has historically only flourished in one part of the world—that part inhabited by Teutonic-Celtic (Nordic or Indo-European) people of relatively pure blood. Nowhere else in the history of the world has it found the rigorous standards essential to its success. Republics, on the other hand, being specially suitable to cope with the problems of multi-racial societies of diverse race and ability, have thrived in these areas of White or Nordic, Indo-European conquest, enabling the control of government to rest with the superior elements of society—which in a multi-racial society is automatically equated with the superior racial strain.

VII

Aristocracy and Republics

It is thus a remarkable and significant characteristic of republics that they usually assume the existence of an aristocracy. As we have seen, Aristotle considered that aristocracy was the best form of government by the few, while republics were the best form (as contrasted with democracy) of government by the many. But history does not allow us to accept Aristotle's system of classification as anything more than a wise but over-rigid analysis, and the subsequent history of the Western powers has revealed many republics which were, in effect aristocracies.

We have seen how, historically, the rise of modern aristocracy in Europe was generally to be traced to the period of the Folk-Wandering, which saw the expansion and territorial conquest of the Teutons, who established themselves as a ruling class wherever they went. Since in their newly-elevated position as nobles, as distinct from mere freemen, they retained their political right to be consulted by their leaders, and generally, to elect their leaders, the aristocracy played an effective part in the government of the land as a whole, beside exercising very extensive powers within their own realms.

Thus an aristocracy is, etymologically speaking, "the rule of the best," and Greek philosophers generally regard it as the rule by those who most nearly attain the

ideals of human perfection.

Similarly, the aristocrats of ancient Greece and Rome were slave-owning Nordic aristocracies. Even during the ruling race never shared the government with the great mass of the non-Nordic population who were their most "democratic" periods of ancient history, the Nordic slaves, and the system of government, although republican, was in fact aristocratic and not democratic. Only toward the end of Greece and Rome, as both slipped into decay, the freeing of the slaves brought democracy, and final collapse.

It is revealing to draw a parallel with the condition of eighteenth century United States, when our Constitution was created. Large numbers of the inhabitants of the country were slaves, just as had been the case in the ancient aristocratic-republicans of Greece and Rome. It was not considered practicable to allow all men, illiterate or otherwise, to share the control of power, and so the constitution that was chosen for America was not a democracy, but a republic.

An authentic story is told of Benjamin Franklin, which is widely known—although one wonders how often the implications are considered in this, the proper context. As Benjamin Franklin left the Independence Hall, after the signing of the Constitution, he was stopped by a lady who asked: "What kind of government have you given us, Mr. Franklin?" The great and wise statesman replied: "A republic—if you can keep it, Ma'am."

Yes. This is a republic, not a democracy. Let's keep it that way!

VIII

The Republican Constitution of America

When William Pitt read the Constitution of the United States of America, he exclaimed: "It will be the wonder and admiration of all future generations and the model of all future constitutions." Gladstone echoed similar thoughts when he said: "It is the greatest piece of work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The making of the American Constitution was certainly one of the finest events in the history of man. It was fortunate in being fashioned at a time when, throughout the eighteenth century, the whole of the Western world had been deeply interested in the nature and history of political science, and it was fashioned by men who, though educated and scholarly to the last degree, were nevertheless sufficiently removed from the trials and problems of Europe to be able to study the experiences of Europe in a detached manner, and choose the shape of the American Constitution free from the emotions and pressures which surrounded all existing European forms of government. A new nation was being forged and the moulders of the American Constitution had the experience of the entire Western world before them. They used it well.

Through reflection, insight, scholarly study and prac-

tical experience, the formulators of the American Constitution chose a republic. They knew the history of other forms of Government that had gone before, and the circumstances in which these forms of Government had thrived or decayed. They knew the history of Greece, Rome, Venice, Florence, the Netherlands and the other countries of Europe. Knowing all this, and after long debate, they eventually produced the Constitution with which we are all so familiar.

Nicholas Butler

We cannot do better, here, than to quote from Nicholas Butler's book, *Why Should We Change Our Form of Government?* written many years ago. What he says still holds true today, for the American Constitution founded upon two thousand years of Western political experience, was meant to last for many centuries, not just a decade or two: "This form of government was founded by men whose minds were fixed upon the problems involved in the creation of political institutions. They were thinking of liberty, of representative government, of protection against tyranny and spoliation, and of ways and means by which public opinion might, in orderly fashion, express itself in statute laws, in judicial judgments and in executive acts. The task of the founders was a political task, and with what almost superhuman wisdom, foresight and skill they accomplished it, is recorded history . . . It is a noteworthy and singular characteristic of our American government that the Constitution provides a means for protecting individual liberty from invasion by the powers of government itself, as well as from invasion by others more powerful and less scrupulous than ourselves. The principles underlying our civil and political liberty are indelibly written into the Constitution of the United States, and the nation's courts are instituted for their protection . . .

"The representative *republic* erected on the American continent under the Constitution of the United States

is a more advanced, more just and wiser form of government than the socialistic and direct democracy which it is now proposed to substitute for it . . . To put the matter bluntly, there is under way in the United States at the present time a definite and determined movement to change our representative *republic* into a socialistic democracy. That attempt, supported by men of conviction, men of sincerity, men of honest purpose, men of patriotism, as they conceive patriotism, is the most impressive political factor in our public life of today . . . It presents itself in many persuasive and seductive forms. It uses attractive formulas to which men like to give adhesion; but if it is successful, it will bring an end to the form of government that was founded when our Constitution was made and that we and our fathers and grandfathers have known and glorified in."

The founders of the Constitution and those who followed them in early years never faltered in the conviction that it was a republic they cherished, not a democracy. As Hamilton said: "We are a Republican Government. Real liberty is never found in a despotism or in the extremes of Democracy."

In the light of a statement such as that, there is no doubt that Hamilton and his colleagues knew all about democracies, and the fact that the Constitution nowhere mentions the word democracy is more than an accident. Not only does the word democracy not appear in the Constitution, but it appears nowhere in the constitutions of any of the fifty states.

James Madison, another of the slave-owning Founding Fathers, wrote: "Democracies have ever been found incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

How then did this deep conviction in the advantages of a republic over a democratic system of government come to be shaken? The answer is simple: from

the spread of Socialist-Communist race-mixing ideology. And let us make no bones about this. The opposition of Communism to Conservatism is not merely one of private capital versus state capital. As modern technology progresses, and corporations grow yet larger in relation to the small one-man business, the political issue becomes less clear. But when all is said and done, the real Communism is race-mixing, race-levelling. It is the destruction of our Western civilization in its entirety, and with it our western White race, not merely the destruction of the capitalist system. Those who think that the fight against Communism is merely the fight to defend Capitalism are sadly misguided—and may well falter and fail in the fight ahead. We are on the defensive against far worse evils than this, our whole civilization—our very biological heritage, is threatened. Money falls into insignificance beside the value of our cultural and ideological heritage, our civilization and our Race. The real danger from the spread of the democratic idea is the dispersion of power to those of inferior ability, those of subordinate race, who have been allowed within our gates.

Robert Welch

Robert Welch, in his book *Republics and Democracies*, has done invaluable work in drawing attention to the present threat to our Republic, by those who are trying to distort the Constitution into a Democracy. To see how the poison of these multi-racialists works we can do no better than to quote from him as follows:

"These conspiratorial hands first got seriously to work in this country in the earliest years of the Twentieth Century. The Fabian philosophy and strategy was imported to America from England as it had been earlier to England from Germany. Some of the members of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, founded in 1905, and some of the members of the League for Industrial Democracy into which it grew, were already a part of, or

affiliated with, an international Communist conspiracy, planning to make the United States a portion of a one-world Communist state. Others saw it as possible and desirable merely to make the United States a separate Socialist Utopia. But they all knew and agreed that to do either they would have to destroy both the constitutional safeguards and the underlying philosophy which made it a republic. So, from the very beginning, the whole drive to convert our republic into a democracy was in two parts. One part was to make our people come to believe that we had, and were supposed to have, a democracy. The second part was actually and insidiously to be changing the republic into a democracy. . .

"It was under Wilson, of course, that the first huge parts of the Marxian program, such as the progressive income tax, were incorporated into the American system. It was under Wilson that the first huge legislative steps to break down what the Romans would have called our 'mixed constitution' of a republic, and convert it into the homogeneous jelly of a democracy, got under way with such measures as the direct election of Senators. And it was under Wilson that the first great propaganda slogan was emblazoned everywhere, to make Americans start thinking favorably of democracies and forget that we had a republic. This was, of course, the slogan of the first World War: "To make the world safe for democracy." If enough Americans had, by those years, remembered enough of their own history, they would have been worrying about how to make the world safe *from* democracy. But the great deception and the great conspiracy were already well under way. . . .

"In 1928 the U.S. Army Training Manual, used for all of our men in uniform, gave the following quite accurate definition of a democracy: "A government of the Masses. . . . Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

"In *The Soldiers Guide*, issued in June of 1952, we find the following: 'Meaning of democracy, *Because the United States is a Democracy*, the majority of the people decide how our government will be organized and run—and that includes the Army, Navy and Air Force . . .'

"Former Governor Lehman of New York, in his first inaugural message in 1922, did not once use the word democracy. The poison had not yet reached into the reservoirs from which flowed his political thoughts. In his inaugural message of 1935 he used the word "democracy" twice. The poison was beginning to work. In his similar message of 1939 he used the word "democracy," or a derivative thereof, *twenty-five* times. And less than a year later, on January 3rd 1940, in his annual message to the New York legislature, he used it thirty-three times. The poison was now permeating every stream of his political philosophy."

Welch's analysis is perfect, except for one thing—unfortunately the most important thing. He forgets that *equality is a sound and just principle for people who are equal*. The only objection, therefore, against democracy in the United States, is that with the present multi-racial pattern the people of the United States are simply not all equal—every year an increasing proportion of the population has the misfortune to be born "unequal." That is a big fact—one upon which all our decisions must henceforth be based. A fact which was not overlooked by the Founding Fathers, slave-owners as they were. Even Thomas Jefferson said: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of Fate, that these people are to be free: but being free, it is equally certain we could not live together in the same government."

Political upheavals have always been frequent in multi-racial states. Political banditry is common in Latin America, because the people have not the backbone to defend their liberties, they are easy dupes to the Communist dictators. But the Anglo-Saxon, Keltic, Teutonic

and true White peoples of the United States are of stronger material than this. As we have seen, our people have historically been the only people who could sustain and make democracy work. When we conquered other lands, we gave firm government, either of an aristocratic type or else as a republican type, or a combination of both, to the people of other races over whom we ruled. Here in America we find ourselves fast becoming a minority—yes, a minority—and we have to accustom ourselves to this idea. Democracy cannot work in the multi-racial state which our United States has become, and for our own sakes and those of our children—also for the good of the other races living in this Union, we must ensure that the Republic which was given to us by our ancestors, the Founding Fathers, is preserved, and not supplanted by a democracy, which, in view of the present racial make-up of our nation, would be Communism in disguise, or would very soon develop into that same Communism.

This is a Republic. Let's keep it that way!