

WEST HOOKER

REPLIES

TO

A

CRITIC

WEST HOOKER REPLIES TO CRITIC

March 26, 1955

Dear Mrs. Van Hying:

Enclosed please find copy of a letter I sent to a Mr. Roebuck who wrote me in regard to the ADL bulletin smear job recently done on me. Photostat of that job is enclosed and was taken from the February, 1955 ADL Bulletin.

If you think it is worth printing in your paper, why go right ahead and do so.

Best regards to you,
West Hooker.

Mr. Hooker's letter is well worth your careful reading. The dignity, the simplicity and impersonal statement of his "Christian position" cannot but increase your own stature and self-respect. You will also respect this young man, who from love of country has made himself a target for "smear" and "abuse". Why shouldn't a person of "money, youth, social position" defend his creed and his country?

Mr. Hooker is organizer for the Nationalists Party (of the U.S.A.), 224 East 38th Street, New York City. He is merely another in the long line of patriots, whom Washington foresaw would become "suspect and adious," "Smear" is rapidly becoming the yard stick of measurement between "real patriots" and pretenders, even as CHRISTIAN is the dividing line.

L.C.V.H.

March 15, 1955

Mr. Mark Roebuck
Brooklyn, New York
Dear Mr. Roebuck:

Thank you for your letter of March 11th and contents noted.

You mention that you have just finished reading "The Case of the Charming Bigot" in the ADL Bulletin and that it seems unbelievable to you "that a young man with a fine background of both family and education could possibly lend himself to a program of anti-Semitism."

I am sure you mean well in your letter and that you are a very sincere person, and I therefore want to answer your letter just as sincerely. If in my "rebuttal" my writing takes on a testy tone, I assure you I don't mean it that way. I am truly trying to give a conscientious rebuttal to your statements.

First then, I want to ask you a question. Did it ever occur to you that perhaps the ADL Bulletin could be referring to me incorrectly when they say I am "anti-Semitic"? In the current Arab versus Israel issue, I tend to side with the Arabs, who are, of course, Semites. I would then tend to be "pro-Semitic," and those people that go by the name of "Israelites" would be the ones that would be "anti-Semitic."

You are perhaps now saying to yourself: "Well, you know what they mean—their use of the term 'anti-Semitic' means 'anti-Jewish'."

My next question to you is: "Do you think it's an accident that the word 'anti-Semitic' is used instead of the word 'anti-Jewish'?" I will answer my own question and assure you that it is really no accident at all that the word 'anti-Semitic' is used in place of the word 'anti-Jewish.'

In another part of your letter you mention, "Our country has progressed because of our democratic way of life." Technically speaking, we have not progressed because of our democratic way of life, but because of our republican way of life. The word "democracy" does not appear anywhere in our Declaration of Independence nor in our Constitution. In fact, our Founding Fathers were very careful and explicit to avoid a "democracy" and to set up a "republic." The word "democracy" comes from the word "demos," which means "mob." And the "-cracy" part means "rule," and therefore the word in its entirety refers to mob rule. Our Founding Fathers were very careful, as I say, to avoid a democracy then. They set up a system where "the people" elected local officials or "electors"—whom presumably they knew, at least slightly, in those days, and then in turn the electors elected from their own numbers the President, etc. In this way the Founding Fathers put one step in between

the direct election from the people up to the President. In this way then they intended to avoid a democracy, and by definition, therefore set up a republic.

I would agree with you, however, that since that time certain forces have brought about a change—somewhat away from a republic to more or less of a democracy—what with the 17th Amendment and other things.

In another part of your letter, you ask the question: "Merely because our religious beliefs vary, does it mean that I would do harm to my country any more than you?" You also say "When we are born, regardless of race, color or creed, we receive love, not hate."

Let's take your words "race, color and creed" and break them down. Race and color are determined by God, and so no one could possibly control what race or color he is—obviously. But why do you, and some others—in fact, the current propaganda trend is to always couple race and color with "creed." This, of course, is wholly incorrect because the word "creed" refers to what people believe in. And what people believe in is determined by the persons themselves, not by God. In fact, God allows one to choose his own belief or religion or creed, and therefore in that sense it is not comparable in any way with race or color—which we have absolutely no power to change whether we wanted to or not. But we do have the power to change our "creed," as I have already stated. Granted, no one should be against anyone because of their race or color. But it is perfectly all right to be against someone because of his creed—assuming that the creed is an obnoxious or unattractive or dangerous one, or an evil or satanic one.

In all the public information media we hear over and over, "We must be tolerant of everyone, no matter what their race, color, or creed." What if one's creed is, let's say, communism. Or let's say somebody else's creed is, for example, worshipping the devil. Or again let's say somebody's creed is to kill every first-born child and offer it up to some god who is the head of that creed. Should we all then be forced to tolerate such a creed? Of course not. But nevertheless, thundering across the nation from everywhere we hear "We are against no one because of his race, color or creed." Even Fulton Sheen at the end of his television program shows a card with words to the effect that "we are against no one because of his race, color or creed." If someone's creed is communism then, we are to assume that Bishop Sheen wants to love or tolerate communism.

Yes, my friend, strange things are happening in our land today, especially in the field of propaganda, and it is these "strange things" that I am directing my energies toward—to discover what's behind them and why our people are being misled so much.

And now to answer your other question, "If our religious beliefs vary, does it mean that I would do harm to my country any more than you?" The answer to that question depends upon what your creed is and what my creed is. All creeds then should be examined as to their content, and then we should see whether they could be tolerated or not.

My "creed" is "Christianity." Christians can tolerate any creed—non-Christian, or what have you—as long as it is not anti-Christian. For example, Islam and Christianity can get along well enough together side by side, as neither can be truly said to be "anti" the other, and both are "anti the devil" or evil. Our Lord taught us only to hate evil, and to love all else.

And so as to whether you would do harm to our country any more than I would, even though our "creeds" might vary—the only thing that I can say in order to answer that question would be to ask you what your creed is? You didn't tell me what your creed was in your letter, but if I assume that your creed means no harm to our country and means no harm to Christianity, which is by far the majority creed in this country,—then there would be no reason for us not to get along, even though our creeds might vary—as long as they don't vary in the manner described herein.

My creed, that of Christianity, is open for everyone to see. We have a Bible, which is the largest seller in the world. Our Bibles are almost everywhere—in hotels, etc. However, I must confess that there have been some attempts by some persons of a certain to prevent the distribution of these bibles in certain areas in our country.

Generally speaking, there are only two creeds in the United States of America—that is, with any number of people—and they are "Christianity" and "Judaism." Since you didn't specify, I am going to take the liberty of assuming that your creed is that known as "Judaism"—since you said our creeds varied. If your creed of Judaism is not anti-Christian, and is anti-evil, then I see no reason why we should have any trouble getting along together in our country, but first, would you tell me something about your creed, if it is Judaism? As I said, we Christians have millions of Bibles available in stores throughout the world. And as I also said, it is the best seller on the book lists every year, year after year. And so anyone can find out about Christianity by reading the Bible.

But what do we read if we want to find out about Judaism? I haven't been able to find any Jewish Bible. I have never seen any sold anywhere. In fact, I daresay most Christians don't even know what Judaism stands for. How can the Jews even know what it stands for if they don't sell a Jewish Bible or hand it out in some manner or other—so that we can all study it.

I read something about Judaism in the June 17, 1952 issue of LOOK magazine. Therein, one Rabbi Kertzer, Director of Inter-Religious Activities of the American Jewish Committee, stated that the creed of Judaism was as outlined in the 63 volumes of the Talmud, and that the Talmud was the textbook used in the training of Rabbis. Does one have to be a Rabbi to read the Talmud? Why isn't it available for everyone to read? Have you ever read the Talmud? How many Jews would you say read the Talmud? I don't see how anyone could read the Talmud—it's so difficult to get hold of. After I searched and searched, and saw it was almost impossible to obtain one, my curiosity was really provoked, and I was determined to find out something about the Talmud.

After searching for awhile, I learned some strange things. I found, for example, that most of the Talmuds there were (and there are not many available), but those that are, are mostly written in Hebrew, and that very few people can read Hebrew. Then I learned that about 1935 or 1936 the 63 volumes in Hebrew were translated into English, and in the process were reduced to about 36 volumes. These English versions are also extremely difficult to obtain—which seems strange to me, a Christian, used to having our Christian Bible in almost every room of the house, and sold everywhere.

Finally, however, I was able to get a look at the English translation of the Talmud, and frankly, my friend, I was truly shocked at what I read.

For example, I read something like this: Do not strike a Christian because there are many more Christians than you, and if the Christians retaliated in kind, you would be destroyed. BUT, if you see a Christian drowning and no one else sees or know, that you are watching him drown—then, according to the Talmud, it says you are to let the Christian drown.

You can well understand, Mr. Roebuck, how amazed I was at finding this in the Talmud. And then I read something else that shocked me even more. The Talmud said that it was all right to have a counterfeit conversion to Christianity if the purpose was to deceive Christians. And at this point you could have blown me over with a feather, Mr. Roebuck.

And then, reading on further, I came across a section which said something to the effect that even the best of the Christians should be killed, and in time of war the good among the Christians are to be killed. And I read further that a high place in Heaven was arranged for those who kill Christians.

After all, Mr. Roebuck, you wouldn't expect me to turn the other cheek to this kind of thing, would you? Am I to tolerate those who believe in this? Perhaps you don't know that these things are in the Talmud, and that these things are part of your creed. If this isn't your creed, Mr. Roebuck, I should think that you Jews would remove these things from your Talmud. If you can't do that, I should think you would find another creed. Do you suppose Fulton Sheen

wants me to tolerate this kind of thing? Of course he does not, but who makes him put at the end of his program word to the effect that he and we are not against anyone because of their race, color, or their creed—no matter what their creed is?

Mr. Roebuck, when I studied more and more about Judaism, I learned that the word "Judaism" was a replacement for the word "Phariseeism" and "Talmudism." I later discovered the reason for these word changes, which again is too extensive to go into in this letter. But again, like the use of the words "Semite" and "Semitic" when you mean "Jewish"—it all has to do with propaganda to deceive both Christians and many many Jews too, I believe. I know that 99% of the Christians don't know what is in the Talmud. I am also beginning to believe that a large percentage of Jews don't know what is in the Talmud either. But these masses of Jews are told to go along with it, nevertheless—and to fight for it, love it and defend it, even though they don't know what's in it. But enough of this; back to the main point.

As I studied further, I learned that your Rabbis say that "Judaism" is just another word for "Phariseeism" and that the philosophy or creed of both is the same and is outlined in the Talmud. Your Rabbis also state that not one word of this creed or the writing in the Talmud has been changed since the time of Jesus Christ. Our Bible is very clear on what Jesus thought of the Pharisees. As a matter of fact, he picked up a scourge and went into the Temple, and drove out the scribes, the Pharisees and the money-changers." He beat them with the scourge (which is another word for the bull-whip) and over-turned their tables, etc. Jesus appeared to be outnumbered when he did this, so he must have been a pretty big, rugged and brave fellow, wouldn't you think? He must have had a lot of courage, or "guts" as we say today, musn't he?

And since my childhood, like other Christians, I have been taught that the best thing we can do in life is to imitate Jesus and be as much like him as we can. Well, I am trying to do that, Mr. Roebuck. In other words, I am certainly against the Pharisees of today. I admit it's kind of hard to figure out who the Pharisees are—of today—but it appears that most of the Pharisees of today are members of the faith or creed called "Judaism." It doesn't necessarily follow, however, that all those people that call themselves Jews are Pharisees. I certainly wouldn't think it would be fair to call them Pharisees—or all of them—if a lot of them don't even know what Judaism is, or that it is another word for Phariseeism.

Let's say, for example, that you are a "Jew" but that you didn't know about some of these things I have mentioned in this letter, and that therefore you wouldn't be a true believer in "Phariseeism." As I say, if you didn't know these things, I think it would be grossly unfair for me to be anti-you. But if you did know them, you could hardly blame me for being anti-you, could you?

Jesus ended by being crucified by the Pharisees, and as a result of the Pharisees. But the Pharisees, being very clever, got a few of the Roman "Dupes" to help them crucify Jesus. The "Dupes" at least later regretted their actions, repented, and became Christians. But the Pharisees secretly sneaked away and were very proud of what they had done. And according to the Rabbis of today they have not changed one word of their ideology or creed, even today, and are continuing just as before.

This doesn't sound too good for me. Mr. Roebuck, because if I keep on trying to imitate Jesus Christ, I will probably end up getting "crucified" just like he did. Don't misunderstand me—I am no Jesus Christ—I just said I was trying to imitate him, in a very small way.

But frankly, Mr. Roebuck, among other things which I don't have that he had, I also don't have the "guts" that he had, either. In other words, I don't want to die before my time, but I certainly—and you can put this down most emphatically—I certainly have got the guts to withstand the barrage of smear attacks that the Jews or Pharisees are putting up against me in the ADL Bulletin, and from there to be carried out elsewhere.

As a matter of fact, to be perfectly frank, what I am trying to do is to gather together or rejuvenate some more Christians and try to help them get a little more "guts" so that they would be a little more willing to live up to their Christian faith and try to imitate Jesus Christ a little more, and start cleaning out the Pharisees from among our people. In our history, Mr. Roebuck, we have had other people with quite a lot of "guts." For example, King Edward I of England in the year 1290 A.D. banished all the Pharisees and Talmudists from the land, and the Pharisees didn't come back to England until about the year 1615 when some of the Pharisees financed Cromwell, and Cromwell took over England. In the 1300 and 1400's, Holland, Spain, France, and other countries banished all of their Pharisees, too, but again the Pharisees returned to these countries also. As a matter of fact, these Pharisees now seem to have control of the very core of the banking systems, and as a result, the educational and public-opinion-forming media, propaganda and Government agencies,—and are proceeding to make it a little difficult to get along well for those true but few Christians who are still trying to imitate Jesus Christ.

It seems that these same Pharisees and their "Dupes" have a stranglehold on our own money and banking system in the U.S.A., have a hand in the great foundations, and thereby influence education, science, and "knowledge," and history,—and are steadily channeling true Christianity into a sort of false hubbub of brotherhood which even tolerates

anti-Christianity. (Imagine that! A Christianity that tolerates anti-Christianity!)

And so, Mr. Roebuck, my creed is true Christianity (not the deviated kind), the rugged, Jesus Christ, anti-Pharisee kind of Christianity, and even though, as you say "maybe our creeds may vary," there is no reason why either you or I should "do harm to our country." This, as I say, as long as you are *not* a Pharisee. And if you are a Pharisee (which I do not believe you are), then you've got a battle on your hands with me and a lot of other Christians, once they wake up.

The Pharisees probably will figure that they will win; as a Christian, however, I believe that we true Christians will win.

Some other time I should like to discuss with you how these various creeds effect our Government politics, segregation versus assimilation, nationalism versus internationalism; and in any event, how nice it would be if we could both be on the same side—that is, good versus evil, Christ versus anti-Christ, segregation and natural assimilation versus forced integration, and forced assimilation; and other things.

Best regards, and good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WEST HOOKER.

"ROOSEVELT'S COMMUNIST MANIFESTO!"

by

EMANUEL M. JOSEPHSON

Proceeds from sale of this book are devoted to the struggle for the preservation of human liberty. This book is dedicated to

THE CONSTITUTION

a blue print of human organization drawn up by the wisest group of men who ever assembled for that purpose.

It is eternally true in its concept of liberty as the fundamental basis of government.

This is published in the hope of restoring the Constitution as our basic law, and preserving the liberty that it was designed to give us, against the onslaught of conspirators from without and within, so that America may become again " . . . the land of the free . . ."

Price \$3.00

WOMEN'S VOICE

WOMEN'S VOICE
537 SO. DEARBORN ST.
ROOM 800
CHICAGO 5, ILL.