

# Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-08/msg01063.html>

---

- *From:* "Dennis B" <Utopian@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 17 Aug 2006 11:59:40 -0700
- 

Dennis B wrote:

My "fortress" is under heavy attack. My terminal has been hacked as have my phelines (not to mention the issues with food/water supplies). Attempts to post this reply to the original thread have been unsuccessful. Therefore, I have decided to try posting this response as a new topic. I will be abandoning this damaged system within the next day and shall properly post a copy of this message as a response to the original thread once I am back online. Hopefully this attempt will be successful.

-Dennis

T Wake wrote:

It doesn't matter how much you assert this is "THE primary law of life."

For it to be accepted as true, first the impartial observer must accept you

as capable of determining what (if anything) is "THE primary law" of anything.

I say the primary law of life is survival because the primary function of a lifeform is to live.

Is it? Shame everything dies then isn't it?

Says who? What research have you done to support this claim?

What about the claims that the primary function is to pass an organism's genetic heritage on?

Survival is the primary function of the genome. The genome is a lifeform. The organism is merely an extension of the genome.

Reproduction occurs in order to statistically ensure survival of the species/sub-species genome.

By the very definition of "live", to live is to survive. That is a fact. If a lifeform fails to live and/or survive, it ceases to exist.

Word soup. Have you been taking lessons of Relf?

I am ultimately speaking about the genome.

All instinctive behaviors cohere to ensure survival.

Says who? Survival or reproduction?

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

Survival of the genome.

There are counter examples of lifeforms which will compromise their "survivability" in order to reproduce.

Yes. In order to ensure survival of the species/sub-species genome.

Kind of flies against your theory, doesnt it?

No. I said that the primary law of life is to survive. Not only survival of the self, but also survival of the species/sub-species (through reproduction). An organism must survive to reproduce.

Not only as an individual but also as a species.

Which takes primacy?

I would suspect that it depends upon the population. If the environment is overpopulated reproduction is disadvantageous to survival. Many will begin to die due to food shortages until a balance is achieved.

Therefore, I believe that the primary law of life is a balance between survival of the self and of the species/sub-species.

Surely survival of the species over the individual also invalidates your "primary law."

No. Survival in general (by any means necessary) is the law of life.

Obviously you dont think so, but your grasp of logic is shaky to say the least.

You don't understand my logic (as a result of your mental incompetence) and are therefore not qualified to criticise.

There are exceptions.

So probably not the primary law then.

The punishment for violating the primary law of life is death (as opposed to the reward of life for those which survive).

Some animals (even humans) exhibit weak or non-existent survival instincts. Nature has a way of eliminating such weaklings. Their abberant survival instincts lead to their demise. Only the strong survive in the end. Those whom engage in racial interbreeding exhibit weak survival instincts and shall eventually meet their demise.

Pure garbage.

You disagree with the fact that only the competent survive?

Survival as the basic law of life is the

Eh?

It seems some text was deleted.

How many people do you know who have sex with wolves?

I don't know of any people whom engage in sexual union with wolves. You misunderstood me. What I had said was that wild wolves are not sexually attracted to humans. And mentally healthy humans are not sexually attracted to wolves. Only if a wolf were raised with a human might it attempt to straddle a humans leg, due to unnatural "imprinting" (by which social identity is formed). Raising a wolf amongst humans is unnatural, as is raising children of different races together. Just as a wolf may attempt to straddle a human's leg if it were raised with humans, so too will different races of human engage in sexual unions with members of other races due to unnatural "imprinting". White children whom grow up as a minority in a society dominated by blacks and asians will lose their cultural and racial identity. They will become ashamed of their white skin and wish that they were not white.

This is a very common phenomena, which I consider an identity disorder.

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

Children should therefore be raised with their own kind.

Wow.

Nonsense. False analogies mixed with unsupported racist dogma. Well done Dennis.

It is an undeniable fact that animals will not naturally mate with members outside of their species/sub-species (due to instinctive barriers). Only if the reproductive instincts are dysfunctional will an animal mate outside of it's species/sub-species. This is why many Macaws have been defined as different species. The fact that Scarlet Macaws and Blue-and-Gold Macaws will reproduce (producing a hybrid), (only) if raised together, proves that they are actually of the same species (yet, different sub-species). Visit the following link for the evidence:

<http://animal-world.com/encyclo/birds/macaws/information/hybrid.htm>

Perhaps the different races of human should be considered different species as well?

Wolves and Humans are different species. White and Black humans are the same.

White and black humans are the same species yet different sub-species.

If you get a Labrador and a Dalmation they will happily mate.

You continue to use domesticated animals as proof that animals naturally mate outside of their species/sub-species. You cannot logically use domesticated animals as evidence because they are not natural. They are the product of unnatural breeding practices and raised in unnatural environments (not in the wild) which has corrupted their minds and their instincts. I use

the example of macaws as a more accurate analogy for inter-racial unions because the different macaws are all the same species, yet, different subspecies, just with as the different "races" of human.

Incorrect analogy. Macaws are birds. We are mammals. Humans aren't separated

into subspecies (except by cranks like yourself and even then it is arbitrary).

You possess an inferior comprehension of biology, as the following link proves:

sub species – Google Search

Address:<http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=sub+species>

From the first hit on your search:

"The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (4th edition, 2000) does not attempt to codify any "infrasubspecific entities" (e.g. human races)."

I believe an "infra-subspecific entity" is a reference to

"sub-subspecies". I believe that sub-subspecies actually exist. The different caucasoid and/or Aryan groups would be an example.

Your use of "sub-species" for Macaws is also inaccurate. Just because the term "Macaw" is used to cover a broad selection of birds doesn't support your

claim.

For example the Golden Collared Macaw is *Propyrrhura auricollis* while

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

the blue throated Macaw is *Ara glaucogularis*.

They are not subspecies names.

sub species – Google Search

Address: <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=sub+species>

My comment still stands.

Again, from the first hit of that search:

Members of one subspecies differ morphologically from members of other subspecies of the species. Subspecies are defined in relation to species. It

is not possible to understand the concept of a subspecies without first grasping what a species is. In the context of large living organisms like trees, flowers, birds, fish and humans, a species can be defined as a distinct and recognisable group that satisfies two conditions:

a.. Members of the group are reliably distinguishable from members of other groups. The distinction can be made in any of a wide number of ways, such as: differently shaped leaves, a different number of primary wing feathers, a particular ritual breeding behaviour, relative size of certain bones, different DNA sequences, and so on. There is no set minimum 'amount of difference': the only criterion is that the difference be reliably discernable. In practice, however, very small differences tend to be ignored.

a.. The flow of genetic material between the group and other groups is small and can be expected to remain so because even if the two groups were to be placed together they would not interbreed to any great extent.

Birds of a feather flock together because it ensures the survival of the sub–species. Unions between different sub–species leads to extinction of the sub–species and perhaps even the species.

Also from that same webpage:

Important difference between species and subspecies Subspecies: a taxonomic subdivision of a species. A group of organisms whose behavior and/or genetically encoded morphological and physiological characteristics differ from those of other members of their species.

Members of different subspecies of the same species are potentially capable of breeding with each other and of producing fertile offspring. However, animals of different species may not interbreed even if there is no geographical impediment. Differences in appearance and behavior often prevent members of different species from recognizing each other as potential sex partners. This is especially true for animals with complicated sexual rituals. Members of different species are either incapable of reproducing, or will produce infertile offspring.

And from:

Google's cache of

<http://www.arthurgrosset.com/misc/subspecies.html> as retrieved on Jul 22, 2006 20:39:03 GMT.

<http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:tNJOjzZyu44J:www.arthurgrosset.com/misc/subspecies.html+sub+sp>

A subspecies is a race within a species that shows identifiable characteristics different from other subspecies. It is usually geographically separate from other subspecies.

Nonsense.

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

It is not non-sense. It is a fact. If scarlet macaws commonly interbreed with other macaws, the different sub-species of macaw would eventually become extinct.

They aren't subspecies. They are different species.

If they were different species they wouldn't be able to successfully reproduce and create fertile hybrids, as they do in captivity (as a result of "damage" to their reproductive instincts from being unnaturally raised together). The fact that they can successfully reproduce proves that they are of the same species, although belonging to different sub-species. Refer to this link for the proof:

<http://animal-world.com/encyclo/birds/macaws/information/hybrid.htm>

Scarlet Macaw is *Ara macao* while (for example) the Red shouldered macaw is *Diopsittaca nobilis*. Do you see they are different? Can you read that?

You do not know what you are talking about. As I said, Scarlet Macaws and Blue-and-Gold Macaws are actually of the same species. They have been incorrectly classified.

Nonsense. "Only humans?" So black cats can't interbreed with white cats?

You are an idiot.

Here you are talking about domesticated cats, which are the product of mutations due to inbreeding and other unnatural breeding practices.

Hahahah.

Domesticated cats do not represent wild animals such as the wild cats, which do not mate outside of their subspecies (or species).

Humans do not mate outside their species.

No. They mate outside of their sub-species due to dysfunctional instincts.

Your strawman argument is getting old.

YOU are getting old (and obviously senile).

You point to animals and say they do not breed outside their species so humans should not breed outside their race. Your racist ideology is getting repetitive.

Humans which breed outside of their sub-species are traitors to their kind.

Humans do not have subspecies, therefore your analogies are farcical.

You are claiming a pride of lions should not breed with a different pride.

Nonsense.

Racial interbreeding is genocidal. It threatens to destroy the different races.

If you disagree that inter-racial couplings are unnatural, perhaps I should emphasise that racial interbreeding could eventually lead to the extinction of the different races?

Only extinction in that the "skin colour" will start to mix. Why is this bad?

It is "bad" because it will lead to the extinction of the white race.

So what?

You are a proponent of genocide.

It may also lead to the extinction of all the races (as we know them).

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

"As we know them" is pretty broad brush.

You are talking nonsense though.

The distinct races will eventually become extinct having been replaced with a new (hybrid) race. My kind will not allow this to happen to them.

Your use of race is an arbitrary distinction anyway.

You harp on about "race" when it is a pretty dysfunctional term.

Are you honestly denying the existence of different races? You don't believe there is any detectable difference between a caucasoid and a negroid? I can assure you there is just as much of a difference between a caucasoid and a negroid as there is between a scarlet macaw and a blue-and-gold macaw.

Far from true. A "Caucasoid" and a "Negroid" may have exterior differences

however these are superficial and only the insane fixate on them.

They are not superficial. They are VERY different (in fact, they are opposites). As different as a Scarlet Macaw and a Military Macaw, which are considered different species as a result of their differences (as well as the fact that they do not interbreed in the wild).

Macaws each have a different species name. All humans are H.sapiens.

Do you know what that means?

It means that humans have been incorrectly classified just as Macaws have.

There is less genetic difference between any two humans than you may think. Visually, to me people from (for example) Scandinavia look very different from people who originate from (for example) Ireland. This does not make them different species.

No. It perhaps makes them different sub-species...or more likely, sub-subspecies. I consider blonde haired blue eyed Aryans and red haired green eyed caucasoids sub-subspecies of the same sub-species or race (the caucasoid race...AKA "Aryans").

Just because, to you, all black people look alike does not make them a different subspecies to "us."

Negroids are readily distinguishable from caucasoids. As distinguishable as a Scarlet Macaw is from a Military Macaw.

Nonsense.

It has been said by proponents of inter-racial marriages that someday

everyone will be the same color (and prejudice based on skin color will

become ancient history).

It would be nice if the prejudice could go away, but I doubt it.

Yet, if everyone were to become the same color, the different races would cease to exist. They would effectively become extinct. This would be a tragedy in my eyes.

Why? They only really exist in your eyes.

You are an insane genocidal maniac.

Are the Germans a different race from the Swedes?

Perhaps. More likely, they are different sub-subspecies (or sub-races).

Interbreeding with dark haired, dark eyed races has further complicated the distinction.

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

You are a fruitcake. Without the cake.

And you are an imbecile since you fail to understand that animals do not mate with others not of their kind, not even bonobos, at least not under natural conditions. And for a reason.

You imply that humans from different parts of the planet are a different "subspecies." This is pure nonsense.

Are you denying there are differences?

I am saying they are not subspecies. I am saying what you have said is nonsense.

Are ginger haired people a different race to blondes?

Hair color is a factor in distinguishing between sub-species.

You harp on about this as the "natural order" and come up with convoluted "Primary Laws of Life" to support your idiocy.

Humans are humans no matter where they are born or the colour of their skin.

Just because you think a human from (for example) Africa is intrinsically

different than one from (for example) Norway is irrelevant.

Although all humans may be human, there are phenotypic differences which have been used to distinguish humans by "race". These phenotypic differences originate from genotypic (in other words, genetic) differences. Therefore, the different "races" are actually different sub-species.

Well, you genuinely do belong in the 1850s.

Its loyalties are to its self. I suspect you are trying to corrupt Dawkin's

"Selfish Gene" to your own ends.

The "self" is merely a vessel for the genome. All (natural) selfish desires originate from and serve the purposes of the genome. This is the basis for Dawkin's Selfish Gene theory, which you obviously do not understand.

I understand it better than you do. That isnt saying much though as my cat

probably understands it better than you.

I seriously doubt that. Your cat is the product of (and very likely a practioner of) very unnatural breeding practices.

Maybe. I try not to ask my cat what it gets up to at night.

She does know more about most things than you though.

I seriously doubt your inbreed mutant cat, which is the product of unnatural breeding practices, possesses the instinctive morals which I do. You certainly don't.

I have no problem with speaking violently.

You condemn Nazi's for their violence.

Well, while it is technically correct to call genocide "violence" it is pushing the boundaries of normal conversation to do so.

Could you elaborate.

I condemn the Nazis for many things. Providing idiots with something to idolise is one of them.

Yet, you speak violently. You are a hypocrite.

Really? You mean to imply that speaking violently is the same as the

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

holocaust? You are an odd one.

Your support of racial interbreeding exposes you as a traitorous proponent of genocide.

I have served in the Army. I have shot at people and been shot at. I have seen the effects of violence. Speaking violently is not even close to the same as actual violence.

Yet, threatening to harm another human is a crime.

Note that I have not spoken violently.

Well, your idiocy has been pretty violent. You have tortured algebra to within an inch of its life.

Numbers are not human. I am not aware of any laws which protect abstract numbers from the actions of humans. My discussion of math and physics is an exercise of my right to freedom of speech. Threatening to harm me for exercising this right is a crime.

I have simply

cited facts in order to elucidate what I believe to be a threat to the survival of not only my kind (the caucasoids/Aryans) but also all races. Racial inter-breeding is racial suicide.

Yeah, but you are talking nonsense so it doesn't matter.

You don't even know how to properly classify lifeforms, so you are not qualified to criticise.

However, your understanding of what is a disease and what isn't is fatally flawed.

A genetic disease is a genetic disease. Cancer is a genetic disease.

Perhaps you are referring to my belief that racial inter-breeding leads to a confused genotype just as it leads to a confusion of phenotypic characteristics? It is an undeniable fact that the mottled phenotypic characteristics of an inter-racial child are the result of a confused genome. I can only imagine what the offspring of a scarlet and blue and gold macaw would look like.

Can different species produce offspring?

Supposedly not. At least, not fertile offspring.

Yet, even without ever having seen such

offspring I can be sure that the genome of the offspring would be confused or corrupt compared to the genome of the parents.

You really are in favour of inbreeding aren't you?

No.

What I am actually proposing is the construction of a segregated Aryan civilisation populated by carefully chosen Aryans, as opposed to sterilising anyone, since I do not believe everyone would comply with sterilisation.

You want an inbreeding programme? Wow. You want to destroy the genetic diversity and ensure that eventually you "Carefully Chosen Aryans" all die out.

Fantastic.

Go for it.

No. I do not advocate an inbreeding programme.

Yes you do. You say "confused or corrupt compared to the genome of the parents" – this is what happens when you reproduce.

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

Confused or corrupted as compared to the sub-species specific genome of the parents. The negligible differences between the individuals of a specific sub-species are just that: negligible.

The child's genome is not an identical copy of the parents. It is a "corrupted" version. For evolution to "work" there has to be genetic variety.

Yet, if the parents are both of the same sub-species, the child's genome will conform with the genotype of the sub-species which the parents belong to, despite negligible differences.

There will be just as much genetic diversity amongst the population of the civilisation I have proposed as there is within any species or sub-species of animal in the wild.

I doubt it.

Why would you expect there to be less diversity than there is amongst Scarlet Macaws in the wild (or any other wild animal)?

Animals do not breed outside of their sub-species in the wild, yet they manage to maintain quite a genetic diversity.

You are fixated with subspecies. There are no human "subspecies" in the manner you mean.

You invest too much faith in the taxonomic system of insane humans, which I have already proven to be erroneous by the fact that Scarlet Macaws and Blue and Gold macaws are capable of interbreeding if the instinctive barriers are compromised (due to having been raised together).

Do you want us to live like wolves?

What do you mean by that? If you are asking if I believe humans should procreate only with members of their sub-species, the answer is a definite "YES".

Even species which reproduce parthenogenically (or asexually) have been found to possess an enormous amount of genetic diversity. This is because the parents' genes are shuffled somewhat and are never an exact copy of the parents' genes (not to say that the emergence of a new species has ever resulted from this gene-shuffling). The proponents of racial inter-breeding often try to say that cultural isolation leads to genetic homogenisation and that the only way to combat this is by racial interbreeding. This is unproven non-sense. Inter-breeding between different races (or sub-species) is not practiced by any animal (that I know of). The undeniable fact is that such interbreeding isn't necessary for the survival of a species or sub-species. Rather, inter-breeding between sub-species is actually counter-productive to survival, due to corruption of the genome.

Gibberish.

Prove me wrong. Show me an example of a species of animal which mates outside of its sub-species (and I mean actual proof...not just unproven reports). Macaws do not mate outside their sub-species in the wild, yet they have managed to survive just as all other animals alive on this planet today have managed to stay alive and healthy. The relative incidence of genetic disease is actually lower amongst wild animals than it is in humans. Why is that? I believe it is because only

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

humans engage in racial inter-breeding practices, which corrupts the gene pool.

Sterilisation would therefore ultimately fail, although it would successfully reduce the incidence of disease. The segregated civilisation I have proposed would succeed in completely eradicating disease from within the civilisation, which is more than you could realistically hope for in this racially confused world at the present time.

Bet you dont.

Well, the future of the world you defend doesn't look very promising.

So what? I still bet you dont.

You can bet all you want. It has no effect on the outcome. What you can be certain of is that the insane world which you defend will ultimately perish due to the incompetence of it's citizens.

How were you sterilised?

Am I right in thinking you are actually 15 years old and when you say you are "sterilised" you mean you simply cant get laid?

The thought that you have had children is frightening.

Cool.

I am right, arent I?

I devote all of my energy towards saving my kind, as opposed to indulging in animalistic pleasures which offers no hope of ensuring the survival of my kind in this world which is about to perish (due to the perverse suicidal insanity of genetically and morally corrupted apes, such as you).

Oh yeah, you arent going to save anyone. You are just going to look after yourselves.

We (Aryans) are not obligated to ensure the survival of the other sub-species of human. It is up to them to ensure their own survival.

After all, life is a test which separates the strong from the weak.

Only the strong survive.

I cant wait.

The wait is almost over. Then you, your children, and grandchildren will all perish. I can almost smell the rotting bodies.

Can you remind me why you started posting here?

In order to catalyse the writing process. I find the debates which invariably ensue to be rather inspiring.

Really? I look forward to seeing your writing. When you have your Aryan civilisation in your own little corner of the world, send me a postcard.

Yet, they all have one thing in common: none of them mate outside of their sub-species.

Idiocy.

Is that all you have to say?

When your post is nonsense it is all there is to say.

Show me one animal which mates outside of it's sub-species in the wild.

A. A. Milne wrote in The London Magazine, "Under exceptional circumstances

it has been known for a tiger to be forced into ranges inhabited by the Asian lion, *Panthera leo persica*, which is the same genus as the

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

tiger. Rare

reports have been made of tigresses mating with lions in the wild and producing offspring known as ligers. When a tiger and a lioness mate the cub is called a tigon."

Wow, that isnt even cross sub-species mating.

I would not consider such reports as proof. Furthermore, such occurrences are admittedly rare according to this report. If it happens at all, this would be due to unnatural circumstances (as well as dysfunctional sexual instincts perhaps caused by the unnatural circumstances of the two cats essentially being forced to live together).

Now, show me what subspecies there are amongst humans today. Caucasoids, Negroids, and Mongoloids are definitely recognized distinctions...although there are actually nine races which are recognised.

Animals do not mate outside their species. I have not disagreed with that.

Your idea to separate different races of human into subspecies is the idiocy.

No, it is an obvious fact to anyone who has eyes. The attempt to suppress the reality of different sub-species of human will ultimately fail. Genetic tests already exist to distinguish the different sub-species of human.

Nonsense. Because people have different skin colour and facial structure does not imply a "sub species" divide.

Such significant distinctions are used to distinguish different sub-species of animal. Why not humans? After all, these phenotypic differences originate from genotypic differences which are significant enough that one can genetically determine the race of an individual without examining their physical appearance.

You are going off the deep end here.

Such genetic testing is a reality and the basis of a new phenomena known as "genetic discrimination".

For a superHumanGodling your powers of comprehension are poor. You are oblivious to reality and in no position to criticise my mental abilities.

Hahaha. Yes I am. Any one can. You are a genuine nutcase.

You are the one who believes Scarlet and Blue-and-Gold Macaws are different species when anyone with eyes and a sane mind can see they are of the same species. Obviously, your sanity is questionable (as is the Taxonomic system and much of science, due to mentally incompetent apes such as you).

You have (erroneously) assumed that inter-racial relationships have caused industrial pollution. You are a buffoon.

I am proposing that racial inter-breeding causes genetic corruption which leads to both physical and mental disease as well as the destruction of the ecosystem as a result of the collective insanity which ensues.

Yes, you have proposed this but you are wrong.

The interbreeding of Macaws is frowned upon by bird breeders and bird

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

breeding organisations. Do you know why? Because such interbreeding can result in mental illnesses. In dogs, this is not a concern because dogs are not expected to have the mind of a Macaw. Note that Macaws possess an intelligence which rivals that of a well developed human child. They are therefore more prone to environmentally induced mental illness (just as in humans). Any inherent potential for mental illness due to genetic aberrations only complicates the matter (just as with humans). Trust me, you do not want to be bitten by a Macaw with an angry disposition. They can inflict serious damage and easily bite your finger off.

Members of my family have suffered tremendously (some to the point of death) due to contamination of the environment. For you to deny the existence of such threats exposes you as an ignorant fool. Tell me, are you deaf and blind? I could forgive you if you were.

Hmm. Feel free to read my posts.

Is that a yes? Or are you just mentally inferior?

No, it is simply an admission that you have not read my posts. You claim I am saying things which I haven't said. Your understanding of what I have said is flawed.

I am not saying there is no contamination of the environment. I am saying to attribute it to mixed race relationships is nonsense.

Just as Macaws are not interbred because of potential mental/personality problems, so too are humans prone to the same potential problems as a result of racial interbreeding.

Also, when (other than "prisoners") have people been taken into slavery?

Well, the Jews believe they were slaves in Egypt. Yet, they were not prisoners.

How were they taken into slavery?

They migrated to Egypt and became employed in exchange for the necessities of survival.

When I say prisoners don't assume that means the same as the modern term for someone in a jail cell. When classical civilisations conquered one another the survivors were generally placed into slavery. They were "prisoners of war" in modern parlance, but in fact slaves.

In addition things like failure to pay debts resulted in slavery. In more recent times white people in England were deported to America as slaves for rebelling against the king.

It is only as you get more recent that slave was synonymous with the mistreatment of black Africans. (Never happened to the Ethiopians though)

Perhaps, yet the Sumerians/Akkadians/Babylonians as well as the Jews and Muslims believed otherwise. As did the Aztecs and Mayans.

Furthermore, slaves were not all mistreated. Slavery does not necessarily imply violent treatment. A slavemaster can be very kind and allow virtually as many freedoms as an American citizen has. After all, both a citizen's and a slave's survival depend upon those whom they serve. This is why Jews often speak of employment as slavery (such as the scriptures which speak of one selling oneself into "slavery"). If a slavemaster treats his/her slaves kindly and with respect, they will likely be more loyal and productive. Abusing one's slaves will likely

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

lead to revolt and possibly the slavemaster's demise.

But, prior to the sixteenth century this didn't happen. For most of humanity's existence slaves have been taken during warfare. The colour of the slaves' skin was not relevant until more recent times when "race" became an issue.

Yet, if you research the archaeological evidence, you will find the majority of the world's cultures claim that dark-skinned humans were created to be slaves for the white-skinned Gods.

Really? What examples do you have of this?

The Judeo-Christian bible, the Sumerian account of mankind's creation, as well as the Aztec and Mayan mythology are examples. I suggest you visit:

[www.ancientmanuscripts.com](http://www.ancientmanuscripts.com)

I will provide more resources if you so desire.

I assume that something this significant is supported by published research as well so, if you can let me know what journals to check out I would love to see it.

There is a magazine which is an excellent resource of information. I believe it is called "American Archaeology", although I will have to verify this. Perhaps you would prefer some sort of scholarly journal published by "educated" fools whom probably believe that Scarlet Macaws and Blue-and-Gold Macaws are different species?

My recollection of classical and Neolithic history is somewhat different. Not

to mention the difficulty in determining racial type from some of the historical artefacts.

Even in Christianity, Jesus is not Caucasian.

Actually, there exists a document which was supposedly dictated by Pontius Pilate which describes the appearance of Jesus. As I recall, it is a message to Tiberius Caesar (whom may have been the father of Jesus, according to the author of "The Bible Fraud"). In this message, Jesus is described as having blonde hair and blue eyes.

I look forward to seeing you create your "Aryan" civilisation.

You'll never see it. It shall be revealed only to those whom are chosen to become citizens.

Ah, now there is a shame

Before I go, tell me, are you the product of interbreeding between different races?

Well it depends on what you think the races are. I am, generally speaking

from Anglo-Saxon / Norse stock. I have fair hair (was blonde, now grey) and blue eyes.

The Germanic tribes and the Nordic tribes may as well be different races though as they do have visible and cultural differences. So, in answer to your question – probably.

You must be of commoner stock and senile as well. Perhaps you have contracted BSE/KJD (AKA "mad cow disease"), which is believed by many to be the cause of senility or Alzheimer's disease? Or perhaps it is heavy metal pollution which has poisoned your mind? I should point out

## Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

that BSE is believed to be caused by heavy metals, especially radioactive metals. Such metals, even the non-radioactive forms, will deform the protein, or prion, associated with BSE/KJD. This protein or prion is a "metallaprotein" which normally contains a copper ion. The valence state of the copper ion controls the structure of the protein. This copper atom can be displaced by other, more reactive, metal ions...such as mercury. Different metals will change the structure of the protein. To complicate the issue, if the metal ion is radioactive, this will also denature the protein and any surrounding proteins, thus explaining the mysterious infectious nature of the BSE/KJD prion, which mysteriously converts other proteins into BSE/KJD prions. This yet another modern threat which plagues this world as a result of the pollution caused by insane racially interbreed humans. The problem is only going to get worse as more minds are destroyed over time until the insane racially interbreed humans have become extinct. One cannot expect them to save themselves with science and technology because they are mentally incompetent. Rather, it is their insane science and technology which shall be their demise (in addition to the gangrenous necrosis of civilisation caused by the spread of genetic disease which results from racial interbreeding).

It is warming to note, that you too are the product of interbreeding. At least I do not perpetuate this perversion. I am relatively pure. More importantly, my mind remains unaffected. I possess an intelligence which rivals most humans (especially non Aryans). If only you could say the same.

–Dennis B

Apparently, the last attempt resulted in a formatting error which I am unable to correct. Ultimately, I was attempting to prove that T Wake's criticism of my assertions concerning the existence of human sub-species was based upon logical reasoning. Furthermore, I was attempting to prove that at least some of the large Macaws are indeed of the same species because they are capable of successfully reproducing (the result being fertile hybrids). They are in fact sub-species. The only reason they are considered as separate species is because they do not mate outside of their kind in the wild. To do so would lead to the extinction of the varieties which interbreed. They would be replaced by a hybrid. This would violate the basic law of survival which all healthy and competent lifeforms obey. It is important for the survival of the different races of human (especially the caucasoid races) to realise this if they are to survive the threat of genocide posed by interbreeding between the races.

To support my assertions, I provide the following references:

<http://animal-world.com/encyclo/birds/macaws/information/hybrid.htm>

And from Wikipedia's article on "Subspecies":

Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here

A sharp boundary between black and white, or a relatively small and stable hybrid zone, on the other hand, shows that the two populations do not interbreed to any great extent and are indeed separate species. Their classification as separate species or as subspecies, however, depends on why they do not interbreed.

If the two groups do not interbreed because of something intrinsic to their genetic make-up (perhaps black frogs do not find white frogs sexually attractive, or they breed at different times of year) then they are different species.

If, on the other hand, the two groups would interbreed freely provided only that some external barrier was removed (perhaps there is a waterfall too high for frogs to scale, or the populations are far distant from one another) then they are subspecies.

Note that the distinction between a species and a subspecies depends only on the likelihood that (absent external barriers) the two populations would merge back into a single, genetically unified population. It has nothing to do with 'how different' the two groups appear to be to the human observer.

As knowledge of a particular group increases, its categorisation may need to be re-assessed. The Rock Pipit was formerly classed as a subspecies of Water Pipit, but is now recognised to be a full species. For an example of a subspecies, see Pied Wagtail.

[edit]

Important difference between species and subspecies

Subspecies: a taxonomic subdivision of a species. A group of organisms whose behavior and/or genetically encoded morphological and physiological characteristics differ from those of other members of their species. Members of different subspecies of the same species are potentially capable of breeding with each other and of producing fertile offspring. However, animals of different species may not interbreed even if there is no geographical impediment. Differences in appearance and behavior often prevent members of different species from recognizing each other as potential sex partners. This is especially true for animals with complicated sexual rituals. Members of different species are either incapable of reproducing, or will produce infertile offspring.

And from (G o o g l e's cache of)

<http://www.arthurgrosset.com/misc/subspecies.html> (as retrieved on Jul 22, 2006 20:39:03 GMT):

<http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:tNJOjzZyu44J:www.arthurgrosset.com/misc/subspecies.html+sub+species&h>

A subspecies is a race within a species that shows identifiable characteristics different from other subspecies. It is usually geographically separate from other subspecies.

–Dennis B

Re: Your Secrets are Safe Here