

“A National Day of Action”

“The most difficult thing is the decision to act, the rest is merely tenacity.” – Amelia Earhart

“The first step in being unafraid is acting like you’re unafraid, even if you’re terrified.” – Anon

“...even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is no surprise if his servants, also, disguise themselves as servants of righteousness. ” – 2 Corinthians 11: 14 – 15

We can and must find ways to resist the destruction of Western man, his nations and institutions, and our strategies must involve more than writing essays, manning petition tables, and lobbying unresponsive politicians. We are no longer involved in the process of creating the language of our side of the debate; we have spent half a century doing this and educating others, and we are now quickly running out of time in which to save ourselves. The time to act is upon us, and the question now becomes: What targets do we specifically push back against, and how specifically do we do the pushing?

For the last half century, the inhabitants of the West have watched as a steady erasing of their societies has occurred before their eyes, with the Third World arriving in inexorable waves, permeating, reinventing, and ultimately obliterating the racial and cultural identities of nations that were once indisputably European and First World in nature. There was absolutely no moral imperative that this purge occur, but our enemies, seeing human migration as a force of nature, decided to harness it and to weaponize it, and they have succeeded in doing incalculable damage to us as a result. It is massive Third World immigration that will most likely be the force that ultimately destroys Western man by scouring him out of existence, and since immigration is the primary and most visible weapon being used to erase our societies, any

appropriate response should include it as the first target for any offensive.

To reiterate, mass immigration is the primary symptom of the assault being waged against us, and a response directed at mass immigration – and its attendant facilitating machinery – is thus the most logical offensive response that we should make.

Accepting this premise, let us theorize what active resistance might look like, and, more specifically, what a widespread organized response might look like. There have been proposals of a National Day of Action, but what specific forms might it take? What nonviolent forms of civil disobedience would be the most appropriate and the most efficient in targeting mass immigration, without bringing down on our heads the full power of the federal government or local law enforcement authorities?

It should be noted here that in the past, most efforts attempting to achieve political solutions to curb the on-going invasion have been delegitimized and marginalized. And on the individual level, individuals objecting to mass immigration have simply been widely dismissed as being guilty of racism or intellectualized racism. The mere use of the word “displacement,” to describe exactly what is being done to us, has traditionally drawn sneers and spittle from the parties orchestrating or facilitating our purge. Further, in the past, many proposed and then actualized tactics have had minimal impact on the immigration debate; for example, in the U.S., an Hispanic boycott of their own employment sites was noteworthy in its failure to gather participants. Of course, the boycott was intended to protest what was perceived as anti-Hispanic immigration legislation, but few Hispanics remained home on the day of the boycott, few refrained from economic activity, and the overall economic impact of the boycott was so negligible as to guarantee that no subsequent similar efforts have occurred. Further, an effort in March of

2014 by activist Kyle Hunt to organize an "anti-Diversity" nationwide "White Man March," a day involving scattered demonstrations and pushback activities, apparently resulted only in a few banners being draped on overpasses and park benches in different cities.

Resistance taking the form of a boycott effort, or a "nationwide" demonstration, or something similar, would therefore have a very high potential for failure, primarily because it would be planned for a mass scale that cannot be realized. Any action should thus seek to achieve maximum impact with a limited number of participants, or, to utilize a strategy of Nelson Mandela (non-hero that he was to us), we must attempt the greatest level of impact with a predictably limited number of willing activists, with the hope that mass actions will later materialize.

Perhaps a more simple analysis would begin merely by asking when a day of dissent should occur. The 1965 immigration legislation that gutted our restrictive quota system was signed on October 3, 1965. Ironically, the legislation passed through Congress with extensive promises that it would not alter the American demographic, political, or cultural landscapes. The legislation was signed into law outdoors, before an entirely white audience, on Liberty Island, with Ellis Island and the crisp silhouette of Manhattan in the background. As he signed the bill, President Johnson made the biggest understatement in human history, reassuring the audience by announcing, "The bill that we sign today is not a revolutionary bill." October 3 would thus be an appropriate date for a National Day of Action, or, perhaps July 5th, the day after the July 4th Independence Day Holiday, when many thousands of overwhelmingly Third World immigrants are routinely sworn in as "New Americans." (Our quota system was gutted as being discriminatory, yet few Europeans now arrive as immigrants on our shores. So much for the Left's definition of "non-discriminatory.")

But what specifically might we do, as acts of defiance? In the past it has sometimes been proposed that activists impede the functions of the government's immigration bureaucracies processing our new colonists. This might be as simple as gathering in small numbers on specific dates, like those mentioned, and blocking the entrances or otherwise impeding the activities of these government offices. The offices in question would be those facilitating our country's absorption of colonists; the effort would not target offices involved in deportations. With a few dozen participants in a dozen U.S. cities, the impact even of such a limited offensive would be explosive. Media coverage would be extensive, and participants in such sit-downs might exploit this by carrying placards with messages (a few possible examples come to mind: "Stop Erasing America," or "The American Nation-state Never Agreed to be Purged" or "In These Offices, They Faciliate America's Extinction"). As an alternative, the demonstrations could be conducted silently, accompanied by someone handing out well-worded fliers, or accompanied by an articulate spokesperson who would speak to the press. Ideally, identical activities would occur at each immigration/colonization office targeted.

The response of the Media, of course, would be shrill and vicious. Government shills and religious and civic figures and Hollywood luminaries could be expected to be venomous in their denunciations. Even passersby – like Pavlovian dogs – could be expected to snarl and shower abuse on the participants.

We would need to be prepared to be temporary martyrs for the cause of political incorrectness, ennobled by each epithet hurled at us. The thunderous outrage and condemnation might nonetheless focus the national eye on the colonization process, galvanizing further debate and resistance. Not to mention, that for a few hours or for a day the machinery of our destruction would be stilled.

The following year, on the same date, the exercise would repeat. And then the year after that, and onward. If the action successfully gathered momentum and numbers, additional demonstration days could be selected. With any luck, the number of protestors participating in the demonstrations might grow, the resistance to the machinery of mass immigration would spread, and the functionings of the immigration bureaucracy would be substantively impeded to a point where they began to falter, requiring an overhaul culminating in more restrictionist immigration policies. The alternative is that the bureaucracy will ultimately collapse anyway, under the sheer press of the numbers of people arriving; the difference would be that the faltering of the system would result in it becoming more restrictive rather than more easily exploited by our invaders, and the latter scenario of exploitation has been the one that has been the most commonplace in the past.

Protestors can expect to be cleared from the demonstration sites by law enforcement. Offenders would be warned away, ticketed, fined, etc. If a pattern of repeat demonstrations could be sustained, tickets might turn into a night in jail, and, with repeat offenses, even multiple nights in jail. If the number of demonstrations indeed increased, even more draconian measures might be applied, despite the nonviolent nature of the activity; the demonstrators would be a manifestation of an enraging political nonconformity, like a red flag being waved before a bull. Nonetheless, at the end of the day, and though the Heavens might appear to fall, it would still be worth the price, to preserve what is left of America.

Assuming that this movement could be expanded, in theory it could branch out to other manifestations of America's ongoing destruction. An agitating, albeit orderly, no-business-as-usual refusal to quietly submit to the death of our nation-state and culture.

In all of these actions, the rules of engagement would be the same rules that have been used in any life or death struggle. The more pragmatic rules of conflict would apply; our straits are too dire for them not to be followed. Anyone who assists us will be considered our ally. Anyone who attacks our enemies will be our ally. The stupid, the brainwashed, and the docile will not be designated as our enemies, even if they wander into our path and temporarily block our advancement. We are fighting for them also. These, and all other basic rules of conflict and engagement, will apply.

We are at a crossroads. We will either shit or remain palavering and theorizing on the pot, until the approaching day when we end up residing inside the pot. Nietzsche once wrote, "A brave army is a convincing argument for the cause for which it fights." Yet, how brave have we been, in our deafening inaction? We are two decades from slipping into minority status in a land overwhelmingly founded and built by our ancestors. We will not do so and then see our situation stabilize; any intelligent mind can perceive that our community will simply continue to dwindle in numbers and influence until we are irrelevant, dispossessed, and despised, floating in the midst of the wreckage created for us, clinging to the tattered remnants of a constitution and a rule of law that no longer protect us. Only two options thus remain before us: find some concretely meaningful way in which to bravely resist, or embrace a soon-approaching extinction.

We dissidents have been, to a significant extent, deplatformed, silenced, or marginalized in the arena of public debate, a place where all silence, enforced or otherwise, is interpreted as both compliance and consent. This forces us into an uncomfortable means of redress, one demanding some form of active resistance. In the past, violent men have said we have a moral right to resist what we are witnessing, a moral right undergirded by a duty to preserve and safeguard the world created by our ancestors, coupled with a duty to

pass that legacy forward to our children. However repugnant we may have found the actions of some of those men – and as much as we may attempt to embrace nonviolent tactics – the organic logic of those particular beliefs remains irrefutable.

We can draw strength from the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: “When injustice becomes law, resistance becomes duty.” It is not justice when our government abdicates its primary responsibility to defend and perpetuate the people and culture that placed it in power, and instead codifies into law the forces that will annihilate us. It is primarily because this injustice has become law, and because venues for peaceful dissent are being closed off to us, that we must now begin the work of a more active resistance. To achieve an active resistance, we must take the struggle out of the blogs and into our institutions and streets, to actively confront and impede the machinery of our destruction.

Again, we must do so knowing that this conflict in which we must engage, this purposefully concealed and obfuscated conflict, is ultimately a struggle for our very survival, because it is a struggle for the survival of our nation-state and culture. Whatever lies are told to us, we must cling to this truth. Because of its existential nature, this is the most important struggle of our century, of our lifetimes, and there is no more important one in which we can engage ourselves. There can be no more honorable struggle than the fight for the survival of one’s own people, and the very laws of nature itself demand such a struggle. It is only a perversion of nature that defines “being on the right side of history” as being a capitulation to extinction. Let us resoundingly reject such madness, and let us reject it by moving one another to action.

While there is yet time, let us begin.

© 2019 Sid Secular – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Sidney Secular: Success_Express@yahoo.com