

ORION SPEECH

Greetings. My name is (xxxx xxxx, of xxxx) and I wish to speak to you about something that should interest all White people living in the United States and Canada. It's about our disappearance! In the United States, from being 85% of the population in 1960, the White population in 2060 will be 43%. That's quite a change in 100 years. A lot of that is a percentage change, expected because of large non-White immigration. But now it is an actual numbers drop, a decline of 8.6% since 2010. Whites are now about 58% of the country's population, a drop from 63.7% in 2010 and the first time in census history that White numbers have been below 60%. Canada presents the same picture, where present demographics predict that the White population in Canada will be a minority by 2050.

Well, we're going to be asked: "Does it make any difference?" After all, our economy largely depends on non-White immigration to do the work that White people are reluctant to do. A lot of needed professionals, as in the medical profession, are from non-White countries. This divide in our thinking depends on our view of nationhood. One view is that a nation is defined primarily by economics and political differences that determine our well being. This is the view found primarily among liberal Americans and English-speaking Canadians. It is the view of the imperial state, inherited from the time of empires when all North America was a colony of one empire or another. Empires are about elites and wealth, not nationhood. Consequently, today ask a liberal American or English-speaking Canadian what the difference is between nation, state and country and he or she will likely not be able to give a definite answer.

Allow me to attempt one. "Nation is a cultural division of humanity, created by history and Nature and is not a conscious creation of the mind, as is the State. The State is a conscious creation of the mind, consisting of government and all its institutions that serve the Nation. Country, of course, is the territory the Nation dwells on, but is not essential for a Nation. Jews have lived as a people for two millennia without having a country. They lived as a people identified by religion. Only recently have they had a country, but they have always known themselves as the People of Israel who nonetheless absorbed others into that definition by accepting the same religion. There are other identifiers of Nation. To the Chinese the "nation" is all who belong to the Chinese Civilization. In the West the identifier is race, essentially all who have the same ethnicity. In all these forms the one essential ingredient is a sense of peoplehood.

So besides the view that a nation can be thought of in terms of economics and as a good place to live, there is the meaning of "nation" in terms of identity, where people feel they belong to a particular culture, and economics is entirely secondary. It's not about how good life is and what you have, it's about who you are. North America is a mix of

both views, one a residue of our elitist colonial past and the other of homesteaders close to the soil. The people of Quebec have the identity view, that is the basis for their desire to separate from “the rest of Canada,” which is a profound mystery to English-speaking Canadians. Isn’t Canada one of the best countries of the world to live in? Wouldn’t Quebec become poorer by separating? “What does Quebec want?” they repeatedly ask. Such questions reveal little or no understanding of identity nationalism. That understanding is also the general understanding of Europeans, producing what is presently referred to as “populism,” which is a reaction against the elites of the European Union. That union imposes a common currency on economies as different as those of Germany and Greece, and would ethnically homogenize all European labour, even labour from outside Europe. These are exactly the decrees of an empire. The difference, as in Canada and America, leads to conflict.

What are the consequences from these divergent views on nationhood? Well, if American capitalists had an identity view of nationhood, would they have “outsourced” capital, and jobs, to the extent of causing huge “rust belts” of decaying industrial skeletons in the former industrial heartland of the United States? Would they have abandoned millions of workers to unemployment, deprivation and dependency? Are these the actions of industrial leaders endowed with any sense of peoplehood? Would America be the absolute plutocracy, the “moneyarchy” it is today, instead of the democracy it set out to be? Would America not have had, long ago, a publicly funded health care system, for everyone? It’s strange how in the United States a publicly funded health care system is thought of as that bug-a-boo, “Socialism,” whereas in Canada and Western Europe, if you take away the mere humanitarian aspects of it, it’s just thought of as a public responsibility, like policing or filling in pot-holes. As in Europe with its elite driven European Union, the imperial view of nationhood has gained dominance due to its greater funding than has the identity view. But it has no understanding of “peoplehood”. Thus race replacement with multiculturalism is preferable to its goals, since that means a cheaper labour market.

And so the bad rep White nationalism has today in the mainstream media, always referred to as “White supremacism”. Yes, there are many White supremacists in the White nationalist movement, but that does not mean that all White nationalists are White supremacists. I am a White nationalist but not a White supremacist. The vast majority of Whites in North America would favour living in a White nation more than a Black one, if asked, without harbouring feelings of racial superiority towards anyone. All they want is to be left alone without the need for integrated neighbourhoods, schools, and businesses, and without being constantly pummelled with guilt propaganda on how nasty their history has been to non-Whites. Yes, it has been nasty, but that is the sad history of humanity. During the 1600s pirates from North Africa raided southern Europe and the

Atlantic European coast for slaves, with full compliance of Moorish rulers. By 1780 it is estimated that at least 1.2 million Europeans were either work or sex enslaved by those rulers. How times changed. At that time and place slavery had an entirely different complexion.

Since we are told so often that White racism is bad, it's only fair that we examine multiculturalism for its morality. We are told that multiculturalism is good for its "diversity." We know that diversity is good because we can see that in Nature. Species diversity is very important because it gives environmental stability and the ability to withstand environmental stress. Without the diversity of species, ecosystems become unbalanced, and if the world's ecosystems were destroyed it would have severe consequences for our world. That's how important species diversity is. So does the same importance extend to the "diversity" of multiculturalism? After all, we've been told by no less than the Prime Minister of Canada that "Multiculturalism is our strength."

Unfortunately, the notion that racial multiculturalism gives diversity is ridiculous. What? you ask. Is this guy blind? Can't he see the mixture of races and cultures on the streets of our Western cities today? Yes, I certainly can. But your mind about the diversity of multiculturalism can change with one word - time. In time racial mixture blends. Multiculturalism is actually the way we destroy diversity, because as history shows, when different races are socially amalgamated, living street-to-street and door-to-door, they interbreed. That does not give diversity. The result is no race, and no diversity.

Of course, the loss of human racial diversity would not destroy our world, as would the loss of species diversity, but we must wonder from the example of species if human racial diversity loss nonetheless has similar consequences to a lesser extent. Robert Putnam is a Professor of Public Policy at the Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, who in a study of 30,000 people in the United States, 2001, found the results so disturbing that he delayed publishing them for six years until 2007. He found that, what he calls "diversity," is associated with low confidence in local government, local leaders and local news media, low confidence in one's own influence, lower frequency of registering to vote, less expectation that others will cooperate to solve dilemmas of collective action, less likelihood of working on a community project, less likelihood of giving to charity or volunteering, fewer close friends and confidants, and more time watching television. Most disturbing was the finding that there is also less trust within ethnic groups. His general finding is that multiculturalism produces less social trust. This is extraordinary, because what is civilization based on more than trust? Imagine companies conducting business in the billions of dollars without trust. Would you give your credit card number over the Internet if you could not trust people on the other end? Would you fall in love and marry someone you couldn't trust. Trust is

essential to all our social interactions, and here is a scientific study by a reputable Harvard professor that multiculturalism diminishes it. The finding should be shouted from the rooftops. But what do we hear about it? There was some initial mention, that lasted a few days, but now nothing. It has been shelved, forgotten. That's how much we can trust our media.

If this is true, and multiculturalism has such a drastic effect on civilization, we should find examples of that possible effect in history. Those examples are not hard to find. One sure example would be the Roman world, that declined under exactly this type of society, the type we call "multicultural," only in those days it was called "cosmopolitan". Rome at that time was the most "cosmopolitan" city of the world, and we know what happened to that great world. Was "cosmopolitanism" a possible cause of that decline, or at least a contributing factor? I don't know, but now knowing Putnam's finding on public trust, I'm suspicious.

The sure corollary we can draw from Putnam's finding is that racially based nationhood is the most stable and harmonious collectivity for human existence. The conclusion is not surprising when we look at the origin of species diversity. It originates from racial diversity. If two separate populations of any species remain separate over tens of thousands of years, each will evolve different characteristics to identify them as separate races, and if they remain separate sufficient differences will accumulate to prevent interbreeding. The two populations will then have become different species. That inability defines a species. To destroy species diversity, then, all we need to do is destroy racial diversity, which can be done simply by having racial intermixture when the differentiating populations can still interbreed. Fortunately in the animal world pheromones are readily sensed, that prevents racial mixture, and animals have less problem with racial mixture than humans. The human species lacks the protection of animals who can better sniff racial pheromone differences, and animals are consciously aware of Nature's breeding prohibitions. Suppression of natural instinct is actually a distinguishing feature of human beings. It is the basis of our morality, as when we control anger, gluttony or sexual promiscuity. But we should never forget that our natural instincts are for our protection. To deplore them because they are not intellectualized is foolish, but that seems to be the case with the abundance of interracial couples strolling our streets today. You see, it is questionable if our human lack of pheromone sensitivity extends to our *subconscious*, as it is likely the underlying hidden source of racial discrimination and conflict in all countries featuring multiculturalism, that racial residue of imperialism.

Racial mixture is particularly destructive of White racial characteristics because genetic White racial features are recessive. By the laws of genetics, if a Black person with two

Black parents has a child by a blond, blue-eyed White person, not one of their children will have blond hair or blue eyes. The couple could have 20 kids, not one child will have those features. An example is Barak Obama. His mother was White. Yet he is considered America's first Black president, and he considers himself Black. Where did the White go? It is still there, but it will only show up in the next generation if the White-Black racially mixed person has a child who also conceives with a blond blue-eyed White person, and then only 50% of those children will have blond hair or blue eyes. In White-Black mixture the White characteristics are submerged. They are genetically recessive. White disappearance is not just a matter of numbers. It is also a matter of submergence, meaning recessiveness.

So what should White people do about their forecasted disappearance? Should we just succumb to the inevitable, as White populations have done before us? Of course not, but the worst reaction would be violence. More weapons are owned by Americans today than there are people in the United States. The temptation is there. But it would be disastrous, not only for the country but for the whole White nationalist movement. White nationalists could never win a revolution against the United States military, since that is what they would be confronting. Even China has enough sense not to try that. The answer is ballots, not bullets.

ORION, which stands for "Our Race Is Our Nation," is a racial nationalist party whose objective is partitioning the present United States and Canada into racial zones, and to determine by referendum how many people would fall by choice into their chosen zones. The first objective, therefore, is to have the ORION Party control the American Congress and White House, determined by democratic election taken throughout all parts of the United States. For a majority victory in today's America this election would have to include compliance and participation of all races that now comprise the United States. Although primarily a White interest, obviously since the non-White populations are approaching one half the total population of the country, this objective cannot involve only the White population. After being elected into government, partitioning would be done in a controlled manner, directed from Washington D.C. under legal mandate by a then ORION-controlled federal government, and legally enforced militarily if necessary. Once people have decided where they belong and free migrations cease, those zones will have borders established and nations declared. This is intended to separate *all* races, including White, Black, Aboriginal, Hispanic and any other wanting to preserve its identity. ORION is a party to preserve *diversity* and welcomes all who want the same. If India can do it in 1947, so can we in North America in coming years.

To be noted is that although primarily a White interest, racial partition of North America is not a White supremacist issue. It is purely a White nationalist issue, the same as

defines nationalist separation movements elsewhere around the world, whether of the Basques, Scots, French Canadians, Chechens, Kurds, etc., none of whom proclaim racial superiority. A French Canadian separatist would be deeply offended if referred to as a French Canadian supremacist. The ORION Party partition would actually be in the interest of non-White participants, since Blacks would be far better off within a nation devoted to the Black heritage, with Black officials, laws, schools, police forces, etc., and without the daily hassle from White America that Blacks now experience. The same is true of Hispanic America, already with its “Aztlán” separatist movement in the SouthWest, and of the native Indians who have suffered disgracefully under White colonial rule and already refer to themselves as “nations”.

No doubt a racially divided North America would be a radical change, but instead of White Canada and America being prosperous seats of sophisticated technological culture, as today, if these formerly White nations become reduced, as current demographics predict, little more than future fishing villages on the east coast of Canada, or remote hamlets in the mountains of Appalachia, - that would be a radical change too.

If you favour an ORION Party, you can help ensure its victory. On website www.evolution.com is a small booklet master in book formatting that you can download and make into booklets on your home computer. Distribution can be to friends and family, or at train and bus stops for reading on the way to work. Or sold at a minimal price. If sold, the money is yours. Your only cost is paper, ink and a little effort. But we are not selling booklets. We want you to sell them, and make money from their sale. Our interest with the booklets is not to make money; it is to spread the ORION requirement.