

[stormer-daily.rw](https://stormer-daily.rw)

## **A Report on the Moronality of Evil - Daily Stormer**

*Andrew Anglin*

14-18 minutes

---



### **Breaking History review: Jared Kushner's dispiriting Trump book**

The former president's son-in-law has written a predictably self-serving and selective memoir of his time in the White House

🕒 13 Aug 2022

I just wanted to point out how bizarre this book review from the Guardian I just read part of is.

I didn't read the whole thing, but here are the first few paragraphs of "[Breaking History review: Jared Kushner's dispiriting Trump book](#)" by Lloyd Green:

The House January 6 committee hearings depict Donald Trump as eager to storm the Capitol. He knew the rally held in his name included armed individuals. When rioters chanted "Hang Mike Pence", Jared Kushner's father-in-law remarked: "He deserves it."

In response to a plea from Kevin McCarthy, the 45th president questioned the House Republican leader's devotion. The mob invaded Congress. Trump sat back and watched.

**Kushner has not fared well either. In testimony to the panel, he has derided Pat Cipollone as a "whiner" and described deigning to exit the shower to take a call from a panicked McCarthy. On the screen, Kushner drips hauteur, empathy nonexistent. It's not a good look.**

Then comes Breaking History, Kushner's White House memoir. It sits at the intersection of spin, absolution and self-aggrandizement.

"What is clear to me is that no one at the White House expected violence that day," Kushner writes of January 6. Cassidy Hutchinson says otherwise.

Kushner adds: "I'm confident that if my colleagues or the president had anticipated violence, they would have prevented it from happening." DC police tell a different story.

Kushner rebuffed early entreaties from Marc Short, the vice-president's chief of staff, to end Trump's attempt to stop certification of Joe Biden's win.

"You know, I'm really focused on the Middle East right now," Kushner

replied. “I haven’t really been involved in the election stuff since Rudy Giuliani came in.”

In the aftermath of January 6, White House morale was at a nadir, according to Kushner. A second impeachment loomed. Kushner told staff to stay the course.

“You took an oath to the country,” he recalls. “This is a moment when we have to do what’s right, not what’s popular. If the country is better off with you here, then stay. If it doesn’t matter, then do what you want.”

That sales pitch sounds canned. Those who had served in the military found the spiel stale and grating.

In *Kushner, Inc*, the author Vicky Ward described Kushner’s earlier efforts to persuade Mark Corallo to join the White House staff. Corallo was once in the army and did a stint at the Department of Justice too.

After he said no, Kushner asked: “Don’t you want to serve your country?”

Corallo replied: “Young man, my three years at the butt end of an M-16 checked that box.”

Trump dodged the draft for Vietnam. When his brother, Fred Jr, accepted a commission in the air national guard, he met with his family’s scorn. In contrast, Mike Pence’s son, the Biden boys, Steve Bannon: all wore a uniform.

It goes on for hundreds of more words like this.

Why would someone write something like this? Or, actually, I know who would write it. This is like something from creative writing class at community college when I was a teenager. There were these men in their thirties in a creative writing class at Columbus State Community College, and they submitted things written like this. The question is, why would the Guardian publish it? And who would share it?

It's a top article in the sidebar:

---

---

---

## Most viewed



**GOP governors rebuke party members' 'outrageous rhetoric' over Trump search**



**Breaking History review: Jared Kushner's dispiriting Trump book**



**Russia-Ukraine war: what we know on day 173 of the invasion**



**Live** Australia news live: governor general says Morrison's appointment to other portfolios followed 'normal process'



**The Mar-a-Lago search prompts a big question: who snitched?**

*Arwa Mahdawi*



## AT WU MURUWI

For anyone confused: “book review” is a category of journalism where you’re allowed to use stylized prose. This is a literary tradition, it goes back to quarterly journals from the 19th century. So the concept is not out of line.

But that is some of the worst prose I’ve ever seen published in a mainstream international news publication.

This book review from Lloyd Green sits at the intersection of spin, absolution and self-aggrandizement. Lloyd Green sits at the intersection of failed novelist, Prozac, and the Dunning-Kruger Effect.

Green, who I have never heard of, is apparently a Jew lawyer from New York who worked for the State Department. He’s alleged to have smuggled out a thesaurus.

I actually wanted to read a review of Kushner’s book, and instead I open the article and it’s some New York Jew trying to jack-off on my face. Literally, he should have just posted a Toobin-style stream of himself masturbating.

[New York Magazine](#) wrote a real write-up of the book. It’s not out yet. It looks like it’s probably worth reading. Or worth skimming. I usually download copies of these potentially relevant political books and skim them. The above mentioned Kushner, Inc is one that I read all the way through, and Ward’s articles are always great. She might write a review of this Kushner book.

But just look at that part in the Guardian piece where he pops from analyzing what is presumably an account from the book he’s reviewing to an extended recounting of something in Kushner, Inc. as a way to lead into celebrating Joe Biden’s son being in the military while Trump didn’t serve. That is bizarrely sloppy.

This is something I’ve said from the beginning: journalists are jealous of me because I’m actually a good writer, and I actually got famous from

doing journalism. I'm the single most famous – and arguably the best – living English-language print journalist under 55 (Glenn Greenwald is 55). I'm more influential than Greenwald, actually, though I think he is a better writer, at least right now. If I live to be 55, I will have surpassed him. Probably.

To be fair, Jamal Khashoggi is more famous than me, but only because he got chopped up.

Censorship is done by journalists. Journalists are the ones who deliver the pressure at the behest of the Jewish lobbying groups. The only relevance of the ADL and the SPLC is that the media treats them as authorities. You can talk about the fact that the media is acting on behalf of the government, but the media is still acting, and journalists really do hate me because I got famous as a writer, which is something they are all naturally incapable of. So you had writers attacking another writer. Remember that Atlantic “profile” of me (that I refused to interview for, meaning it was not actually a profile), where you had this seething weirdo making up sex fantasies about me, alongside all of this other disinformation, and the whole thing was very poorly written? If you strip aside the political context, which no one really cares about, you just have a really bad writer in his 50s slandering a much better, much younger writer.

All of these people are hacks. I've talked to academics studying the “Alt-Right” – I've talked to several of them, and it was always off the record on both sides, so I won't name names, but some of them were serious people – and I have always said: “you get that my political views are more or less the same as Pat Buchanan's, right?” and all of them, except for one Jew, said “yes, I've gathered that the edginess is aesthetic.” Everyone with any basic intelligence knows that I'm not a “neo-Nazi.” So it's just an insult, and it is yellow journalism. I actually say what I want, and people actually enjoy reading my writing, and I'm extremely successful.

Journalists are the scum of the earth. They are necessarily failures who can't get work anywhere else. Every single time Glenn Greenwald talks about journalism, he talks about how he grew up looking up to journalists as truth-tellers. No millennial had that experience. There is no reason to join the "profession" of journalism unless you are incapable of getting work anywhere else, and you are willing to be a professional liar for very little money. Like being a taxi driver, journalism is a job that only attracts scumbags. I don't know of any right-wing journalists, other than myself and Darren Beattie, who are not scumbags. On the left, there are not more people than you can count on one hand. (There is sometimes decent writing in Vanity Fair or the New Yorker, but those publications require people to lie on purpose to push the Jewish agenda.)

It is worse than being a taxi driver or an insurance salesman. Taxi drivers can say "well, at least I'm not a drug dealer," and they don't have the education or intelligence to make any more money than they're making. They are also not directly harming society at large. People working in insurance can at least make a significant amount of money, and are not doing nearly the harm that journalists do. Journalists will destroy civilization for a pittance, and the only people of such low moral character are stupid.

Remember this: morality is correlated with intelligence. That was the point I am attempting to make in this poorly written rant about bad writing. These same things I said about journalists can largely be said about politicians, though they make a lot more money. As a general rule, virtually all evil people are dumb. The current order is so obsessed with loyalty tests that they have cleansed the entire establishment of intelligence to the point where they can't manage to maintain even the most basic level of competence.

The single biggest misconception among the right-wing in general is that leftists are competent. Part of that probably stems from the fact that lower IQ right-wing people perceive the maliciousness of the left as



incompetence (though they are doing that less now). Intelligent right-wingers are constantly contrasting themselves with low intelligence right-wingers. There is an understandable amount of disdain for boomer types who listen to Sean Hannity and read Breitbart. I don't share the disdain, because I am able to just classify these people as low IQ, and if someone is stupid but means well I can't really despise them. But if you listen to Sean Hannity, you get the impression that leftists genuinely believe what they are saying and are simply stupid. If you're more intelligent, you see that this is ridiculous, and leftists are malicious and in fact sadistic (leftism is simply political Judaism, frankly). So, it then follows – or rather, people perceive that it follows – that leftists must not also be stupid. That does not actually follow. The Sean Hannity boomer right perceives leftists as genuine but stupid, while they are actually mendacious and stupid.



The core problem with this boomer perspective is that it assumes that if you could just manage to explain to leftists that they are wrong that they would change their minds. They would not change their minds because they know they are lying and they are doing this all on purpose, but being able to lie does not indicate intelligence or competence. Part of the boomer misconception is that up through the 1990s, there were a significant number of leftists who were genuine, but the only ones that



remain now are people like Glenn Greenwald or Jimmy Dore who, in this current ordering of things, are effectively right-wingers who happen to support free college and have sympathy for black people. In terms of the CNN left, the New York Times left, the tranny left – these people are malicious and they are lying, but that does not mean they are smart.

All over the right-wing internet you find people tying themselves up into pretzels trying to explain how the ZOG regime is secretly competent, and you end up with people claiming that the US government is purposefully trying to empower Russia and China, as there is no other way to explain the behavior of the Brandon Administration. However, if you actually go through all of this stuff logically, you end up at the conclusion that the government is not competent, that the people running it are stupid, and the whole thing is totally unsustainable. This lines up with the conclusion that low morality correlates with low intelligence, and moreover, it is a hopeful message, as it means that there is a clock on just how long these evil people are going to be able to maintain power over the Western world. It also implies that the new order that will rise after the fall of this current order will be a moral order run by moral people, as moral people are going to be the ones with the intelligence to seize power.

It is instructive to look at the various transformative events in 20th century Russia. You have a total takeover by the Jews in 1917, but this lasted for only a brief period before Stalin took power. Stalin might not have had the highest moral character, but he was nationalistic and pro-family, and he put an end to the collectivization and church burnings. I don't think the USSR was the ideal society, but most people led normal, peaceful lives. When communism collapsed, Jews began a looting process, but out of that chaos came Putin, who established a positive, Christian order. Russia still has problems, but it is by far the most healthy white country, and things are getting better rather than worse – alcoholism, suicide, abortion, divorce, poverty and the various other phenomena of social decay are progressively lessening. Putin is an

intelligent and moral person who has surrounded himself with intelligent and moral people. You can see a similar version of events through 20th century China. You can also see these sorts of ebbs and flows all throughout recorded history. When societies are in a state of chaos and evil, they are always at some stage on a path back towards order and morality. It's important to understand that far from our situation being futile, a victory of righteousness is inevitable.

## **Addendum**

The response to “low intelligence is correlated with low morality” is always “Jews have a high average IQ.” While I don't think high Jewish intelligence is some kind of myth, it is largely exaggerated. We do not have very many good contributions from the Jews in really any field. If anything, outside of finance, Jews under-achieve, and rely extremely heavily on nepotism as a means to material success. Jews, collectively, also have a pattern of very poor decision-making and acting against their own interests, which their entire history attests to.

What's more, Jews appear to be getting dumber as society slides.

Following another line of reasoning, you could argue that Jews are actually metaphysically and/or genetically so different from white people that they operate on a different morality. Jews, all over the world, will help one another without asking for repayment. I've talked to Jews about this. There is a “Jewish community” in virtually every country on earth, and a Jew in need can always contact this community, wherever they are, and get aid. So within their own group, they behave in a way that we would perceive as moral. In the Jewish moral universe, non-Jews are beasts created by their god to serve them, so they do not have any moral obligation to non-Jews. Jews such as Bernie Madoff who commit crimes against other Jews are relatively rare. I don't believe there are multiple forms of morality, which is why Christianity lines up so much with Eastern religions like Buddhism or Confucianism, and why Christian ethics line up with those of Plato and Aristotle. There is a

natural moral order hardwired into the universe, and Jews violate this order. Still, it is notable that they have entirely different impulses than normal humans.

Finally, Jews are a very small group of people, and they rely on collaborators to accomplish their goals, and the only people they can convince to enthusiastically cooperate with them at this point are totally scummy people of very low intelligence.