

Vicisti, Galilae...



Vicisti, Galilæe

An Unofficial Compilation of 4 Separate Works by
Dr. Revilo P. Oliver on Various Aspects of Christianity.

Written by:

Dr. Revilo P. Oliver

Compiled and Formatted by:

)))JEREMY WHITLOCK(((

Table of Contents

PREFACE

CHRISTIANITY: A RELIGION FOR SHEEP

Introduction

The Fathers of the Church

God's Race

The Doctrine

All This, and Hell Too!

How the Jews Hate Christianity!

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

Introduction

Religion

The Triple Function

Cohesion

Immortality

Polytheism

Monotheism

Theodicy

Ritual and Aryan Worship

Ritual

Aryan Worship

Shamans

Lying for the Lord

Theoktony and Belief

Theoktony

Belief

Zoroaster

Zoroaster's Creation

The Great Überwertung, Psychic Magic, God's House, Buddhism, and Tapas

The Great Überwertung

Psychic Magic

God's House

Buddhism

Tapas

Ahura Mazda

Later Zoroastrianism

REFLECTIONS ON THE CHRIST MYTH

Introduction

Hellenism

The New Age

One Hypothesis

An Alternative

Appendix

ADDENDUM

Theological Claptrap

Jews and Islam

Creation

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SURVIVAL OF THE WEST

The Religion of the West

The Orient

Christianity Today

The Predictable Future

The Consequences

Succedaneous Religion

Postscript

THE JEWISH STRATEGY

Autobiographical Note

The Plight of Western Man

A Realistic Appraisal of the Jews: Their Unparalleled Achievements

The Jewish Strategy at Work: Ancient Alexandria

Survival of the Fittest

The Jewish Strategy Itself: In Their Own Words

A Unique Mentality

The Jewish Religion

Conspiracy or Instinct?

Extermination

Genetic 'Integration'

Religiosity

Christianity

Preface

This unofficial compilation contains the following 5 works by Dr. Oliver:

1. CHRISTIANITY: A RELIGION FOR SHEEP (A concise overview of Dr. Oliver's views on Christianity)
2. THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTINAITY (An exploration into its origins)
3. REFLECTIONS ON THE CHRIST MYTH (An outline of its puzzling and inconsistent nature)
4. CHRISTIANTIY AND THE WEST (A sobering analysis of Christianity's consequences – past, present, and future)
5. THE JEWISH STRATEGY (A biological investigation into the subversive Jewish spirit in juxtaposition to the weakened Aryan spirit)

The specific ordering of these works is intentional; They've been placed as such in order to give it a more book-like flow, as can be seen based on the descriptions of each of the works above. Additionally, all works we're converted and formatted from image-scanned PDFs into a convenient, light-weight eBooks format; Section headings have been added, and the original addendum notes accompanying the end of each section/chapter (causing the reader to have to consistently flip back and forth) have been converted into footnotes; This simple change greatly improves readability and provides a clear organization of the narrative. Finally, I've converted all Anglicizations and archaic British-isms (Dr. Oliver would sometimes write under a pseudonym, presumably of European origin given the Anglicized wordings and phrases he employed) into standard American.

With all of that out of the way.... I give you: **Vicisti, Galilæe!**

CHRISTIANITY: A RELIGION FOR SHEEP

(Originally titled: The Jews Love Christianity!)

by Revilo P. Oliver

Professor of the Classics, Retired; University of Illinois, Urban

[Note: This work was originally penned under the pseudonym Ralph Perier, a fictitious, presumably Europeanoid given all of the brutal Anglicisations strewn throughout, all of which I've laborious reverted back into standard, good-old American.]

Introduction

Our contemporaries are coming to a radically new understanding of the Jewish problem. One by one, and independently of one another, several of our best minds have re-examined the historical record or analyzed the forces that are today driving our race to suicide. And each of them has come spontaneously to the conclusion that Christianity was a Jewish invention, devised for the specific purpose of enfeebling and paralyzing the civilized peoples of the world, on whom the Jews were preying in antiquity and have preyed ever since.

A century ago, Nietzsche perceived that our civilization, although it seemed to have an absolute mastery of the whole world, was infected by a degenerative disease, a cancer of the spirit that would destroy it, if our people did not have the intelligence and the fortitude to excise the malignancy. He came to the conclusion that Christianity was a "transvaluation of values," a mental virus cunningly invented and propagated by the Jews to implement "Jewish vengeance and hatred, — the deepest and sublimest hatred in human history." Our contemporaries, whether or not they have read the *Genealogy of Morals*, reason largely from events that have occurred or from historical evidence that became available since Nietzsche's day. They come to substantially the same conclusion.

The origins of Christianity are extremely obscure. No historical record of its beginnings has survived, and scholars can only draw deductions from the earliest historical references to it and inferences from its confusing and incoherent mythology.

One thing is certain. Christianity was originated by Jews and based on oral traditions about one or, more probably, several of the Jewish agitators and miracle-mongers who bore the extremely common Jewish name of Jesus and called themselves christs. The word 'christ' comes from a Greek word that means 'oil, grease,' but which was used in the Jews' uncouth dialect of Greek to mean 'a messiah,' that is, a man appointed by the Jews' tribal god to lead his Chosen barbarians to a definitive victory over the civilized peoples, whom they implacably hated. One of the cleverest tricks of the Fathers of the Church in promoting their cult was to give to non-Jews the impression that 'christ' was the name of a person, and even to this day many Christians ignorantly believe that their god was a man who was baptized "Jesus Christ."

Nietzsche saw that successful promotion of Christianity depended on a pretense of reciprocal hostility between Christians and Jews. It depended on making the Jewish cult, when peddled to the *goyim*, seem non-Jewish and even anti-Jewish. "Was it not," he asked, "a necessary feature of a truly brilliant politics of vengeance, a far-sighted, subterranean, slowly and carefully planned vengeance, that Israel had to deny its true instrument publicly and nail him to the cross like a mortal enemy, so that 'the whole world' (meaning all the enemies of the Jews) might naively swallow the bait?" This policy, however, produced an unexpected backlash, which was only with difficulty brought under control.

It would take a volume even to summarize the scandalous and scabrous history of Christianity from its known beginnings around the middle of the second century to the triumph of a particularly shrewd and aggressive sect in the fifth century. There were hundreds of sects,

each with its own bundle of gospels, peculiar doctrines, and adroit theologians, but among them there were dozens of sects that took seriously the purported antagonism of the Jews to the new religion.

One of the earliest of the Christian sects of which we have some record, and for almost two centuries one of the largest, was the Marcionites. It is noteworthy, by the way, that until quite recently, the earliest extant inscription from a Christian church came from a Marcionite church that was built in 318 and, of course, destroyed when the victorious sect got the power to persecute.

The Marcionites believed that the Jews were “the synagogue of Satan.” They denied that *their* Jesus had been a Jew. They saw that it was preposterous to claim that an incarnate god could die or would foolishly have himself crucified. They held that it was outrageous to identify the supreme god, who was a just god and loved all mankind, with the capricious, ferocious, and highly immoral god described in the Jews’ story-book, which Christians now call “the Old Testament.” The Marcionites naively thought those stories historical, but regarded them as a chronicle of the crimes perpetrated by the Jews and their supernatural accomplice, a much inferior deity whose abused power the supreme god had justly revoked. Other Christian sects took the logical step of frankly identifying the Jews’ god with Satan. This plausible identification commended itself to *goyim* who had to live with Jews and suffer their depredations.¹

We have no means of estimating numbers, but it is possible that early in the third century, taking the numerous sects as a whole, a majority of the Christians repudiated the notion that the wily Jews were God’s People and that the Jesus who was divine could have been a Jew. The anti-Jewish sects, however, appear to have thought of themselves as merely religions and to have believed what was said in their scriptures about love, faith, and peace. Content to believe certain dogmas and to observe rules that would assure them postmortem bliss, they seem to have had no interest in political intrigue and conspiracy, for which they had no talent. So they eventually fell victims to a gang of crafty, ruthless, and tightly-organized theologians, who are now known as the Fathers of the Church and given a prominence they cannot have had in their own time, when they must have appeared to be just another clique of salvation-hucksters.

When the Fathers of the Church finally got their hands on the police powers of the state, doubtless with much covert help from the Jews, they extirpated the anti-Jewish Christians with fire and sword, the natural instruments of Christian love as understood by ambitious holy men. Despite all the pious massacres in the fifth century, the anti-Jewish “heresy” has reappeared from time to time in later ages. It is found today in certain “fundamentalist” churches and, most clearly, in the group of loosely affiliated sects called “British Israel,” whose members probably have never even heard of the Marcionites or their other ancient precursors.

¹ [There are other convincing reasons (beyond Jewry’s behavior) to conclude that Yahweh and the Devil are actually one and the same. For an thorough analysis on this topic, see French author Laurent Guyénot’s brilliant article, [“The Devil’s Trick: Unmasking the God of Israel.”](#)]

“British Israel” may be another ploy that backfired. It began in England at the time when Disraeli was crawling up to the British Prime Ministry and peerage. In its original form, it taught that the “ten lost tribes” supposedly taken captive by the Assyrians had been Anglo-Saxons, who migrated, *en masse*, from Assyrian territory to the British Isles. A handsome genealogy was concocted to show that Queen Victoria was a lineal descendant of a bandit chief named David. It followed, therefore, that God’s Own People, to-wit, the Anglo-Saxons and the Jews, reunited at last after many centuries, should jointly rule the world. That notion, however, imposed too great a strain on even Christian credulity.

Today, the “British Israelites” accept the story that the “ten tribes” were Anglo-Saxons or, at least, Nordics, and hot-footed it from Assyrian territory to the British Isles or, at least, northern Europe. They further claim that the Jesus of Holy Writ was an Aryan, despite his distinctively Jewish name and the distinctively Jewish (or conceivably Egyptian) name of his supposed mother. They rely principally on some of the early Christian forgeries which explicitly describe that Jesus as having had blue eyes and blond hair and beard. They do not use, and seem not to know, the tradition, attested as early as any of the other Christian tales, that one of the Jesuses was the son of a Jewess by a soldier named Pandara/Panthera, who probably was not a Jew and could well have been a Macedonian or other Greek in a Seleucid or Roman army.

We must feel a considerable sympathy for the “British Israelites” of the present. They candidly recognize the Jews as the eternal enemies of our race. They are the best of the Christians and are making a valiant effort to free their religion from its Jewish trammels and make it conducive to the survival of our race. Unfortunately, their doctrine is historically preposterous and, what is even worse, demoralizing. It makes our race the accomplices and beneficiaries of the ferocious god, Yahweh, who, according to the “Old Testament,” helped his pets swindle, plunder, torment, and butcher their betters in Egypt and Canaan.

The Fathers of the Church

Christianity today, including all of the many minor sects, is what it was made by the patient and subtle work of the Fathers of the Church. They were a knavish lot. There is no way of knowing how many of them were actually Jews on duty for God’s Race. It is highly unlikely that any one of them was a Greek or Roman. Most of them were probably Semites or descendants of one of the other Oriental peoples that swarmed into the mongrelized Roman Empire and displaced or replaced the Romans. Whatever their racial antecedents, it is clear from their own writings, despite much later whitewashing, that they were a motley crew of shysters, psychopaths, and other misfits. They were calculating or compulsive liars and forgers; see the able review of their record by Joseph Wheless, *Forgery in Christianity* (New York, 1930).

One of the Fathers’ most audacious and successful hoaxes certainly emits a Jewish odor. By brazen affirmation constantly repeated, they put over the claim that the wicked Romans, beginning in the time of Nero, persecuted Jesus’s little lambs because the innocent creatures wanted to worship “the true God.” Nothing could be more absurd historically. The Romans, aside from their typically Aryan obtuseness to the facts of race, were an admirably practical

people and knew how to govern. It was their fixed policy never to interfere with the superstitions of their subjects. They impartially tolerated the most grotesque rites and obscene religions. Some of the disgusting cults that flourished among the dregs of society practiced human sacrifice, but so long as they were content to sacrifice their own members, the Romans took no action: they knew that nothing *should* be done to save fools from the consequences of their folly. It was only when religious zeal inspired the murder of Romans or of the subjects entitled to their protection that the Romans drew a line beyond which their toleration would not go. Even then, they punished, not the pernicious faith, but only violence and conspiracy to commit violence.

The vermin executed by Nero were Jewish terrorists from the rabble of the huge ghetto that the Jews had planted in Rome. They were accused of having set the great fire that destroyed the greater part of Rome in 64; they confessed and were executed — cruelly, it is true. When one considers the appalling outbreaks of Jewish nihilism that occurred throughout the world from time to time, whenever a christ stirred up the rabble, one sees that it is highly probable that the terrorists were guilty of the crime to which they confessed. It is true that Nero's political opponents, who were conspiring to overthrow him, preferred to accuse him of the crime; and the young egomaniac's arrogant folly, when he expropriated the devastated center of the city for an extravagant new palace, seemed to confirm the political propaganda. That was what enabled the Fathers, when they began to impose their hoax on the ignorant more than a century later, to pretend that the ferocious terrorists had been persecuted for wanting to love everybody.

When historical criticism became feasible in our eighteenth century, the Fathers' clever hoax long escaped detection: thirteen centuries of Christianity had so accustomed our people to the practice of torturing and killing men for their thoughts and superstitions that the story seemed plausible enough.

After the middle of the third century, when the successors of the extinct Romans tried desperately to shore up the crumbling empire, a few of them are known to have taken some action against Christians as such, but we do not know under what provocation and, of course, no reliance can be placed on the tales told by the Fathers. The usual policy, however, was toleration, and we know that Diocletian admitted Christians to positions of high trust and responsibility in his own palace until 303, when tire Christians' piety got the better of them and they tried to murder him by burning him alive in his own bedroom. That made him angry.

At the end of the fourth century, St. Jerome, who was much better educated than most of the Fathers and probably the best of a bad lot, was the real founder of a new type of short story that became immensely popular: tales about the "martyrs" who "suffered for their faith." There is extant a letter by Jerome in which he bitterly reproves some Christians who thought that it mattered that the hero of his first fiction had never existed. That, Jerome indignantly said, was irrelevant, since his tale edified the clergy's customers, who knew no better. And Jerome went on concocting the tales with such brilliant success that he soon had a host of imitators, all trying to invent more grisly plots.

Jerome, as you see, was an accomplished theologian. He is now best remembered for his revision of the Latin text of the Bible, which he carried out with the help of kindly Jews, who hovered about him, eager to explain the mysteries of God's Word. Those Jews, we may be sure, knew what Christianity was doing for them.

In 313, Constantine and his colleague, Licinius, who were jointly fighting civil wars against rival emperors, issued the so-called Edict of Milan, which proclaimed universal toleration for all religious cults and specifically named the Christians as cults to be tolerated. The two emperors undoubtedly felt that the support of the Christian organizations would be an asset in the civil wars, and Constantine may have foreseen that they could be especially useful to him when the time came for him to turn upon and destroy his ally and brother-in-law, Licinius. Of course, as soon as Constantine was safely dead, the Fathers of the Church concocted a story that he had been privately "converted" by a childishy-imagined miracle in 312, and had been actually baptized on his death bed, so that the soul of one of the most treacherous rulers undoubtedly flitted right up to Jesus.

Christians still like to repeat the myth about the "conversion" of Constantine and the Triumph of the True Faith. All that really happened was that the Fathers of the Church, securely established by the edict of toleration, shrewdly used their bargaining power in intrigues with the various ambitious generals who were slugging it out for the grand prize. The real triumph of their Church came only with the final victory of Theodosius in 394, when the Fathers at last got the power to use the imperial police and army to begin persecuting in earnest. Their first concern, of course, was to exterminate their Christian competitors and destroy all their gospels. Some of those gospels, however, escaped them in one way or another. That is why we now know a good deal about the competing brands of Christianity.

We Aryans still have an instinctive respect for honesty and a peculiar respect for facts. We are shocked by the hypocrisy and mendacity of the Fathers, and Christians of our race cannot bring themselves to believe those ostentatiously pious individuals were what the record shows them to have been. In justice to them, however, we should remember that their deceptions were not un-Christian. They thought — or at least it was their business to teach — that Salvation depended on belief in certain inherently implausible tales and on conduct they approved. From that premise, it followed that any lie or trick that would induce the desired faith in the yokels was not only justified, but meritorious. As a recent writer has said, "Lying for the Lord is a normal exercise of piety."

God's Race

The Fathers of the Church got down to work near the end of the second century, when, incidentally, the Emperor in Rome, although he bore a Roman name, was a man from northern Africa, probably of mixed Semitic and Berber ancestry, whose native language was Punic, a Semitic dialect. Their overriding purpose, to judge from the results, was to preserve and protect the Jewish connection, which the Marcionites and other "heretics" had threatened.

When the Christians started scribbling gospels around the middle of the second century, they produced a very large number, and the composition of gospels to suit the whims or ambitions of would-be holy men went on through most of the next two centuries.

From such compositions, the Fathers of the Church collected and selected their favorites, making such revisions as they deemed expedient and probably composing supplements. These they eventually put together into a small anthology, which they called a "New Testament" and thus indissolubly joined to the Jews' story book, which they called an "Old Testament." The final selection of pieces for the anthology is said to have been made in 367 by Athanasius, a particularly bull-headed holy man, who is still revered for his services in establishing the incomprehensible doctrine of a three- in-one-god, of which Jesus was 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ %. His authority made it thenceforth impossible to compose new gospels with any chance of implanting them in the canon he had established. Thereafter, revision of the stories about Jesus was limited to short interpolations and verbal substitutions.

The effect of this combination of "Testaments" was to impose on Christians, under pain of eternal damnation, the odd belief that, throughout the greater part of human history, the Jews were the Chosen People of a terrible and truculent god, who savagely and often capriciously afflicted the lower races when they did not cravenly submit to his Master Race. To be sure, the Jews temporarily alienated his affections when they crucified one-third of him, but Christian doctrine assures us that God will eventually "change their hearts" and they will come flocking back to Jesus. (No one seems to worry about the morality of changing a man's mind by a psychological process that must resemble hypnosis.) In the meantime, God still loves his erring children, even though they worship only a third of him, and they must be preserved for the coming miracle of their reconciliation with daddy.

Another consequence of the Fathers' convenient doctrine is that the Jews were God's Race until a date that Christians now set at sometime between A.D. 29 and 34; thereafter, they became a religion, since Jews who have been laundered in holy water miraculously cease to be Jews.

The effect of this paradox was to make Christianity seem anti-Jewish and therefore attractive to all the *goyim* who resented their exploiters, while preserving for the Jews their prestige as a wonderfully "righteous" and "god-fearing" people, who had long been the intimates of the Christians' own god.

Of the many advantages that Christianity conferred on the Jews, none was greater than the privilege of masquerading as a religion and thus concealing their race. It ensured them the protection of both church and state as they rapaciously amassed wealth in mediaeval Europe. One has only to ask himself what would have happened, had Chinese or Malays swarmed into the cities to set up their enclaves (ghettos) to monopolize commerce, practice usury, and control finance. Even more important, it gave them perpetual access to the seats of power.

We are told that Ferdinand and Isabella expelled the Jews from Spain in 1492. Nonsense! By that time, Jews were safely and immovably ensconced in every important segment of Spanish society as "converts." A century later, one-third of the archbishops in Spain and of the

higher clergy was composed of Jews who practiced Christian rites in public and privately snickered at the stupidity of the *goyim*. Toynbee estimates that Jews formed about the same proportion of the nobility. And no one need be told that a tightly cohesive third of any organization has effective control of it. The Inquisition, to be sure, caught a few of the *marranos* who were careless or inept in their dissembling, but that served to reassure and pacify the populace.

Edward I banished the Jews from England in 1290, and we are told that England was *Judenfrei* until they swarmed in (with their money-bags) under Cromwell. No one, I believe, has tried to compute how many Jews, in keeping with the immemorial tactic of their race, had themselves sprinkled with the Christians' magic water, took English names, and tried not to laugh at the British in public. And one can only guess how much the masqueraders had to do with the rise of Puritanism, a brand of Christianity that was primarily based on the "Old Testament," and the revolution that placed in power fanatics who, for example, made the observation of Christmas illegal.

Christians today wax irate when they are shown translations of certain passages in the Jewish *Talmuds*, which are said to prove how much the Jews hate Christianity. It is true that there are pejorative references to Jesus of Nazareth, who was certainly one of the christs who contributed to the composite figure in the "New Testament."

No one seems to notice that the *Talmuds* speak as pejoratively of the last of the important christs in antiquity, of whose Jewish orthodoxy there can be no question.

Assuming the name Bar-Kokhba, he caught thousands of the Greeks and Romans off guard and butchered them, and he carried on a guerrilla war of terrorism for almost three years until the Roman legions gave proof that Yahweh had again forgotten to send celestial reinforcements to help His People exterminate the *goyim*. Nevertheless, the Talmudists denounce him bitterly, even changing his assumed name from Bar-Kokhba ("the son of the star") to Bar-Koziba ("the son of the liar"). The Jews hate him and asperse his memory *because he failed*.

Theologians who are concerned to show Christians how much the Jews hate their religion translate as "Christians" or "Christianity" some or all of a dozen words and phrases in Rabbinic, of no one of which is the meaning so indubitable that the Jews cannot quibble about it. It would be a waste of time to quibble with them. The Jews do feel contempt for persons who believe the Christian tales, and they do hate our race, which is probably meant by those words and phrases which are not merely synonyms of *goyim*, their general term for races and peoples who perversely refuse to recognize the vast superiority of the Jews.

The Doctrine

It remains for us to consider the consequences of Christianity, now restricting that term to the religion established by the Fathers of the Church. It has dominated and distorted the mind of our race for fifteen centuries — and *it continues to do so*.

We must first eliminate a potential ambiguity. Various investigations and estimates made a decade or more ago agree that about 10% to 15% of the members of our race (including about 90% of our “right wing”!) are Christians in the sense that they believe the tales in the “New Testament” to be historically true or at least accept as true the dogmas about the divinity of Jesus, etc. Although the percentages have probably been increased by the intensive promotion of Christianity in very recent years, the religion by this estimate controls only a minority of our race. When we estimate the influence of the religion in our world, however, we must not overlook *Ersatz*-Christianity. As a recent writer has pointed out, a very large number of our contemporaries, who call themselves “liberals,” “progressives,” and the like, pride themselves on having rejected the incredible tales about supernatural beings and the other trappings of Christian mythology, but retain an abiding faith in its social superstitions. As Nietzsche keenly observed, almost all of the persons who think they have freed themselves from Christianity disdain its creed but love its poison. If we include this *Ersatz*-Christianity, the Fathers of the Church established an enduring dominion over our race, to which at least 95% of our contemporaries are now subject. That is a datum to be remembered when you read the following outline.

It is obvious — obvious at least to everyone who has made even a cursory study of religion as an historical phenomenon — that Christian doctrine is a forced combination of three incompatible constituents: Zoroastrianism. Buddhism and Judaism.

I. The first of these, which is probably the most important, is appropriately symbolized in the well-known myth that Zoroastrian priests (*Magi*) came to attend the nativity of Jesus. This component did come directly from Persia.

If one compares the Zoroastrian cult to the more healthy polytheisms of antiquity, one sees how bizarre and irrational it is, although Christianity has so accustomed us to it that few reflect on how pernicious is a belief in an *evil* god. No mental poison has been more deadly than the Zoroastrians’ great innovation, the basic tenet that the world is a battlefield on which two gods contend for mastery: a good god and an evil god, each of whom would be omnipotent, were it not for the other. For no intelligible reason, these two mighty supernatural beings, one of whom had the power to create the entire universe, have to recruit puny mortals for a war that is absurd anyway, since everyone knows that in the end the good god will overcome the evil god, take him captive, and settle down to torturing him for all eternity. In the meantime, however, all men must join one or the other army and fight desperately to destroy their enemies.

This fantastic notion has given rise to what may be the most pernicious idea in human history: a holy war, fought to destroy evil. Rational men go to war to extend their own dominion over other people or sometimes to maintain it against other nations that are trying to extend their own power, in conformity with what is the fixed and unalterable condition of human life. Under the Zoroastrian-Christian system, however, whole nations are subject to periodic fits of insanity. Crazy hordes imagine themselves chosen by the good god (Yahweh & Son, Inc.) to butcher and annihilate the diabolic minions of the evil god (Satan, alias Antichrist). Our civilization has been repeatedly brought to the verge of destruction, and some of our greatest nations have in fact doomed themselves in such self-righteous paroxysms of homicidal mania,

while their enemies watched happily, reaping both enormous profits and spiritual satisfaction from the disasters the maddened Aryans brought on themselves in their eagerness to slaughter one another to please the ferocious Asiatic god that had been foisted upon them. A few examples will suffice.

The Protestant Reformation (which, incidentally, was sparked and abetted by the Jews) precipitated the Wars of Religion, in just one of which *two-thirds* of the population of Germany perished. The crazed Aryans, highly resolved to extirpate the devil-possessed legions of the Antichrist in Rome or the devil-possessed legions of the Antichrist who had revolted from Rome, irreparably impoverished our race's genetic heritage while they made wastelands of many of the most civilized and prosperous parts of Europe and blighted their own culture for almost two centuries. They fought valiantly on both sides, it is true, and equally mortgaged their lands to the Jews.

In America, the northern states effectively destroyed the American Constitution when they invaded the southern states in 1860 to deny them the rights the colonies had jointly won in 1781. Historians, to be sure, have identified economic causes, especially the greed of northern industrialists, but the crusade against the South was essentially a holy war to liberate savages from slavery, although the Christians' holy book expressly sanctioned and authorized slavery (even of higher races) in passages that the howling dervishes in the pulpits conveniently forget. The genetic heritage of the Americans was impoverished, while Jews naturally cheered on both sides and, after the war, flocked into the South to batten on the devastated land and its ruined people, and in the North consolidated political corruption.

In 1917, a sleazy shyster, whom the Jews had cleverly installed in the White House, proclaimed a holy "war to end wars"! The witless Americans, maddened as their holy men howled for blood, as usual, stampeded into Europe, believing in their frenzy that the Antichrist had become incarnate in the German Kaiser and his nation. No one needs to be reminded what profits that jihad brought to the Jews.

Again, in August 1933, when the Germans were trying to make themselves independent of the aliens in their country. Samuel B. Untermyer, as spokesman for his international race, declared a Holy War against the insubordinate nation. The Jews, however, did not invade Germany as their ancestors had invaded Canaan when they coveted that country. This was a Holy War for the Christianized Aryans in the rest of the world, who were easily incited to blind rage against the Satanic nation that dared not to venerate God's Holy Race. In their fratricidal delirium, the hate-crazed Aryans consummated what is likely to have been the Suicide of the West and the irreversible doom of our race. And now, Yahweh's Chosen Tribe happily control the economic life of the impoverished and stultified Aryans everywhere, demand that the cowering white men believe even such obscene fictions as the "Holocaust," and ever more openly display their just contempt for brutes who can so easily be stampeded to their own destruction.

The Zoroastrian idea of a holy war is, of course, but one component of the poison that has made our race schizophrenic. In the intervals between the attacks of self-righteous insanity that

makes them run amuck in holy wars, they do not become rational, even momentarily, but instead babble in the throes of another hallucination. They jabber about pacifism and, in a kind of delirium tremens, imagine they see such impossible things as “world (!) peace” cavorting just beyond their reach. So the lunatics try to run hard enough to overtake the ever-retreating phantom.

II. The Buddhist component of Christianity reached it indirectly, perhaps largely through the Essenes, and was considerably adulterated on the way.

The essential element is the gloomy and cowardly doctrine that human life is not worthwhile — that all the things dear to healthy men, such as health, strength, sexual love, beauty, culture, learning, intelligence, wealth, and even individuality, are merely “vanity of vanities,” empty illusions. (Christianity, of course, makes them *evil* illusions.) The proper attitude is that of a man hopelessly diseased and in pain: he longs for death. The cult, however, denies us a rational release from our misery in suicide, which it says is impossible, since some kind of ghost will survive the death of the body. What we can and should do, however, is to refrain absolutely from sexual intercourse, so that we will not engender fresh links in the chain of misery that is life on earth. Furthermore, some mysterious supernatural power has ordained that we can acquire post-mortem benefits for our souls by frustrating all the desires that healthy men feel, and even greater rewards by inflicting physical pain on ourselves. There is a heavenly bookkeeping machine which makes entries to our credit whenever we make ourselves suffer pain and enters debits against us whenever we yield to temptation and enjoy something, whether it be a woman’s love, the beauty of great art, the intellectual exhilaration of discovering a fact of nature, or any other pleasure. The balance of our account when we die determines the future of the soul. (Buddhism assumes that that future is reincarnation, but Christianity perverts and degrades that not implausible myth by adding the Zoroastrian notion of a final judgement: after our only life on earth, an angel will read the computer’s print-out and, if the amount of our debts has made us insolvent, will pitchfork us into Hell, where our impalpable and intangible souls will be roasted on hot coals and suffer all other imaginable bodily torments for all eternity — not a year or a century or a millennium or a billion years, but all the eternity of *infinite* time!)

From this notion, corrupted by the addition of some of the sexual obsessions that seem to be an innate part of the Jews' racial mentality. Christianity proclaimed the doctrine of race suicide for our people. Allowance was made, of course, for the men who did not have the fortitude to castrate themselves or otherwise frustrate the instincts of healthy men, but by a monstrously obscene transvaluation of rational values, disease was called “health” and strength was called “weakness.” Men too “weak” to be eunuchs were permitted the “sin” of having offspring to provide customers for the next generation of shamans, but it was the will of Christianity’s fearful god that our race be as celibate as possible. For fifteen centuries, enormous numbers of male Aryans were herded into the chinch, both as priests and as monastics, to blight their masculinity with homosexuality and perversion, mitigated only by the chance of furtive adulteries. And enormous numbers of our women were imprisoned in convents to become psychopathic or practice secret abortions.

It may seem to us now that the institutions for race suicide attracted, as today, only the misfits, the physically or psychically defective, who should always be prevented, so far as possible, from reproducing themselves. To some extent that was true, but for reasons which are historically obvious, some of the best blood of our race was irretrievably lost in mad efforts to curry favor with the god the Jews had exported to us. For century after century, the sexual superstitions of Christianity systematically weakened and impoverished our race. The Jews could have invented nothing better for their purposes.

The Jews despise our race for its gullibility, venality, and the debility of its racial instincts, but they also hate us, fearing that we may never become perfectly docile livestock on their world-wide plantation. The Jewish attitude toward us was somewhat indiscreetly revealed in English by Theodore Kaufmann in his *Germany Must Perish!* (Newark. 1941; recently reprinted). Kaufmann demanded that every man, woman, and child in Germany be surgically sterilized to exterminate a people that had been guilty of insubordination to God's Race. The rabid Jew realized that it would be premature to urge similar treatment of the Aryans in other nations, and, as things turned out, it proved not to be feasible to carry out the Jewish plan even in Germany at that time. In the United States and other countries once ruled by our race, the same end is to be achieved more gradually by mongrelization and the incitation of a sexual mania, which, incidentally, is a revival of the early Christian sects that taught that Jesus had revealed that the only road to Salvation lay in male homosexuality or, conversely, in unlimited promiscuity and the abolition of families to liberate females for intense and indiscriminate copulation *ad libitum*.

Another derivative of the Buddhistic negation of the values of human life was also distorted and polluted in transmission. It is the mawkish sentimentality, the fatuous self-abasement, and the total repudiation of reason that appears in the so-called Sermon on the Mount, a concentrated poison for which Christians still have a morbid appetite. It is the essence of what Nietzsche called the "slave morality" — the morality of persons so degenerate or diseased that they are fit only for slavery. It is the negation of life itself. Glory is reserved for the meek and humble who take a masochistic delight in being trampled upon. They must be so abject and feeble-minded that they love their enemies. The dregs of human society are the "salt of the earth," and they are promised the joy of seeing their betters suffer, when "the last shall be made first." Nothing that makes life worth living is not evil, and the idiots are exhorted, "take no thought for your life" — indeed, to abstain totally from rational thought. The ideal mentality for Christians is that of vegetables, but since it is not quite feasible to attain that blessed state, Christians take pride in proclaiming they are sheep, the most stupid of all mammals, incapable of defending themselves, living only to feed, multiply, and be fleeced periodically. Christians even like to depict themselves as lambs that stare uncomprehendingly at the world about them. They recite with unctious psalms that aver that they are mindless and will-less sheep, confident that the Jews' god will herd them to "green pastures beside still waters." where they may lie down to chew their cud in uninterrupted bliss.

Commanded to "take no thought for the morrow," but to have bird-brains and be "like the fowls of the air" that "sow not, neither do they reap," relying on their "heavenly Father" to feed

them, Christians who actually believed the Drivel on the Mount would, if sufficiently numerous, simply precipitate the total breakdown of any civilized or even barbarous society — and would not even grow pelts for the Jews to fleece. Perhaps it is fortunate that Christians like to befuddle themselves with sentimental verbiage they do not understand and holy “mysteries” which they can contemplate with bovine incomprehension.

Christianity, indeed, enjoins pride in imbecility. Its god became incarnate to “make folly of the wisdom of this world.” Its votaries must have an unthinking faith in an incomprehensible farrago of patently false statements. To abjure the use of reason is the only path to Salvation and the animal-like joys of eternal idleness in Heaven. Learning and wisdom must be despised. Every effort of human reason to understand the world in which we live is a sin, an affront to a god who has given us the perfect model of righteous wisdom in an oyster.

The repudiation of reason and sanity was a particularly deadly poison to our race, which, as several writers on ethnology have recently pointed out. has in some of its members, at least, an innate capacity for the objective and philosophical thought by which alone our race attained a partial control over the forces of nature and the power to defend itself by imposing its will on other-races.

This power, which we have now fatuously surrendered, was won for us slowly and painfully by the often-heroic efforts of a few men and only over the frantic opposition of the Christian witchdoctors. The debased superstition that insanely exalts ignorance over knowledge and faith over reason repressed and deformed for many centuries our race’s unique capacity for a rational and mighty civilization.

III. Students of religion commonly deny originality to the Jews, because all of the cosmogonic tales in the “Old Testament” were lifted from the mythologies of more civilized peoples, especially the Babylonians, and only superficially Judaized. They thus overlook or ignore what is unique in the religion professed by the Jews, especially after they had the brilliant idea of converting their religion from a henotheism to a monotheism to imitate and appropriate the monotheism of Greek Stoicism.

It is true that the peculiarities of Jewish religion are not mere superstitions, such as other races may ignorantly accept, but spring from their innate certainty that their race is immeasurably and categorically superior to all others, an absolute certainty that is independent of any mythological explanation of it they may give to others or even to themselves. That poses a biological problem which we cannot consider here, but we must notice the specifically Jewish element that went into the Christian amalgam.

The Jews are, by nature, a proletarian people. It is a matter of common observation that when they invade a country, they infiltrate every prosperous city and set up their ghettos, in which they huddle together, like ants in their anthill, bees in the hive, or termites in their nest. Everyone has noticed that when a Jew or a few Jews associate with *goyim*, they successfully simulate the manners and culture of the people among whom they have planted themselves;²

² [See Goebells’ [Mimicry](#).]

but when Jews become a majority in any place, from a single room to a city, they become a swarm, a buzzing synagogue, an unmistakable alien species.

Some Jews, of course, become immensely wealthy, but they remain parts of the international swarm. According to a dispatch in *Sunday Chronicle* (the official Jewish newspaper in London), January 2nd, 1938, the Jews, incensed that the Germans should dare to be disrespectful to God's Master Race, held a meeting near Geneva at which Jewish financiers promptly contributed £500,000,000 to a fund to punish the insubordinate *goyim*. The reader, especially if he has had experience of "right-wing" activity in any of our nations, can estimate for himself the chances that Aryan financiers would have given \$2,433,250,000 in 1938 to *preserve* their own race, or would contribute (if asked) an equivalent sum today, say £20,000,000,000. If he thinks that unlikely, he has the measure of the difference between the Jewish race and ours.

The racial solidarity of the Jews makes them unique among the peoples of the world. We can only envy them a bond of cohesion that indissolubly unites the poor with the rich, subordinates personal greed and ambition, and even transcends religious differences. The professed beliefs of Talmudists, Kabbalists, and Jewish atheists seem irreconcilable to us, but they no more impede the race's effective unity than the ferocious religious dissensions of the last centuries B.C. impeded the Jews' exploitation of the gullible *goyim*, the Seleucids, the Ptolemies, and the Romans, whom the Jews adroitly played off against each other. Tacitus marveled at the Jews' "obstinate devotion to their own kind" coupled with "implacable hatred of the rest of mankind." He wrote before the race's solidarity was most impressively demonstrated by the Jewish outbreaks in many Roman provinces around A.D. 117. In Cyrenaica, for example, the Jews had naturally planted a huge ghetto in the provincial capital and controlled a large part of the trade on which the region's prosperity depended. Many Jews must have been among the wealthiest inhabitants. But a christ named Andrew brought the glad tidings that Yahweh said it was time for his Chosen Race to put the *goyim* in their place. Filled with zeal for righteousness, the Jewish swarm caught the stupidly complacent Greeks and Romans off guard and slaughtered more than 200,000 men and women in various ingenious ways, such as sawing off their hands and feet and ripping out their intestines while they were still alive. God's People then destroyed all the property in the city (including their own!), evidently burning all the buildings to the ground and levelling the mins. Then they rushed out into the country side to destroy the villages and uproot the crops. That done, the enthusiastic horde of nihilists descended on Egypt, leaving behind only a scorched desert and dismembered corpses.

This nihilism was vividly expressed in the Christians' favorite horror story, the Jewish apocalypse that the Fathers of the Church selected for inclusion in their appendix to the "Old Testament." The wild phantasmagoria describes in loving detail all the disasters and torments with which Jesus will afflict and destroy the civilized peoples of the earth when he returns in glory from the clouds with a squad of sadistic angels. One should note the characteristic provision that *goyim* are not to be merely killed outright: they are to be made to suffer exquisite agonies for five months first. But what Lloyd Graham has properly called the "diabolical

savagery" of the Jew god is not satisfied with exterminating all the *goyim* with every kind of torture a lurid imagination could invent. He destroys the land, the mountains, the sea, the whole earth; he destroys the sun and the moon; and he rolls up the heavens like a scroll, presumably including even the most remote galaxies . . . *Everything* is annihilated. And all this for the sake of Jesus's pets, an elite of 144,000 male Jews who despise women. For these, to be sure, he creates a New Jerusalem, in which they will loaf happily for a thousand years.

The Jews spiced Christianity with their rancor and nihilism. As Maurice Samuels said, with laudable candor. "We, the Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers forever ... *We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world.*" And by inventing Christianity, they stopped credulous *goyim* from inquiring what kind of god their race created for itself.

All This, and Hell Too!

Christians like to prate about how much their bundle of irreconcilable superstitions has done for us. Well, it first gave our race schizophrenia and has now given it a suicidal mania.

It was bad enough when the Christians were under the spell of the Zoroastrian notion that the biological reality of race can be charmed away by a kind of magic called "conversion." They hired missionaries to pester everyone else in the world, from the highly civilized Chinese to the uncivilizable anthropoids in Africa. They believed that the aliens could be transformed into the equivalent of white Europeans, if they were dunked in holy water by a licensed practitioner. For the dunking, the *Ersatz*-Christians substitute "education," which they think a much more powerful kind of magic. But from this silly idea we have now progressed to a more baneful kind of unreason.

The Buddhist notion of equality, perverted by proletarian malice and festering envy, has become the fanatical faith of 95% of our race today. In a recent article, R. P. Oliver observed that our "intellectuals," who disdain the Christian fairy tales about Jesus and preen themselves on being atheists or, at least, agnostics, nevertheless "cling to the morbid hatred of superiority that makes Christians dote on whatever is lowly, inferior, irrational, debased, deformed, and degenerate." Both groups hold frantically to the dogma of the "equality of all races" (except, of course, the vastly superior race of the "Old Testament"), and equally believe that moral excellence is evinced by faith in what daily experience shows to be patently preposterous. And when they can no longer close their eyes to shut out the real world, they have a solution. The various races (except God's People) must be *made* equal, must be reduced to the lowest common denominator of anthropoids. And so we come to the breathtaking transvaluation that is the dominant creed of our time: the Aryans, by virtue of the superiority they have shown in the past, are a vastly inferior race. They are burdened by the horrible guilt of not having committed suicide, a guilt they can expiate only by taxing themselves to hire their enemies to destroy them. They must love their enemies, but hate their own children. Especially in once-great Britain and the United States, the crazed whites are not only subsidizing the proliferation of their vermin and legislating to inhibit the reproduction of their own kind, but are importing

from all the world hordes of their biological enemies to destroy their posterity. Especially in the United States, they condemn their own children to the most degrading association with savages in their "integrated" schools. American parents evidently feel a "spiritual" satisfaction when their own children — or, at least, their neighbors' children — are beaten, raped, and mutilated by the sub-humans. And British parents, who, if still prosperous, can protect their children from physical, though not from mental, squalor, abhor as wicked "racists" the few individuals who think their race is fit to survive. An honest psychiatrist (there are a few) could perhaps determine what weird mixture of sadism and masochism has been inculcated into the minds of our people.

Everywhere, the Christianized Aryans (including those who imagine they are not Christians) evidently agree that our race must be stamped out for the comfort and joy of the several mammalian species that covet our property and instinctively hate us.

How the Jews Hate Christianity!

The Jews no longer make a serious effort to maintain the pretense of an antipathy to Christianity. It is true that once in a while they protest the public display of Christian symbols, such as the cross. But that merely spices their joke. When they erect a thirty-foot "menorah" in front of the White House to remind their tenant who owns the place, the cowed Christians never think of protesting.

Oliver, in his fairly well-known book, *Christianity and the Survival of the West*, claimed that it was a "Western" religion, but he had to base his argument on what had to be *added* to the doctrine to make it acceptable to the Nordic peoples after the collapse of the rotted Empire that had once been Roman. And in the postscript to his second edition, he admitted that the religion had been stripped of those additions and was being reduced to the superstition of the early Christian sects that either excluded non-Jews or admitted them only to the status of "whining dogs," which they could attain by having themselves mutilated sexually, observing the Jewish taboos, and obeying their God-like masters.

The holiness of the Jews is now an established dogma, especially among the *Ersatz*-Christians. A friend of mine, who is now in the United States, wrote to presidents of various colleges and universities that were trying to make a few extra bucks by offering courses to prove the "truth" of the Jews' hoax about the "six million" of God's People that the Germans are supposed to have "exterminated" by a procedure that is physically impossible. He had several very nasty replies from chief diploma-salesmen who intimated that he, who holds a Ph.D. in modern history, should be locked up for his "ignorance." I have seen copies of some of those letters. The irate proxies were clearly endorsing their own faith. They *knew* that Jews could not lie, just as their grandfathers had *known* that Jesus walked on water and held a picnic that was the least expensive fish-fry in history. It boots not to inquire how much of their grandfathers' faith or their own was founded on actual belief in what "everybody believes" and how much was based on a calculation that it would not be remunerative to doubt what

"everybody knows." The results are the same. Woe to him who questions any tale told by the "righteous" race.

By this time, everyone must know that the Jews have acquired a working control of all the media of communication: the press, the radio, the boob-tube, and the publication of widely-distributed books. If the Jews had the slightest animus against the Christian religion, they would use these powerful weapons to destroy it. Instead, the real opponents of Christianity, the rational atheists, are systematically and totally excluded from the "media." No newspaper, no widely distributed periodical, dares print one of their articles or even to mention them without derision. No radio or television station will admit they exist, and even if they telephone on "call-in" programs, they are shut off before their first significant word reaches the antenna. To get into print, they must organize their own starveling publishing companies to issue books or periodicals that are very expensive because only a few copies can be printed for a tiny audience that cannot be increased because no newspaper or radio could be hired to advertise such publications at any price. The managers, even if not Jews, prudently assume that atheists, who would substitute facts and reason for fairy tales and blind faith in "spiritual values," are very wicked, and they regret that it is not currently feasible to bum them at the stake. If the Jews had an antipathy to Christianity, they could change that attitude overnight with a few directives to their hirelings, and they could make the religion ludicrous in the eyes of the majority within a year or two. The boobs simply absorb what they are told.

The Jew-controlled "media" constantly and systematically lavish free publicity on the Christian churches and especially on the salvation-hucksters. The æther is clamorous with the bellowing and wheedling of "evangelists," who are plying their trade and raking in money from everyone whose emotions can be stirred by their crude rhetoric. Even the richest of the gospel-businesses receive much of their advertising free; when they do have to pay, they are given much reduced rates. The "media" religiously report miracles that could have happened only East of the Sun and West of the Moon. And they religiously assume that the Christian shamans are so holy they must "mean well," even when they are caught in embezzlement or fraud.

I hear that about half a dozen white preachers, more or less subtly "racist" or even anti-Jewish, are allowed to speak (for a fee) over some of the smaller radio stations in the United States, provided, of course, that they do no more than furtively intimate what they mean on racial subjects. If they really annoyed the Jews, they would be shut up on some pretext or other. The "evangelists" who make it to the big time (an annual take of ten million dollars or more) all make it clear that a Christian's first obligation is to adore God's People.

Furthermore, although the Christians and some sociologists miss the point, the "media" are industriously creating the atmosphere most propitious to a recrudescence of Christianity. The religion grew in the decaying Roman Empire with the growth of universal unreason: it had to compete only with other superstitions so gross that historians are perplexed when asked to decide which was the most grotesque. The "media" are today stridently promoting every kind of hokum that encourages belief in the supernatural. They not only advertise, but even hire "psychics," "seers," astrologers, and mystery mongers who spin tall tales about haunted houses, weekends on "flying saucers," "Bermuda Triangles," and similar boob-bait. All the adepts of

such cults are potential customers for the Christian fakirs. When, for example, a man begins to practice the self-hypnosis called "transcendental meditation," he will soon ripen himself for an access of Faith. When he has so blunted his intelligence that he can believe that the planets, while obeying the law of gravitation with mathematical precision, took the trouble to portend his future, he can soon believe in the Second Coming and the End of Time.

I have seen no statistics that indicate how greatly the percentage of belief in the theological myths of Christianity has been increased by the Jews' strenuous promotion of it, but I observe that in the United States the three clowns who recently competed for the job of doing the Jews' work in the White House thought it good advertising to call for a "spiritual rebirth" and to claim that they had been laundered in "the blood of the Lamb" and "born again." A candidate's chances of winning the popularity-contest now seem to be increased by evidence that he either is a liar or has hallucinations.

The most stupendous of the Jews' many hoaxes is a witch's brew that has, over the centuries, transformed the once intelligent and valiant Aryans into flocks of uncomprehending sheep, easily herded, easily fleeced, and easily stampeded.³

³ The first edition of this work was titled, "The Jews Love Christianity," with the only other difference besides the title being this last sentence, which, in keeping with the title, read: "The Jews love Christianity. Why shouldn't they? The Most stupendous of their hoaxes has become their most deadly weapon against us."

THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

by Revido P. Oliver

Professor of the Classics, Retired; University of Illinois, Urbana

Introduction

OF THE MANY PROBLEMS that confront us today, none is more vexing than that of the relation of Christianity to Western Civilization. None, certainly, causes more acrimonious controversy and internecine hostility between the members of the race which created that civilization. None more thoroughly counteracts their common interest in its preservation and renders them impotent and helpless. And that is not remarkable: what is in question is the essential nature of our civilization, and if there is no agreement about that, there can be no effective agreement on other questions.

Around 1910, Georges Matisse, in *Les Ruines de l'Idée de Dieu*,¹ predicted that by 1960, at the very latest, the only churches left in the civilized world would be the ones that were preserved as museum pieces for their architectural beauty or historical associations. The scientific and historical knowledge accumulated by our race had rendered belief in supernatural beings impossible for cultivated men, and universal education would speedily destroy the credulity of the masses. "We have climbed out of the dead end of the dungeon into which Christianity cast us. The man of today walks in the open air and the daylight. He has won confidence in himself."

In 1980, especially in the United States, there was a massive "upsurge" of Christianity. In November, one of America's many bawling evangelists, Oral Roberts, had an interview with Jesus and took the opportunity to observe that Jesus is nine hundred feet tall. That datum so impressed his followers that within two weeks, it is said, they supplied him with an extra \$5,000,000 to supplement the \$45,000,000 they give him annually. A little earlier, another holy man, Don Stewart, reportedly made the big time in evangelism (i.e., an annual take of more than \$10,000,000) by distributing to his votaries snippets of his underwear, which True Believers put under their pillows, since the bits of cloth that had been in contact with his flesh had absorbed the mana of his holiness. And in the quadrennial popularity contest to determine which actor was to have the star role in the White House, all three of the presidential candidates deemed it expedient to announce that they had "got Jesus" and been "born again."

More significantly, in both England and the United States, a considerable number of men who have received enough technical training to be called scientists, have been hired or inspired to prove the authenticity of the Holy Shroud of Turin by "scientific" proof that the coarse cloth was discolored by supernatural means, the mana of divinity. Some of these scientists, it is true, claim that the vague picture was formed on the fabric because the body of the deceased god was highly radio-active and emitted radiation of an intensity comparable to that produced by the explosion of an atomic bomb at Hiroshima, but obviously only a very supernatural force could have charged the cells of an organic body with such enormous and deadly energy. In many American colleges, professors of reputable academic subjects are teaching courses to demonstrate that human beings cannot be the product of the biological process of evolution,

¹ Paris, Mercure de France, s.a. All translations from foreign languages in these pages are mine, unless otherwise noted.

but must have been specially designed and manufactured by a god in a way that they more or less explicitly identify with the well-known account of the descent of mankind from Adam and his spare rib. The divinity school of Emory University (founded in 1836) offers, for the edification of Methodist ministers, a graduate seminar in the theology of America's most distinguished automobile thief and rapist, a Black preacher named King, and, presumably for such exemplary Christianity, was rewarded with a gift of \$100,000,000, the largest private benefaction on record.

The United States has always been noted for the multiplicity and fanaticism of its Christian sects, but on a much smaller scale a Christian "outreach" (to use the evangelical term) for souls and funds may be observed in several countries of Europe, even including, it is said, some in Soviet territory. And one wonders whether a survey in England today would maintain the statistics that permitted Professor A. N. Whitehead to conclude, in 1942, that "far less than one-fifth of the population are in *any* sense Christians today." I hear that the fraction would have to be significantly increased, and that Roman Catholicism, more than other sects, is constantly attracting a significant number of "converts." But the number of persons who attend churches or profess to believe some one of the numerous Christian doctrines is relatively unimportant. The domestic and foreign policies of all the nations of the Western world are based on ideas that their populations as a whole take for granted and accept without reflection or consideration – ideas which are obviously, though sometimes not explicitly, derived from Christian theology and are, so to speak, a residue of the ages when our race was, not inaccurately, called Christendom.

Matisse was egregiously wrong. His spectacular error, however, was a projection logically made from the evidence available to him in 1910, when he concluded that "the White race has conquered the whole world and slain the Dragon [of superstition]. And the race had to do it. If the human mind had been incapable of that achievement, the most difficult of all its achievements, it would have been doomed. Intellect would have ended in failure on this planet. It was a question of the life or death of intelligence... The indisputable proof of the innately superior power of the European mind today is atheism."

Matisse, of course, did not foresee the catastrophe of 1914 or sense the subterranean and occult forces that were secretly in operation even in 1910 to precipitate, not just another European war to alter the balance of power on the Continent, but a war that those forces converted into a universal disaster, even more destructive of rationality than of property and life, which may prove to have been the beginning of the end for our civilization and race. The question that Matisse so clearly posed therefore remains, not altered by the calamities he could not foresee, but instead now made even more vital and urgent.

The question is obviously, perhaps fatally, divisive, but it cannot be evaded or ignored. The question is one to which even reticence is an answer; and hypocrisy is demoralizing. I have therefore undertaken the exacting and almost impossible task of presenting in these pages an objective and dispassionate summary of the problem, condensing into a few pages what would more properly be the substance of several volumes, themselves compendious. I have necessarily refrained from debating side issues and from straying into scholarly controversies. I have tried to limit myself to skeletal essentials of what may with confidence be regarded as established

fact and logical inference therefrom, and I assume that I need not tell intelligent readers that the subject is one on which it is flatly impossible to make *any* statement whatsoever that is not contradicted somewhere in the horrendous tonnage of printed paper on the shelves of even a mediocre library.²

To view our problem clearly, we must begin with its beginnings and indicate, as summarily as possible, its prehistoric origins, limiting ourselves to matters directly relevant to our own race, with which alone we need have a rational concern. And since Indo-European is best reserved for use as a linguistic term, and such words as Nordic and Celtic are too restrictive as designations of variations within our species, we shall use the only available word in general use that designates our race as a whole, although the Jews have forbidden us to use it. Aryan, furthermore, has the advantage that it is not a geographic term, and while some may think it immodest to describe ourselves as arya, 'noble,' that word does indicate a range of moral concepts for which our race seems to have instinctively a peculiar and characteristic respect, which differentiates it from other races as sharply as do its physical traits, and, like them, more or less conspicuously, depending on the particular contrast that is made. It is unfortunate that in the present state of knowledge we cannot trace our species, the Aryans, to the species of *Homo erectus* or *Homo habilis* from which it is descended.

² I have restricted the documentary notes to a bare minimum, limited to points that may not generally be matters of common knowledge. So far as possible, I have cited only works available in English, selecting from these the one or two that give, so far as I know, the most succinct and perspicuous treatment of the given topic.

Religion

Religion, which we may define as a belief in the existence of præter-human and supernatural beings, is a phenomenon limited to several human species, since it depends on rudimentary powers of reason and relatively developed powers of imagination. We may agree with Xenophanes that if oxen or horses or lions conceived of gods, each species would, like men, create its gods in its own image, but there is no slightest reason for supposing that mammals other than man have any conception of superior beings other than an instinctive recognition of predatory species that can prey on them and an instinctive suspicion of whatever is unfamiliar and may therefore be dangerous.

Anatole France, to be sure, identified dogs as religious animals, and he had a basis for doing so. A dog does venerate his master as a being with powers vastly superior to his own. He worships his god in his own way, seeking to conciliate his favor with propitiatory motions and caresses, learning to obey his wishes and whims, and even having a sense of sin when he knows that he has yielded to a temptation to do something that will displease his deity. A dog tries to appease his god's anger, as men do, by humility and fawning and he will fight for his god, even at the risk of his own life. But we must not carry France's analogy too far. The dog's god is a living being, who normally feeds his canine worshipper, punishes him physically on occasion, and, if worthy of devotion, pets him affectionately. No dog ever worshipped a being that he could not see, hear, smell, and touch.

Eugène Marais, whose scientific investigations have at last been accorded the honor they long deserved, made observations of the highest importance for anthropological studies. He discovered that baboons collectively evince a degree of intelligence that, in certain respects, surpasses that of the apes that are usually classified as anthropoid, and, despite their lack of an articulated language, they may favorably be compared to the more primitive species that are classified as human. The chacmas whom Marais so patiently observed undoubtedly have rudimentary powers of reason, to which, indeed, they owe their survival in an environment that became overwhelmingly hostile when farmers and government undertook to exterminate them. In his articles for the general public, which were collected and translated under the title, *My Friends, the Baboons* (London, 1939), Marais describes a highly significant incident that occurred during his prolonged observation of a band of baboons that had, after long observation, come to accept him and his colleague as not hostile members of a species they justly feared. When many of the infant baboons were smitten by an epidemic malady, the elders of the band, its oligarchs, solicited human help and found a way to show that they believed or hoped that kindly members of our species, which, they knew by experience, had the power to inflict death miraculously with a rifle, also had the miraculous power to preserve from death beings they chose to protect. And at least one of the female baboons, mother of a dead infant, unmistakably believed or hoped that men had the power to resurrect the dead and restore them to life.

If the pathetic episode is reported correctly, the chacmas have something of the power of imagination that is requisite for religiosity. But we should not call them religious. They attributed to a mammalian species, which they knew to have powers incomprehensible to them, a power the species did not have. Baboons do fear night and darkness, but if they give a shape to what they fear, they probably think of it as a leopard. There is no evidence to suggest that they have even the most rudimentary notion of gods. No more can be said of some species of anthropoids that are classified as human because they have an articulate, though rudimentary, language. Anthropologists who had opportunities to observe those species before their native consciousness had been much corrupted by "missionaries" or by contact with higher races (which usually excites an almost simian imitativeness), report that the dim consciousness of those species, although possessing certain animal instincts and faculties that are weak or wanting in our race, is strictly animistic, attributing, so far as we can tell, the efficacy of a spear to some power inherent in the spear itself, and being unable to distinguish between animate and inanimate objects. The creatures live in a world of perpetual mystery, incapable of perceiving a relation between cause and effect. Scrupulous observation has shown that the Arunta and other tribes of Australoids, admittedly the lowest species that is classified as human, propagated themselves for at least fifty thousand years without even guessing that there might be some causal relationship between sexual intercourse and pregnancy. For aught we know to the contrary, baboons may have more native intelligence. Obviously, where nothing is either natural or supernatural, there can be no concept that could be called religious.

Such facts should make us chary of trying to reconstruct the unknown pre-history of our race from observation of the primitive races that have survived to our own time. They, like the primitive coelacanth, which has survived much longer, may represent the dead ends of an evolutionary process that can go no farther. The work of Frobenius, best known in the English translation entitled *The Childhood of Man* (London, 1909), encouraged, more by its title than its content, an assumption once generally held as a residue of Christian doctrine. When the dogma that all human beings were the progeny of Adam and his spare rib could no longer be maintained, it was, as happens with all cultural residues, modified as little as possible, and it was replaced with the notion of human descent from a single hypothetical ancestral family. Now, that Dr. Carleton Coon, in his *Origin of Races* (New York, 1962), has shown, as conclusively as the exiguous data permit, that the five primary races owe their diversity to the differences between the several pithecanthropoid species from which they respectively evolved, we can no longer assume that, for example, the Hottentots of today represent a stage of evolution through which our ancestors once passed. There is simply no evidence that our race was ever animistic; its religiosity may have appeared in minds of basically different quality.

We have no certain trace of our race before comparatively recent times. If we overrule some dissenting opinions and identify the Cro-Magnon people as Aryan, we have gone as far as we can into our past, and that, for most of our evidence, is less than twenty thousand years. We may think it likely that the Cro-Magnons had a religion, but we have no means of knowing what it was. The confident statements that one so commonly sees are conjectures, formed largely on inadmissible analogies with modern primitives, and based entirely on two kinds of evidence:

burials and the cave-paintings that evince an artistic talent that makes the Cro-Magnons unique among the peoples of the world in their time.

We are frequently told that care for the dead and painstaking burials are evidence of some belief in an afterlife and, hence, in ghosts, but that is a guess. Burial may be no more than a manifestation of an instinctive respect or affection for the dead and an unwillingness to see his corpse devoured by beasts or becoming putrescent near the camp. When a man's possessions are buried with him, there may indeed have been some notion (as is attested in Egypt, for example) that the equipment would be useful to him in a postmortem existence, but it is equally possible that some or many instances of this custom may indicate the emergence of a strong sense of private property: the spear or the beads or the golden drinking horn were the dead man's, and no one should steal from him when he dies and can no longer defend his own.

In the celebrated cave-paintings, we see men who wear the heads and hides of animals, so we are told, on the basis of conjectural analogies, that the figures are shamans making magic for a successful hunt. But the very cave ("Trois-Frères" in Haute-Garonne) that contains the best-known depiction of such a "sorcerer" also contains a painting that shows a man who wears the head and hide of a reindeer while stalking a herd of those animals, and his disguise has an obviously practical purpose. The isolated figures in animal costume that seem to be dancing may be merely cavorting for the amusement of their fellows or, conceivably, exhibiting extravagant joy over luck in hunting.

In one cave (Willendorf) is found a small figurine, carved with noteworthy skill from the tusk of a mammoth, which depicts a very plump woman with an elaborate coiffure in an advanced stage of pregnancy, clearly not her first. Some wit satirically calls it a "Venus," and we soon have our choice between several dissertations about fertility cults and the religion of which they were a part. The fact is that we do not know who carved the figurine or why. It does evince some interest in pregnancy – perhaps that of a husband who hopes for another offspring, perhaps that of a man who had a whim to carve something from a tusk.

We may, of course, form conjectures about the origin of religion. Statius was doubtless right: *primus in orbe deos fecit timor*. Early men did live in a world filled with terrors and dangers that they, no matter how natively intelligent, could not understand. Earthquakes are awesome, even when they are not destructive. Storms arise without perceptible causes; hurricanes and violent lightnings awaken atavistic fears in us, even if we, who know that they are merely natural phenomena, are in places of safety. The very seasons (especially in a time of climatic changes following the retreat of glaciers) seem mysterious at best, and even fearful when accompanied by prolonged rainfall, excessive snow, or desiccating drought. Even luck, that is, unexplained coincidences, makes some of our own contemporaries superstitious and, if adverse, may suggest the activity of mysteriously inimical forces. And, like the baboons, we instinctively dread darkness, which may conceal all the fearsome dangers that the imagination can conceive. Ignorance is terrible. So much is obvious.

We are reduced to precarious speculation, however, when we try to understand why our remote ancestors imagined that the incomprehensible phenomena amid which they had to live

could be influenced by their own acts – that they could, for example, appease whatever caused storms or persuade whatever caused rain to end a drought. And was it because phenomena of which the cause is unknown seem capricious and thus like impulses and whims of men that they imagined that invisible beings, præterhuman men, consciously produced the phenomena? Did many bands or tribes spontaneously and independently imagine supernatural beings as the causes of inexplicable phenomena, or did the notion first occur to some visionary individual, whose explanation was accepted and adopted ever more widely because no one could think of a better one? Or did adults transfer to the external world the sentiments excited when they were children and subject to whatever rewards or chastisements a parent chose to bestow or inflict? One may speculate endlessly why men began to attribute natural phenomena to supernatural persons. The only certainty is that they did, and whenever they did so, religion was born. It was an attempt to understand the world by identifying causes and classifying them, and crude as it seems to us, it evinces a more than animal intelligence.

The Triple Function

WE LIVE IN A TIME in which there is much talk about "religious freedom." It is assumed that beliefs about the supernatural are a "private matter" which every individual has a right to determine for himself. Thus we have the dogma about the "separation of church and state" which was one of the basic principles of the American Constitution and survives today as one of the few bases of that Constitution that have not been officially repudiated or covertly abrogated.

This conception of religion is a recent one. It was a novelty when the Constitution was written, and it was then a compromise that many of our people accepted only reluctantly. It has consequences that very large segments of our population are unwilling to accept today. And it is now a source of infinite sophistry, hypocrisy, chicanery, and befuddlement.

We must therefore remind ourselves that religion is historically a social phenomenon and a concern of the collectivity much more than of the individual. From the earliest history of our race to the present, religion has, in varying degrees, served three distinct purposes: as a political bond, as a sanction for social morality, and as a consolation for individuals. These three functions became so intertwined that at any given time in our history, including the present, they seem inextricably interwoven, but to distinguish them clearly, we may consider them separately.

Cohesion

As all readers of Robert Ardrey's brilliant expositions of biological facts, *The Territorial Imperative* and *The Social Contract*, well know, all animals that hunt in packs must have an instinctive sense of a common purpose and a rudimentary social organization that regulates the relations between individuals and produces, at least temporarily, a cohesion between them by subordinating the individual to the group and its common purpose. Obedience to the law of the pack must be automatic among wolves, lycaones, and all species that depend for survival on cooperation between individuals.

We may be certain that that instinctive sense was present in our remote biological antecedents of two or more million years ago, the Australopithecids, who hunted in small packs and even learned to use as simple weapons stones and the bones of animals they had killed and devoured. We may assume, however, that they, like wolves, assembled as packs only to hunt larger animals, and that the bond between individuals, other than mates, endured only during the hunt. This instinct for limited confederation must have been present, a million or more years later, in the various prehuman species, commonly called *Hominis Erecti*, some of which, as Carleton Coon has shown in his *Origin of Races*, survived as distinct species of anthropoids that eventually developed into the extant races of mankind. It is a reasonable and perhaps necessary deduction from the available evidence that the species which survived to become human were those in which the instinct became strong enough to produce more permanent associations, a pack that remained together even after the successful termination of the hunt and the eating of its quarry, while the species that could form no larger permanent groups than do gorillas today were headed for extinction.

We must assume that the several species of *Homines Erecti* that became the ancestors of the various races now alive were as intelligent as baboons, hunted in packs of from ten to twelve adult males, remained together as a band or miniature tribe, as do baboons, and communicated with one another by uttering a variety of cries and other sounds, supplemented by gestures, again as baboons do. And it is probable that no association of individuals larger than such a band was possible for many thousands of years.

The Neanderthals, whom the Cro-Magnons wisely, though no doubt instinctively, exterminated in Europe and perhaps elsewhere, are now generally regarded as an extinct race of human beings, probably even lower than the Australoids and Congoids of our own time, and most biologists now include them in the taxonomic category that embraces the several races that have been ironically called *homines sapientes*. Although it is frequently assumed that the Neanderthals formed groups larger than a band of baboons, there is no valid evidence that they did, and such social cohesion as they had must have been entirely instinctive and subconscious. Although some anthropologists have found new grounds for dissent, the majority now believes that the Neanderthals were able to communicate with one another by means of a very crude and rudimentary language, that is, articulated sounds of definite meaning, as distinct from the variety of inarticulate cries and grunts, supplemented by gestures, by which baboons now communicate, and *homines erecti* must have communicated, with one another. It is most unlikely, however, that the Neanderthals' language was sufficiently developed to permit either generalizations or statements about the past and future rather than the present.

The success of the Cro-Magnon people in hunting such formidable game as mammoths is sufficient proof that they must have lived together in groups large enough to be called a tribe, and that they had a language that was in some way inflected to form tenses and thus indicate temporal relationships, thereby making possible conscious planning and specific reference to past experiences. This, in turn, permitted the generalizations that are a kind of rough classification and a conscious awareness of tribal unity, which could be communicated to the young by spoken precept and rule, however crude and elementary, thus forming what anthropologists call a culture.

What superstitions the Cro-Magnons had, and what rituals they performed, can only be conjectured by tenuous speculations, but a moment's reflection will show that if they had a religion (as is, of course, likely), it must have been concerned with tribal purposes, such as success in hunting or the mitigation of an epidemic disease or the production of rain. And such religious ceremonies as may have been performed for such purposes were doubtless rituals that required the participation of the whole tribe or the part of it that was immediately concerned, such as all adult males, if hunting was involved, or all females, if fertility, and offspring were sought. The ritual thus became an affirmation of tribal unity.

The earliest religions of which we have knowledge are tribal, and their ceremonies are rituals in which the whole tribe (except children) participates or all of the part of the tribe that is concerned (e.g., all men of military age or all married women) or a group that has been selected to perform a dance or a sacrifice on behalf of the tribe as a whole. And when a number of tribes coalesce to form a small state, the demonstration of their effective unity and common purpose

by religious unanimity becomes even more necessary, and it is affirmed by festivals in which every citizen is expected to participate, at least by abstaining from other activity and being present as a spectator, and in which aliens, whether visitors or *metecs*, are not permitted to participate and from which they may be so excluded that they are forbidden to witness any part of the proceedings. The number of citizens is now so large that active participation of all in a religious ritual is no longer feasible, and comparatively small groups must be selected to act on behalf of the whole state or the whole of a class in it. Alcman's *Partheneion*, for example, was written for a choir of virgins who performed a ceremony on behalf of all the virgin daughters of Spartan citizens to conciliate for them the favor of Artemis. The Panathenæa, which celebrated the political unification of Attica, was a series of varied ceremonies (one of which was a reading of the poems of Homer) in honor of the goddess who was the city's patroness, and although a fairly large number of individuals took part in the chariot-races, musical contests, choral performances, cult dances, and other ceremonies, only a small fraction of the citizen body could take an active part in the festival that was held for the benefit of the whole state, and on the last day, traditionally Athena's birthday, *metecs* were even permitted to join the grand procession as attendants on citizens. At Rome, the twenty-four Salii solicited for the entire nation the favor of Mars and Quirinus by performing their archaic dance accompanied by a litany in Latin so archaic that its meaning was only vaguely known. And the *feriæ* in honor of Jupiter on the Alban Mount, at which the presence of both consuls was mandatory, celebrated the political unification of Latium.

What many of our uninformed contemporaries overlook is the fact that participation in such ceremonies, including attendance at them, was essentially a political act by which citizens affirmed their participation in their state. It did not in the least matter, for example, whether the individual citizen "believed in" the gods who were propitiated and honored: if he disbelieved in their existence or spoke of them in injurious terms (except during the ceremonies themselves), and if the gods concerned took notice and resented his conduct, it was up to those gods (as Augustus had to remind some of his contemporaries) to take what action they deemed appropriate against him. And it did not really matter whether the rites were really efficacious: the important thing was that persons who refused to participate in them thereby exhibited their alienation from the state and seemed to be renouncing their citizenship. If a Roman who was an atheist was elected consul, his office obliged him to make the appropriate sacrifices to Jupiter at the *Feriæ Latinæ* and to preside at, or otherwise participate in, other religious rites, but he had no sense of incongruity or hypocrisy: he was performing an essentially political rite for which a religious faith was no more necessary than it was, e.g., for watching a chariot race in the circus, which officially was also a religious ceremony.

This function of religion is to affirm political cohesion. And it has retained that function almost to our own time. When the unity of Christendom was shattered by the Reformation and it became clear that it would not be easy for either the Catholics or the Protestants to exterminate the other party, an early compromise was the doctrine of *cuius regio, eius religio*. By agreeing that the ruler's religion was to be that of all of his subjects (except of course, the Jews, who were always given special privileges), men hoped to maintain the effective unity of each state, and that was a political purpose that atheists could and did recognize as expedient. The

establishment of the Anglican Church was one of the least unsuccessful applications of the principle, and from the political standpoint, the disabilities of the Catholics in England are less remarkable than the toleration that was accorded them. And it is perverse to refuse to understand the attitude of Louis XIV in Catholic France after he was convinced that Jansenists, although indubitably Catholic, were fracturing the nation's political unity. The story that he at first refused to appoint a man to high office because he had heard the man was a Jansenist, but gladly appointed him as soon as he was reliably informed that the man did not believe in god at all, is undoubtedly true – was probably true on several occasions. The king was probably quite uninterested in the theological hair-pulling and cut-throat competition that was then making so much noise, but he had the common sense to perceive that by appointing an atheist he was not strengthening a faction of political trouble-makers. If he knew of Cardinal Dubois's famous dictum that God is a bogeyman who must be brandished to scare the populace into some approximation of honesty, he may or may not have thought that the good cardinal was running a risk of post-mortem woe, but he recognized that Dubois's opinions did not detract from his political efficiency in maintaining social stability.

The requirement at Oxford and Cambridge until quite recent times of an oath of affirmation in the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles has been perversely misunderstood. Everyone knew for centuries that many did not believe what they affirmed, and there was some truth in the hot-headed Sir William Hamilton's charge that Oxford was a "school of perjury," but he naïvely became excited because he did not perceive that the requirement had not the fantastic theological purpose of pleasing a god in whom many who took the oath did not believe, but the strictly practical one of excluding fanatics who were emotionally attached to dogmas that would inspire trouble-making agitation over questions that, if not totally illusory, were incapable of rational determination. It was regrettable, of course, that adolescents like young Gibbon should, in effect, expel themselves from the university through a waywardness they would later regret, and that intelligent adults like Newman should develop emotional enthusiasms and a zeal for fruitless controversy that, the conservatives felt, was much better than bestowing the prestige of the universities on seditious fanatics.

In the United States, Benjamin Franklin certainly did not believe in any form of Christian doctrine, but that did not prevent him from approving, if he did not inspire, a state constitution which, by requiring an oath of belief in the Trinity, effectively excluded from political influence many of the Jews and such dissidents as the Quakers, who, for example, refused to defend with arms a society whose privileges they wanted to enjoy, and were, at least passively, disturbers of the political cohesion of the state of Pennsylvania. The persecution of the Mormons, which effectively gives the lie to Americans who want to boast about "religious freedom," was led by holy men who wanted to stamp out competition in their business, but some part of that episode was caused by an awareness, probably subconscious in the majority, that the political consensus requisite for national survival would be gravely impaired or destroyed if the population were split into two incompatible groups, one of which believed polygamy divinely ordained while the other insisted on pretending that Christian doctrine forbade every kind of polygamy.

The principle of the separation of church and state, which was one of the bases of the Federal Constitution, has been nullified by the various states and, hypocritically, by the Federal government itself by exempting nominally religious organizations from taxation, and is nullified in practice by the strenuous political activity of virtually all the Christian and other religious sects, which, of course, is laudable when they agitate and intrigue for political ends of which you and I approve, and damnable when they use their power to oppose them, as any theologian can prove in five minutes by reciting selected passages of Holy Writ and tacitly lying by pretending that contradictory passages do not exist. The separation of church and state has proved impossible in practice in the United States, and for all practical purposes the ostensibly religious organizations have become privileged political organizations, most of which are actively engaged in subverting what little cohesion the nation once had and are furthermore avowed enemies of the race to which we and many of their members belong.

The use of religion as an expression of cultural unity and political consensus cannot long survive the first practice of toleration by which the nation's Established Church, whatever it is, is tacitly disavowed by failure to suppress openly dissident sects. That function of religion, once the most important of all, has, in little more than a century, been so completely forgotten that some of our contemporaries are astonished when they hear of it.

Immortality

The Greeks, being Aryans, liked to think of human beings as rational and they accordingly tried to trace social phenomena, so far as possible, to the operations of human reason. Critias (Plato's uncle) accordingly explained religion as a calculated device, invented by good minds to create a stable civilization.

Organized society is made possible only by laws to govern the conduct of individuals, but since laws can always be secretly evaded by men who conceal their crime or their responsibility for it, gods were invented, deathless beings who, themselves unseen, observe, by psychic faculties that do not depend on sight or hearing, all the acts, words, and thoughts of men. And the founders of civilization attributed to the imagined gods the natural phenomena, the lightning and the whirlwind, that terrify men. By this noble fiction they replaced lawlessness with law.

Thus far, Critias simply described the theology of Hesiod as the invention of nomothetes, and it is at this point that our fragment of his play ends.¹ If he went on (and I do not claim that he did), he added that when men learned by experience that they could still violate the laws secretly with impunity, the lawgivers perfected their invention by claiming that men had souls which were immortal, so that the gods, who failed to use their lightnings to punish crime in this world, would infallibly inflict terrible penalties on the guilty and condignly reward the guiltless after death. Thus they placed their civilizing fiction beyond possible verification or disproof, and provided supernatural sanctions to buttress their laws and scare their people into honesty.

¹ It is quoted by Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. math.*, IX.55 (= *In phys.*, I.54). A good English translation by R. G. Bury may be found in Vol. III of the edition of Sextus Empiricus in the well-known Loeb Library.

Whether or not Critias carried his argument to its logical conclusion, it is clear that the effective use of religion as a political instrument to enforce morality required a doctrine that would promise to individuals after death the justice that the gods failed to administer in this world. This association of ideas has now become commonplace and is so taken for granted that our contemporaries often assume that a religion – any and every religion – must be primarily concerned with the provision of suitable rewards and penalties in an afterlife. This idea, however, was a startling and revolutionary one when it reached the Greeks in the sixth century B.C.

The notion that a person's individuality does not wholly perish when he dies is, of course, a very old one and may be older than belief in the existence of gods. Its oldest and most elementary form, which still lingers in our subliminal consciousness, is the supposition that something of the dead man survives him and lives on in his tomb. Only later did men come to believe that the ghost of the dead migrated to a realm of the dead that was located either underground or, more poetically, in the west beyond the sunset. But the dead were phantoms, bodiless shades, doomed forever to an umbratile existence, mourning the life they had known and could never know again. When Ulysses, in the famous *Nekyia*, sailed beyond the Ocean to the sunless land, shrouded in mist and eternal twilight, he found only tenuous wraiths that were voiceless until he permitted them to lap up the blood of freshly slain sheep; and even Achilles, though he was the son of a goddess and half-divine, had become only a shadow in the gloom and could only say fretfully that it were better to be the meanest and most miserable slave among the living than king of all the dead.

Such was the immortality to which the heroes of the Trojan War could look forward – an immortality in comparison with which annihilation would have been a boon. And we may reasonably ask whether any of us today would have the courage to face such a future, to say nothing of the awesome strength to choose, as Achilles did, to die young with honor rather than live a long life of mediocrity.

It is easy to see why a promise of *post-mortem* comfort fascinated the minds of men and gained their allegiance to religions which promised it as a reward for obedience to a society's moral code. There were, however, two quite different conceptions of the way in which such immortality could be obtained: if, as the Homeric eschatology assumed, our present life on earth is the only one, even the righteous man must be rescued from the common fate of mankind by some special and miraculous benefaction by gods capable of communicating to him something of their theurgic power; if, on the other hand, we assume that the dead survive by metempsychosis, we can construct an eschatology of the kind familiar to us from the Hindu doctrine of *karma*, assuming that when a man dies the spark of life within him enters another body, so that he will be reincarnated again and again forever and is doomed to repeat endlessly (and without knowing it) the peripeties and sorrows of the life we know, unless he, by exemplary moral conduct, finds a way to escape from the "grievous cycle of rebirth" and thus attain a beatific existence in a transmundane realm of enduring felicity.

The first of these alternative theories was adopted by the numerous mystery-cults of antiquity, the Eleusinian, Samothracian, Andanian, and others.

Despite the oaths of secrecy taken by the initiates and never deliberately violated, we know that the *mystæ*, candidates for Salvation, had to be guiltless of gross violations of the prevailing moral code, underwent a prolonged initiation into divine mysteries by the hierophants – (the professional holy men in charge), and were eventually “born again” through the grace of some god, usually one who had himself experienced mortality by being slain and rising from the dead. Having thus been Saved, the *mystes*, sometimes a year after his first initiation, became an *epoptes*, seeing the god (or goddess) and experiencing *enthusiasm* (which, we must remember, was the state of irrationality and rapture that occurred when a mortal was literally possessed by a god). Although such hallucinations often accompany psychotic states that may in turn be provoked by extreme asceticism or overheated imaginations, the number of apparently rational persons who were initiated into the various mysteries is proof that the hierophants must have administered hallucinatory drugs to induce the temporary madness.

Aryans are innately suspicious of enthusiasm and similar irrationality, and many of them naturally preferred the alternative.

The most reasonable and most beautiful doctrine of immortality that I have seen was stated in the matchless verse of Pindar’s second Olympian, composed and declaimed in Sicily soon after 476 B.C. When an individual has passed through three or six² successive mortal lives in which he has observed strict justice in all his actions and lived with perfect integrity, he will have emancipated himself from the cycles of reincarnation and will transcend the limits of beyond mortality: he will pass beyond the Tower of Cronus to the fair realm that cannot be reached by land or sea, where the mildly bright sun stands always at the vernal equinox and gentle breezes from a placid ocean blow forever over the fields of asphodel. If you read Pindar, you will think all other Heavens insufferably vulgar. It would be a waste of time to talk about them.

Since we have spoken of Greek conceptions, we should remark that they and our racial kinsmen, the Norse, did not imagine an Elysium.³ The idea of metempsychosis was not unknown, for some persons expected that a man would be reborn as his grandson or great-grandson, but it commanded little assent. A short passage in the *Hávamál* implies that death is annihilation, but that view was not widely held. The ghost of the dead man was thought to linger in his tomb or to go to Hel, where all were equal in wretchedness, although there is one mention of a yet more terrible abode (*Nifhel*) for the spectacularly wicked. Perhaps the most optimistic view was that brave men who die in battle are taken to the halls of Odin, Valhalla, where they will feast until the time comes for them and the gods themselves to perish in the final catastrophe, the Ragnarök.

² Whether three or six depends on the meaning of the words [unreadable], which I do not know. Each of the commentators has his idea of what Pindar meant, and so do I, but the fact is that none of us can know the details of the doctrine, presumably “Orphic,” that Pindar and Theron of Acragas took for granted.

³ I am aware that a paradise is mentioned in Ibn Fadlân’s description of a funeral he witnessed when negotiating with the Rús on the Volga, but if the Arab is telling the truth and did not misunderstand his interpreter, the belief, like the ceremony he witnessed, must have been exceptional.

Polytheism

If gods exist, a polytheism is the most reasonable form of religion, since it conforms most closely to the facts of nature and does not raise the almost insoluble problem of constructing a plausible theodicy.

A polytheism assumes the existence of numerous gods, each of whom is essentially the personification of some force of nature and may, in his or her own province act independently of other gods in his or her relations with mortals. The gods are thought of as immortal *Übermenschen*, forming, so to speak, an aristocracy unapproachably far above mortal men, but having human character and emotions, so that their acts are readily comprehensible and involve no theological mysteries, and it is natural to imagine them as anthropomorphic in bodily form as well as in mind, so that belief in them does not imply the paradox inherent in religions that try to imagine gods that do not look like men and women.

The members of the divine aristocracy are deathless and are far more powerful than mortals, but they are not omnipotent. As in all aristocracies the gods are not equal, some being more prominent than others, and they have a chief who has a certain authority over them but is himself bound by the social code of divinities. Jupiter/*Zeus* is styled *pater hominum divomque* and Odin is called *Alfaðir*, but, among the great gods, the Olympians and the *Æsir*, their chief is only *primus inter pares*, and while he is stronger than any one other god, his authority is limited by political realities and really depends on the voluntary allegiance of his peers. In the *Iliad*, it is clear that *Zeus* favors the Trojans and wants them to be victorious, and some of the other gods share his sentiments, but he and his sympathizers cannot inhibit the actions of the gods who are partial to the Greeks, and in the end, of course, it is the Greeks who will be victorious.

Each of the great gods has authority over some force of nature, sets it in motion, and may direct it to favor or harm mortals who have pleased or offended him, but in Aryan religions – and this is most important – all the gods together are not omnipotent. They dwell in a universe they did not create: one hymn in the *Rig-veda* specifically states that “the gods are later than the creation of the world,” and in the following lines the author asks whether the world was created by giving form to what was “void and formless,” and whether the creating force, if there was one, was conscious or unconscious. The gods, therefore, although they control such natural phenomena as the winds, the lightning, and sexual attraction, are themselves subject to the natural laws of the universe, much as among men rulers have power over their subjects but are themselves subject to the laws of nature. The Greeks and the Norse, with their mythopoeic imaginations and the tripartite modality of our racial mind, personified fate as three women, the *Moeræ*, *Parcæ*, *Nornir*, but their real belief was in an impersonal, inexorable, automatic force that was inherent in the very structure of the universe and which no god could alter or deflect: *Moros*, *Fatum*, *Wyrd*, *Destiny*. From that causality there was no escape: behind the capricious gods with their miraculous powers there lay the implacable nexus of cause and effect that is reality.

The gods are essentially personifications of natural forces, and like those forces, they are neither good nor evil but operate with a complete indifference to the convenience and wishes of mortals, except in special cases, when some mortal has won a god's favor or incurred his displeasure. One god's goodwill or enmity toward a given mortal does not influence his colleagues: they will remain indifferent or even, if they have cause, help that man. This gives us a fairly rational conception of human life, in which, as we all know, a man who is "lucky" at cards may be "unlucky" in love and on the sea and in battle. And the religious conception, although it does admit of miracles, i.e., the intervention of supernatural beings in natural phenomena, does not too drastically conceal the realities of a universe that was not made for man. The gods are not only the explanation of natural phenomena of which the causes had not yet been ascertained, but the conceptions of their characters, aside from a few whimsical myths, are really quite rationally drawn, although idealists, such as Plato, often miss the point.

Men always create their gods in their own image, and the gods, although endowed with supernatural powers, remain human in their minds and morality. Idealists whimper about the "immorality" of the gods and want something better, that is to say, something more fantastic, more incredible. Odin is the god of war and of an aristocracy that had a relatively high code of honor, but he is wily, for his votaries know that victory in battle depends less on sheer berserk courage than it does on strategy, which is simply the art of deceiving the enemy. Odin is treacherous, falling below the moral code of his votaries, because it is a simple fact that treachery is often victorious, and it is Odin who gives victory. That is unfortunate, no doubt, and we may wish to be morally superior to our gods, but if we claim that Odin is not treacherous, we are irrationally denying the fact that in this world treason is often so successful that none dare call it treason.

Venus is caught in adultery with Mars. Honorable wives will not imitate the goddess to whom they pray, but it is a fact, deplorable no doubt, that Helen and Paris are by no means the only example of adultery in this world, and it is a notorious fact that dissatisfied wives are apt to be especially attracted to men of military prowess and distinction. It was wrong, no doubt, of Venus to inspire Helen with love and desire for Paris, but it is a sad fact that in this world the force of sexual attraction very commonly operates in disregard of both morality and prudence. It does happen that beautiful women, even if married, are desired by, and attracted to, handsome young men, and it also happens that the young men form liaisons which, in societies that have not completely repudiated sexual morality, bring disaster on themselves and their families. If we imagine a Venus who is ideally chaste, we are lying to ourselves about the power of sexual attraction in the real world in which we live.

The ancient Aryans were often puzzled by themselves, and we, despite the best efforts of sane psychologists, find "in man the darkest mist of all" and admit that "we knowers are to ourselves unknown." Every man of letters is aware that in any creative process, such as the writing of poetry, his best thoughts usually come inexplicably into his conscious mind by "inspiration"; scientists and mathematicians confess that they "suddenly saw" the solution of a problem that long defied their most systematic efforts to solve it; and men of action, including victorious generals, have reported that they were guided by a "hunch" or "instinctively felt"

which was the best of alternatives between which conscious planning had not enabled them to choose. The processes of strictly logical reasoning on the basis of ascertained data have their limitations, and the right decisions are often made by intuitive impulses that we now attribute to the subconscious mind, without being able precisely to explain them. In polytheism, thoughts which come to the conscious mind from a source outside itself are ideas injected by some god. When Achilles stayed his hand from drawing his sword on Agamemnon, he was too irate to reason that he would precipitate an irreparable division within the army that would end the Greeks' chances of victory, but an impulse restrained him: Pallas Athena, the goddess of rational activity, took him by his blond hair and held him back, and she, invisible to all but him, soundlessly told him that he should not resort to violence against the commander of the host. Needless to say, the gods, for purposes of their own, may deceive, for "hunches" are often misleading, and Agamemnon will more than once have occasion to complain that Zeus tricked him with "inspirations" that made him blunder. The psychology may seem crude, but it compares favorably with some "scientific" superstitions now in vogue.

Much may be said for polytheism, especially in Aryan religions.

There are many gods – innumerable ones, if we count the minor and local deities who preside over a fountain and make it gush now and barely trickle at another time, or dwell in a river and make it overflow its banks or subside into a rill, or are the spirits of the wildwood and inspire awe or panic in the impressionable traveler. Even major gods are too numerous to be given equal worship, despite the risks of offending some by neglect. An Aryan people, with its tripartite thought, may select a trinity of gods as deserving special honor for their functions, such as the archaic and Capitoline triads at Rome, or the triad of gods that were joint tenants of the great Norse temple at Upsala, three specialists, as it were, who could care for most needs. If a worshipper wanted success in war, he naturally addressed Odin; if the weather and crops depending on it were his concern, he naturally turned to Thor; and if his problem was sexual, Freyr was there to help him.

Cities naturally selected a god or goddess as their special patron, the focus of their civic cults, and understood that courtesy among immortals precluded jealousy in such cases. Pallas Athena was the patron of Athens, but although Poseidon had hoped to be chosen in her stead, he did not prevent Athens from becoming a thalassocracy, while Athena was not offended by lavish rites in honor of Demeter and Dionysus. Other cities chose other tutelary gods.

The gratitude of worshippers whose prayers had been granted, and sometimes the civic pride of cities that had a local deity, often led to hyperbole that other gods politely overlooked. A few minutes with the great collections of inscriptions will enable anyone to compile an astonishing roster of gods, including even such as Osogoa, the patron of the small and declining town of Mylasa, who are enthusiastically described in Greek or Latin as *maximus deorum*, and when the Norse salute one of their gods as "most august" (*arwurdost*), they are indulging in the same extravagant emotion. The pious men and women who are moved to hyperbole because a god had heard their prayers and wrought some miracle for them are no more hypocritical than you are, when you have really enjoyed a dinner and tell your hostess it was the best you have ever had. Everyone understands such things, and no god feels slighted, while the worshipper

will turn from his "greatest of the gods" to another, when he wants something in the other god's special province.

This tendency, however, may lead individuals and even tribes to an odd modification of polytheism, in which, without in the least doubting the existence and power of the other gods, they decide to concentrate their worship on one of them. In individuals this is known as monolatry, and Euripides has shown in his *Hippolytus* the dangers carrying this tendency to the excess of slighting other deities that represent natural forces: he flattered the virgin Artemis but angered Aphrodite. Such indiscretion was very rare in the Classical world: one would naturally show special devotion to a god who had been particularly beneficent, but it would be very rash to put all of one's supernatural eggs in one basket. The practice was more common among the Norse, a number of whom selected some god as their *fulltrúi* and entrusted to him the care of all their interests, thus ignoring the division of labor among the gods.

I mention this rare oddity only for contrast to an extremely un-Aryan form of polytheism, the Jewish religion shown in what Christians call the "Old Testament." The Jews selected a god, Yahweh, who was at first content to have no competitor associated with him in a temple and worshipped in his presence ("before me," "*coram me*") but eventually demanded exclusive veneration, and entered into a contract with the tribe to assist them in all their undertakings, if they would observe all his taboos and give him, in sacrifices, a share of the profits. According to the "Old Testament," the Semitic god thus chosen for a form of religion that is called henotheism was able to beat up the gods of other peoples whom the Jews wished to exploit, such as Dagon, whom Yahweh decapitated and crippled at night when no one was looking.

Such henotheism is utterly foreign to the Aryan mind, which, as it rejects fanaticism and holy ferocity as manifestations of savagery, naturally does not attribute such jealousy and malevolence to its gods.

Monothelism

MONOTHEISM is a quite unusual form of religion and one which creates difficulties for even its most adroit theologians. If it is a theism, its god must be a superhuman person, conscious and accessible to his votaries. Thus religions which posit an impersonal force, such as the Classical Fatum or the Hindu's impersonal Brahma (neuter), as the supreme power in the universe are excluded, as are all forms of pantheism which assume that the whole universe is a living but unconscious entity that cannot properly be called a god. And if the theism is *mono*, the God must be actually supreme and therefore omnipotent, although he need not be the only supernatural being in the universe. Men cannot readily imagine a hermit god, so viable monotheisms suppose a god who is indeed absolute master, but has his retinue of associates, companions, and servants who obey him and carry out his orders. But he must be supreme: all other gods must be thought of as his agents, and no other god can be represented as his rival and enemy. That, of course, rules out Christianity for the greater part of its history and as described in its Holy Book, which provides the Christian god with a rival god, Satan, and assumes that the two gods are slugging it out for mastery now, although it is predicted that one of them will eventually triumph. In quite recent years the clergy of most Christian sects have joined in killing off the Devil to make their religion a monotheism, so that, as an eminent Catholic theologian, Father Jacques Turmel, complained in the work which he published in an English translation under the pseudonym Louis Coulange, "Satan ... is now like the Son of Man, of whom the Gospel tells us that He had nowhere to lay His head." But so long as Christianity supposed the existence of a god and an anti-god, it was a ditheism, and that only on the assumption that its tripartite god counted as one and that the anti-god was the sovereign of *all* other gods, such as Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Dionysus, a point on which some of the early Fathers of the Church could not quite make up their minds.

The invention of monotheism is generally credited to Ikhnoton (Akh-en-Aton), a deformed and half-mad king, who ruled (and almost ruined), Egypt from c.1369 to 1354 B.C., and who cannot have been worthy of his lovely wife, Nefertiti, whom he later so hated that he erased her name from their joint monuments. His portraits show that he suffered from some disease or malformation that produced an enormously distended belly and heavy hips that are in painful contrast to his asthenic limbs and torso. He was a mongrel. His grandmother was a blonde Aryan, perhaps Nordic, princess, whose skull and hair attest her race. His father's features may show some admixture of Semitic blood; the race of his round-faced mother is uncertain: she could have been an octoroon or even a quadroon; and his own protruding negroid lips attest a considerable black taint in his blood, while his oddly shaped jaw shows some clash of incompatible genes. A mind so divided against itself genetically must have matched the distortion of his body. It is quite certain that he venerated Aton, the solar disk, as the supreme god, and we must grant that heliolatry is a quite rational monotheism, since the sun is obviously the source of all life on earth. Whether the king admitted the existence of other and subordinate gods is a question on which Egyptologists are divided, but not, as we have indicated above, crucial to his claim to be the first monotheist. There is greater uncertainty as to whether the

religious innovation should be credited to his father, Amenhotep III, with whom he may have ruled jointly for a few years.

Ikhnaton's religion, for which he convulsed Egypt and forfeited her empire, must have been well-known to the contemporary Aryans on Crete and in the Mycenæan territories elsewhere, but there is no indication that they were in the least impressed by his monotheism. Some have conjectured that a tradition about him may have reached the Jews, who however, show no tendency toward monotheism until more than a millennium later, when they had quite different models before them.

The first Aryan known as a monotheist was Xenophanes (born c. 570 B.C., died c.470). He certainly repudiated the anthropomorphic gods of polytheism and posited one god, spherical because that is the perfect form, eternal, and unchanging; but we are also told that the god was an infinite sphere and identical with the universe. Now, was the universe conscious, and could men, whom Xenophanes thought the products of a kind of chemical reaction between earth and water, pray to the vast being of which they were an infinitesimal part? There is no evidence that Xenophanes thought they could, and I do not see how one could imagine that a man could attract the attention of the universe. Even assuming that Xenophanes thought of the universe as a living being (which, of course, is not unchanging), can we imagine one cell in our bodies as praying to us? My guess is that what has been called "the only true monotheism that has ever existed in the world" was, strictly speaking, atheism.¹ If there are no gods whom men can ask to intervene in human affairs, it is simply an abuse of language to call an impersonal, inexorable force 'god.' Xenophanes was certainly one of the great men in whom our race may legitimately take pride, but I do not see how we can properly term him a monotheist, although he may have influenced later Greeks to accept a monotheism.

The spread of Stoicism in the Græco-Roman world is one of the most remarkable phenomena of history. Many have remarked on the paradox that a Semite, a Phoenician merchant in the export trade, who went to Athens on business and happened to attend lectures by one of the Cynic philosophers and who could not speak grammatically correct Greek, should have set himself up as a philosopher in his own right and, despite his alien features and tongue, attracted a large following of Greeks. And there is the greater paradox that a doctrine which inspired the subversive agitations and revolutionary outbreaks that Robert von Pöhlmann identified as ancient Communism should have become the philosophy of the most conservative Romans. The first paradox may be explained by the fact that when Zeno went to Athens in the second half of the fourth century B.C., Greece was in the midst of a prolonged economic crisis and culturally demoralized, and many of the citizens felt the morbid fascination with the exotic and alien that in our time gave prominence to "soulful" Russians and Hindu swamis. As for the second paradox,

¹ Xenophanes is known only from brief quotations, paraphrases, and allusions in later writers, and there are endless controversies about many points; he was a gentleman and a poet who wrote drinking songs with conventional allusions to gods, which some determined theists would take seriously. By far the best criticism and summation of the evidence known to me is in the first volume of W. K. C. Guthrie's *History of Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge University, 1962).

Zeno's successors so modified his doctrine that Panætius, a Greek from Rhodes, was able to transform it into a philosophy that was attractive to Roman minds.²

Stoicism became for several centuries the dominant philosophy of educated men in the Græco-Roman world for four principal reasons.

1. It claimed to be based exclusively on the observed realities of the physical world and to "follow nature," and to reject all superstitions about the supernatural. This claim was reinforced by studies of natural phenomena, such as the causes of the tides, undertaken by a few of the prominent Stoics.

2. A claim to be based strictly on reason, with no concessions to religious mysticism, and this claim was supported by a very elaborate system of logic and dialectics by which every proposition could infallibly be deduced from observed phenomena, thus providing complete certainty and satisfying minds, that could not be content with a high degree of probability, which is all that epistemological limitations permit us to attain.

3. It provided social stability by guaranteeing the essentials of the accepted code of morality and stigmatizing all derogations from that code as irrational and unnatural.

4. What was most important to the Roman mind, Stoicism (as revised by Panætius) was the one philosophy which encouraged and even enjoined men to take an active part in political life and devote themselves to service of the state and nation. Patriotism and the morality that makes great statesmen and generals were disparaged by some other philosophical systems, especially the Cyrenaic, Cynic, and Epicurean, and virtually disregarded by the New Academy, which anticipated the methodology of modern science and represents the intellectual high tide of Græco-Roman civilization, but demanded a rationalism and cool objectivity of which only the best minds are capable. Everyone who has read Cicero's *De natura deorum* will remember how he was taken by surprise when Cicero, in the very last paragraph, pronounces in favor of the Stoic position, although Cicero was himself an Academic and, furthermore, cannot have failed to see which of the arguments he has summarized was the most reasonable. In that last sentence the statesman silenced the philosopher with a *raison d'état*.

Stoicism, which was embraced by the majority of educated and influential men to the time of Marcus Aurelius and the twilight of human reason, was a philosophy, not a religion: it had no mysteries, no revelations, no gospels, no temples, no priests, no rituals, no ceremonies, no worship. But nevertheless, this eminently "respectable" doctrine, which extended its influence deep into the masses, was a monotheism.

The Stoics claimed that the universe (which, remember, was for them the earth with its appurtenances, the sun, moon, and stars that circled about it) was a single living organism of

² I need not say that I am making generalizations, which I believe valid, about a doctrine that had a long and complicated history and was represented by a great many writers and teachers, who introduced various modifications of the doctrine with, of course, endless controversies. The most systematic and complete study of Stoicism is in German: Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (Göttingen, 2 vols., 1948). The modest little book by Professor Edwyn Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics* (London, 1913), can be read with enjoyment as well as profit.

which God was the brain, the *animus mundi*. This cosmic mind ordained and controlled all that happened, so that Fate, the nexus of cause and effect (*heimarmene*), was actually the same as divine Providence (*pronoia*). This *animus mundi*, which they usually called Zeus and which some of them located in the sun, was conscious and had thoughts and purposes incomprehensible to men, who could only conform to them. Their Zeus, who, of course, was not anthropomorphic, was the supreme god, perhaps the only god. Few, however, were willing to spurn a compromise with the prevalent religions, and they accordingly admitted the probable existence of the popular gods as subordinates of Zeus, an order of living beings superior to men and more or less anthropomorphic, who were parts of the Divine Plan. They accordingly explained the popular beliefs and myths as allegories by twisting words and manipulating ideas with a sophistic ingenuity that made them expert theologians. Having made this concession to the state cults and popular superstitions, the Stoics insist that a wise man will perceive that the various gods which seem real to the populace are all really aspects of the *animus mundi*, and that there really is only One God.

Cleanthes, Zeno's disciples and successor at Athens, is best known for the eloquent prayer, commonly called a hymn, addressed to the One God, which begins "Lead me on, O Zeus!" After speaking of the majesty of the Universal Mind, he assures Zeus that he will follow willingly whithersoever the god leads him, but adds that if he were unwilling, it would make no difference, for he would be compelled to follow. This, of course, is simply Seneca's oft-quoted line, *Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt* with which, by the way, Spengler appropriately concluded his *Untergang des Abendlandes*. It makes excellent sense because we recognize in *fata* the inexorable nexus of cause and effect in the real world. We are taken aback when we find it addressed to a god, who presumably can hear the prayer, and are then assured that Divine Providence has so unalterably arranged the sequence of events that what is destined will occur anyway. A sensible man will immediately ask, Why pray, if the prayer can make no difference?

The Stoics have an answer. Good and evil, pain and pleasure, are only in the mind, and what makes the difference is your attitude toward events: it would be wrong as well as futile to resist the Divine Plan, no matter what it ordains for you. The only important thing is the maintenance of your moral integrity, and so long as you do that, events have no power over you. They even insist that a wise man, conscious of his moral integrity, would be perfectly happy, even if he were being boiled in oil. So far as I know, this proposition was never tested empirically, although intelligent men must often have thought that it would be an interesting experiment to put Chrysippus or some other prominent Stoic in the pot to ascertain whether the boiling oil would alter his opinion.

The Stoics insisted that since all things happen "according to Nature," i.e., Providence, there can be no evil or injustice in the world. To maintain this paradox, they had to devise various arguments, usually packed into a long sequence of apparently logical propositions, spiced with endlessly intricate definitions, some of which were mere verbal trickery that passed unnoticed in the harangue. The most plausible proposition was a claim that whatever seems unjust or wrong to us is only part of a whole which we do not see. It may be simplified by the analogy

that lungs or livers considered by themselves are ugly, but may form necessary parts of a beautiful woman.

The Stoics thus constructed a theodicy that was satisfactory to them. They were, of course, intellectuals busy, as usual, with excogitating arguments to override common sense.

What we have said will suffice to show how the Stoics made monotheism an eminently respectable creed. It became the hall mark of Big Brains.

There is much truth in an observation made by Professor Gilbert Murray in his well-known *Five Stages of Greek Religion*. Reporting the anecdote that an impressionable Greek, who had attended lectures by the Aristotelians and then heard the Stoics, said that his experience was like turning from men to gods, Murray remarks: "It was really turning from Greeks to Semites, from philosophy to religion." It is true that we know that Zeno and a few other Stoics were Semites and we suspect that quite a few others were, or perhaps were hybrids, half-Greek and half from some one of the pullulent peoples of Asia Minor that Alexander's conquests had Hellenized, but the fact is that their doctrine did enlist Aryans (there is no reason to suppose that Panætius was not of our race) and was unsuspectingly accepted by a majority of the Greeks and Romans of the educated classes. That is what gave it prestige.

Stoicism, furthermore, was not merely an alien ideology foisted on credulous Aryans. It contained elements congenial to our racial psyche. Professor Günther has observed that Aryans "have always tended to raise the power of destiny above that of the gods," and cites the belief in an impersonal, inexorable *Moros*, *Fatum*, *Wyrd*, to which we referred above. This was approximated by the Stoics' *animus mundi* with its immutable Providence. Aryans accept the reality of the visible, tangible world of nature and instinctively reject the festering Semitic hatred of this world. "Never," says Günther, "have Indo-Europeans [= Aryans] imagined to become more religious when a 'beyond' claimed to release them from 'this world,' which was devalued to a place of sorrow, persecution, and salvation." Here again the Stoic belief that this world is the only one and that all things happen "according to nature" was consonant with our race's mentality. The Aryan belief in the unalterable nexus of cause and effect does not lead to the passive slavish fatalism, *kismet*, of Islam, but fate is, instead, a reality that the Aryan accepts manfully: "The very fact of being bound to destiny has from the beginning proved to be the source of his spiritual existence." Thus the healthy Aryan "cannot even wish to be redeemed from the tension of his destiny-bound life," and Günther quotes Schopenhauer: "A happy life is impossible; the highest to which man can attain is an heroic course of life." The Aryan ideal, Günther continues, is the hero who "loftily understands the fate meeting him as his destiny, remains upright in the midst of it, and, is thus true to himself." Compare the Stoic insistence that the maintenance of one's moral integrity is the highest good. The fatalism may seem passive, but Stoicism was in practice the creed of Cato of Utica and many another Roman aristocrat who lived heroically and died proudly, meeting his fate with unflinching resolution.

Stoicism was founded and to a considerable extent promoted by Semites, and although it included, by chance or design, much that was in conformity with the Aryan spirit and mentality, it was hybrid, a bastard philosophy, for it also contained much that was Semitic and alien to our

race. As Gilbert Murray remarked, it had a latent fanaticism in its religiosity and it professed to offer a kind of Salvation to unhappy mankind; despite its ostentatious appeal to nature and reason, it was a kind of evangelism "whose professions dazzled the reason." It professed to deduce from biology an asceticism that was in fact fundamentally inhuman and therefore irrational, e.g., the limitation of sexual intercourse to the begetting of offspring. Although it was the creed of heroes, we cannot but feel that there was in it something sickly and deformed.

Stoicism, furthermore, was an intellectual disaster. It carried with it the poisonous cosmopolitanism that talks about "One World" and imagines that Divine Providence has made all human beings part of the Divine Plan, so that there are no racial differences, but only differences in education and understanding of the Stoics' Truth. That is why we today so often do not know the race of an individual who had learned to speak and write good Greek (or Latin) and had been given, or had adopted, a civilized name. Our sources of information were so bemused by vapid verbiage about the Brotherhood of Man that they forgot to discriminate.

Professor Murray is right in saying that Stoicism was basically a religion, but it was so wrapped in layer after layer of speciously logical and precise discourse and required so much intellectual effort to understand its complexities that it was considered a philosophy. And I think we may accept it as such on the basis of one criterion: it had no rituals or ceremonies and it had no priests. That is an important point to which we shall return later.

Theodicy

THIS IS THE REEF on which founder all religions that posit a supreme and benevolent god who is interested in mankind.

The Stoics constructed for their *animus mundi* a theodicy that evidently satisfied persons who were primarily interested in ethics and desiderated a system of moral certainties to stabilize societies. The Stoic answer was like that given in the Fourteenth Century by William of Occam and the other Nominalists, who saw that the only escape from the impasse was to assert that whatever the Christian god ordained, was, *eo ipso*, just. The Stoic answer could not content people who wanted a god who could and, if properly appeased, would interfere with the processes of nature and make miracles for his favorites: what use was a god who couldn't do anything for you? William of Occam's answer cannot content persons who have our innate and racial sense of justice and refuse to believe that unmerited suffering, agony and death inflicted on innocent and helpless individuals, can be right, no matter who orders it: who can respect a god who rewards evil and punishes good?

It is the business of theologians, of course, to devise arguments and rhetoric that will confuse the issue, and the theologians of all creeds have exhibited a high degree of ingenuity, but the only way to evade the problem of theodicy successfully is to assume, as do several of the Hindu cults, that metempsychosis provides a long series of incarnations that produce a spiritual and moral evolution of the individual from the very simplest and lowest forms of organic life through ascending forms of mammalian life to mankind and then on upward to superhuman species, who reside on the moon or in some place beyond human attainment, and eventually to gods in some well-furnished heaven. On this vast scale, the suffering that comes upon any individual in any one life shrinks to insignificance and, furthermore, is condign and just punishment for the misdeeds of an earlier life and is a necessary process of spiritual purification and evolution.

If the present life is the only one we shall have on earth it will do no good to say that divine injustice in it doesn't matter because this life will be followed by a few hundred thousand years or a few million years or even an eternity in some heaven that will be equipped to prevent its inhabitants from dying of boredom after a few dozen centuries. To our racial mind, justice *does* matter and furthermore it is inherently unjust to make an infinite future depend on conduct during a few years by a person who was born with certain innate tendencies and capacities and placed in situations that more or less determined how his character would respond to them.

One of the important junctures in our civilization is marked by the short treatise *De libero arbitrio*,¹ written around 1436 by Laurentius Valla, who had the most incisive critical mind of

¹ The text was well edited by Maria Anfossi (Firenze, 1934); I have not heard of a translation. Almost all scholars who concern themselves with the Humanists of the Renaissance assume that Valla could not have been so impious as to say anything that was bad for the salvation-business. It is true that at the end of the dialogue Valla says that he has proved that human reason cannot cope with the Divine Mystery, but I take that to be an anticipation of the notion of a "double truth," which enabled Pomponatius and many other philosophers of the age to affirm that they believed

the early Renaissance. Under the transparent veil of a dialogue about Apollo's power to predict human conduct, Valla demonstrates that no god can be omniscient, omnipotent, and benevolent.

The proof is simple. Take one of the incidents, so common today, in which an obviously innocent little girl of five or six, old enough certainly to feel pain, is raped and blinded or raped and killed by one of the savages on which masochistic or sadistic British and Americans now dote. Now, if there is a god who oversees the lives of men and sparrows, did he foresee the conduct of the savage, whom he created and presumably endowed with a savage's instincts? If he did not foresee it, he is not omniscient. If he did foresee it, was he able to prevent the child's agony? If not, he is not omnipotent. If he had the power and did not use it, he willed the crime and he willed the suffering of the child, so he cannot be benevolent.

Theologians, of course, explain that if the girl had not been killed at that time, she might have grown up and become an atheist – or papa must have offended a deity who chose to take out his anger on both the innocent child and her mother (who, of course, may have done something to vex him).² Or we mustn't think about it, because thinking is bad for souls. None of these explanations will satisfy an Aryan's sense of justice.

Valla's explanation did not too greatly perturb contemporary churchmen, for Christian ditheism then attributed such things to its anti-god, who either had on this earth a power that his celestial antagonist could not overcome or sneaked in to promote the dirty work when God wasn't looking. Everyone knew, after all, that the Devil was so powerful that he had been able to carry a third of the Christian god up to high mountains and there try to bribe him. But with the current tendency to make Christianity a monotheism, the problem has to be faced.

It is probably impossible to devise for a monotheism a theodicy that will satisfy the Aryan mind. At least, no one has done it yet.

by faith what they had just proved to be impossible. In the Fifteenth Century men with inquiring minds had to take precautions to avoid being tortured to death if they annoyed the theologians. The hounds of Heaven were baying on Valla's trail often enough as it was, and once he was saved only by the intervention of King Alfonso of Naples.

² Every such incident has repercussions on persons other than those immediately involved. Years ago, an old man, with whom I was discussing the efforts of professional holy men to attribute the coincidences that are called luck to intervention by their deity, told me that his life had been shaped by an appointment he had kept when he was a young man. He had decided to keep that crucial appointment in the metropolis by taking a train that passed through his town in the early morning. That morning his alarm clock failed to ring, and when he awoke, he threw on his clothes and ran to the station, although he knew he could not reach it in time. He was fifteen minutes late, but that morning the train, for the first time in many months, was even later: it had been delayed when it struck an automobile on a grade crossing, killing the occupants. "If I had been superstitious," he said, "I would have decided that Jesus so loved me that he killed three persons, a man, his wife, and their child, to enable me to keep my appointment. Or, if the train had not been late, I would have been sure that my sins had so annoyed him that he slipped into my bedroom that night and tampered with the mechanism. But that would have drastically changed the life of my wife, whom I married later, and our children would never have been born. Of course, she and I might have married other spouses, changing both their lives and our own, and each of us would have had quite different children, who would have grown up to change the lives of many others and themselves engender children. The consequences of that accident at the grade crossing are almost infinite and incalculable, for, of course, we should have to consider also the victims and the results of their death."

There is one more topic that must be considered in our hurried sketch of the evolution of religions with reference to what we suppose to be the innate mentality of our race. When we speak of any religion today, we automatically think of its priests, a specialized and professional clergy. That is not a necessary connection.

Ritual and Aryan Worship

Ritual

A RELIGIOUS RITUAL is a fixed sequence of acts (often including speech) performed to make magic by influencing supernatural forces. Most rituals began at a time so remote and among men so primitive that they may antedate our race; their origins and original meanings were forgotten long before the earliest written records, while the rites were perpetuated by a continuing tradition, so that even the function they were thought to serve may have changed drastically as the pattern of the ritual was handed down through innumerable generations. The process may be illustrated by a partial analogy in the development of language. As we all know, many speakers of English today, for example, will say that a man "has shot his bolt," without thinking of how long it takes to reload a crossbow; that he was "taken aback," without understanding the navigation of ships under sail; and that he "curries favor," without having ever heard of Fauvel or knowing what a favel is and without knowing how to curry a horse. Many persons could not think of any connection between a muscular man and a mouse, and rare indeed must be the individuals who think of the Egyptian god Amon Ra when they meet a woman named Mary.

Rituals are a common source of myths, much as one phase of the Germanic celebration of Christmas gave rise to the myth of Santa Claus, who, by the way, is a typically Aryan myth. (To anticipate a point we shall have to make later, ask yourself whether we "believe in" Santa Claus and then, would an observer come to earth, like Voltaire's *Micromégas*, from a remote planet conclude that we "believed in" Santa Claus?) As everyone knows, the customs associated with Santa Claus are much older than the Christian coloring that has been given them. And finally we have an ætiological myth to explain the myth, in a story that is now having some success as an alternative to Dickens' *Christmas Carol*, a tale by an obscure writer of popular fiction who imagined that Claus was a Roman named Claudius, who was "converted" at the Crucifixion and then became the first missionary to northern countries. In a less literate age, Seabury Quinn's short story, written for a "pulp" magazine a few decades ago, would probably become an item of popular belief.

A good example of the persistence of ritual may be found in the Thesmophoria, the ceremony that Aristophanes so delightfully parodied in his well-known comedy. It was not an Aryan rite: it was practiced by the indigenous population of Greece when the first wave of Aryans arrived, and there are indications that for a considerable time many or most of the Greeks refused to have anything to do with the cult of the "Pelasgians" whom they had subdued. The purpose of the ritual, so far as we can determine from its performance in historical times, was to ensure that seeds planted in the autumn would germinate in the spring, but we have no idea what spirit or spirits the ritual was intended to placate or stimulate. When the Greeks took up the ritual, they decided, not unnaturally, that it must be associated with Demeter, their goddess of grain, and so they saw in the first day of the three-day ceremony a reference to her descent into the underworld. And suitable ætiological myths were produced. It is likely that the prohibition of pomegranates in the ritual contributed an important part of the myth of Persephone. The

sacrifice of pigs certainly produced the myth of Eubuleus. And what was probably only a verbal similarity between the name of the secret cult objects and the Greek word for 'law and order' convinced the Greeks that the ceremony in some way commemorated the establishment of civilized society. And in our own time an anthropologist (Professor Agnes Vaughan) has elaborated a "scientific" explanation of the Thesmophoria that is just another ætiological myth.

Rituals are rationally inexplicable. Some, especially the cult dances of primitive tribes, may represent the "methectic collaboration with autochthonic spirits" that warms the minds of some anthropologists, but that explanation, at best, does not take us very far. When, for example, an Arval promises to sacrifice a spotless white heifer to Juno, if the goddess keeps her part of a bargain, why should Juno be interested? Oh yes, the animal is a heifer because Juno is female and her delicacy would be offended by a male offering; it is white, because she is a goddess of the world of light and a black animal would be suited only to a deity of the underworld; and it must be spotless because divinity demands what is perfect and rare. But what conceivable pleasure could Juno derive from watching her votaries banquet on Wiener Schnitzel while the inedible parts of the animal are burned on her altar? (The ætiological myth about Zeus's mistake is, of course, humorous and in the vein of Aristophanes' burlesque of the idea.) One can try to imagine explanations of Juno's odd tastes, but after we have discoursed about totems and theromorphic spirits and the like, we end with the conclusion that is fundamental to all religions: in this instance, the gods are pleased by the sacrifice of an animal because animal sacrifices are pleasing to the gods. Q.E.D.

Primitive rituals are comparatively simple, no more complicated than the action and pattern of a traditional Morris dance, for example. Anyone can learn the ritual by listening attentively to someone who has performed it. No technical expertise is needed to make magic in this way. Even a fairly elaborate series of rituals is no more elaborate than the ritual of a Masonic lodge, for example, which imposes so little strain on mnemonic faculties that a local barber or automobile salesman or tavern-keeper could memorize his way to exaltation as a Worshipful Grand Master or Sublime Potentate, if his finances permitted.

This is a most important point. If we restrict the word 'priest' to specialists in the supernatural, a religion of rituals requires no priests. If a priest is just a man who performs a religious rite, then, in such a religion, any person, not an infant or of the wrong sex, may be a priest whenever occasion demands it.

What appears to be the native Aryan worship is therefore entirely feasible.

Aryan Worship

If we perpend the available evidence for social structure and religious practices of the Aryans when they first appear in history – the oldest hymns in the *Rig-veda*, the practices of the early Greek cults, the native religion of the Romans, what we can ascertain about the rites of the prehistoric Norse, and a scattering of corroboratory information from such sources as Tokharian and even traces in Hittite – we are driven irresistibly to the conclusion that the early and authentic Aryan religion had *no place* for professional holy men.

The essentials of native Aryan religious practice may be summarized in a few lines. The head of every household was its priest, who himself performed for his household such rites as the family tradition prescribed, usually or always including some *sacra* peculiar to the family line, and such other ceremonies as seemed appropriate to him. If wealthy and devoted to some particular god, he might erect an open altar or a modest temple (i.e., structure) to that deity on his own property, and the shrine would descend to his heirs in the usual way. The owner would determine whether other votaries of the god should be admitted to private property.

The tribe or the state was, in a sense, a great family and naturally had its own rites and gods to which it accorded a tribal or national worship. The rites were invariably performed by citizens, *never* by professionals. And, of course, the community had its own shrines and temples, which might be no more than a plot of ground in an open field or in a forest, but was usually an edifice as simple or elaborate as the community's prosperity dictated.

The rites were conducted and sacrifices performed personally by persons, selected temporarily or permanently from the citizen body, who devoted to their duties a small amount of time occasionally taken from their normal occupations, and these citizens had no assistants other than a janitor to keep the temple clean and perhaps, if inclined to luxury, a slave or temporary employee to do the more messy jobs of butchering. The Thesmophoria we mentioned above were rites performed by married women, and in Athens the married women, wives of Athenian citizens and necessarily also daughters of Athenian citizens, in each Attic deme selected each year two of their number, financially able to bear the modest expenses, to organize and preside over the ceremonies, in collaboration, of course, with the women elected by the other demes. At Rome, all the great priesthoods were filled by the election or co-option of men (or, where appropriate, women) from the leading families, usually Patrician families. The offices were usually held for life, but were not hereditary, and there were exceptions. For example, the priestess of the Bona Dea in any year was, *ex officio*, the wife of the presiding magistrate for that year. The priesthoods were high political offices and were sought as honors or for the political power they conferred.

No taint of religious professionalism appears. It is true that one of the flaminates, that of the Flamen Dialis, was hedged about with traditional taboos (the purpose of which had long been forgotten), which severely limited the political and particularly the military careers of the holder of that office: that is why the young Cæsar prudently refused it. Late in the Republic some politician raised the constitutional question whether one of the other flamens could be prevented from taking command of an army outside Italy, but in general a Roman priest was a citizen of prominence, and no one ever imagined that he should have any religious qualification for the position, other than a suitable lineage, usually Patrician birth.

If the tribe or state had a specific ceremony for the collectivity, the priest was always, *ex officio*, the chief of the tribe, the king of the state, or a magistrate who replaced the king if the monarchy had been eliminated. In Rome under Augustus, one of the signs that the state was being gradually and almost surreptitiously converted to a monarchy was that Augustus (and his successors) became the Pontifex Maximus *ex officio*.

Aryan society doubtless included individuals who claimed some special skill in interpreting omens (one thinks of Tiresias) and religious enthusiasts. Such persons were free to communicate their opinions and might be asked for advice in perplexing situations, but they were citizens, received no emoluments, had no official standing, and could only offer advice which the king or responsible magistrate might or might not see fit to take (it was up to Agamemnon to decide whether he should pay attention to Tiresias's monitions). There were no professional holy men. No one could gain wealth or grasp power by claiming to be an expert technician of the supernatural.

In short, the evidence supports the conclusion of Professor Hans F. K. Günther: "A priesthood as a more sacred class, elevated above the rest of the people, could not develop amongst the original Indo-Europeans. The idea of priests as mediators between the deity and men would have been a contradiction of Indo-European religiosity."¹ But there are difficulties.

Georges Dumézil, a sagacious and distinguished student of Aryan religions, has identified a "tripartite" modality of thought, an instinctive grouping of concepts in units of three, as characteristic of our racial mentality; which appears in everything from our fairy stories and other fiction, in which it is always the third attempt to solve a problem that succeeds, to the grouping of gods in triads, as in the Capitoline trinity at Rome (originally, Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus; later, Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva) and the two Norse triads (Odin, Thor, and Tyr; Niord, Freyr, and Freyja) which were reduced to the trinity worshipped in the famous temple at Uppsala (Odin, Thor, and Freyr). Dumézil finds this same tripartite pattern in a social organization consisting of warriors, priests, and commoners, thus making a priestly class a native and necessary part of early Aryan society. We may counter this theoretical objection by arguing either that the tripartite thinking did not extend to social organization or that Dumézil has wrongly identified the three elements, which could be king (or equivalent), nobility, and commoners, or even aristocracy, plebeians, and serfs. And there is the solid evidence that the earliest Aryan societies of which we have knowledge show no certain trace of a priestly caste.

The real difficulty is that no societies have been more priest-ridden than India after the Aryan conquest, where a caste of priests achieved an effective monopoly of all religious rites, and Celtic Gaul, where the Druids had virtually unlimited power. In other Aryan societies we find a caste of professional holy men, as in ancient Persia, or a priesthood which, though not hereditary, has attained an ascendancy over the citizens and the state.

So drastic a change seems, at first sight, incredible. It seems most unlikely, *a priori*, that in India, for example, in a territory that was certainly conquered by the Aryan invaders and ruled by them, and on which they imposed their Indo-European language and presumably the culture it represented so thoroughly that all but the vaguest recollection of what had preceded them

¹ *Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans*, translated by Vivian Bird and Roger Pearson (London, Clair Press, 1967). The question here is treated somewhat more fully in Günther's *Die Nordische Rasse bei den Indogermanen Asiens* (München, 1934) which has not been translated, so far as I know. The parts of Günther's work that are most open to question are the dating of the cult of Odin and the supposed religious toleration in Iceland, neither of which is relevant here. It may be that here and there he is not sufficiently strict in weighing data favorable to his thesis. It is true that he holds our race in high esteem, and that, I need not say, is considered very sinful today.

disappeared, the Aryan principalities and kingdoms should have developed a religion and a social structure that was "a contradiction" of Aryan religiosity. For this paradox, however, Professor Günther has a reasonable explanation. In all parts of the world, Aryan migrations, so far as we can discern, followed a pattern that must have been determined by our racial peculiarities. An Aryan tribe invades a desirable territory and subdues a much more numerous native population of a different race and is content to rule over them, instead of exterminating them and even their domestic animals, as the Jews claim to have done in Canaan and as the Assyrians may have done in some places. The natives, thus spared by what could be considered a biological blunder, were made subjects, but the majority of them were not enslaved or even reduced to serfdom; they and their native customs were probably treated with a measure of the toleration and protection that the Romans later accorded their subjects. The inevitable result was miscegenation, both biological and cultural. The consequence of the long and intimate association of the dominant Aryans with their subjects of a different race, Professor Günther says, was that "a spirit alien in nature," corresponding to the dilution and hybridization of the racial stock, "permeated the original religious ideas" of the Aryans and "then expressed in their language religious ideas which were no longer purely or even predominantly European [i.e., Aryan]." And he identifies certain elements in our race's mentality and especially in its religiosity, especially the lack of fanaticism, which made it particularly susceptible to the contagion of alien superstitions. What happened, in other words, was a kind of spiritual mongrelization that, in all probability, largely preceded and certainly facilitated the biological mongrelization.

We may find a small but neat example of this process in the Thesmophoria we have mentioned above. In the Peloponnesus, these rites were practiced by the native population until the Dorian invasion; thereafter, for some centuries, the ceremonies persisted only in the mountain-girt hill country of Arcadia, which the Dorians had not taken the trouble to occupy; but then the Dorian conquerors, including the notoriously conservative Spartans, begin to practice themselves the alien ritual of the Thesmophoria, giving to it a name that was at least partly Greek and associating it with their own religious concepts.²

The process, so clearly illustrated by the Thesmophoria, probably took place in every territory that the Aryans subdued, and the cumulative effect must have been a religious and cultural perversion that could well have produced in India, for example, even so drastic a change as the eventual subjugation of the conquerors' descendants to a caste of professional holy men. For an extreme and frightening example of what mongrelization can do to the minds of our race, we have only to consider the Guayakis of South America, who, as is conclusively shown by anthropological and especially anthropometric studies, contain a large admixture of Nordic

² There is an indubitable historical basis for this Greek tradition, first reported by Herodotus (II.171). The Greeks, naturally, had no means of knowing whence the Pelasgians (who were white, but of undetermined race) derived the ritual or with what superstitions the Pelasgians had associated it.

blood and exhibit a cultural degeneracy noteworthy even among the Indian populations of that continent.³

These considerations, and especially our race's notorious lack of a racial consciousness and its concomitant generosity toward other races, adequately explain a corruption of its native religious tendencies, and accordingly we may accord to Professor Günther's description of our pristine religiosity a high degree of probability, although the limitations of the available data preclude certainty. We may, however, observe that it is possible to go much farther in speculations that can be no more than suggestive.

L. A. Waddell was a distinguished scholar, although his achievements and reputation have been eclipsed because his pioneer attempt to read Sumerian as an Indo-European language was as mistaken as the work of his numerous contemporaries, who were trying to read it as a Semitic language.⁴ On his misreading of Sumerian, he based an elaborate reconstruction of early history that, despite the great learning shown in it, necessarily collapsed with the failure of its foundation. That does not necessarily invalidate his startling suggestion that the name of the priestly caste that worked its way to power in India, *Brāmana* is a word derived from Semitic; that the institution of a class of professional priests in Sumeria was the work of the Semites that gradually took over Sumerian society; and that the priestly caste in India was derived from Sumeria.⁵

The etymology is probably wrong, but the suggestion is made the more impressive by the fact that Waddell in 1925 must have been prescient to anticipate that subsequent excavations would prove beyond doubt the presence in the Indus Valley of a relatively advanced civilization

³ See Jacques de Mahieu, *L'Agonie du Dieu Soleil* (Paris, Laffont, 1974); there is a German translation (which I have not seen), but none in English, so far as I know. Cf. *Nouvelle École*, #24 (mars 1974), pp. 46 sqq, Pessimists, who assume that the present direction of society in Britain and the United States will continue unchanged and have the courage to extrapolate from it, may see in the Guayakis the prototypes of what is likely to be left of our race two or three centuries hence.

⁴ We now know, of course, that Sumerian is neither Indo-European nor Semitic. The race of the Sumerians is uncertain; the possibility that they were Aryan cannot be excluded.

⁵ † *Indo-Sumerian Seals Deciphered* (London, 1925), *passim*; *The Makers of Civilization in Race and History* (New Delhi, Chand, 1968 = London, 1929), pp. 386 sqq. If Waddell completed and published the special work promised on p. 399, I have overlooked it. I think it probable that the Sanskrit *brāhmana* is cognate to the Latin *flāmen* and is therefore Indo-European, but I need not tell anyone even casually acquainted with Indo-European philology, in which everything that is not obvious is extremely obscure, that no etymology of either of the two words is accepted by a majority of students. What is important is not the origin of the word, but of the idea that it represents. Note that there are several related words in Sanskrit that should be carefully distinguished: *brāhma* (neut.), perhaps best translated as 'divine'; *Brāhma* or *Brāhman* (neut.), the impersonal, unknowable cosmopoietic force that is regarded as the ultimate and only eternal reality; *Brāhman* (masc.), the creator god who is a member of the Hindu Trinity; *Brāhmana* (masc. with fem. *Brāhmani*), a member of the highest and most venerable caste, born holy, and first of the twice-born; *Brāhmana* (neut.), one of the commentaries on the Vedas, some of which are interesting as showing early stages of the process by which rituals were so complicated and elaborated by interpretation as to make expert assistance desirable even before the rituals were made the monopoly of experts. It is uncertain which of these words should be regarded as the one from which the others were derived.

that flourished before the Aryan invasion and was very closely connected with the Sumerians so closely that it is possible that the Sumerians came to Mesopotamia from the Indus Valley.⁶

This suggests a question that will startle students who naïvely cling to the old notion that race is shown by geography or language.⁷ What was the race of persons who contrived the establishment of priestly castes in ancient India and Persia? That the breathtaking question is not entirely idle will appear from indications that the dominant priesthoods may originally have been racial, especially the following:

The great hero of the priestly caste of Brahmans in India is Parasurāma, an incarnation of the god Vishnu and a great warrior (!), who extirpated the *Ksatrias*, the Aryan caste of warriors and rulers, by killing each and every member of the “kingly race” twenty-one times – a phenomenal overkill that suggests a Semitic imagination! The blessed event thus described is mythical, of course, but *something* did extirpate the warrior caste (unless some escaped to become the ancestors of the Rajputs (rājaputras) as the latter claim), and by the Third Century, at the latest, supposedly Aryan states were ruled by kings who were Sudras, i.e., descendants of the dark-skinned race that the Aryans, and quite possibly their predecessors in the Indus Valley, had subdued and subjected to civilization. It is probable that the ruling caste was destroyed as Aryan aristocracies always are, by miscegenation, war, internal feuds, revolution, and superstition, but the racial animus of the Brahmans’ Saviour and of the Brahmans who devised and perpetuated the story is unmistakable.

The Magi, also, were an hereditary caste of holy men, who claimed lineal descent from an especially godly clan or tribe in Media. The language of the Magi and their holy books is uncertain: it may have been Aramaic, the Semitic tongue that was the common language of the Persian Empire (including its administration), since Persian was not widely understood by the subjects. As is well known, one of the Magi tried to grab the Persian Empire by impersonating the deceased brother of Cambyses, and when the impersonator was unmasked and killed, it was believed that he had been the leader or agent of a conspiracy of the Magi to take over the Empire, and popular indignation in the capital resulted in the famous Magophonia, which sounds very much like a pogrom, because the religion seems not to have been affected by it. There is no hint of a religious schism, such as that between Catholics and Protestants in Europe, and

⁶ Attempts to identify the civilized people of the Indus Valley as Dravidians on linguistic grounds are nugatory; on the most elaborate attempt to do so, see Arlene Zide and Kamil Zvelebil, *The Soviet Decipherment of the Indus Valley Script* (The Hague, Mouton, 1976). There are extraordinary similarities between that script and the *rongo-rongo* script of Easter Island and they are too great to be coincidental; from this fact, he who wishes may evoke romantic dreams of what might have been.

⁷ So far as I know, not even the most advanced “Liberals” today would identify as Englishmen everyone who writes a passable English or everyone who lives in Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Until fairly recent times, however, historians have blithely assumed that everyone who wrote in Sanskrit, at least before a comparatively late date, was an Aryan, and that everyone who lived in Rome or even in the vast territory of the Roman Empire was a Roman, unless clearly identified as of other nationality and race and this so long as the Empire lasted as a political unit and long after the Romans had become, for all practical purposes, extinct. It is true that very often – even usually – we have no means of knowing the race of an individual who has adopted a civilized name. For example, we would naturally suppose that L. Cæcilius Iucundus, the wealthy banker of Pompeii, had been a Roman, if his vanity had not led him to commission the repulsive portrait that shows him to have been some intruder from Asia Minor.

Darius himself recorded his unaltered piety in extant inscriptions. An alien caste of priests would naturally have enlisted members of the dominant race as accomplices in one way or another, and the latter could have carried on, perhaps with gratification, after their principals or superiors had been massacred. If, for example, all the Catholic priests in Italy today were massacred on religious grounds, we cannot imagine how Italy could remain a Catholic nation; but if the hierarchy and its favorites were composed of aliens – Irish, for example – and they were massacred on racial grounds, the nation's religion would not necessarily be compromised and might even be stimulated.

It is true that both the Brahmans and the Magi loudly claimed to be *ārya*, but it is not inconceivable that they began by using the word in its general meaning, 'noble, excellent,' and claiming for themselves the transcendent excellence of their holiness, extending the ambiguous word, by the verbal trickery common to theologians, to a racial signification. Nor would such a *supercherie* be impossible for clever white men of a different race dwelling among Aryans who exhibited such physical diversity, as in color of hair and eyes, as is taken for granted today. As we all know, many Jews now not only pretend to be Englishmen or Frenchmen or Americans, but, if not betrayed by too grossly alien features and if moderately discreet in their conduct, are actually accepted as such by the general populace, which exhibits the characteristically Aryan disregard of race. A comparable masquerade might not have been impossible in India and Persia.

These remarks, needless to say, are intended to suggest what speculations could be based on some neglected items in our fragmentary information about the early history of Aryan nations. If an hypothesis were based on them, it would pose some startling questions, e.g., was the caste system in India originally based, not on a distinction between Aryans and non-Aryans, but on a distinction between white and dark-skinned races? It would require a reconsideration of all the evidence for the early history of India so drastic that the very prospect would freeze the blood of a modern historian.

The speculations, furthermore, are irrelevant here. No one would contend that Aryans have not been pirates, bandits, and swindlers, exploiting their racial kinsmen; it would be absurd to ask whether they could not also have become professionals in religion!

It will suffice to have indicated the likelihood that our racial psyche, though highly susceptible to alien ideas and superstitions, is innately averse from granting power and influence to professional holy men. This may help us understand some otherwise puzzling episodes in our racial history.

Shamans

WHATEVER the origin of professional priesthoods and their claim that a strange expertise is necessary to mediate between their human customers and the invisible supernatural beings that are supposed to have power over nature, that origin was also the beginning of an interminable history of sordid chicanery, fraud, and forgery. The holy man's prosperity and even his livelihood depend on his ability, or the ability of the caste or professional organization to which he belongs, to convince ordinary mortals that he has powers they do not possess.

In the third of his *Dialogues*, Renan, speculating about the consequences of the scientific research that, even in his day, was giving governments ever increasing power to control and coerce a populace, noted the inadequacy of religion as a means of social control. The structure of Hindu society, he observed, ultimately depended on the Brahmans' claim to have supernatural powers, including that of blasting a human being with a glance from their holy eyes. "But no human being has ever been blasted by a Brahman. He is therefore using an imaginary fear to support a mendacious creed." The Brahman's authority (and income) therefore depended on a bluff. To make his point, Renan simplified his statement by ignoring the prevalent (and non-Aryan) mentality of the masses of polyphyletic India at the time that the Brahmanic superiority was firmly established, but he has made clear by a sharp contrast the problem that confronts all professional priesthoods, whether a class of individuals without formal organization or a body of disciplined professionals directed by a person or central office that has quasi-despotic authority over them.

The Brahmans' prestige (and income) depended primarily on their theology and their supposed intimacy with, and expert knowledge of, the gods and the means of influencing them. This they augmented with stories about Brahmans, perhaps especially gifted ones (*rishis*), who, in some distant place or time, had blasted a discourteous person with a glance or impregnated a virgin by focusing his thought on her or resurrected a dead man with an incantation. Those tales edified the gullible, but there were, especially before the days of Brahmanic ascendancy, wicked individuals with materialistic tendencies who might doubt what they had not actually seen, and it was necessary to impress them. Clever and dexterous holy men found ways to do that, and thus was born the magic for which India acquired a reputation that was no doubt deserved at one time, although our own more adroit magicians regard the techniques as crude and almost childish by their more sophisticated standards. No Hindu fakir could compete with an ordinarily accomplished magician, to say nothing of such experts as Houdini and James Randi.

The only question is the extent of conscious fraud and deception in all religions. It is not a simple question. A well-known religious technique, which has been studied by some very competent anthropologists, is used by the Eskimo shamans. The observers have noted, by the way, that the shamans, although mentally more alert than their tribesmen, are always neurotic individuals, spiritually consumed with envy of men who are admired by the tribe for courage, skill in hunting, the virility that attracts women, or even good luck, so that the shamans are covertly malevolent toward a society that respects qualities they do not possess. They maintain their prestige by using hypnotism on the simple-minded, and by performing the less-demanding

tricks of prestidigitation and illusion employed by our stage magicians. A somewhat more sophisticated stunt consists of swallowing a thin bladder that is filled with seal's blood; at the psychological moment, the shaman ruptures the bladder by contracting his abdominal muscles and vomits up a small flood of blood, thus mightily impressing with his sanctity his open-mouthed and goggle-eyed customers.

The trick is obviously a hoax and the shaman must know it, but some responsible anthropologists report that, so far as they can determine, the shaman actually believes that he is exercising a power given him by supernatural forces with which he communicates in trances. That seems incredible to us at first sight and until we remember that the shamans belong to a race that has a mentality so different from our own that we are illogical if we expect logic from them or try to set limits to what such minds may be able to believe.

Aryans, if sane, do not delude themselves when they use trickery. For example, when the little Fox girls, bored in bed and inclined to mischief, thought of a way to scare their silly mamma, and their adult half-sister shrewdly perceived the revenue-producing virtues of the spirits of the dear departed, they inaugurated one of the most successful and lucrative rackets of modern times, which kept simpletons agog for almost a century, and produced some "Mediums" of really noteworthy ingenuity and dexterity – some, indeed, who imposed on such surprising suckers as Sir Arthur Conan

Doyle and Sir Oliver Lodge when those otherwise intelligent gentlemen were emotionally overwrought. Now it is absolutely certain that all the successful "spiritualistic mediums," from the sub-adolescent little girls whose pranks started the craze to the individuals who are trying today to revive a discredited business, are conscious frauds who exploit the gullibility of the insatiably credulous and the sorrow of the bereaved. There have been psychopathic individuals whose hallucinations convinced them they could communicate with ghosts, but their addled minds lacked the cunning to impose on many persons.

The "mediums," however, leave us with a psychological problem of great importance, since we are dealing with Aryans. About most of the famous spook-raisers there can be no doubt: they were very adroit magicians and competent actors (or, more commonly, actresses) who cynically exploited human credulity and irrationality for profit or for the pleasure of notoriety. But the careers of some make it seem likely that they had a certain perverse sincerity. They knew that they were perpetrating hoaxes, of course, but they evidently had religious convictions and had convinced themselves that they were performing a great and pious service by so deluding others as to instill in them belief in the existence and purposes of the supernatural beings in whose reality the "medium" herself actually believed by an act of faith. Outrageous deceit may, and often does, accompany a sincere faith, paradoxical as that fact seems to a coolly rational mind. And if we do not bear that fact in mind, there is much that we will misunderstand in the history of religions.

There is another factor of very great importance that we must take into account: the hallucinatory power of many botanicals. The investigations of R. Gordon Weston have made it virtually certain that the *soma* of the Brahmins and the *homa* (*haoma*) of the Magi was the

sacred mushroom (*Amanita muscaria*), which is probably the greatest single source of religious experiences, although there are, of course, many others. Incidentally, it may be worthy of note that Weston is of the opinion that the sacred mushroom was not used by the priests at Eleusis in the celebrated mysteries that gave to so many Greeks an assurance of immortality; from a cursory inspection of the records, he thinks that as many as four other hallucinatory drugs may have been used at various times.¹ Needless to say, the pious pharmacopoeia was always a professional secret of the holy men, wherever it was used, and investigators must depend chiefly on the experiences reported by initiates, often inadvertently, since they were sworn to silence in most cults.

The hallucinations induced by such drugs partly depend on the preconceptions of the mind that experiences them; in other words, persons who have ingested the drug see, in large part, what they expect to see, usually accompanied by visual illusions of extraordinary brilliance and often beauty and perhaps auditory illusions that are in some way distorted or intensified. In other words, a person who drank an adequate quantity of *soma* for the purpose of “elevating his consciousness” to perception of a “higher world” was likely to see gods as he had imagined them, but as part of hallucinations so vivid and intense, surpassing everything in his waking experience, as to seem wonderful revelations of the supernatural. If the *soma* were administered to him without his knowledge – in a cup of ordinary wine, for example – he would probably see images drawn from his subconscious mind, accompanied, of course, by illusions so vivid that they command the credence of persons who have no knowledge of the psychagogic power of some pharmaca. Now a professional holy man who administers such a potion to his clients must (at least, if Aryan) know what he is doing, but it is quite possible that he, having himself experienced such hallucinations, is himself persuaded of their reality and believes that the sacred mushroom or whatever other hallucinogen he is using does have the miraculous power of disclosing to mortal perception the mirific realities of a supernatural world. He may delude others, himself deluded. In the nature of things, of course, we can never be sure of the hidden thoughts and secret beliefs of any individual, and there are many circumstances in which it would be unjust to assume fraud when other explanations are not unlikely, especially when we have scientific knowledge that makes the world somewhat less mysterious to us than it was to the person whom we are judging.

Until quite recent times, the mysterious potency of the sacred mushroom and similar botanical poisons was the closely guarded secret of certain orders of holy men, who transmitted knowledge of it orally or only in enigmatic or cryptic allusions in writing.² Even today, we have

¹ See Weston’s contribution to *Flesh of the Gods*, edited by Peter Furst (New York, Praeger, 1972), pp.194 sq. Scores of volumes and hundreds of articles have been devoted to attempts to determine the nature of the Eleusinian Mysteries from the hints let fall by initiates who were bound by dire oaths not to disclose their experiences, but I do not recall having read one that took into account the probable use of hallucinatory drugs. Recent archaeological excavations have permitted a more accurate description of the sanctuary; see George Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton University, 1961).

² There is thus ample justification for the method followed by John Allegro in *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross* (New York, Doubleday, 1970), although I fear the learned and distinguished scholar sadly overworks some of his etymologies.

not ascertained how hallucinations are excited in otherwise sane minds by the numerous drugs that are often designated by the offensive neologism "psychedelic."³ We only know that they induce in the victim hallucinations that are so vivid that they seem to him as real as, or even more real than, his perceptions of quotidian reality, from which they differ so drastically as to seem supernatural.

The delusions frequently include visions of præterhuman beings, evidently drawn from the subconsciousness of the victim.⁴ In other words, the drugs induce a temporary insanity from which the victim may recover without being aware of what has happened to him, and some of the drugs, at least, if frequently ingested, bring on, by a cumulative effect, a permanent mental alienation. We also know of various psychopathic conditions that involve continuous delusions, less spectacular, it is said, than those evoked by drugs, but more or less permanent, and deform only a part of the mind, so that these forms of madness do not preclude a forced rationality of conduct and are often accompanied by a very high degree of cunning. Persons suffering from these mental diseases or deformations may not seem insane to their contemporaries and may acquire prestige as prophets and the like. While they often employ fraud and deceit, the delusions from which they suffer cannot be classed as intentional.

We must often remain in doubt about prominent figures in the history of religions, even in recent times. Emanuel Swedenborg was a man of the highest intellectual ability, eminent as one of the greatest and most versatile men of the Eighteenth Century: he wrote Latin verse of exceptional merit; was a mathematician of note; was brilliant as a civil and military engineer; was an influential member of the Swedish House of Nobles and distinguished for his studies in political economy and mercantile theory; was an expert on metallurgy and mining; made discoveries in paleontology, optics, physics, chemistry that anticipated discoveries made a century after his work in those fields had been obscured by his later activities; and was a pioneer in studying the structure and functioning of the human brain. There was no scientist more distinguished in the Europe of his time. It is true that he had religious interests and tried to ascertain how the brain was controlled by the soul, but this cannot explain why, in 1745, when he was fifty-seven, he was suddenly accosted by various angels, who gave him a Cook's tour of Heaven and Hell, and introduced him to "God, the Lord, Creator and Redeemer of the World," who gave him a commission to save mankind from the bloody piety of the various Christian sects then still engaged in perpetual war to extirpate heresy. Anyone who reads the nine volumes of his *Arcana coelestia* and its infernal sequel will be impressed by the ingenuity with which the author uses the theological device of allegorical interpretation no less than by the

³ The neologism, if not an ignorant error for psychodeletic, is not only improperly formed, but even more improperly derived from d'Aló, 'clear, manifest,' evidently for the purpose of suggesting that fits of insanity "expand the mind's awareness" or make visible a "higher reality." This hoax naturally pleases, in one way or another, the numerous and diverse gangs that have vested interests in promoting superstitions about a "spiritual world" or in inhibiting rationality in our people.

⁴ In one case, a university student in his mid-twenties, having ingested a synthetic hallucinogen of great potency, lysergic acid diethylamide tartrate, fled in panic down a street until he encountered a middle-aged woman, whom he wildly implored to save him from the demons who were pursuing him. He was said not to have been superstitious when sane, but it is likely that his subconscious mind retained stories about devils and fiends he had heard in his childhood or even later.

wild phantasmagoria of his hallucinations. Now Swedenborg, who had a high and evidently deserved reputation for personal integrity, was too famous to have sought notoriety, and neither sought nor obtained profit. So we remain suspended between the three possible explanations: (a) he perpetrated a calculated and brilliant hoax in the hope of ending the religious antagonisms that were still squandering the blood and energy of Europe; (b) he, perhaps inadvertently, ingested some extract of the sacred mushroom or a comparable drug that induced hallucinations he mistook for actual experiences; or (c) his mind, overheated by speculations or debilitated by premature senility, lapsed into one form of insanity.

For men such as Swedenborg, ancient or modern, one must feel sympathy and a certain respect, however we explain their activities, but there are not many of them. Throughout history, with a melancholy consistency, holy men have been imposters and swindlers, differing only, it would seem, in skill and sophistication. But our contemporaries seem to regard mention of that fact as a social impropriety, if not an obscenity.

Perhaps no archaeological find in the Western Hemisphere is more famous than the colossal heads, nine feet high, skillfully sculptured in hard basalt, that were unearthed at La Venta in Tabasco. Commonly assigned to various dates between 800 B.C. and 350 B.C., they enter prominently into every discussion of early navigation from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Mexico and are a prime datum in every theory concerning the race of such visitors to the Western Hemisphere and the cause of their coming; and even apart from such controversies, the heads naturally excite curiosity in themselves. Most of the references to them, however, omit the datum that in the central head a small tube was patiently bored through the basalt from the mouth to a point behind the ear as a speaking-tube for the convenience of a priest, who thus communicated the Word of God to his True Believers, whoever they were.

The promotion of holiness often demanded devices more ingenious than speaking-tubes, and inspired a great variety of mechanical, acoustical, and chemical contrivances. Even our scanty sources on thaumaturgic technology in the ancient world describe some of them. Hero of Alexandria, in his famous essay on mechanics, shows the construction of a number of miracle-making machines, but we know that even more elaborate ones were in use in various temples to show the ways of god to man. Unfortunately, we do not have a description of the apparatus that was used to make gods and other supernatural beings appear on a wide curtain of smoke or vapor, but an optical lens must have been used. Manifestations of divinity were not limited to temples. A common procedure was to take a pious person to the middle of an open field on a moonless night when some deity, such as Hecate, was scheduled to be passing by; the sucker was warned to keep his head covered and not to look on divinity, but he, of course, always risked a glance when the holy man's concealed accomplice set fire to a falcon or hawk that had been covered with tow and pitch or doused in petroleum; the anguished screaming of the blazing-bird as it flew frantically away always helped instill the fear of god and suitable generosity in the worshipper.

It would be a waste of time to multiply examples of religious techniques in the Classical world amid the first great civilization of our race, but we may mention one measure of its decline. Livy knew from his sources the secret of the miraculous torches that were carried by

hysterical females during the Bacchanalian craze, excited by a Greek-speaking evangelist in 186 B.C., but in the Second Century, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and Pausanias mention chemically similar miracles without indicating that they did not believe them to be of supernatural origin. One hopes those authors were not so credulous, but they lived in a century in which both reason and our race were nearing their end in the mongrelized Empire that was still called Roman.

Where the skill to perform miracles is lacking, visual demonstration must be replaced by appeals to the imagination. The arts of oratory and creative writing, with rhetoric nicely adjusted to the comprehension and prejudices of the audience, can produce an effect almost as strong, and have the great advantage that they can body forth in the mind of the hearer or reader marvels that could not be performed on even the most elaborately equipped stage. Nothing is more persuasive than narratives purportedly by eye-witnesses of miracles, preferably supported by theological pronouncements made by a divinely-inspired prophet or by the god himself.

A student of religions must carefully distinguish between myths and the kind of compositions that we may call gospels. Among Aryans, myths do not purport to be history and are not so considered by intelligent adults, whereas gospels purport to be veracious and accurate reports of events that actually happened and of words that were actually uttered.

The Homeric poems are sometimes called "the Bible" of the Greeks. The epithet is grossly misleading. The two epics were indeed the writings that every literate Greek read, but he did not imagine they were history. He knew they were poetry. He knew that the Trojan War had taken place, and he believed – more or less – in the existence of the gods Homer mentions and was willing to believe that the Greek gods had been active, some on the Greek side and some on the Trojan, for he did not have the irrational fanaticism to suppose that the war had been a contest between right and wrong or that there were evil gods. But he knew that Homer had not been present at Troy and had never known anyone who had been. The poet had worked from uncertain and often conflicting traditions, from which he had selected the ones that suited his purpose, and these he had arranged and elaborated with details that were as much his own invention as the hexameters themselves. The epics were beautiful and memorable descriptions of what might have happened, but no one was obliged to believe they were truthful. An intelligent Greek believed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* much as we believe *Hamlet* or *King Lear* or *The Tempest*. They were literature.

The Greeks intelligently understood that all the stories about their gods were myths. No one knew — no one could know what had actually happened. The gods probably existed, and certain traditional rituals and ceremonies were thought to propitiate or please them, and their intentions might be learned from certain oracles; furthermore, persons of extraordinary ability and achievement doubtless enjoyed divine favor and might trace their lineage to heroes, that is, to the children of gods by mortals. But no one could possibly know whether Zeus had abducted Europa or Perseus had slain the Gorgon and rescued Andromeda or Hercules had saved Alcestis from Thanatos. And since no one could know what had happened (if anything!), every poet, every story-teller was free to reshape the story in accordance with his own artistic instincts and his purpose in writing.

The same reasonable attitude appears in the Norse myths. The gods probably exist, and one should perform the traditional ceremonies in their honor, unless one is prepared to take the possible consequences of failing to do so. The *Völuspá* may well be right and it mirrors our *Weltanschauung* and essential pessimism, but, after all, no one can be sure that the sibyl was right or has been reported correctly. As for the *Rígsþula*, one would have to be feeble-minded to suppose that the story of Heimdall was intended to be believed:⁵ it is, on the very face of it, a fantasy on the theme, (probably historical) that the primitive inhabitants of Scandinavia were Lapps, who were subdued by a migration of brown-haired Aryans, who were in turn forced to accept the mild overlordship of a band of blond Nordics. When the skalds recited their verses before a Norse chieftain and retinue of warriors, the listeners, who must have had a high native intelligence,⁶ knew that the skald was inventing a large part of his story about the gods and heroes, and, what is more, many of the episodes were designedly humorous and intended to provoke laughter.⁷

To the Aryan mind, at least, myths differ *toto cælo* from gospels: the former are exercises of the imagination; the latter purport to be history.

⁵ Who could seriously believe that a god created mankind by visiting existing households and in some way influencing the offspring of his host and hostess?

⁶ The auditors, most of them illiterate, must have had both memories that retained an enormous oral literature and extraordinary mental agility to understand the skald's kennings, i.e., the designation of common things by elliptical allusions, many of them invented by the skald as part of his poetic technique. A modern reader, even if he has read a fair amount of Norse literature, is likely to be nonplussed by such expressions as "the brandisher of Gungnir" (=Odin), "the burden of the gallows" (=Odin), "Kvasir's blood" (=the art of poetry), "Ymir's blood" (=the ocean), "the speech of the giants" (=gold), the price of the otter" (=gold), and hundreds of similar expressions. Without Sturluson's description of the art and modern commentaries based on his, we should be hopelessly at sea. But the skald's audience was delighted by his wit.

⁷ Occasionally we are frankly told that given sagas were "good entertainment" (*góð skemmtan*) or were recited "for amusement" (*til gamans*). The question is how many of the episodes that seem so grotesque to us in the adventures of the gods were taken seriously by the audience and how many were what we call "comic relief"?

Lying for the Lord

WHEN PROFESSIONAL PRIESTS undertake to bolster the faith of their congregations by producing historical documents to substantiate their doctrines they face obstacles that are inversely proportional to the ignorance of their customers. The production of a passable forgery demands precise and exacting labor, and what usually happens is that the holy men, whether actuated by a high-minded yearning to disseminate their own faith or by a natural wish to augment their income, do only enough work to impose on their immediate audience. It is an odd fact, however, that if they have a nucleus of fanatical followers, they can enlist their services and skills in manufacturing a hoax to spread the glad tidings. Even so, however, success will depend on the general level of intelligence in the group or community to be evangelized.

One of the most interesting illustrations of this rule may be worth a paragraph or two here.

As everyone knows, Pythagoras, who was born on the Greek island of Samos early in the sixth century B.C. but may not have been an Aryan, was both a philosopher and the founder of a Puritanic cult, of which the doctrine may or may not have been largely derived from the religions of the Oriental lands which he was said to have visited. His sect was roughly comparable to the Masonic lodges today, since members had to undergo a fairly trying and expensive initiation before they were admitted to secret doctrines they had sworn never to reveal to outsiders, but there was the important difference that the Pythagoreans admitted women to equality with men. Everyone who has been in Rome has visited the subterranean basilica under the railroad tracks that converge on the central station, and, while express trains roared overhead, has stood in the hall, in which, two thousand years ago, pious

Neopythagoreans assembled for worship and earnestly contemplated the transcendental meaning of the allegorical figures sculptured in stucco on the walls. Pythagoras had, of course, been equipped long before with the usual paraphernalia of divinity, a virgin birth, a god (Apollo) as father, and an odd identification as an incarnation of his own father, who had taken on a mortal body to instruct his elite in the ways to salvation and a blissful immortality by proper conduct in their successive lives on earth.

Almost two centuries before that basilica was constructed underground, the Neopythagoreans at Rome made a remarkable effort to increase their influence or, perhaps, disseminate their faith. Two stone chests, about eight feet long and four feet wide, were carefully made, sealed with molten lead, adorned with incised inscriptions in both Latin and Greek, and buried in a spot where a farmer, ploughing more deeply than usual, would find them. One of the chests was, according to the inscription, the coffin of Numa Pompilius, the legendary successor of Romulus and second King of Rome, who, according to tradition, had established the official religion of Rome. That chest was empty, doubtless on the theory that Numa, having been a pious prophet, had ascended to Heaven to join his divine relatives. The other chest contained seven books in Latin and seven in Greek, written by Numa to describe the true structure of the universe, as it had been revealed to him by Pythagoras, and the true religion, which he had established at Rome and which, as everyone who read his holy books could see,

differed enormously from the corrupted and perverted practices of the time at which the farmer, perhaps by divine instigation, had uncovered the chests. Precisely what Numa's precious words ordained, and what political purposes lay behind them, we do not know,¹ any more than we know to what ethnic groups most of the members of the Pythagorean lodges at Rome belonged. Numa's books, by the way, had been perfectly preserved, because he had taken the precaution of saturating the papyrus with oil of cedar to preserve them through the centuries.

In 181 B.C., the Roman aristocracy was still preponderantly Aryan, rational, and hard-headed. When they learned of the providential discovery, they were not deceived by the forgeries. Discounting the chances of human bodies floating heavenward, they knew that some remains of a corpse would be left in a sealed stone casket, even after five centuries. Oil of cedar would not have preserved papyrus so well for so long a time, and there were doubtless other signs of forgery.² The aristocracy regarded one religion as intrinsically as good as another, but they recognized the devastating effects of religious agitation and emotionalism on the lower classes and on excitable females and "intellectuals" in their own class. The religiously incendiary books were accordingly burned. Whether copies of them were surreptitiously kept is unknown, but the faith of the Pythagoreans at Rome seems not to have been shaken, for Cicero, in the second book of his *De republica*, thought it worth while to point out, *ob iter*, that it was chronologically impossible for Numa to have been a disciple of Pythagoras.

The difficulty of providing religious documentation may be further illustrated by two of the most recent Christian gospels, each of which is instructive in its own way.

When Joseph Smith, an enterprising young man in Palmyra, New York, found that swindling farmers by claiming that his magic stone monocle enabled him to see buried treasure underground resulted in unpleasant experiences in court, he turned his fertile mind to higher things and manufactured a whole new "New Testament" with the aid of an obscure book that had been published in a small town in Vermont some years before, and (probably) the manuscript of an unpublished novel, and (certainly) his thorough knowledge of the diction and contents of the English Bible and his own lush imagination. With the aid of his stone monocle, now put to godly use, he was able to translate into Biblical English the fifteen books of his supplemental Scriptures from the hieroglyphics inscribed on massive gold plates, which an obliging angel prudently carried off to Heaven as soon as he had completed his inspired task. Smith found a few perjurers, mostly members of his own family, who were willing to swear they had seen the gold plates before they were removed to God's city in the welkin. Later, when Smith decided to write a "Book of Abraham," he tried for greater verisimilitude, but was less cautious. He procured part of one of the cheap papyrus copies of the Egyptian *Book of the Dead* from the wrappings of the Egyptian mummies that were being used at that time for fuel on the Nile steamboats, and exhibited it to the gawking True Believers as an autograph

¹ For one conjecture about the contents, see A. Delatte's article in the *Bulletin de l'Academie royale de Belgique, Lettres*, 1936, pp.19-40.

² Our sources (principally Livy and Seneca) do not inform us whether the devout Pythagoreans tried to reproduce the Greek and Latin scripts that were appropriate to the time of Numa or the orthography, which, especially in Latin, would have differed greatly from that with which they were familiar in their own time.

manuscript, the crudely drawn hieroglyphic text being one in which he could recognize Abraham's own handwriting. On the basis of a drawing of the dead Osiris, which is usually found in such copies, Smith elaborated a fantasy about how the priests of the Egyptian Pharaoh in Chaldæa (*sic*), after sacrificing a bevy of virgins, thought of popping young Abraham onto the altar in the posture shown by the picture with which Abraham had illustrated his holograph. This naturally called for prompt action by the Lord God, and the tale came to a happy ending. Now Smith was so reckless that he not only preserved the papyrus (which, after his death, was presented to the Metropolitan Museum as a priceless treasure by a True Believer with more faith than education) but had the tell-pictures, with only the head of Anubis crudely redrawn, copied on wood-blocks and printed with the text of his latest holy book to impress the yokels. The only reasonable explanation of such astounding indiscretion is that Smith was interested only in enjoying his eminence (and other men's wives) during his lifetime, and cared not at all what would happen to his sect after his death.

Smith had a shrewd successor and thus became the founder of the most cohesive and strongest Christian Church in the United States, which has survived frantic persecutions by competing holy men and their followers, and almost succeeded in establishing a country of its own in what is now Utah. The major Mormon sect has more than three million members in the United States and at least a million in other parts of the world. The three minor sects, products of various schisms, probably number no more than two hundred thousand all together. And we should note that the members of the Mormon Church in its earlier days were almost exclusively, and still are predominantly, of English ancestry.

Another recent gospel-writer is a pleasing contrast to the Prophet of the Latter-Day Saints. One cannot avoid the impression that the prime object of Joseph Smith's devotion was Joseph Smith, and it must require much Faith to like him, but the Reverend Mr. William Dennis Mahan is a sympathetic figure, a man whom we must respect for a deeply sincere Christian faith and his effort to defend it. I confess that I was prejudiced against him when I began to look into his career, but I ended by liking and pitying the man. He was an ordained Presbyterian minister, born in 1824, and in 1879 he was the poorly-paid pastor of the local church in Boonville, a little town, scarcely more than a village, in central Missouri. For years, from his scantily-furnished parsonage in the boondocks, he had watched with sorrow and dismay as infidels, especially Colonel Ingersoll, blasphemed against his god and excited doubts that caused many of Jesus's sheep to stray from their folds. And then in 1879, Ingersoll expanded one of his famous lectures, "The Mistakes of Moses," into a book of 270 soul-destroying pages and published it. For years, America's most eminent divines had screeched at the eloquent Beelzebub from their opulent pulpits and preached jeremiads about the apostasy of a nation in which it was not possible to flay Ingersoll alive or, at least, cut his tongue out – but they had appealed to god and man in vain. So poor Mahan girded up his loins to defend his faith. Mahan published *A Correct Transcript of Pilate's Court*, a precious historical document that he had obtained from the Vatican through the good offices of an itinerant German scholar, whom he had befriended when snowbound in Missouri twenty-three years before. The book created a sensation and was promptly pirated by clergymen throughout the nation. In 1883, Mahan started all over, and produced a much improved version of the document, now called the *Acta Pilati*, and supported it in the following

year with a whole passel of historical records that conclusively established the truth of the "New Testament," including "Jonathan's Interview with the Bethlehem Shepherds," "Gamaliel's Interview with Joseph and Mary," the authentic "reports of Caiaphas to the Sanhedrim" concerning (a) "the Execution of Jesus" and (b) "the Resurrection of Jesus," the speech given by Herod before the Roman Senate when he was prosecuted for his "conduct at Bethlehem," and other equally precious documents, making a total of sixteen. And then, of course, there were letters from strangely named European scholars who had helped Mahan find these treasures in the Vatican and the "Library of St. Sophia" in Constantinople, and letters from other scholars authenticating those letters. To this collection, Mahan gave a title too long to be quoted here, but some of the later publishers brought it out under the odd, but concise title, "The Archko Volume."

This collection enjoyed a considerable success; I do not know how often it was published and have not tried to find out, but I have noticed fourteen editions between 1884 and 1942, including some by Eerdmans, one of the most prominent religious publishing houses in the United States. The report from Pontius Pilate to Tiberius has been the most popular item in the collection and frequently reprinted separately, most recently, to my knowledge, in 1974, when the clergyman who published it claimed that his "transcription" had been verified from the original by the British Museum! I should not fail to mention a remarkable edition printed on a long strip of oilcloth attached to small wooden cylinders with projecting *umbilici* to resemble an ancient papyrus *volumen*.

One feels sorry for Mahan. He was a poor man, and although he made some money from his first hoax, despite the pirating by brother clergymen, he had to borrow \$150 from a bank so that he could hide out in a village in Illinois called Rome to prepare his greater effort and to permit his wife to aver that he had gone to Rome, whence he was sending her letters regularly. He had so little experience of the world that his account of his voyage to Europe, his meeting with "Dr. McIntoch" and "Dr. Twyman" of the "Antiquerian (*sic*) Lodge, Genoa, Italy," their researches in the Vatican and St. Sophia, etc. would be ludicrous, if it were not pathetic. He was an ignorant man, knowing only what he had learned in a Presbyterian seminary and probably without even the most elementary works of reference at hand. He seems not even to have known that the early Christians had forged quite a variety of letters from Pilate to Tiberius or Claudius, reports on the Crucifixion from a Roman consul to the Senate, and letters written by Jesus and the Virgin Mary, and scores of other documents from which he could have assembled quite a bouquet of sacred blossoms, for which he could plausibly have claimed a respectable antiquity and exhibited texts in Latin or Greek. The great weakness of his imposture was that he had only English "translations" to show. The Reverend Mr. William Overton Clough, who was one of the first of the holy men to pirate Mahan's work, translated parts of it into Latin to make it seem more authentic to his readers, but Mahan evidently could not do as much. Mahan's compositions are filled with wild anachronisms and grotesque errors of every kind, which only the eye of Faith could overlook, but he did his best for his religion, and perhaps that best required hard labor. And he undoubtedly did succeed in bolstering the faith and warming the emotions of many thousands of Christians who read his books.

There is no indication that Mahan sought profit or notoriety. There is evidence that he was a sincerely devout Christian and, unlike so many of Jesus's shepherds, truly believed in the religion he professed. He tried to defend it when clergymen more learned and more prosperous than he failed to confute the infidels. And given his attachment to his faith, I see something tragic in his declaration in his edition of 1887: "I have as much reason for believing the genuineness of the contents of this book, as I have to believe the genuineness of the Scriptures, looking at the question from a human standpoint."

The way of the forger is hard, and poor Mahan attempted the impossible. A book recently published in England purveys a revised Christian doctrine, including the claim that St. Paul, instead of wasting much time in the Mediterranean, hot-footed it to London to announce the glad tidings to his fellow Anglo-Saxons on the site of St. Paul's Cathedral, which, however, he is not credited with building. This is doubtless a doctrine that will be attractive to many Christians, but to be really effective, it would require the corroboration of a suitable gospel or, at least, an 'EpiotolĒ prŌj toŸj BrettanoŰj opportunely discovered. But that can't be done. There are probably a score of scholars in the world (I am not one) who could compose to specifications a gospel or epistle in the somewhat peculiar dialect used by the writers of the letters now attributed to Paul. I hope that none could be hired to do it, but if a linguistically sound forgery were produced, it would be impossible to manufacture papyrus that could pass for ancient, and while a case could perhaps be made for a use of parchment in remote Britain, I doubt that it would be possible to prepare and chemically age parchment that would not betray its modernity, if subjected to rigorous tests. Ancient ink could probably be duplicated, but then we would face the enormous task of finding an expert paleographer who could, after months of practice, simulate a script appropriate to the supposed date. Then we should have to manufacture an hermetically sealed container, indistinguishable from an ancient one, in which the document would have been preserved. And if that were done, it would still be necessary to plant the container somewhere – in the ground or in the wall of a building – and the techniques of archaeology are now so refined that there is no chance of a planting that would not immediately be identified as a hoax. And even if all these obstacles were overcome – and that would be the greatest of miracles – there would remain the radioactive isotope of carbon that would betray the date of the very best forgery!

Lying for the Lord is a normal exercise of piety, but it is becoming harder and harder.

Theoktony and Belief

Theoktony

IN CONCLUDING this highly, and perhaps excessively, condensed prolegomenon, we must notice a fact of the utmost importance in the history of religions. There is a relatively high mortality-rate among the immortals.

The basis of all religions is a belief that there are gods who control natural phenomena and can be persuaded to use their power for the benefit of their votaries when placated by rituals and prayers. But what happens when the approved methods prove inefficacious?

Some tribes of American aborigines end periods of drought by performing methectic dances to stimulate the rain-spirits to action. Observers report that the dances frequently produce the desired effect, since, in well-run tribes, they are performed when the old men sense an impending change in weather. Christians, by the way, are less circumspect and often pray for such benefits unseasonably. One remembers the *bon mot* of the young Duke of Clarence who later became King William IV. At a church service at which the clergymen were exhorting Jesus to make rain, he remarked *sotto voce* to his entourage, "Egad, it won't work while the wind's in the southwest."

Any respectable theologian can produce offhand a dozen explanations why gods remain obdurate in any given case, and worshippers, like gamblers, are not discouraged by a few failures, since they hope they will hit the divine jackpot the next time. Constant disappointment, however, leads polytheist worshippers to transfer their supplications from an obdurate god to one untried, and when accumulated experience engenders doubts about the goodwill of several gods, they welcome new ones, who may be more amenable to persuasion. This undoubtedly accounts in large part for the loss of popularity suffered by many gods and eventual changes in a people's pantheon. One is reminded of the Norse who, when the Northern peoples were being solicited by Christian missionaries, remarked that since Odin had done nothing for them, they would try the new god. Some students believe that at an earlier date Odin had supplanted Tyr for the same reason.

A powerless god is a contradiction in terms, and when a god's impotence is spectacularly demonstrated, he ceases to inspire awe and worship. When the Christian sect headed by the Fathers of the Church shrewdly acquired influence over the despots of the decaying empire that had once been Roman, Christian mobs began to plunder the homes of wealthy citizens in some cities and to pillage and destroy the shrines of the gods whom the Christians hated. That was by far the most effective Christian propaganda. The "pagans," as the clever Fathers of the Church called them,¹ naturally reasoned that if their gods were unable to protect the stately and beautiful temples that had been built in their honor and adorned with the irreplaceable masterpieces of the world's greatest artists, those gods must be less powerful than the god of the religion that was so steadily taking over the government of the state. As temple after temple

¹ On this ingenious device in propaganda, see below.

throughout the world was defiled and destroyed by the rioting mobs, it required great faith in Symmachus and the other members of the "pagan aristocracy" to remain true to their ancestral creed, and perhaps they could not have done so, had not some of them thought of attributing to the impiety of the Christians the disasters that were accumulating upon the dying empire as it yielded ever more and more to the virile barbarians from the north, who must be the instruments of the outraged gods. It will be remembered that since the Fathers of the Church had not yet gained control of the state's police powers and army to begin persecuting in earnest Augustine had to try to answer that argument with his famous *De civitate Dei* and to prod one of his followers, Orosius, into compiling a distortion of history, now remembered because it contains some fragments of ancient historians whose works were lost. And when the Fathers finally could use the army for ruthless persecution, they not only stamped out the worship of the discredited gods but acquired a theological argument that was irrefragable and even more effective than the terrorism of fire and sword in destroying the competing Christian sects. The congregations of those sects naturally reasoned that the Christian god must have approved the theology of the Fathers to grant them such power. There is truth in the American proverb that nothing succeeds like success.

The converse phenomenon may be seen in Christian Europe during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. The schism that fractured forever the unity of Christendom was essentially religious and appeared to both sides as the work of the anti-god, although opinion was naturally divided as to whether the Devil had inspired Luther and the other heresiarchs or had been put on the defensive by attacks on the Church which he had thus far controlled. The result was the long series of Wars of Religion, as the True Believers on each side rallied to the support of their beleaguered god and enthusiastically butchered millions of their fellow Aryans, sacked great cities, and made waste lands of rich provinces *ad maiorem gloriam Dei*. But after two centuries of godly slaughter and destruction, the zealots on both sides had to stop in sheer exhaustion, and each had to concede that God had been either unable or unwilling to help them exterminate the servants of Satan. That admission necessarily undermined their faith, and the agnosticism and atheism that had theretofore been the secret belief of a very few learned men gradually spread to ever wider circles. We are reminded of the Icelandic chieftain who, as the *Hrafnkels Saga* tells us, was specially devoted to Freyr, to whom he built a temple and consecrated the prized stud-stallion that, by the god's power, was engendering a superior breed of horses. When his enemies destroyed the temple and cast the stallion into the sea, the chieftain concluded that there were no gods and religion was only a grand hoax. The Wars of Religion, even more than the steady advance of scientific knowledge in the Eighteenth Century, accounted for the mounting wave of scepticism and incredulity that was checked only when the ferocity and horrors of the French Revolution demonstrated, as Gibbon said, "the danger of exposing an old superstition to the contempt of the blind and fanatic multitude."

There is another factor, however, that must not be overlooked when we are dealing with our race, of which a major characteristic is the capacity for objective thought, which Professor Haas terms the philosophical mentality and which has made possible what we call science, which is simply the systematic investigation of natural phenomena to ascertain their natural causes. It begins, as everyone knows, with the earliest Greek philosophers and especially with

Thales, although some scholars now question the tradition that he, at so early a date, not only understood the cause of eclipses but had sufficient data to predict them accurately. However that may be, when the physical causes of natural phenomena are ascertained, the power of the gods is thereby contracted.

In 168 B.C., L. Aemilius Paullus ordered an assembly of his army to listen to a lecture in which C. Sulpicius Galus explained the causes of eclipses and why he knew that an eclipse of the moon would occur at a stated hour on the following night. Thus did Aemilius, a sagacious general, avert the panic or dismay that would have destroyed the efficiency of the legions with which, two or three days later at Pydna, he broke a Macedonian phalanx in an open field and thus assured the supremacy of Rome in the civilized world. Aemilius, a sagacious Roman aristocrat, had no wish to impair the religiosity which he deemed the irreplaceable basis of an ordered society, but, of course, he did so. In the minds of the common soldiers, one large and important province was taken from the gods and restored to the nexus of cause and effect that governs the real world and with which no god can tamper.

From Thales to the present, interrupted only by a long relapse during the Dark Ages, the growth of scientific knowledge has steadily forced the gods to retreat from the real world into an invisible world of the supernatural, out of time and space, with consequent loss of their powers of imminence. In 1902, when the eruption of Mt. Pelée, so vividly described by Edward Diecmann Jr., in his *Volcano Mondo* (Los Angeles, Pinnacle, 1977), devastated a tenth of the island of Martinique, including the capital city, the clergy, whose colleagues in St. Pierre had been praying diligently ever since the volcano showed signs of activity, were much embarrassed. They did not dare to claim that Jesus had incinerated more than fifty thousand persons, including the pious who had taken refuge in his cathedral, so they had to concede that the phenomenal firestorm had been due to natural causes, and the best they could do was exploit the coincidence that in the ruins of the totally destroyed cathedral one sacred image was found unbroken. That, they claimed, proved that Jesus had belatedly intervened to save the garish statue while he obviously paid no attention to his most pious votaries and even made no effort to save his own consecrated priests. But with persons capable of even a modicum of reflective thought, that extemporized proof of divine activity did more harm than good to their faith.

We must not forget that the retreat of the supernatural is in accord with the innate propensities of the Aryan mind, shown by the universal Aryan belief in a destiny *Moros*, *Fatum*, *Wyrd*, inherent in the nature of the physical world and beyond the power of whatever gods there be. So strong was this racial instinct that it eventually produced the Anglo-Saxon proverb, "Christ is powerful, but more powerful is destiny."²

Destiny is simply the Greek *heimarmene*, the nexus of cause and effect that unalterably governs the physical world. It is not remarkable that atheism appears very early in the thought of our race.

² Quoted by Gunther, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

The outlines, at least, of Greek philosophy are too well known to justify a description here. We have already mentioned Xenophanes and Critias, and the common noun, 'Euhemerism,' will remind everyone of Euhemerus, whose ironically entitled Sacred Scripture was translated into Latin as the *Sacra Historia* by Ennius when Rome was still predominantly Aryan. We should note that Critias was so frank in his play, performed for the whole body of Athenian citizens, as to impair the social utility of religion.³ Aristotle was content to remark in his *Metaphysica* that since society depended on a moral order, religion was necessary "to convince the masses." This view was held by a large part of the Roman aristocracy in the great days of the Republic. The elder Cato said that he wondered how an haruspex could avoid grinning when he met a colleague: he could speak freely about foreigners;⁴ it would have been bad taste to speak so crudely about members of a Roman religious *collegium* and, in any case, a well-bred Roman was supposed to maintain his *gravitas* in public. Cicero, who had attained the coveted honor of co-optation to the college of augurs, had no illusions about the religious efficacy of an office which was prized for the political power it gave as a constitutional check on the actions of certain magistrates.

We are here in the presence of a very important factor in religious history: the belief, possibly correct, in the necessity of religion to perform the function Critias had attributed to it. This, of course, has had great weight, not only with sagacious students of politics, such as Machiavelli, but with many churchmen, although few have been so candid as the celebrated Cardinal Dubois, whose opinion we mentioned above. One thinks, for example, of the Protestant minister, Allamand, whom Gibbon knew in his youth and who adroitly fostered the young man's intellectual development, but, since Gibbon was still a Christian, "had some measures to keep" and never showed him "the true colors of his secret scepticism." Allamand, like the famous Father Jean Meslier, who left, disguised as a last will and testament, an avowal of his own atheism, was a man of high moral principles, and in antiquity, as in our own time, the description *est sacrificulus in pago et rusticos decipit* may sometimes correspond to a high sense of social responsibility, although, of course, it more often describes only a cynical exploitation of the credulity of the masses.

Atheism, furthermore, is by no means restricted to the main stream of our civilization. Among the Norse there were many 'godless' (goðlauss) men, and although we can be absolutely certain only about those who said specifically that they believed *only* in their own strength and courage (*á mátt sinn ok megin*) and destiny (auðna), it is highly unlikely that any of them retained any superstitions about the supernatural, although some scholars of Norse antiquities would like to salvage by conjecture some vestiges of religiosity.

³ We do not know in what part of his *Sisyphus* the preserved passage occurred, nor are we informed about the plot. The character who spoke those pregnant lines may have been punished for his rationalism, thus satisfying the religious.

⁴ The official haruspices were noble Etruscans and were summoned from Etruria when it was thought necessary to consult them about the wishes of the gods. On one famous occasion, in 162 B.C., when they returned a politically inexpedient opinion, Tib. Sempronius Gracchus (father of the noted "idealists"), then consul, denounced them as foreign barbarians and had them thrown out, but he had eventually to yield to the superstitions of the populace.

What may astonish some readers is the fact that atheism also appeared among the Aryans of India. In the great uncertainty that besets all attempts to fix a chronology of the early history of India, one cannot be certain of anything, but I feel confident that the strict materialism and atheism called Lokāyaka accompanied the breakdown of the Vedic religion and was a precondition to the rise of Buddhism; I therefore place it at least as early as the beginning of the sixth century B.C., the date favored by Paul Masson-Oursel. It is certainly older than the *Maitri-upanisad* (whatever its date!), which mentions (iii.5) atheism (specifically *nāstikya*) among human afflictions. It is certainly older than the oldest parts of the Mahābhārata, which mention atheism. Some passages, probably interpolated, threaten: persons who do not believe in a “spiritual world” with condign punishments, and one amusing episode (XII.clxxx.47) introduces us to a jackal who laments that in his previous life he was an “infidel” (*pāsanda*) and so wicked that he was a rationalist (*haituka*), devoted to the “useless art of reasoning” and so perverse as to doubt what he was told by the professional priests. It is uncertain how long the Aryan (*philosophical*) mentality persisted in India after it was finally mongrelized by Buddhism and the dominant mentality became what Haas termed *philousian*, which is capable, by some mental operation incomprehensible to us, of seeing itself in the clouds, the sun, and the whole living universe, of which it feels itself a part.⁵ As late as the Fourteenth Century (A.D.), Mādhava, in his *Sarva-sargana-samgraha*,⁶ included a chapter on the materialists (*carvakas*), who deny the existence of gods, souls, and other spooks, and assert that religion “was made by Nature for the livelihood of persons who are destitute of both learning and manhood,” and is therefore a racket that provides professional priests with an assured income. It is doubtful whether Mādhava, at so late a date, actually knew persons who held such opinions; he could have derived his information about such sinful ideas from written sources.

All of the three independent Aryan cultures of which we have good records early developed atheism as a *Weltanschauung* of some men. As was only to be expected, professional holy men, understandably alarmed by the threat to their incomes, clamorously assert that atheists are dreadfully wicked and immoral. They seem not to stop to reflect that an atheist who had no moral principles would naturally become an evangelist himself, and obtain a handsome income and flattering prominence by hawking salvation to the masses or otherwise exploiting their credulity. In our society, the avowed atheist clearly places his devotion to intellectual integrity above the material rewards that he, as a materialist, should primarily seek! Explain that paradox as you will. Given the innate propensity of the Aryan mind, we are left with the uncomfortable

⁵ Günther, who believes that a pantheistic mysticism is also native to our minds, would take exception to my implication that the “philousian” mind is entirely alien. One can argue the question both ways.

⁶ There is a generally good translation by E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough (London Kegan Paul, 1904), who, however, translate as “demons” etc. (i.e., supernatural beings) words which really mean “savages,” i.e., the dark-skinned aboriginal races of India in their native habitat, creatures whom the Aryans regarded as evil and so described by words (*paisaci*, etc.) which also mean ‘demon.’ There is an odd tradition that Gunādhyā wrote his *Brhatkathā* (the source of the well-known *Ocean of Story*, elegantly translated by C. H. Tawney and commented by N. M. Penzer, 10 vols., London, 1924-1928), in the Paisaci language, which is absurd unless the word there means some adulterated dialect comparable to modern Urdu; cf. ancient Hittite.

fact that in general we cannot tell how many holy men are atheists at heart, and how many atheists profess conformity to the established religion to avert damage to the social structure.

Belief

Psychologists have speculated endlessly about the true nature of the human psyche⁷ and hence about its susceptibility to systematic superstition, commonly called religiosity. Into that pathless labyrinth we need not venture, and we cannot take the time even to outline what is the most cogent of the innumerable theories. It may be that, as Carl Jung claims, religiosity is an inherent and inherited tendency of our nature, determined by the archetypal symbols that are latent in our subconscious minds as our inheritance from the collective unconscious of the race to which we belong – a psychic substratum that was formed by our race's collective experience during all the millennia since it became a human species. But although Jung's arguments are plausible, his theory is, at the limit, no more demonstrable than the many that are more superficial.

There are, however, two indubitable factors that we may mention, since they are sometimes so obvious they are overlooked, being simply taken for granted.

Although all of the higher mammals have certain rudimentary powers of reason and communication, the several species that are distinguished as human possess, in varying degrees, the ability to form a language, by which certain arbitrary sounds are given specific meanings and may be assembled into the sentences of a statement that becomes a substitute for visual, auditory, or tactile perception. The word 'spear' causes the hearer's imagination to form a picture of a specific instrument, and the statement 'I hurled a spear at the tiger' makes the hearer visualize in his consciousness not only the weapon, the tiger, and me, but also the act in which I am said to have engaged. There is nothing in the statement or in the hearer's imaginative reaction to it that indicates the truth or the falsity of the statement. Language, in other words, confers the power to lie, and the validity of any statement, if it possesses internal consistency, can be determined only by external criteria, the common-sense test of plausibility in the light of our own experience of reality, and, if that test is passed, the availability of independent corroboration of the statement. If I tell you that I was in London this morning, you will know that I lie, because I could not conceivably have returned thence in the elapsed time. If I tell you

⁷ We should remember that, properly speaking, *psyche* is the vital principle, the life-force that distinguishes a living organism from an inanimate one. As Aristotle defines it in the *De anima*, all living things necessarily have a *psyche* of an appropriate degree of complexity. The simple *psyche* of plants enables them to absorb nourishment, grow, and reproduce. Animals have a more complex *psyche*, which gives them also the power of movement and of perception through the five senses. The human *psyche* has, in addition, the kind of consciousness that embraces the cognitive and ratiocinative faculties. When death supervenes, the *psyche* (including, of course, the human personality) ceases to exist, since it was inherent in the functioning of the organism, from which it can have no separate existence. The energy that produces such faculties is, of course, a part of the structure of the universe; a modern reader will most readily understand the disputed passage at the end of III.5 by an analogy with Schopenhauer's doctrine of the survival of the will as an impersonal force. Aristotle logically denies the possibility of a personal immortality, such as is so beautifully set forth in the poetry of Pindar, who is believed to have been the first to use *psyche* (in a famous passage quoted by Plato, *Meno*, 81a) to designate a personal entity that is supposed to survive death and be capable of reincarnation.

that I thought of London this morning, you will never be able to determine whether or not I have told the truth.

If we read Sir Walter Scott's *Life of Swift* and his *Waverley*, there is nothing in either narrative that permits us to distinguish between biography and fiction. We know, however, from our basic education that there was a distinguished writer named Swift who lived at the time mentioned in the first of these books, and what we know of his writings and the circumstances of his life agrees with what Scott tells us; we therefore accept the *Life of Swift* as a statement of facts, truthful and accurate, except insofar as Scott may have overlooked or misunderstood data that we can ascertain from other and reliable sources.⁸ When we read the second of these books, however, we have no means of knowing offhand whether a man named Edward Waverley lived at the time indicated and we could not find out, except by a prolonged and laborious search through the vast mass of relevant records that might contain mention of him and confirm at least some of the acts attributed to him; but Sir Walter has informed us in his preface that *Waverley* is merely a creation of his own imagination.

If we read Hervey Allen's *Anthony Adverse*, we know that it is a novel, for so the author has told us. If it were labelled a biography, we might wonder how some of the incidents and personal sentiments recorded became known to the writer, and we might be sceptical about parts of the narrative, but an enormous amount of research would be necessary before we would dare affirm that the protagonist never lived. Kenneth Roberts' *Oliver Wiswell* would present an even more difficult problem, since almost all of the leading characters except the protagonist are historical figures who did participate in the events that are described in the book with historical accuracy, as can be determined from some or many authentic sources, and the protagonist is essentially an observer, so that we should have to prove that he could not have witnessed those events.

If now we turn to the famous works of J. R. R. Tolkien, we find a narrative that is, *per se*, as circumstantial and seemingly realistic, as convincing, as any of the books mentioned above. We know at once, however, that we are reading fiction – and we should know it, no matter how positively the author asseverated that it was a veracious account of actual happenings – because we know, from our basic education, that no such beings as hobbits, elves, and wizards ever existed and that many of the incidents described violate the ascertained and indubitable laws of nature. We know, beyond possible doubt, that Tolkien's books are grandiose tissues of falsehood, of what would be impudent falsehood, if the author pretended otherwise. They are, however, works of brilliant and almost poetic fantasy and so serve a spiritual need that is an essential part of our nature and cannot be denied with impunity.

For our æsthetic satisfaction, therefore, we practice what is called the "poetic suspension of doubt," that is to say, we, by an act of will, assume that the narrative is a factual and veracious account while we are reading it and in our minds, so to speak, we temporarily suspend the laws of nature and our own rationality, so that we may enjoy a delightful illusion and satisfy our emotional need to escape for a time from the grim limitations of reality. *Dulce et decorum est desipere in loco*. At the end of the reading, as though at the end of a symphony, having

⁸ [missing footnote]

experienced the spiritual and emotional release that our psyche needed, we return to reality and the dire world from which we escaped for a time in imagination. We return to painful sanity in a world in which, alas, there is no magic.

If we were propense to superstition and could not bear to surrender the dulcet illusion, if we were willing to believe what is manifestly impossible, only the author's explicit statement that he wrote fiction would save us from taking Tolkien's books as the veracious gospels of a religion more plausible and internally consistent than any other. Tolkien's books are the work of a single and singularly lucid mind, not a mere congeries of myths elaborated at widely different times for widely different purposes by many obscure authors and never given competent editorial revision, which would have eliminated internal inconsistencies in each tale and gross contradictions between tales, such as have to be explained away by the theologians of all religions that have sacred scriptures. When Tolkien wrote his trilogy, he revised *The Hobbit* to make it agree with what he said in the later work; his *Silmarillion* was published posthumously from many shorter narratives, written at various times, mere, tentative drafts that the author would have revised and harmonized with the published volumes, had he lived to combine them into a continuous narrative.

There are some inconsistencies, therefore, but far fewer and far less troublesome than the flagrant self-contradictions found in the holy books of every revealed religion.⁹ It is possible,

⁹ Bibles that are the work of a single author are likely to show fewer inconsistencies. An obvious exception is the Koran (*Qu'rán*), which I have read through only in the English translations by JM Rodwell (Everyman's, 1909) and R. Bell (Edinburgh, 1937-39). God's Word appears to be almost entirely the composition of Mahomet (Muhammad), but its chapters have been lumped together without the slightest regard for either logical or chronological order, and each *sura* seems to preserve the form in which it was dictated by God's Prophet at some point in his long and adventurous career, which was marked by many vicissitudes and drastic changes of circumstances. He frequently found it expedient to have God change his mind, but while he sometimes remembered what he had had God say months or years before, he never attempted to revise or reconcile pronouncements made over a period of about twenty-two years. The result, of course, is an indigestible mass of grotesque internal contradictions, which, however, pious Moslems read in a trance, much as Christians read their Bible, such powers of reflective thought as the reader may possibly possess by nature having been congealed and anaesthetized by religious awe. Moslem theologians, whose ambitions naturally thaw out their brains, use the technique of *násikh* and *mansúkh*, determining what passages were abrogated by what other passages, with an ingenuity and effrontery worthy of the most eminent Christian theologians. Needless to say, Mahomet's innumerable *hadith* were invented by many theologians, each trying to sharpen his own axe. here are, of course, very many other bibles composed by a single *halluciné* or charlatan. I read Joseph Smith's *Book of Mormon* rather cursorily many years ago; I do not recall having noticed conspicuous inconsistencies. At about the same time, I read Swedenborg's *Arcana coelestia* with somewhat greater attention and, given the wild imaginings of the author, did not notice internal contradictions, although I did remark passages in which I thought the author's Latin designedly ambiguous. Mary Baker Eddy's *Science and Health*, while not attributed to God as author, is really the gospel of a sect which deserves attention as one of the two major religions invented in the United States; the book appears internally consistent, doubtless because its authoress gave it a careful revision before publishing it. Lodowicke Muggleton (1609-1698) and his cousin, reputedly the Prophets of God whose coming was foretold in the *Apocalypse*, produced *The Divine Looking-Glass*, at which I have glanced (in the edition of 1846), but without attempting to determine whether the divine ravings have any coherence. It was with reference to this book that Hervey Allen, in his best-known novel, succinctly described the reaction of a pious reader of revelations: he could not understand the words and was, therefore, profoundly moved by them. The quantity of divinely inspired trash is simply enormous in all literate parts of the world. A man who took the time to read the *Bāni*, composed by Dadu, a Hindu Representative of God, (1544-1603), for his 152 disciples, informs me

indeed, to predict a collapse of our civilization and a new Dark Ages, and to imagine that the text of the *Silmarillion* and perhaps the other books will survive the destruction of most of our culture and come into the hands of ignorant survivors of our race or barbarians of a race to which our modalities of thought and feeling are congenial, with the result that Tolkien's fantasies will be taken as the Sacred Bible of a new religion.

Tolkien's has both coherence and a noble morality, but neither is requisite for sacred writings. The late Clark Ashton Smith wrote a series of short stories about a continent named Zothique that will appear in the far distant future, and the late Robert E Howard published a large number of short stories about a continent that vanished in the remote past; neither author aimed at more than a superficial similarity between the various short stories' imaginary setting, and each story was composed for its own dramatic and romantic effectiveness in exciting horror and wonder in the readers of the popular periodicals in which the various stories were published over a period of many years. Nevertheless, the admirers of each writer have drawn maps of the imaginary continents, arranged the tales in a chronological order, and compiled biographies of the principal characters, explaining away inconsistencies with only a modicum of the ingenuity that theologians have to put into concealing the irremediable conflicts within their chosen body of myths. And the same admirers could, if they wished, read into the stories a religious significance. We may be quite certain that any moderately competent theologian could take the diverse tales thrown together in some one of Andrew Lang's varicolored Fairy Books and, with the usual techniques of sophistry and mendacity, make of them an apparently coherent doctrine and a religion that many of our contemporaries would be prone to accept.

Language, in other words, can be used to portray what never happened and never could have happened in terms so vivid that they will induce belief subject only to the vigilance of the reader's common sense and knowledge of reality, his critical faculties, which will enable him to test the story's consistency, and, if necessary, his knowledge of the relevant facts of history and science. We know that no man can walk on water, that an omniscient god could not be surprised by an unforeseen event, and that the sun cannot be stopped above a town on earth. If such events were narrated in fiction written with a very high degree of literary skill and imaginative art, we could, for a brief time, feign belief in them for the sake of æsthetic satisfaction, but if we permit emotional cravings to put our rational faculties permanently into cold storage, there is absolutely no limit whatsoever to what we can believe, and even the crudest tale will induce chronic delusions. Oddly enough, however, the paralysis of the intellect can be limited somehow to certain *idées fixes*. thus permitting the mind to reason from its own delusions, as in the well-known story about Dr Abernethy's insane patient: the man was convinced that he was dead, and when the physician lanced his arm, the patient congratulated him on having made an epochal medical discovery, to-wit, that dead men can bleed.

that it is an unusually intelligible revelation of a religion that is essentially an odd mixture of Euhemerism and monotheism. All of the scriptures mentioned above depend on affirmations purportedly made by a god, and it may be worthy of note, as illustrative of the innate mentality of our race, that when educated Aryans intoxicate themselves with mysticism, they characteristically do so with the methods of scholarship; a good example is Godfrey Higgins' *Anacalypsis* (London, 1833-1836; republished, New York, 1927).

Obviously, an individual's credulity is relative to two quite different factors, first, the quality and vigor of his intellect, which is genetically determined,¹⁰ and second, the amount of factual knowledge at his disposal, which depends on his education and, above all, on the extent of the accurate information that has been accumulated by his society in the time at which he lives. He cannot avoid erroneous suppositions about phenomena that have not yet been explained or correctly observed, and it is only natural that whenever an increase in knowledge destroys a false belief that is emotionally comforting to human weakness, many individuals will suffer a psychic perturbation that is strictly comparable to the "withdrawal symptoms" experienced by addicts who have been deprived of their drugs. What concerns us here is the persistence of belief in what is *known* to be impossible.

We must first of all remark that such an irrational belief satisfies a craving of our subliminal psyche, which is certainly shaped by our genetic inheritance and, most probably, by the collective unconscious of our race as formed by the evolution of our species for a hundred thousand years or more. It is a craving only a little less imperative than sexual desire, which is partly physical,¹¹ and which, as Hippolytus discovered, men cannot deny with impunity. A yearning to transcend the cruel reality of a world in which we are ephemerae is born in us and is today made only the more imperative by our knowledge that our twenty thousand days under the sun are but a moment, no more than the dance of a midge that is born in the morning to die at evening, in the infinite time of a universe in which we, and our race, and all mammals, and

¹⁰ It must be noted that two distinct factors are here combined, the intelligence of an individual relative to the average for his race, and the racial determinant of his mental processes. The latter was identified for our race by Professor William S. Haas in his fundamental *Destiny of the Mind* (New York, 1956), to which we may add the sociological data adduced by Géryke Young in her *Two Worlds, Not One* (London, 1969). Ours is what Haas terms the *philosophical* mentality, and, to use his example, an Aryan who thought that he saw himself in the clouds would be rightly adjudged insane, but, as he shows, persons who have been born with a *philousian* mentality can do so and are sane in terms of the innate conformation of their racial mind, which is basically beyond our comprehension, although we may observe its effects in their conduct. When we deal with Mongolians, Jews, and other intelligent races (including many hybrids), it is only fair and prudent to remember that they do not perceive reality as we do and cannot think about what they perceive with our logic. At the limit, of course, this poses one of the epistemological problems that are abstractly insoluble and to which, as Hume proved, we can only give the summary answer demanded by our will to live.

¹¹ Only *partly* physical in our race, at least, since there is often the spiritual component of a need for permanent companionship and reciprocal trust to assuage an individual's terrible loneliness and bolster his weakness. It is only fair to add that a comparable need appears to be felt instinctively by the many species of animals that mate for life, ie, numerous species of birds and mammals, including (contrary to vulgar belief) most wolves (as distinct from dogs). The intensive effort in our schools to force members of our race to believe that sex is a strictly physical function, like defecation, represents, of course, a concerted and planned assault on our racial survival. I do not know whether or not the female professors who proclaim that "we must destroy love," that "we have to abolish marriage," and that "we must encourage women not to live individually with men" are Jewesses obeying their race's animus against ours; if they are Aryans, they are a terrifying illustration of the extent to which the racial psyche of our women can be poisoned by systematically induced delusions. In any case, although the proclaimed "liberation" of our women from their biological nature is accompanied by a theoretical presumption that children will continue to be engendered and will be raised, like chickens, in pens provided by the government and explicitly designed to enforce equality with the lowest species of human life, it is obvious that the necessary result will be that women of an intelligence above the animal level will refuse to bear offspring, and our race, or at least the valuable part of it, will become extinct, as is, of course, tacitly desired by the promoters.

our peculiar planet itself are infinitesimally unimportant epiphenomena in a universe that is vast beyond our comprehension and actuated by the blind forces of an inexorable and insentient nature from which there is no appeal. Cultured men and women can satisfy this yearning with great literature, both poetry and highly imaginative prose, and, less directly, by music and the æsthetic satisfactions afforded by mimetic arts that correspond to our racial conceptions of beauty.¹² Such rational indulgence of a psychic need is not available to the unfortunate individuals who have been denied participation in our cultural heritage by their schools, their private circumstances, or their own abilities, and it is not remarkable that the sabotage of our civilization by “educators” is currently producing a frightening increment of voluntary belief in the impossible, thus more and more levelling our population to a peneplane on which it will be impossible for our race to retain the intelligence requisite for survival.

The fact that religiosity does correspond to a psychic need accounts, of course, for its persistence in otherwise intelligent individuals who were in their early years subjected by clever teachers to a process of conditioning that implanted a habit before the development of rational faculties in the child’s mind. A maxim frequently repeated in the schools of several religious corporations states the principle quite bluntly: “If we have them until they are seven, we’ve got them for life.” This, of course, is an exaggeration: the technique often fails, either because the pedagogues who apply it are inefficient or because they encounter a firm resistance in the minds of precocious children. The method is not infallible, but it is often successful. We have all encountered from time to time men who have attained distinction in historical scholarship or technology (including the methodology of the genuine sciences), but have never been able to break the religious habits formed by the mold in which their infantile minds were forced to grow. This is the psychic equivalent of the physical deformation of the skull practiced by many savage and barbarous tribes, possibly for the subconscious purpose of concealing some racial diversity in the components of the tribe, at least at the time that it came together. Our children are born with the psychic need for transcending reality and instinctively take pleasure in fairy stories, tales of the marvellous and impossible, but naturally outgrow serious belief in such things as they grow up; but if childish belief in a given set of fairy tales is enforced by an imposed routine of acts of worship, thus implanting a habit that is both physical and mental, the sapling thus bent may become a tree that retains the inclination thus forced upon it. The efficacy of this psychological device was first discovered by religious organizations, but, as we all know, it is now intensively used by the revolutionaries who have made of the public schools in the United States a monstrous tool for the sabotage of our civilization and liquidation of our race. Their deformation of children’s minds and characters does not concern us here, since it does not at

¹² Here again we cannot determine whether the obscenely disgusting malformations that are so successfully peddled as “art” by Picasso, Epstein, *et alii quam multi*, really correspond to some way in which Jews perceive reality or are an expression of racial hatred or are merely devices to profit contemptuously from the gullibility of barbarized Aryans. Picasso once declared, seemingly with candor, that he was just exploiting the suckers. The question cannot be resolved by the well-known fact that identical “art” is produced by hopelessly schizophrenic children in asylums for the feeble-minded. Much “art” of this sort is also produced by Aryans for profit and the pleasure of thumbing their noses at boobies. As an “artist,” who collected junk from the city dump and piled it up in front of a hotel to collect a handsome fee for “sculpture” from the proprietor, remarked to one of his friends, “if the jackass will pay twenty dollars a pound for scrap metal, why not?”

present induce religiosity,¹³ except insofar as the stunting of native intelligence so debilitates the mind that it becomes susceptible to uncontrolled emotions and induced hallucinations.

Aside from conditioning in infancy, the emotional fixation requisite for belief in the impossible depends on two factors, if we exclude cases of patent insanity, temporary or permanent. As the promoters of "democracy" well know and vociferously deny, human beings, from both mental indolence and fear of the unknown, try to shirk responsibility for decisions that will affect their own future. The sentimental idealization of childhood springs, not so much from oblivion of the tears shed and pain felt in early years, as from recollection of the happy state in which all important decisions were made by parents, who sheltered, clothed, fed, and educated the child without requiring him to make any decision of real moment. When those happy years are past, the adult yearns for a replacement of the lost parent whenever he is confronted by a need to make a decision in circumstances in which it is not obvious to him which of the alternatives will be the more advantageous. He wishes to transfer the responsibility to the stars, oracles, or soothsayers, and if he cannot believe in such frauds, he can at least tell himself that a Big Daddy in the clouds is watching over him and, if he is a good boy, will save him from serious harm. Political theorists, especially if "conservative," like to forget that for the masses, as for children, "liberty" is merely freedom to indulge whims and appetites, at present most commonly in a bar room, where alcohol will give them a happy hour and a female can be picked up for nocturnal exercise, but *alia aliis*, for there is a variety in such tastes. Given the "liberty" they prize, they will welcome any dictation not physically painful that will spare them the unpleasant exertion of thought about decisions of which the consequences on their own lives may be problematical. They can be stirred from the most supine acquiescence in decisions made for them only by a prospect of more money, i.e., of indulgence in more whims and sensual appetites. The liberty about which "conservatives" so constantly and vainly orate is desired only by an aristocracy, and, in cold fact, can in any society be fully enjoyed only by a privileged minority, which may be either an aristocracy or the masters of an ochlocracy. Given this fact, it is easy to see why individuals, especially if, as at present, they feel the terrible loneliness of

¹³ Unlike religious schools, our public schools, devoted to the revolutionary implementation of "democracy," are naturally most concerned with blighting the character of our children by destroying the racial psyche. For example, as we all know, the schools work intensively to incite indiscriminate copulation in children at the earliest possible age, preferably before puberty, to destroy their capacity for sexual love and thus render them incapable of ever experiencing the greatest of all the psychic satisfactions demanded by our racial instincts. The very institution of public schools in which children of greatly differing intelligence are lumped together has, of course, the effect of aborting innately superior minds and that purpose is even openly admitted to the accompaniment of mawkish snivelling about the "underprivileged" (if we may use one of the most disgusting nonsense-words coined by the con men). Forcing Aryan children into close association with savages is obviously a device to destroy their self-respect and their capacity for culture. A remarkable statistical proof of the efficiency of American schools is given by Professor Raymond B Cattell in his *New Morality from Science* (New York, 1972), p. 378: "In the early part of this century the classical studies of Burt (1917, 1925), Chassell (1935), and Terman (1926), clearly showed a decided tendency of delinquents to be below average in intelligence, and of highly intelligent children to be on an average of superior character and emotional stability. In some [recent] studies the correlation *now approaches zero.*" (My italics.) The distinguished author goes on to point out that it is imperative for us (assuming that we do not acquiesce in our liquidation) to train our citizens "in defenses against psychological warfare." He does not explain, however, how this is to be done without abolishing the publicly financed boob-hatcheries and crime-breeding centers.

men without status or secure social ties, feel a need for reliance on some supernatural being, *faute de mieux*.

As we remarked earlier, the survival of the anthropoids that evolved into the several human species was made possible only by their association in packs for hunting and self-protection. The very function of a pack requires that its members feel the unanimity without which it would be merely a chance collection of helpless individuals, and this law of the pack was bred into our subliminal psyche through a hundred millennia or more before we became recognizably human. It is so deeply embedded in our being that everyone knows packs, mobs, crowds are collectively capable of a unanimous action that few or possibly none of the individuals in it would consciously undertake. We need not explore *la psychologie des foules*¹⁴ to perceive that obvious fact, nor need we question the report of competent observers that a unanimity of emotion or purpose in a large crowd may produce in an observer and even more in the leader who is temporarily the crowd's master a distinctly perceptible sensation that has been compared to an electrical charge in the atmosphere.¹⁵ However that may be, it is also a matter of common knowledge that a crowd, however strong its collective emotion, is incapable of action without some initiative, some modicum of leadership at least, on the part of some individual. A crowd strongly charged with emotion is like a supersaturated solution (of sodium thiosulphate, for example) that will remain liquid until a small shock, no more than a light tap with a pencil on the exterior of the flask, causes it to crystallize instantly. Here again we have the law of the pack, which always follows a leader, the individual whom social biologists now call the alpha male or, in some circumstances, the alpha female. When wolves, for example, assemble for a hunt, the dominant individual (who, incidentally, takes the greatest risk) leads and the rest of the pack follows him with a spontaneous unanimity. After the common purpose has been served, the pack disperses, but within the territory which it has taken for itself and which its leader patrols. The members of the pack retain a sense of their unity, however, and are aware of it when they encounter one of their fellows.¹⁶ In human packs, unanimity in a common purpose

¹⁴ We may remark in passing that we normally do not make a search for verification of all details, especially if the work is a recent one and so presumably is based on all relevant knowledge now available. We are thus vulnerable to the sophisticated technique of mental poisoning now practiced by professional liars, who produce a generally accurate and verifiable narrative and artfully imbed in it the one crucial lie that they wish to implant in the minds of their victims.

¹⁵ I allude, of course, to the magisterial work by Gustave Le Bon (Paris, 1895), one of the truly great men who undertook an objective study of human society. His work is denounced by the professors who are working the "social science" rackets, since it negates many of the myths they propagate for profit – and often, no doubt, to compensate for a dim awareness of their own inferiority. There is an English translation, which I have not seen.

¹⁶ So far as I know, there has been no investigation of this phenomenon. It probably has no relation to the now fashionable fraud called "Extra Sensory Perception." There may be some relation to the ability of a dog to sense the mood of his master when the latter, so far as he knows, has given no indication of it by word or gesture. The ability of many animals to sense fear in a human being is usually explained by reference to their olfactory sense, and anger stimulates glandular reactions that a dog may perceive in the same way. Such perception seems most unlikely in human beings. Speculation about brain waves would be gratuitous in the absence of a scientific study of a phenomenon which could be illusory.

The many similarities between wolves and men make a study of their social organization particularly interesting; see the recent work by Barry Holstun Lopez, *Of Wolves and Men* (New York, 1978). It is, incidentally, odd and perhaps significant that wolves are now generally regarded with hostility and aversion, whereas our Aryan ancestors

or belief satisfies an immemorial instinct of the species and is doubtless pleasant in itself. For that emotional satisfaction, men in general are quite willing to believe what their fellows in the pack believe.

This human tropism can be distinguished from the use of religion as a force for social cohesion, which we discussed above. The cohesion is requisite for large societies, which do, indeed, generate an emotional unanimity for an urgent common purpose, most commonly that of defending the state or of looting another state. When the larger cohesion is not imposed by some stress, the emotional satisfaction of belonging to the pack is normally felt only by comparatively small groups, a few score or hundred at the most, probably the limiting size of the packs or small tribes of our prehistoric ancestors. This probably explains the disintegration of all religions into small sects when no external force compels a formal cohesion for a common purpose that transcends or constrains the tendency to give allegiance to a comparatively small pack, which usually persists in the formation of factions within the large sect. For our purposes here, we need only note the psychological fact that assent to, and even belief in, a given superstition is a price that most individuals are willing to pay for the comforting sense of belonging to a pack, a sense that is some vestige of the instinct implanted in our remote ancestors when belonging to the pack was a matter of life or death.

I have tried to account, in the simplest possible psychological terms, for the persistence of belief in religious dogmas that demonstrably demand belief in what is impossible. The analysis is applicable only to laymen, votaries, congregations, and the like. Professional holy men, who have made religion their business, necessarily represent a quite different mentality.

regarded them with a just admiration, as is obvious from the number of men today who bear such names as Ralph, Raoul, Rudolph, Adolph, Randal, Randolph, Rolf, Ulric, Wolfram, Pandulf, Bardolf, and doubtless others that I do not call to mind at the moment.

Zoroaster

WITH SO MUCH of a prolegomenon, and with an iteration of the proviso that we are trying only to summarize the bare essentials of a subject that is almost infinitely complex, we may turn to Christianity, which, as everyone should know, was not an Aryan religion. It may be succinctly described as a Judaized form of Zoroastrianism. That relationship, indeed, is acknowledged in the Christian gospels which state that Zoroastrian priests (Magi) were present at the nativity of Jesus, some of which specifically ascribe their coming to a prophecy made by Zoroaster.¹ As we shall show below, however, there was a third major source of Christian doctrine, which we may identify as Buddhism. We shall therefore notice, as concisely as possible, the three principal constituents of the religious amalgam.

Since the term 'Magian' is best reserved for a group of related religions and the culture they represent, I shall use 'Zoroastrianism' to designate the specific religion, also called Mazdaism, that was traditionally founded by a Saviour, to whom I shall refer by the familiar form of his name, derived from Greek references to him, Zoroaster, although his name in Persian was something like Zarathustra (*Zaraüstra*, *Zaratüstra*, *Zaratost*, *Zaradost*, *Zarahust*, *Zardust*, etc).² The name may not be Indo-European; scholars who think it must be have proposed various etymologies, most of which posit that the man's name had something to do with camels.

¹ Zoroaster was doubtless named in all versions of the story about Herod and the Magi, but the reference was attenuated in the version of the Gospel of Matthew that the Fathers of the Church decided to include in their anthology when they put their "New Testament" together near the end of the Fourth Century. In the present version, the Magi are made to say (2.5) that the christ they are seeking will be born "in Bethlehem of Judæa, for thus it is written by the prophet." The Prophet, of course, is Zoroaster, whose name is retained in other gospels, e.g., in an *Euangelium Infantiae* which says (6), "Magi came from the East to Jerusalem in conformity with the prophecy of Zoroaster, and they had with them gifts, gold, frankincense, and myrrh, and they worshipped him [the infant Jesus]." The intention, of course, was to represent Jesus as the Saviour (*Saošyant*) whom Zoroaster expected to be his eventual successor. The christian form of the prophecy is doubtless preserved in the writings of Salomon, Bishop of Basra, and Theodore bar Konai: Zoroaster said to his favorite disciples "At the end of time and at the final dissolution, a child shall be conceived in the womb of a virgin... They will take him and crucify him upon a tree, and heaven and earth shall sit in mourning for his sake... He will come [again] with the armies of light, and be borne aloft on white clouds.... He shall descend from my family, for I am he and he is I: he is in me and I am in him." The prophecy thus put into the mouth of Zoroaster originally referred to his son, to be born of a virgin in the miraculous way I shall mention below, which could not be fitted to a story that placed the birth in Judæa. - The text of the *Euangelium Infantiae* I mentioned above may be found in the *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* edited by Ioannes Carolus Tbilo (Lipsiæ, 1832), Vol. I, p. 71. This is one of the gospels that records the first miracle (omitting the famous one listed in the Gospels of James) of Jesus: when a mad youth tried to steal one of Jesus's diapers, which had been washed and were hanging on a clothes-line, contact with the cloth, which was, of course, imbued with mana, drove the demons from his body and he became sane. An 'apocryphal' gospel is one that the Fathers of the Church excluded from their collection when they finally agreed on the contents of the "New Testament."

² In what follows, I shall give the exact form of proper names at their first occurrence and thereafter dispense with diacritics, which I necessarily retain on words printed in italics. In transliterating Old Persian, Avestan, and Pahlavi, I use the old system that was once standard. The more modern transliterations, found in recent studies (e.g., the ones by Mary Boyce and Marijan Molé that I cite below), are more accurate but involve the use of special types that would needlessly exasperate the printer of this book.

Some scholars have held that no such man ever existed, that he is merely a mythical figure to whose name were attached religious pronouncements and marvellous tales invented by successive generations of holy men.³ They are right in that no individual could ever have done and said a tenth of what tradition ascribes to Zoroaster, but the same could be said of Gautama, Vaddhamana, Jesus, Mahomet, and other founders of new religions who, it is generally agreed, were historical figures, although their personalities and careers have been all but totally obliterated by the jungles of myth and superstition that have grown over their graves. Furthermore, as many scholars have judiciously remarked, the existence of Zoroaster is virtually guaranteed by the *gathas*, crude hymns and purportedly inspired utterances, attributed to him in the extant *Avesta*.⁴ As the case was neatly stated by Professor K. F. Geldner, the Zoroaster who speaks in the *gathas* "is the exact opposite of the miraculous personage of later legend ... He ... had to face, not merely all forms of outward opposition and the unbelief and lukewarmness of his adherents, but also the inward misgivings of his own heart as to the truth and final victory of his cause. At one time hope, at another despair ... here a firm faith in the speedy coming of the kingdom of heaven, there the thought of taking refuge by flight – such is the range of the emotions which find their immediate expression in these hymns." It is inconceivable that theologians would or could forge such a document as a proof of the glorious triumph of a Son of God who delivered the world from infinite evil and whose divinely contrived nativity had been attended by all the miracles that Saviours customarily perform at birth. The *gathas* must

³ For a convenient conspectus of conjectures about Zoroaster and the time at which he lived, see the relevant chapters in A. Christensen's *Die Iranier* (München, 1933 = *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, Abteilung III, Teil 1, Band 3, Abschnitt 3, Lieferung 1). Naturally, it does not cover more recent studies, notably the ones by Molé and Miss Boyce that I shall have to mention below.

⁴ The *gathas* form twenty-seven (Nos. 28-54) of the seventy-two chapters or sections of the *Yasna*, which is the first of the five parts into which the extant *Avesta* is divided. The language of most of the *gathas* differs markedly from, and is presumably more archaic than, the language, now called *Avestan*, of the rest of *Avesta*, which does not even purport to be the work of Zoroaster and is obviously the work of generations of theologians who were industriously entrenching themselves in a monopoly of the new religion. Since Zoroaster betrays his emotions in some of the *gathas* but alludes to very few facts, we have to depend on the rest of the *Avesta* for the traditions about his life. *Avestan* became a dead language long before the final recension of the text in the time of Chosroes I, so the meaning of the *Avestan* text was expounded in commentaries written in Pahlavi, and an enormous bulk of theological writing was produced thereafter in that language. Most of it was destroyed by the Moslems when they conquered Persia, but what remains is enough to daunt any man by both its bulk and the theological unreason it naturally displays. Selections from it are quoted by Molé. I do not pretend to have read more than samplings of this trash. The translation of the *Avesta* that I have used is by James Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta* (3 vols., Paris, 1892-93). *Avestan* (to say nothing of Pahlavi!) is a crude language in comparison with Sanskrit or even Old Persian. It may be significant that the Zoroastrian scriptures known to the Greeks were written in Aramaic, which was then the sacred language of the Magi, although they used Greek in intercourse with more civilized people. Aramaic must also have been the language of the Magi in the time of the Persian Empire, since Old Persian, the native language of the ruling Aryans, was not widely understood, while the Persians themselves used as the language of administration Aramaic, the Semitic dialect that was generally known throughout their empire and used internationally beyond their borders. Aramaic could have been the language of the Magi's ceremonies and sermons even to Persians. The *Avesta* (the title may not be Indo-European) may therefore have been translated from Aramaic into a decadent form of Persian, so that *Avestan*, which does resemble in many ways the corrupt Persian of the last days of the Empire, may be a late, not an early, dialect. I should consider the evidence for a Semitic original conclusive but for the apparent authenticity of the *gathas*, which seem to represent what Zoroaster said. That is an obstacle, but not an insurmountable one. It is quite likely that many of the statements attributed to Jesus in the "New Testament" were actually made by a man of that name, but no one would believe that he spoke in Greek to the Jewish rabble. For our purposes here, I am content to leave the question open.

represent, at least approximately, texts that were already fairly well known before the holy men undertook to elaborate the religion for the stupefaction of their customers.

We need not hesitate therefore to believe that there was a man whose name was something like Zarathustra, that he propounded a drastically new religion, which he claimed had been divinely revealed to him, and that most of the *gathas* bear a fairly close relation to what he actually said. He was therefore the inventor of the basic structure of Zoroastrianism, which is all that will concern us here, and naturally was not responsible for the innumerable surcharges and embellishments that were added by the theological ingenuity of the Magi.

There is doubt about the date at which the founder of the religion lived. The priestly traditions that credit him with a fantastic antiquity are, of course, to be disregarded. A recent scholar, Dr. Mary Boyce, following Eduard Meyer and others, would place him between 1300 and 1000 B.C. on the basis of tenuously hypothetical determinations of the probable date of the pastoral society that seems implied in some of the *gathas*, the putative date of a conjectural schism in the Vedic cults, and a late genealogy of Zoroaster that need mean no more than the genealogies in the "New Testament." The only secure historical evidence shows only that Zoroaster began to propagate his religion at some time before Cyrus the Great conquered Media in 550 B.C. or soon thereafter. A much earlier date would make it extremely unlikely that the utterances of Zoroaster could have been committed to writing and would have been preserved with some approximation to accuracy. In all probability, the dates for Zoroaster's life, c. 628 to c. 551 B.C., accepted by a majority of modern scholars, are at least approximately correct.

With the exception of the Jews' claim that Zoroaster was a Jew,⁵ all traditions agree that he was an Aryan. His mother is most commonly described as a Mede, and her husband is sometimes said to have been of the same nationality; but an extraordinary number of places are identified as the site of his birth and childhood. Almost all of them are cities or districts in ancient Media, Atropatene, or Bactria (approximately the parts of modern Iran that lie south and west of the

⁵ The Jews claimed that Zoroaster was a Jew and wrote in Hebrew; see the texts cited and quoted by J. Bidez & F. Cumont, *Les Mages hellénisés* (Paris, 1973 = 1938), Vol. I, p. 50, nn. 3,4, and Vol. II, pp. 103-104, 129, 131. It is entirely conceivable that Zoroaster really was a Jew, whose true name was Baruch; that he was born in the colony of Jews which, according to Jewish tradition (Reg. IV [= Kings II], 17.6 & 18.1), had been planted in Media; and that, as Jews so often do, he masqueraded as a white man to start a disruptive religious agitation and exploit the credulity of the goyim. Furthermore, as we remarked earlier, the Magi claimed to be a tribe of incomparably holy people in Media, and there are some indications that they were racially distinct from the Persians, i.e., were not Aryans. The racial arrogance, even greater than that of the Hindu Brahmins, also sounds Jewish in their insistence that their godly ichor was transmitted through females (hence their famous dogma of *xvætvadatha*, which I shall mention later), but chronology favors the view that the Jews took over and adapted devices which had been so successful and lucrative for the Magi. The Magi could have been Jews, and that would explain a great deal! But there is no substantive proof that they were, and since deceit and forgery are simply normal racial habits of the Jews, it is safest to assume that their claim that Zoroaster belonged to their race was just another example of their policy of filching any esteemed historical or mythical figure that would enhance their own claims to racial superiority. There are innumerable instances of this Jewish custom, but one of the most impudent may be found in *Maccab.*, I.12.19-23, a forged letter, purportedly from a King of Sparta, who had consulted his historical archives and discovered – oh, joy! – that the Spartans were descendants of Abraham and therefore blood brothers of the sacred race of Jews in Jerusalem. The first two of the four books of "Maccabees" are included in many Christian Bibles as "apocrypha," as though they could be more apocryphal (in the common sense of that word) than the rest of the collection.

Caspian Sea or the northeast corner of Afghanistan with the Soviet territory immediately north of it).

Needless to say, Zoroaster, as is *de rigueur* for all Saviours, was born of a virgin who had been fecundated by a supreme god, who sent an emanation of himself (*hvareno*) to impregnate her, much as Yahweh despatched the Holy Ghost to carry out his philoprogenitive wishes in the "New Testament." His wondrous nativity was preceded, accompanied, and followed by the miracles that are customary in such cases.⁶ He did, however, distinguish himself from other Saviours by one act: as soon as he emerged from his mother's body and dazzled bystanders with the effulgent light of his divine ancestry, he laughed loudly, thus signifying that life is good and should be enjoyed.

According to tradition, Zoroaster, despite numerous and various persecutions and temptations by the indefatigable powers of evil, remained at home, wherever that was, until he was twenty, when he bade farewell to his parents and either became a vagabond or retired into a desert to think things over for ten years. One morning, when he was thirty, he went at dawn into a river to bathe and fetch fresh water for a matutinal cup of *haoma*. As he emerged, he was accosted by the archangel Vohu Manah ("Good Intentions"), who conducted his soul into the presence of Ahura Mazda, the supreme god. Enthroned in glory and attended by the six archangels who are his principal lieutenants, Ahura Mazda revealed to Zoroaster the True Religion and ordered him to save mankind from perdition by preaching it to all the world.

The foregoing, which is supported by references in the *gathas*, must be the account of his Revelation and Ministry that Zoroaster gave to his converts, and there are obviously only three possible explanations, viz.:

1. He did in fact converse with Ahura Mazda, by whom he was instructed in the True Religion, which you and I must profess, if we are not to be damned to eternal torment.

2. He had delusions, either from an overheated imagination or after imbibing *haoma*, i.e., an hallucinatory drug prepared by crushing and dissolving in water the active ingredients of the sacred mushroom, *Amanita muscaria*.⁷

3. He deliberately devised a fiction to impose on the credulous – an odd procedure for a man who professed that his Mission in life was to combat Deceit. Whether he contrived the fraud to

⁶ Most of the miracles were taken over by the Christians in one or another of their many gospels, although not necessarily all in gospels that were included in the Fathers' anthology. One that has some slight theological significance appears in most of the versions of the Gospel of James (who was Jesus's brother and should have known!): when Jesus was born, time stopped for a while and everything on earth was temporarily petrified, as in many fairy stories, such as the one of the Sleeping Beauty; the sun was motionless and birds flying high in the air were frozen in place and did not move; the hands of men who were carrying food to their mouths or raising a staff to strike stopped midway in the intended act, etc. Then time started again. Given the Zoroastrian doctrine of time, which the Christians echoed only in a few phrases they did not try to understand, the borrowing of the idea in that popular gospel is significant. A common version of the Gospel of James is translated into English in Excluded Books of the New Testament, translated by Lord Bishop J. B. Lightfoot et al., (London, s.a. [1926?]).

⁷ See above, p. 52.

dignify a moral code that had caught his fancy or to exalt himself above ordinary men, is a secondary question of no great importance.

The first of these explanations will seem cogent only to Parsees, so we are left with the other two. Whichever of the alternatives we choose, Zoroastrianism is equally spurious. Whether it was the product of temporary insanity or of cunning artifice, the religion, no matter how numerous its adherents and great its influence, can have been nothing more than an epidemic delusion and another example of human credulity.

It is a distressing fact, however, that many of our contemporaries, including some who have learned the techniques of scholarship, have been so habituated by Christianity and its derivatives to the kind of irrationality that George Orwell calls "doublethink" that they will argue that what is false is true. Persons in whom religiosity is stronger than reason will opt for the theory that Zoroaster was "sincere," i.e., that he was a madman who could not distinguish between his hallucinations and reality, and they will then assure you that the crazy man proclaimed "spiritual truths" of "surpassingly great value" for the "salvation" of the whole world or, at least, "all mankind." This strange but common phenomenon is a fact with which all students of religion or society today must reckon, however the aberration may be explained in terms of psychology or psychopathology.

Zoroaster, after receiving his revelation and commission from God, wandered from place to place throughout the Middle East, preaching the Gospel to whomsoever he could induce to listen to him, for ten years, naturally encountering the persecutions and temptations that are obligatory of all first-class Saviours; but although he was advised on six separate occasions by one of the six archangels in turn, he did not succeed in making a single convert. At the end of the ten years, however, he, having apparently wandered back to his homeland, wherever that was, met his first cousin in a forest wilderness and persuaded that man to become his first disciple and the "leader of all mankind" to the Truth.

Encouraged by his first success and a fresh consultation with Ahura Mazda, Zoroaster, now accompanied by his faithful acolyte, preached the Gospel fruitlessly for two more years, roaming from place to place, until they came into Bactria. There his sermons incensed the local "pagans," servants of the Evil One, whom he floored in a debate, whereupon they slandered him, accusing him of the thirty-three mortal sins and planting proofs of his iniquity that were discovered when his luggage was searched. He was accordingly arrested and thrown into prison, where he suffered hunger, thirst, and assorted torments for a long time, until he performed a miracle, healing the king's favorite horse of a supernatural disease. Released and accorded royal favor, he set to work to save the soul of the legendary or unidentifiable king of Bactria, Vistaspa, and after two years of persuasion brought the king to the point at which he admitted the truth of Zoroaster's revelation but insisted that his sins were too numerous to be forgiven by God. Zoroaster then performed a miracle that sounds authentic: he gave the king a big slug

of *haoma* and put him into a trance during which the monarch beheld the glory of God and all the wonders of Heaven.⁸ When he recovered consciousness, Vistaspa had Faith.

According to one version, Vistaspa, having seen the Light, proceeded to save the souls of his subjects by giving them a choice between becoming righteous and becoming corpses. He then mobilized his army and embarked on a Holy War to give neighboring peoples the same freedom of choice.

In the meantime, it would seem, Zoroaster performed another miracle. He ascended to the summit of a mountain, where the powers of evil, in a last desperate effort, rained down fire that enveloped the peak in flames and liquefied the rocks, but naturally left the Saviour unscathed, so that he strolled down from the burning mountain and taught the True Religion to the assembled tribe of Magi, who thenceforth became its apostles and priests.⁹ Thus launched at last, the new religion spread quickly throughout the territories that were to become the Persian Empire.

It is a general rule that Saviours should disdain females,¹⁰ but Zoroaster was an exception, as befits one who, by his laughter at birth, affirmed that life is worth living. As soon as he had established himself at the court of King Vistaspa, he married, but, being given to moderation, he

⁸ Zoroaster is commonly said to have spiked the *haoma* with *mang*, which was probably hashish. It would have prolonged the intoxication and further stimulated the imagination of the drugged man. Of such are the wonders of Heaven.

⁹ It is noteworthy that the word for Magus (*magu*), was never used by Zoroaster and is said not to occur in any part of the Avesta. He does use the word *maga*, which has flustered linguists who want to identify it, but was, in all probability, a neologism that Zoroaster coined to express the holiness of his new religion. (If he had in mind the Vedic term *maghá*, 'gift,' he intended his coinage to express something like the Christian 'gift of the Holy Spirit' or 'gift of God,' i.e., Salvation.) What is clear is that a man or woman who has been Saved is a *magavan*, and since Zoroaster invented a religion of spiritual egalitarianism, every *magavan*, regardless of race, sex, or social status, is the religious equal of every other. The term, therefore, cannot possibly be the equivalent of Magus, a professional holy man with hereditary superiority to ordinary mortals. The only terms for persons with religious function are (1) *zotar*, which is usually held to be the equivalent of the Vedic *hótr*, who, as we observed in the first part of this essay, must originally have been the head of a household in his capacity as the family's priest; and (2) *athravan*, a word which was probably thought of as meaning 'fire-kindler,' even though linguists assure us that it could not be derived from *atar*, 'fire.' (Although linguists assure us it hadn't ought to, the Vedic word *átharvan*, however perversely, did designate the man who had care of the fire on the altar and, perhaps, the *soma*.) Zoroaster (assuming *gatha* 42 is his) uses the word *athravan* to designate the missionaries who are to carry his Gospel to all the world. It could be argued, therefore, that he did not envisage a professional priesthood, but, whether he intended it or not, his religion inevitably required the services of specialists, experts in righteousness, who knew exactly what Ahura Mazda wanted of every individual in every circumstance of his mortal life.

¹⁰ Jesus cannot be considered an exception, for the Gospel of Peter, which represents him as travelling with Mary Magdalene as one of his disciples, and the Gospel of Philip, which says that his male disciples were jealous of his passion for her, were rejected by the Christian sect that the Fathers of the Church made victorious over all the others. If we now had the whole of the Gospel of Philip, we would probably find that it followed the tradition that Mary Magdalene was the concubine (or, with Salome, one of the concubines) who accompanied him on his evangelical peregrinations and whom he was wont to kiss and fondle in public. That tradition sent the Fathers into a tizzy at the thought of it, and they also excised, at a fairly early date, the homosexual episode in the Gospel of Mark that they did include in their anthology. They made of their Jesus an ascetic who condemns sex and despises women, even his Virgin Mother, whom he contemptuously addresses as "woman" and informs that he will have nothing to do with her.

contented himself with three wives, of whom the third, Hvovi, was the daughter of the King's Prime Minister.¹¹ By his several wives, he had sons and daughters, whose careers are reported at length in the legends. What is even more unusual, he by an odd relationship with Hvovi, engendered a son who has not yet been born, but whose birth, according to one chronology, may be expected around A.D. 2341.¹² Most Saviours, after they have ascended to Heaven, either personally return to earth in glory to complete their work or have themselves reincarnated in a new body, but here also Zoroaster showed a certain originality. Having fulfilled his mission on earth and attained eternal beatitude, he will have no need to interrupt his celestial bliss and undertake a new mission, since he, so to speak, presciently planted while on earth the seed from which, in the fullness of time, will come his son and successor, the *Saosyant* (*Sosan*), who will definitively deliver the world from evil, resurrect the dead, preside at the Last Judgement, and then *abolish space and time* to inaugurate an era of perfect, unchanging happiness for his True Believers. As Zoroaster is the son of Ahura Mazda, so will his son become the last Saviour.

¹¹ This is undoubtedly the original story and could even be authentic insofar as it describes Zoroaster's marriages. I insist on its significance: the later tradition credits him with having married his seven sisters and the sister-daughter that his mother conceived by him. That was undoubtedly invented by the Magi to support their dogma of *xvætvadatha* and their own peculiar tastes. The legitimacy of marriage between brother and sister is necessarily recognized by all religions which, like the Zoroastrian and Christian, teach that all human beings are the descendants of an original man and woman. Christian theologians worm their way out of the obvious implications of the myth of Adam and Eve, but Zoroastrian theologians logically accept the myth that the first pair were Masi and Masani, who were twins. (Feminists should note that the first Lady of the world was not an afterthought, hurriedly manufactured from a spare rib, but, as is proper in an egalitarian religion, was her husband's twin sister and came into the world, at the same instant, as his equal.) Whether Zoroaster thought of the logic of that myth (or even knew of it), I do not know. It is possible, of course, that he did not marry a sister because all of his were back home (wherever that was), but the point is, that, according to the early tradition, he did not. What seems peculiar in the theology of the Magi is the doctrine that a man acquires a big hunk of religious merit by having sexual intercourse with his mother. They undoubtedly invented the dogma of *xvætvadatha* to justify the marriages with sisters, mothers, and daughters by which they preserved the divine ichor of their holy race from all danger of genetic pollution. And I am quite sure that they also, and for the same reason, amplified the cosmological myth by inventing Gayomart, whose elder sister conceived him by her father and in turn conceived by him the twins, who then peopled the world. I therefore regard strophes 3 to 6 of gatha 73 as a priestly forgery. I am not in the least interested in vindicating Zoroaster's morality; I merely call attention to a neat example of the methods by which Salvation-hucksters manipulate their customers.

¹² When Zoroaster was engaged in coitus with Hvovi, he had an orgasm extra vaginam, and his semen was taken by waiting angels (*fravasis*) to Lake Kayansih, where it is being guarded by angels (according to one count, 99,999 of them) until the appointed day, still far in the future, when an unsuspecting virgin will bathe in the lake, be impregnated by the semen, and (to her astonishment) bear the new Saviour. If you doubt this fact, you have only to go to Lake Kayansih (if you can locate it), and you will see the fecundating essence glowing in the depths of the lake like three lamps. It is like three lamps because it is divine, but the Magian theologians later elaborated the myth to give Zoroaster three sons (by as many virgin baigneuses); they will successively be Saviours at intervals of ten thousand or eleven thousand years. When one reads the gathas, one has the impression that Zoroaster expected the Last Judgement in the near future, though not necessarily in the lifetime of his disciples, but, unlike the Jesus in the "New Testament," he was not so rash as to set a time limit for the occurrence of the eschatological Big Bang and thus leave to his professional successors the embarrassing task of inventing an explanation for the untoward delay of the scheduled event. The only plausible explanation, of course, was the well-known myth of the Wandering Jew, who, it should be noted, considerably appeared in Europe to reassure True Believers eighteen times between 1575 and 1830 and even visited Salt Lake City in 1868. The legend was much improved by the invention of a Wandering Jewess, which, I believe, is to be credited to Eugene Suë in his *Le Juif errant*, of which the prologue is worth reading.

Zoroaster flourished until he attained the age of seventy-seven years and forty days, when he was slain by one of the votaries of the false religion he had come to supplant. When dying, he forgave his assassin, as etiquette requires Saviours to do.

So much for the legends. Historically, Cyrus the Great probably became a Zoroastrian at some time in his career, for at his death Zoroastrianism was the official religion of his capital city and, probably, of his empire, and the Magi had attained the monopoly of religion that is always the first goal of godly ambition. If the dates I have accepted for Zoroaster are correct, the new religion, once launched, must have spread with the rapidity of a pestilence, but that is not astonishing, if one perpend the novelty of Zoroaster's invention and the various elements in it, which we shall examine later, that aroused enthusiasm in very large segments of the subject population of the multi-racial Persian Empire. What is more remarkable is the anomalous but indubitable fact that the innovation, although alien to the native tendencies of the Aryan mentality, became, as did Christianity much later, an Aryan religion in the sense that it was accepted by Aryans.¹³ It was considered to be, and probably was, the characteristic and only proper religion of the Persians and other Aryans of the ruling race.

It is at this stage that we begin to receive independent information from the Greek writers whose interest in, and observations of, Zoroastrian cults extended over seven centuries.¹⁴ Information from sources earlier than the third century B.C. is especially valuable as confirming or supplementing what we can infer from Zoroastrian sources about the religion under the Persian Empire. It must be used with discretion, however, for the Greeks were confronted by a kind of religion that the Aryan mind does not find congenial and has difficulty in understanding, although it evidently can accept such alien beliefs when they are imposed on it by circumstances.¹⁵ Furthermore, when the Greeks report matters beyond their own

¹³ In this sense, of course, Buddhism could be called a Mongolian religion since it was accepted by the Chinese and Tibetans and indeed flourished among them after it had vanished from the land of its birth.

¹⁴ The sources besides Herodotus were partly collected by A. V. Williams Jackson in his *Zoroaster* (New York, 1901), which is still useful, and more thoroughly by Bidez and Cumont in *Les Mages hellénisés*, which I cited in note 5 above, and in which texts are accompanied by invaluable critical notes. I need not remark that what counts is not the date of a given writer but the date of his source, assuming that we can rely on him to have reported it accurately.

¹⁵ For example, Greek sources as early as Aristotle and probably as early as Xanthus, who was not much later than Herodotus, report a Magian claim that Zoroaster lived six thousand years or more before their time. We may be virtually certain that what the Magi claimed was the doctrine, of which we know from late Zoroastrian books, that the soul of Zoroaster was created by Ahura Mazda in heaven at a date equivalent to 6630 B.C., but was, so to speak, kept in storage in heaven for six thousand years before it was sent to earth and became incarnate in the body of Zoroaster, the Saviour of mankind. (Cf. note 17 *infra*.) To the Greek mind, the notion of souls created by gods and kept in cold storage for millennia was absurd, so the Greeks naturally interpreted the Magi's pronouncements as meaning that Zoroaster had been born on earth at the specified time, for a claim to such enormous antiquity seemed less incredible. The well-known Egyptologist, E. A. Wallis Budge, in *The Gods of the Egyptians* (London, 1904; available in a Dover reprint), observes, in his preface to Volume I: "The only beliefs of the Egyptian religion which the educated Greek or Roman truly understood were those which characterized the various forms of Aryan religion, namely the polytheistic and solar... For all the religious ceremonies and observances which presupposed a belief in the resurrection of the dead and in everlasting life ... he had no regard whatsoever. The evidence on the subject now available indicates that he was racially incapable of appreciating the importance of such beliefs to those who held them, and that although ... he was ready to tolerate, and even, for state purposes, to adopt them, it was impossible for him to absorb them into his life." Budge italicized the crucial word in a statement that I regard as unexceptionable insofar as it describes the innate quality of what is, in Haas's terminology, the philosophical mentality. Our minds

observation of the cult's ceremonies, they were largely dependent on what the Magi told them or translated for them from their sacred books in Aramaic. And the Magi with whom a Greek was most likely to come into contact were missionaries who were peddling their Gospel in and near the Greek cities in Ionia and elsewhere that were subject to Persian dominion or on the borders of the Empire.

Perhaps the most important single datum from Greek sources is the proof that in the time of the Persian Empire the Magian theologians were already at variance with each other and engaged in doctrinal disputes as each tried to twist the cult's dogmas into the form most agreeable to his tastes and ambitions. This, to be sure, is only what we should expect, for first-rate theologians are always eager, each to sharpen his own axe and make himself a leader instead of a mere follower, a rank that only humbler and duller holy men are willing to accept. But it is good to have historical proof that everything was normal in Zoroastrianism and the doctrines known to the Greeks were diverse and disparate. We hear of a board or commission of seven Magi who were the supreme religious authorities and located in the Persian capital; it was doubtless their function to consecrate a Persian king when he succeeded to the throne and to suppress heresy. As we all know, a heresy is a theological doctrine that is denounced by theologians who call themselves 'orthodox,' especially when the orthodoxy of the latter is guaranteed by the police and hangmen. We do not know to what extent the credentials of orthodoxy were made available to the Zoroastrian substitute for a Papacy, and it is even possible that the power of the supreme Magi was broken when they overreached themselves.¹⁶ It is certain, however, that heresies did flourish, possibly including some important ones that we shall have to mention in a later section. It would be vain, however, and for our purposes otiose to try to reconstruct from the exiguous data the views of Zoroastrian heresiarchs, especially since we cannot be certain what dogmas had come to be accepted as orthodox.¹⁷

can contemplate the existence of several supernatural beings as the causes of unexplained phenomena, but they instinctively reject the irrational mysticism that one god controls elements that are at war among themselves, or can perform miracles, such as the resurrection of a putrified body, that are patently impossible. Ours, however, is also a mentality that accepts facts, however unpleasant, and it must be remembered that our ancestors accepted Christianity because they had been made to believe that its holy books were records of historical facts, of events that had actually occurred and which therefore proved the existence of a god, a terrible god, in whom they were obliged to believe, despite their instinctive aversion. And it may be doubted whether any Aryan understood that Magian religion in the way its founders intended: he read into it terms that were comprehensible to him. At the limit, Christians always had recourse to the theologians' favorite gambit, – that what was unreasonable and incomprehensible was therefore too profound for the weak minds of mortals, whom their creator did not intend to be rational anyway. That notion is always manna from heaven to persons who have not learned to control their emotions or are adverse from exercising brain tissue unnecessarily.

¹⁶ I do not know what weight should be given to Ammianus Marcellinus who, reporting earlier sources that he unfortunately does not name, says that the power of the priestly oligarchy was broken by Darius after their coup d'état, by which they usurped the Persian throne, having a Magus impersonate the dead brother of Cambyses. If that is so, the heads of the priesthood could have been replaced by seven or eight more cautious holy men, or, on the other hand, the religion could have been left without authorized managers. In the absence of more information, it would be foolish even to guess.

¹⁷ For example, the dogma of the pre-existence of Zoroaster that I mentioned in note 15 flatly contradicts the gathas, which were accepted as Zoroaster's own words, and contradicts the assumptions underlying most of the Avesta, according to which Zoroaster (even if born of a virgin, etc.) was a mortal man and discovered the Truth only when it was revealed to him by Ahura Mazda, with whom he presumably had no previous acquaintance. We may think it

There is one point of some passing interest. Although it falls short of proof, the evidence strongly suggests that during the Persian Empire the Magi who were in contact with the Greeks had already deformed the name of their Saviour from something like Zarathustra to Zoroaster.¹⁸ If we could be certain of that, we could then try to estimate to what extent these missionaries (possibly heretics at the time) were already peddling astrology as a useful adjunct to their evangelism, thus anticipating their successors in the Hellenistic Age.

highly improbable that “orthodox” Zoroastrian theologians would have promulgated a doctrine so obviously contradicted by their own holy book, but we must remember that Christians, who believe all the tales about their Jesus in their “New Testament,” which clearly state that, although he was a bright youngster, he didn’t get his inspiration until after he was baptized by a John “the Baptist,” and that thereafter he behaved in most situations as a mortal man, are also able to believe in his pre-existence and that he was 3313% of their god. If they think at all, they must assume that the part of their god forgot the rest of himself and everything he had known from all eternity in heaven when he decided to have his conjoined Holy Ghost insert him into Mary’s womb. If orthodox Christianity can accept such a dogma without laughter, it is certainly possible that orthodox Zoroastrians had accepted a comparable negation of their own scriptures. There is simply no limit to the effrontery of theologians or to the gullibility of their sheep.

¹⁸ Linguists try hard to imagine how a Persian word like Zarathustra could have been so mispronounced or misunderstood as to be transcribed in Greek as Ζωροιστῆς. The question arises only from an odd fixation among our contemporaries, who assume that holy men always mean well, despite all the evidence to the contrary. A little common sense will show us that since the Magi, probably before the fall of the Persian Empire and certainly soon thereafter, made astrology a very lucrative part of their holy business, it was obviously advantageous to them to give their Saviour a name which would suggest to persons who knew Greek that he had been a prophet of astral phenomena. A verbal change so helpful in their trade could hardly have come about by chance. According to a record preserved by Diogenes Laërtius (Pro. 6.8), the Magi claimed that Zoroaster’s name meant ‘priest of the stars’ or ‘diviner by the stars,’ evidently assuming with wonted impudence that he had been named in Greek at birth. (A scholion on the pseudo-Platonic Alcibiades I (ad 121E) says they claimed ‘Zoroaster’ was the Greek translation of his Persian name.) A better explanation devised by some of the Magi is preserved in two of the earliest Christian gospels, both purportedly written by Clement, a close friend and companion of Peter, the apostle of Jesus. In the *Recognitiones* (4.28) Zoroaster’s name is said to mean ‘living star.’ Clement is more explicit in one of the *Homilies* (9-5), memoirs preserved in his correspondence with Jesus’s brother James, which is further authenticated by a prefatory letter from Peter himself; in this text, he says that the name represents Ζω (sa) ρο (ος) ἑστῆροϋ, i.e., “the living influence of the star.” According to Diogenes Laërtius (*ibid.*, 2.2), two or more great Magi who flourished before the time of Alexander the Great bore the name *Astrampsychos*, which was probably intended to mean ‘the living star’ or ‘incarnate star.’ This could have been originally just a variation or explanation of ‘Zoroaster.’ There is extant under this name a curious art of fortune-telling, commonly called the *Sortes Astrampsychi*, which should be read in the edition by Professor Gerald M. Browne, which is forthcoming from Teubner at Leipzig. The ‘oracles’ are elicited by a kind of arithmetical trickery, and I think it likely that the method goes back to the Persian Magi, although the extant versions, as Professor Browne has shown, are late and were probably concocted in Egypt, where, by the way, the name of Zoroaster was still potent in the early centuries of the present era. One of the gospels found at *Chenoboskion* is so arranged that the holy man using it can attribute the divine revelation to either Thoth or Zoroaster or Jesus, depending on his estimate of which is the most likely to impress his clientele. I believe this neat device was first identified by Jean Doresse in *Les livres secrets des Gnostiques d’Égypte* (Paris, 1958). The association of Zoroaster with the ‘living stars’ explains, of course, the tale in the “New Testament” about the star which, floating through the atmosphere, led the Magi to the marvellous Nativity at Bethlehem. Oddly enough, none of the gospels, so far as I can recall at the moment, tells us whether the obliging star returned to heaven when its mission was accomplished or simply vanished.

The scanty information that we derive from the inscriptions by Persian kings is by far our best: there can be no doubt about either its authenticity or its dates.¹⁹ We may use it to trace summarily the evolution of official Zoroastrianism in the Persian Empire, and, incidentally, to check the claim of a learned Parsee who has recently argued that “the wars of expansion waged by the Persians under the Achæmenids” should be compared to the early wars of Islam, for the Persian kings “had a divine mission to offer mankind,” so that their wars “were dominated by a religious fervor that must be taken into account.”²⁰ It is quite true that the teachings of Zoroaster enjoined on the Persian monarchs an enthusiasm for Holy Wars, but they were also Aryans and not without political intelligence, so it will be well to look at the record.

Cyrus was a Zoroastrian himself and made the new faith the official religion, but he was not a fanatic. He was a statesman and not only paid off the Jews for their work of sabotage in undermining the Babylonian Empire and their treachery in opening the gates of Babylon to him, but also placated the Babylonians by honoring their god, Marduk, and probably constructing a new temple for him, and he authorized or himself founded other temples for the local gods of the many and diverse nations that he had subjected to his tolerant rule. He probably encouraged the Zoroastrian missionaries to spread the Gospel by haranguing such audiences as they could attract, but he must have thwarted the holy men’s professional eagerness to start persecuting.

He was succeeded in 530 by his son, Cambyses, whose major exploit was the conquest of Egypt. We are entitled to surmise that he was a godly man and that his piety motivated the contempt or hatred of the Egyptians’ religion that he exhibited by violating sepulchres, ordering priests to be beaten for speaking on behalf of their cult, and slaying the sacred Apis bull, which was the incarnation of the soul (or part of the soul) of Osiris. We know, however, that he did not exhibit this fanaticism throughout his rule in Egypt.²¹

While Cambyses was in Egypt and just before his death in 522, the Magi carried out a *coup d’état* by having one of their number impersonate Smerdis, the brother of Cambyses and next heir to the throne, and installing him in power. They were thus able to cooperate with Ahura Mazda and to gratify their pious itch to persecute. They destroyed the “pagan” temples that Darius, in his famous inscription at Behistan, said he had to restore, and, knowing holy men, we

¹⁹ The text of the relevant inscriptions may most conveniently be consulted in Roland G. Kent’s *Old Persian* (Yale University, 1950).

²⁰ Ruhi Muhsen Afnan, *Zoroaster’s Influence on Anaxagoras, the Greek Tragedians, and Socrates* (New York, 1969). The book is valuable as a reminder that Zoroastrianism, which is still a living faith, had the qualities that attract the masses and are requisite for a “universal” religion, but the influence of which the author speaks is largely illusory. The Greeks were naturally interested in the religion of the vast Persian Empire, with which they came into conflict many times, but ‘Medism’ is a strictly political term, which came into use when the Greek cities of Ionia tried to defend themselves diplomatically by maneuvering between the proximately dangerous power of Lydia and the more remote power of the Median kingdom. During the Persian invasions of the Greek mainland, it was applied to the Greeks who thought the might of Persia irresistible and believed that it would be prudent to come to terms with it. Even the Delphic Oracle, whose priests, like all ‘psychics,’ had to base their predictions on the best information available to them, made that mistake.

²¹ There is evidence, collected by Georges Posener, *La première domination perse en Égypte* (Cairo, 1936), that Cambyses during part of his reign conciliated the Egyptians by treating their deities respectfully, but it is uncertain whether he concealed his fanaticism until after his conquest was completed or abated it after he began to suffer military reverses in his efforts to conquer adjacent lands that were defended by natural barriers.

may assume that they also enjoyed some exhilarating killing *ad maiorem gloriam Dei*. It is likely that their overweening fanaticism touched off the many revolutions in the provinces that Darius says he had to suppress. In 521, the false Smerdis was assassinated by a band of conspirators led by Darius, and there followed the pogrom of Magi we mentioned earlier.²²

Darius was the greatest of the Persian kings, and his reorganization of the Persian Empire still commands admiration. We may be sure that he did not try to combine fanaticism with government, and he undoubtedly kept a tight rein on the holy men. We have also the confession of his personal faith in documents of signal importance since they undoubtedly show the official doctrines of Zoroastrianism in his day. He attributes his victories and power to the One True God, Ahura Mazda (*Aüramazda*), who bestowed the kingdom on him, and of whom he says: "He created the earth, he created the heavens, he created mankind, and he established *siyatis* for mortals." (There is no precise equivalent of the Persian word, which, from its basic meaning, 'welfare,' had come to imply security on earth and happiness after death; 'salvation' or 'way of salvation' would do, provided we understood it to apply to both this world and heaven.) We thus have assurance that Darius put his trust in the one good god of Zoroaster's revelation.²³

Xerxes, who succeeded his father in 486, was a king more to the liking of the holy men. We do not hear of persecutions in his own realm, but we may conjecture that religion played some part in the revolts that broke out soon after his accession. He desecrated the great temple of Marduk in Babylon, slaying at least one of the priests, and carried off the huge statue of the god, which was said to be of solid gold. Historians believe that his purpose was political, to destroy the god who was traditionally the protector of Babylon and would serve as the focus of a separatist movement and revolt, but at the very least Xerxes must have had such confidence in Ahura Mazda that he feared no reprisals from the Marduk whom he contemptuously outraged and whom, as a good Zoroastrian, he should have regarded as the diabolical enemy of his own Good God. Piety could have moved him as much as political expediency, especially since the Magi at his court would have constantly reminded him of the duties of righteousness. And Xerxes

²² *Supra*, p. 49.

²³ Some scholars are misled by the fact that Darius refers to Ahura Mazda as *mathista baganam* in several inscriptions and late in the long one at Behistan (§62) acknowledges help from *aniyaha bagaha*; they assume that *baga* means 'god,' so that Ahura Mazda is merely the greatest among many. Old Persian *baga*, Sanskrit *bhaga*, seems originally to have meant 'giver of gifts, lord,' and in both languages it was a title of respect that could be applied to a human, as well as a supernatural, superior. Given Darius's confession of faith in Ahura Mazda as the unique creator, the most reasonable explanation is that he intended *baga* to be the equivalent of the Avestan word *spenta*, which Zoroaster used as an adjective to describe Ahura Mazda (to whom he also referred as the *spenta mainyu*, meaning something like 'the bounteous lord' or 'the power of goodness') and also as a designation of the six *amesa spentas*, the six great archangels who are emanations of Ahura Mazda, representing abstract virtues ("Truth," "Good Will," etc.); they are really aspects of the Good God, but are also thought of as his lieutenants; it will be remembered that after Ahura Mazda revealed himself to Zoroaster, he, from time to time, sent one of his *amesa spentas* to advise him in the course of his missionary efforts. The word 'archangel' is a convenient English term for an emanation of the Zoroastrian god, although the *spentas* differ from the Christian archangels in that they have no will (and hence no personality) of their own, it being explicitly stated that their will is always Ahura Mazda's, so that while *spenta* and *baga* (in my understanding of Darius's meaning) may be used in the plural, the plural does not detract from the unity of Zoroaster's one Good God. So far as we know, the Old Persian word may have been in general use among Zoroastrians in Darius's time with the meaning I have suggested, and Darius, as a prudent monarch, would not have been concerned if the "Pagans" misunderstood it.

has left us one eloquent witness to his religious fanaticism, the now famous inscription at Persepolis in which he prematurely boasts of his conquest of Greece and particularly of his godliness in destroying the temples on the Athenian acropolis in which the Greeks had worshipped devils, and in commanding them to worship such beings no longer. He presumably purified the polluted place, for he consecrated it to his one god, Ahura Mazda, whom he worships reverently in the confidence that the god will grant him felicity on earth and beatitude in heaven.²⁴

Xerxes' untimely vaunt must have seemed ironic after the supposedly subjugated Greeks inflicted two disastrous defeats on him, and the collapse of his great plan to conquer all Europe must have shaken his faith as well as that of many other Persians. Ahura Mazda hadn't helped the righteous! Nevertheless the theology of Darius and Xerxes seems to have undergone no significant change before the death of Darius II (the king who shrewdly intervened in the Peloponnesian War) in 405,²⁵ but his son, Artaxerxes II (the king of the *Anabasis*, once known to every schoolboy), attests a remarkable change in theology: he worships a Trinity. The tendency to tripartite thinking that Dumézil identifies as distinctively Aryan may have had some influence, but it is clear that at least two of the pre-Zoroastrian gods refused to be permanently suppressed in the minds of their "converted" votaries. Artaxerxes prays to Ahura Mazda, Anahita (the Virgin, *an-ahita*, 'undefiled'), and Mithra. The exact relationship of Ahura Mazda to his virginal consort is uncertain; it is not inconceivable that she was regarded as the Virgin Mother of Mithra at this time, having conceived miraculously, as mothers of gods usually do, and moreover, having like Mary in the Christian tale, given birth to a child even more miraculously and without rupture of her hymen,²⁶ or, alternatively and more plausibly, having the power to

²⁴ Xerxes does not name Athens, but his meaning is unmistakable. The Persians also piously destroyed the Greek temples at Branchidæ, Naxos, Abæ, and doubtless other places of which we hear nothing; and we may be sure that they spared Delphi only because the priests there had made a poor guess and had their god advise the Greeks to yield to Persian might. It is slightly amusing that before the discovery of the inscription at Persepolis, quite a few historians discounted as "probably untrue" the statements of Herodotus and Cicero that Xerxes had destroyed the temples on the Acropolis; some still question Herodotus's report that the holy men at Xerxes' court egged him on to the invasion, promising him the conquest and annexation of all Europe. After Xerxes had to run back to Persia, he must have wondered why his Magi had sold him such a bill of spurious goods, and he probably asked questions, but holy men can usually think of an explanation to satisfy the customer.

²⁵ In one of his inscriptions at Susa, Darius II asks Ahura Mazda to protect him *hada bagaibis*; the noun is in the instrumental case, so the passage may be interpreted in conformity with what I said about the great Darius in note 22 above.

²⁶ This is stated in all the versions of the Gospel of James, which describe more or less explicitly the proof of it in connection with the first miracle performed by the Saviour, when he was only a few minutes old. The most explicit account that I have seen is in the Genesis Mariæ preserved in a Third Century papyrus now in the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana. Salome refuses to believe the midwife's assertion that the mother is still a virgin; she thrusts her finger into Mary's vagina and finds the hymen intact, but the vaginal membranes are so charged with divinity that her finger is set on fire and she is in great distress until she thinks of praying to Jesus's celestial father, who obligingly sends an angel to tell her to touch the divine infant; she does so and is instantly healed. Then the Magi come in, etc. It is hard to see why the Fathers did not include this gospel or, at least, some version of the Gospel of James, of which the authority was certainly guaranteed (since the author was the younger brother of Jesus), in their "New Testament." It is one of the earliest of the gospels and was accepted by many of the Fathers before the contents of the anthology were more or less settled by Athanasius in 369 or by Damasus in 382 (whose list of the contents is probably reproduced in the Decree that was forged in the name of Gelasius sometime after 495). Although the gospels that contained the proof of Mary's virginity post partum were excluded from the final compilation, many of

renew her virginity by bathing in magical water.²⁷ According to Berossus, Artaxerxes II not only introduced the worship of Anahita but also, by an equally daring innovation, set up statues of his gods, obviously in defiance of Zoroaster's explicit command that God was to be thought of aniconically and represented only by the flames of a sacred fire. The king's theology was unquestionably orthodox during his lifetime, since his army remained loyal, but it must have dismayed many, perhaps a majority, of the True Believers, and have excited furious controversies and intrigues among the Magi, but of those religious tempests we have, so far as I know, no record at all. It is doubtless significant that the king's son, Artaxerxes III, expelled Anahita and worshipped only Ahura Mazda and Mithra,²⁸ but we have no means of knowing exactly what it signifies.

The innovations of Artaxerxes II foreshadow the later evolution of the Zoroastrian cults. Poor Anahita was paradoxically identified with a Babylonian goddess and became Anaitis, whose attributes were the very antithesis of virginity. Mithra, a solar deity, is the son of Ahura Mazda, however he was engendered, and, as the sun moves between the earth and the vault of the sky, so was he the intermediary between mortals and his more inaccessible Father; he, moreover, had been born on earth with a miraculous nativity first witnessed by the shepherds who reappear in the Christian legend, and on the day that the Christians, after long debate, finally selected as the birthday of their Saviour. And, as happened in Christianity, the Son eventually, for all practical purposes, replaced his aloof Father, producing the late derivative of Zoroastrianism that long competed with Christianity in the dying Roman Empire.

the early Fathers of the Church, e.g., Didymus the Blind, Jerome, Ambrose, maintained the perpetual virginity of Mary, belief in which became an orthodox dogma in the Fifth Century. No one ever tried to explain in detail how she remained a virgin after Joseph began to have sexual intercourse with her, as is explicitly stated in Matth. 1.25, and she bore him four sons, but theologians like to have things both ways. It is astonishing that no one thought of taking a Gospel of James in which Simon appears as Mary's stepson and her attendant at the time of the Nativity, interpolating it to make James et al. younger stepsons left at home, and then attributing the authorship to Simon, who would have had more opportunity to observe than a younger son of Mary. It would have been only reasonable to delete the line in the Gospel of Matthew and replace it with a few words stating that Joseph had the decency to respect the Wife of God. That would have settled everything nicely; but the sheer carelessness of the Fathers, evinced by so many contradictions they could have edited out of God's Word, constantly astonishes us as we read the texts they approved.

²⁷ This oddly anatomical conception of virginity was doubtless of Oriental origin, but there was a Greek myth, mentioned by Pausanias (II.38.2), that Juno regularly renewed her virginity by bathing in a magical fountain, and, more to the point, Aelian (N.H., XII.30) mentions a goddess who restored her virginity after every coitus by bathing in a fountain located between the upper Tigris and Euphrates in the very territory in which contemporary Zoroastrians located some of their holy places. I need not remind the reader that my suggestion about Anahita is sheer speculation.

²⁸ An ambiguity in the cuneiform script of an inscription of Artaxerxes III at Persepolis would make it possible to argue that he regarded Father and Son as one person, thus anticipating the paradox in one of the later Christian ideas about the constitution of a Trinity, but I think this highly improbable.

Zoroaster's Creation

ZOROASTER'S RELIGION, often called Mazdaism, is the greatest religion ever created by one man. It is the religion that had the greatest influence on our race, although most of that influence was exerted through its derivatives. And its invention was one of the crucial events in the history of the world.

It does not greatly matter whether Zoroaster was deranged and suffered from continual hallucinations or consciously manufactured his doctrine for some altruistic or egotistic purpose of his own. He so altered the subsequent course of civilization on this planet that we become dazed when we try to conjecture what we would be today, had Zoroastrianism never been invented. We cannot name another man whose effect on human history was as profound and as permanent as Zoroaster's. And it would be a mere quibble to argue that if he had not lived, some other revolutionary would have done as much.

Zoroastrianism was a spiritual catastrophe. It was the archetype of all the "universal religions," of which only Toynbee seems to have perceived the crucial importance as forces that constrict and deform a people's native culture and mentality. Toynbee, however, did not see, or thought it expedient not to notice, how lethal are religions that induce delusions about "all mankind" and propagate the idiotic notion that "all men are created equal." Zoroaster's doctrine of Salvation introduced some very peculiar and epochal superstitions that have been profoundly deleterious to all the races influenced by them, perhaps including even the Jews, although they profited most by exploiting them.

Zoroaster created a supreme god of good, whom he called Ahura Mazda, and a supreme god of evil, whom he called Angra Mainyu.¹ In the beginning, only these two great gods existed,² but they were antagonists from the first, each striving to his utmost to destroy the other and all of the other's works. Each created for himself subordinate generals and legions of supernatural troops to fight for him in the Cosmic War. Either of the two gods would be omnipotent if the other were conquered; and they and their vast armies are now locked in a desperate struggle for supremacy and mastery of the whole universe, a perpetual war between pure Good and pure Evil. Since it posits the existence of two great and hostile gods, neither of whom can now overcome the other, Zoroastrianism is obviously a ditheism, a religious dualism. And so, of course, is the Christian *rifacimento* of it. It must be remembered that the word 'monotheism' is

¹ My account of the Zoroastrian religion conforms to what would have been found in standard reference works (e.g., the Eleventh and Twelfth Editions of the Encyclopædia Britannica) in the first third of this century and no further comment would have been needed. Subsequent research and study has produced no fact which would call for a significant modification in the essentials (with which we are alone concerned here), but it has produced a great proliferation of theoretical reconstructions of what Zoroaster supposedly believed but never said. This has caused a great deal of confusion, and I feel obliged to consider summarily in Appendix I below the cardinal point in all such reconstructions, although I consider it too nebulous and hypothetical to be of practical (historical) value.

² Zoroaster is not sufficiently explicit in the gathas to enable us to be certain how he explained the origin of two antagonists, but his reference to them as "twins" suggests that he thought of both as existing from the very beginning of time. The alternative explanation, which is quite early, is that the Good God inadvertently created the Evil God by having a moment of doubt, i.e., stopping to think, which, as any theologian will tell you, is very bad business indeed.

a neologism formed from Greek roots and introduced into English around the middle of the Seventeenth Century; and it can mean only one thing: belief in the existence of only one supreme god. Such a god, by definition, must have a power that is not limited by the power of any other supernatural being. Now it is true that during the past three centuries an increasing number of Christian theologians have wanted to make their religion a monotheism, but they can do this only by junking their Bible, and that would leave them without any basis for a belief in the existence of Jesus & Co. Their "New Testament" explicitly states that Satan is the mighty "prince of this world" and had such power that he was able to kidnap one-third of their God, carry him off to a mountain top, and there offer him wealth and dominion that Jesus was obviously unable to obtain for himself; and the gospels in the collection are full of stories about activities of Satan and his lieutenants that God was obviously unable to prevent. It is clear, therefore, that the Christian god's power is limited by the power of a rival god, who is as strong and sometimes even stronger than he, and that the earth must be regarded as a kind of No Man's Land between two opposing armies. That is precisely the Zoroastrian doctrine.

Some Christians try to twist their way out of the dilemma by claiming that their god is the only one that True Believers should worship, but that is simply monolatry, a phenomenon which, as we have already said, appears in many polytheistic religions. Another favorite evasion is resort to the Zoroastrian prediction that the good god will at some time in the future conquer the bad god, but that ploy will not work in talking about the present: If there is a war going on, it is necessarily a combat between two opposing forces, and it would be lunacy to pretend that there is only one force, and therefore no war, because one will in the end be victorious over the other. Modern theologians cannot improve on the old sophistry that Satan is not a god, although a god is, by definition, a powerful supernatural being, and Satan's right to that title is obvious from almost every page of the Christians' holy book. This device is one of the most ingenious tricks of early Christian propaganda.

In all of our languages, the word 'god' (qeḏj, *deus*, *god*) is a common noun designating a class of beings, specifically powerful supernatural beings, just as 'woman' is a common noun designating a class of human beings, and the individuals in a class must be identified by a personal name, such as Zeus or Helen. Now the early Christians took to calling their god *deus* (we can distinguish by writing *Deus*, but, of course, that use of capital letters is a modern innovation, unknown in Antiquity), and by baptizing their god God they could claim that all other supernatural powers were non-gods, just as you could baptize your daughter Woman and thus claim that all other females are non-women. A very few among the early Christians, especially Lactantius (*Institutiones*, II.9.13) ³ were honest enough to call Satan an *antitheus*,³ but the purloining of the common noun *deus* was commonly covered by imitating Zoroaster and inverting the meaning of another common noun, *dæmon*, which designated a larger class of supernatural beings that included not only gods but less powerful spirits. The Christians called all the other gods (in whose existence, of course, orthodox Christians must firmly believe) *dæmones*, which was strictly correct, but then they claimed that all *dæmones* were the subordinates of Satan, just as Zoroaster had audaciously claimed that all

³ Readers of Homer will not need to be told that the word is here used in a sense that has nothing to do with the familiar Homeric epithet. In Lactantius who died around 320, the word has come to mean 'anti-god', i.e. a god who is the adversary of another god or gods, as the Titans were of the Olympians in the well-known myth. Lactantius, of course, says that Satan is a *pravus antitheus*, but in this passage, at least, he shows him a decent respect.

of the *devas* were the subordinates of his Angra Mainyu. Thus did Christians create the word 'demon' in its current sense of 'devil.' Their propaganda was certainly adroit, and we must give them credit for having improved a little on Zoroaster. But the verbal trick should impose on no one.

So much had to be said at this point to make it clear that both Zoroastrianism and its late derivative, Christianity, are equally ditheisms – and that if, by some sophistry, the term 'monotheism' is to be perverted and applied to one, the other has an equal title to it. Both posit the existence of only two great gods, each of whom is supreme in his own territory and neither of whom can now overcome the other. And this has the strange consequence that although the good god (Ahura Mazda, Yahweh) had the power to create the whole universe and is now supported by angelic legions commanded by his trusty and doughty, archangels, and the evil god can marshal legions of mighty and valiant devils, including all the gods previously worshipped by men, both antagonists need to recruit reinforcements from the puny race of mortals and strive to enlist every one of the weaklings they can persuade.⁴ The cosmic conflict between the two gods and their supernatural and human armies is now a desperate one, waged with all their resources and causing infinite devastation and suffering on earth, although, bizarrely enough, the result is a foregone conclusion and everyone knows that the good god will triumph in the end and spend eternity in joyously tormenting his defeated adversary and all of the fallen monarch's wickedly loyal and luckless followers.

One can only marvel that so preposterous a fiction could have imposed on Aryan minds. It is not only illogical, but one of its basic premises is alien to our racial mentality. The Aryans' gods are never *evil*. They may, of course, punish mortals who have insolently offended them, and they may act, as do all the forces of nature, with complete disregard of the convenience or safety of individuals or nations, but they are never *malevolent*. Pan (the model for Satan in Christian iconography) does indeed excite panics, but every man who has found himself utterly alone in a desert, pathless mountains, or a great forest has experienced the god's power. You and I know, of course, that the reaction of our nerves, the subconscious fear of helplessness that it requires an effort of reason to overcome, is atavistic and represents a flaw that lies deep in the human psyche, but it can be thought of as some power that abides in the place, a *numen* that is hostile in the sense in which other great forces of nature, such as a hurricane or an angry ocean (note the pathetic fallacy), are hostile because they reck nothing of us; but they are not malevolent, they do not have a conscious purpose to destroy us. The Great God Pan is the spirit of the wild, of the nature on which we can intrude only at our own peril.⁵ He does

⁴ If we use the Zoroastrianism of Artaxerxes II for comparison, the congruency will be perfect, since the good gods of the two religions will also have the support of their mighty sons (Jesus, Mithra).

⁵ Since verbal misunderstandings play a large part in the evolution of religious beliefs, I note that Pan is a pastoral deity whose name, of uncertain derivation (one possibility is that it comes from the Indo-European root represented by the Sanskrit verb *pus* 'to nourish, to cause to grow'), has nothing whatsoever to do with another word of identical spelling and almost identical pronunciation in Greek, *pan*, which is the neuter of the adjective meaning 'all,' so that the god's name could be, and was, misunderstood to mean 'everything,' i.e., the whole universe. The mistake was compounded by the tendency of pious persons enthusiastically to exaggerate the attributes and powers of a god to whom they are particularly devoted (cf. *supra*, p. 30). Since no one seems to have noticed it before, I recommend to students of religion a doxology that they can also enjoy as poetry, unless their canons of Latinity are so strict that they cannot appreciate the *Pervigilium Veneris*, which comes from about the same time. I refer to a hymn to Priapus ("pater rerum" and so identified with the universal Pan) that will be found in the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*,

not really differ from, say, Poseidon or Aphrodite, gods who also have purposes that are not ours.

The Norse religion is likewise true to nature. There are beings that are hostile to gods and men in the sense that they injure and destroy, but they are essentially natural powers and without malevolence. Fenrir is not malicious: he is a celestial wolf, the counterpart of terrestrial wolves, who pursue and pull down deer because it is their nature to do so, not because they wish to inflict pain on their victims. Nigg gnaws at the roots of Yggdrasill as cut-worms destroy plants by feeding on their roots. The relation between the Norse gods and the Giants is a general hostility moderated by visits and occasional alliances that seem odd and even perplexing to modern readers until they understand that a Jötunn is not a devil in the Christian sense but a supernatural being of a race that is fundamentally incompatible with the race of the Esir and Vannir. The relationship is analogous to that between the aborigines and our race when we invaded North America: the two races were necessarily enemies and each had to try to destroy the other, but in the meantime, some individuals of different race could meet and associate on terms of neutrality or temporary friendship.

Loki often appears evil to minds that have been imbued with Christian notions, and even scholars, who should know better, try to decide whether he is a 'good' god or an 'evil' one. The answer is that he is simply a supernatural human being. He exhibits the feckless mischievousness that is natural in children and accounts for their more vexing pranks on Guy Fawkes Day or Hallowe'en, and is often found in adults who humorously perpetrate "practical jokes" or "initiations" into "fraternal societies" that sometimes result in the unintended death of one or more victims. At the worst, he is like so many of our contemporary "intellectuals," who take a perverse pleasure in siding with our enemies, but, if put to the test, would not murder us in cold blood. Loki exists as a supernatural being like the gods, but no one worships him, because it would be folly to expect help from so irresponsible an individual. The Aryan mind instinctively rejects the notion of divine malevolence. When forced to accept the unpalatable notion by an alien religion, however, the racial mind can interpret it in terms of our feeling for the dramatic and heroic.⁶

XIV. 3565. The author of these genial stanzas (they are stanzas, with a refrain) is unknown; it is most unlikely that they were composed by the freedman who had them engraved on the marble base of the statue that he, at the behest of his god, commissioned and had set up at Tibur, where I was told by a local antiquary that the beautiful statue was destroyed by Christian fanatics around the end of the Eighteenth Century, a late, though not impossible, date.

⁶ It is instructive to compare Tolkien's three romances. Some of the præternatural beings we encounter in *The Hobbit* are noxious (Goblins, Trolls, Dragons), but that is because it is their nature to prey on us: they are like cannibals and dinosaurs, creatures that we would exterminate in any region we inhabit. That is one of the several reasons why the book is an entertaining and absorbing tale, but not one that moves us deeply. *The Lord of the Rings*, however, takes up the Zoroastrian idea and is dominated by the equivalent of Angra Mainyu, a mighty supernatural being who is supernaturally malevolent and exerts all of his vast powers to inflict degradation and suffering on our race and its allies; and that is one of the factors that make the book a story of high emprise and heroism that often rises to the level of epic poetry, and assure it of a place among the great literature of our race. *The Silmarillion* is, so to speak, a new Bible, a combination of cosmological and pseudo-historical myth that is free from the gross immorality, disgusting vulgarity, and patent absurdities of that holy book and vastly superior from every standpoint, but it inevitably fails to give a convincing account of the origin of supernatural evil and resembles a panoramic painting of

And the idea does acquire some plausibility because we always imagine our gods as anthropomorphic and malevolence is an exclusively human trait. Whereas all other mammals kill only because they are hungry or have to defend themselves, and never inflict pain for the satisfaction of seeing suffering, the several species called human kill and torture for the sheer joy of inflicting death and pain and take an even more disgusting pleasure in watching others inflict agony and death, especially when the victims have offended them in some way or merely refused to listen to them, as did the persons whom Jesus wanted to have murdered where he could enjoy the spectacle of their death-agonies.⁷ Sadism and kindred passions are exclusively human, and when we call the more repulsive human beings, savages or the degenerates of our species, brutal and bestial, we are traducing the innumerable species of morally superior animals.

It is an identifiable characteristic of our race, which distinguishes it from all others, that while we, if we have not become effete, kill with exemplary efficiency the enemies who are a danger to us, we are averse from inflicting unnecessary suffering even on them and, what is more, if they are enemies whom we can respect in terms of our standards, even feel compassion and regret that we must slay them.⁸ Unlike all other races, we find the gratuitous infliction of

the Dutch school that depends for its total effect on our observation of a large number of small figures crowded, with distracting detail, into every square inch of the large canvas. Hence the disappointment of many readers; poetic suspension of doubt has its limits and cannot approximate a religious faith.

⁷ Our holy men try to ignore the significant pronouncement at Luke 19.27, although it is an essential part of their creed.

⁸ The reader may be interested in an example from a source from which he would scarcely expect it, one which will incidentally show that although India became a multi-racial jungle, something of the Aryan mentality survived as late as the Seventh Century. Many years ago I essayed a verse version of a stanza by Mayura that is preserved in the *Saduktikanamrta* (I.xv.3). It is based on the story that the Asuras had three great cities, of silver, gold, and steel respectively, and made war upon the old Aryan gods. The Thirty-three Gods were unable to resist the Asuras, and so appealed to the great Trinity. In answer to their prayer, Siva, the dread and ruthless god of destruction, destroyed the three cities of the Asuras with his arrows of unquenchable fire.

I sing the god of world-destroying might,

Siva, who smote with bolts of quenchless flame

The triple city of the anti-gods:

For when he saw the molten walls decay

And fall, the thund'ring bow fell from his hands

And his immortal eyes were touched with tears.

In inner rooms the demon-women stood;

He saw the fire cut away the hems

pain on any mammal repulsive and disgusting. And when members of our race violate our racial instinct, we consider them degenerate or insane, except in the rare instances when an individual has himself suffered, in his own person or in that of persons dear to him, such enormous outrage that a frenzied passion to inflict the utmost retribution is understandable, though scarcely laudable.

Malevolence is human. That is why it is so commonly attributed to the spirits of the dead, who, in the popular superstitions of many races, are supposed to be invidious and to envy the living and therefore seek to harm them. A striking example is the Ciupipiltin of the Aztecs: the ghosts of women who died in childbirth hover about the living and strive incessantly to injure women who have been more fortunate than they and especially to cripple those women's children. Our race is more apt to attribute malignity to the ghosts of the wicked or, sometimes, to mindless entities that lurk in the corruption of the grave.⁹ From this it is a small step to belief in demons – but let us always remember that, as we have already remarked, the Christian word is a typical perversion of the Classical *dæmon*, which designated a supernatural being that was often benevolent and, at worst, uninterested in human beings who do not offend it.¹⁰ Zoroaster's

Of their embroidered robes and lave their hair.

He saw the flame upon their bodiced gowns

He saw its fingers stroke their girdled loins

And pluck the silver apples of their breasts.

Siva felt compassionate admiration for the noble enemies whom he had to destroy. That is what it means to be an Aryan. When Philip of Macedon, in all the pride of his great victory, saw the men of the Hieros Lochos of Thebes, who lay dead in their ranks on the field at Chæronea, he wept. A Jew would have spat and urinated on them.

⁹ In modern literatures, the ghost of a murdered man may justly seek vengeance on his murderer, but the ghosts of murderers are sometimes thought of as lamenting or expiating their crimes, and sometimes as bent on multiplying from beyond the tomb the crimes they committed while alive. There is, of course, a large Christian element in these superstitions. Literary critics have often remarked that Classical ghost stories are comparatively tame; Sherwin-White, for example, thinks that is because Græco-Roman society did not have Mediaeval castles or isolated manor houses for ghosts to haunt, but that is to miss the point. In the Classical tales, such as the well-known ghost story told by the younger Pliny (VII.27) or the yarns collected by Lucian in his *Philopseudes*, the ghost clanks chains or makes terrifying gestures, but all that he wants is decent burial for his corpse or bones. What is lacking is the element of actual or potential malevolence that spices so many of our tales of the supernatural.

¹⁰ *Dæmon* is a word of very wide meaning and also serves in Classical psychology to explain the operations of the subconscious mind, including instincts and intuition, which we ourselves do not fully understand and commonly regard as separable from conscious personality, for we generally attribute the excellence of a poet, musician, or other artist to his genius rather than to the man himself, and we do so correctly, for he usually explains his achievement as the result of inspiration rather than conscious thought; and we commonly understand and accept such explanations of peculiar conduct as "something made me do it." Every man has his genius or *dæmon* that accounts for the intuitive and sub-rational part of his personality, which often determines his success or failure in a given undertaking or in his life as a whole. One thinks of the *dæmon* of Socrates, for example, and I note that William G. Simpson, in his admirable book, *Which Way, Western Man?*, posits a virtually identical force in the human mind. I emphasize the psychological application of the word in ancient literature because I have noticed a deplorable blunder in our standard Greek-English lexicon (Liddell-Scott-Jones), in which the Greek *kakodaimon* is defined as "possession by an evil genius" and *kakodaimonao* is actually defined as "to be possessed by an evil spirit," definitions which will certainly mislead persons who have not read much Greek and may imagine some connection with

great invention was his dichotomy of the whole world, natural and supernatural, by a moral division between perfect goodness and perfect evil. Each of these fictions logically implied its antithesis, and they may have been simply the spontaneous product of his imagination. If, however, we seek a source for the un-Aryan notion of an evil god, we may find it in the Semitic religions, of which Zoroaster is likely to have had some knowledge. As is generally known, the predominantly Semitic Babylonians¹¹ thought themselves encompassed by swarms of maleficent demons who, inspired by an abiding malignity, ceaselessly strove to injure men by every means, from diseases to hurricanes, under the command of the Seven Evil Gods, Namtaru, Rabisu, Pazuzu, et al. These demons would destroy mankind but for the precarious protection that might be won from the more placable gods, especially Marduk, the solar deity, and his purifying agent, fire, which significantly reappears in Zoroastrianism as the power that wards off evil.

The Evil Gods hated mankind and their devices were subtle and endlessly varied. In one of the tales about Naram-Sin (grandson of Sargon of Agade), which probably grew from a germ of fact, we are told that his realm was invaded by an enormous horde of beings who had the faces, and apparently also the bodies, of ravens. The urgent question whether they were demons or mortals was settled by the discovery that they bled when wounded, but nevertheless they, zealously assisted by the Evil Gods, brought manifold disasters upon the kingdom until the god Enlil was persuaded to take some action against them that was described on a missing part of the clay tablet. Enlil was a deity taken over from the Sumerians and eventually supplanted by Marduk, the 'Son of the Sun,' who was thoroughly Semitized.¹²

Christian notions about persons "possessed of the devil," etc. Nothing could be more erroneous. There is no idea whatsoever of a malevolent spirit. A man is kakodaimon because his own character (or sometimes, chance) has made him, unfortunate; he is "cross-grained" or "a blunderer" or "unlucky," and his conduct is of the kind that we often describe by saying "he won't listen to reason" or "he has an unattractive personality" or "his instincts are all wrong" or "he is his own worst enemy." A misunderstanding of the Greek words is a measure of the extent to which our Aryan mentality has been distorted by Semitic ideas.

¹¹ The Babylonians were the dominant power at the time Zoroaster began to preach his gospel, and he may have been influenced by their culture and religion. Most scholars agree that the Assyrian-Babylonian demonology had no precedent in the religion of the Sumerians, from whom the Semites derived the greater part of their culture. In the time of Zoroaster, the Babylonians were predominantly Semitic, but it is a mistake to infer from their language that the population belonged entirely to that race. There was a large admixture of other races, almost certainly including descendants (perhaps more or less mongrelized) of the Cassites, who conquered Babylonia near the end of the seventeenth century B.C. and ruled it for about five centuries. The Cassites spoke an Indo-European language and seem to have been Aryans, although they, like the Mitanni, who conquered Assyria in that period, may have been a nation composed of an Aryan aristocracy and subject masses belonging to one or more other races. In Zoroaster's time, the Jews were well established in Babylon, which they would betray to Cyrus the Great in return for rights of occupation in Palestine, to which they despatched a contingent from their wealthy colony in Babylon. It is not remarkable that most of their mythology is Babylonian in origin.

¹² Naram-Sin, like his grandfather, was the hero of a cycle of tales composed many centuries after his death. This tale probably represents a folk-memory of events of which we know from Sumerian historical sources, an invasion by the Gutians, a wild and barbarous people (who may have had Armenoid features that suggested birds' beaks), and other disasters that ended the empire of Agade soon after Naram-Sin was succeeded by his ill-fated son. There followed a period of anarchy which the Sumerian king list neatly summarizes in the words, "Who was king? Who was not king?" A Sumerian religious text informs us that the invasions and disasters fell upon Naram-Sin because his troops had looted the temple of Enlil in Nippur. In requital of that outrage, a curse was put upon Naram-Sin's capital,

Although his influence on Zoroaster is more problematical, we should mention another contemporary god of evil. In the overgrown and incoherent theology of the Egyptians,¹³ Set (Seth) was originally a companion of the beneficent Horus, but later regarded less favorably, and after 1570 B.C. he was execrated as the very incarnation of evil and the enemy of mankind for two reasons between which the connection is not entirely clear.

(1) Osiris was the Egyptian version of the god whose death and resurrection made it possible for righteous men to attain immortality. According to an account that seems relatively early, while Osiris was on earth, he was murdered by Set, who first concealed the body and later dismembered it, scattering its various organs throughout Egypt to prevent the Resurrection, which was eventually brought about through the devotion of Isis, sister and wife of Osiris. Set was therefore the implacable enemy of the beneficent gods and consequently of mortals, and his malignant hatred was manifested, even after the Resurrection, in many ways, including, for example, an attempted homosexual rape of the divine child, son of Isis and Osiris.

(2) Egypt long suffered from a steady infiltration of Semites, a continuous trickle of covertly enemy aliens across the Sinai peninsula, who, after they became sufficiently numerous, gnawed away the foundations of Egyptian society by the usual techniques of political subversion, inflicted on the nation all the horrors of a proletarian revolution, and finally took it over, ruling it, with the aid of native traitors, from about 1780 B.C. until they were finally expelled by an Egyptian revolt in 1570BC. The Semites had a tribal god, comparable to the Jews' Yahweh, whom they identified with Set and whose worship they tried, whenever it was not politically inexpedient, to impose on all the Egyptians. The insidious aliens were cordially hated by the Egyptians (including, no doubt, the opportunists who served the enemy as front men and collaborators), and after the expulsion of the Semites, their god, Set, was abominated as the patron of the foul race that had brought on Egypt innumerable disasters and two centuries of ill-disguised servitude.

Agade. The curse served as a model for the cursing attributed to Isaiah (13.19-22) in the "Old-Testament," with the difference that Agade was totally destroyed, whereas the city of Babylon (and its wealthy Jewish parasites) flourished for centuries after the futile raving in that chapter, which was probably composed as propaganda to demoralize the Babylonians at the time of the Persian invasion of their territory in 540.

¹³ E. A. Wallis Budge's *The Gods of the Egyptians*, available in Dover reprint (2 vols., New York, 1969 = 1904), is the most convenient survey of Egyptian theology, although three-quarters of a century of intensive archaeological exploration and scholarship have naturally produced many additions and corrections, of which only one is really crucial. Egypt was a union of many regions that were strung out along the Nile from its mouths to the First Cataract, and its religion was necessarily a theocracy, which was never made coherent. Our minds boggle, for example, when we discover that Horus was the brother of his father and the son of his aunt, and that he mourned at his father's bier although he was not conceived until after his father rose from the dead. Confronted by this fatras of absurdities, Sir Wallis, who was impressed by the fact that Christians could believe a Trinitarian doctrine, which made an "only begotten son" as old as the father who begat him, tried to read a monotheistic basis into the incoherent polytheism, as though the many gods had been aspects of a single divinity. This view, set forth in his short introductory volume, *Egyptian Religion* (New York, 1959 = 1900), only slightly contaminated the major work I cited above. Egyptologists now emphatically reject a notion for which there is no evidence whatsoever.

Both of these considerations made Set an analogue of the Christian Satan, an anti-god whom the Egyptians execrated – most of the time, for we cannot expect logical consistency from their religiously muddled minds.¹⁴

It is possible, though not demonstrable, that Zoroaster was influenced by what he had heard of the Babylonian and perhaps Egyptian polytheisms when he formulated his revolutionary dualism.

¹⁴ Set was loathed as the god of all evil, but, incredible as it seems to us, he was at times simultaneously worshipped as a benefactor and shown special honor by the kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty (1320-1200), two of whom even took the name Seti (Sethos) to identify themselves as his special protégés. That is as though some kings of Christian Europe consecrated cathedrals to Judas and Satan! Racial decay probably set in fairly early in Egyptian history, but as late as the Twelfth Dynasty we find an intelligent understanding of racial differences; under the rule of the Hyksos, the country was rather thoroughly mongrelized and its religion became a chaos of confused superstitions. So far as I know, there is no evidence that would authorize a conjecture that the Setis' worship of Set had racial implications, nor need there have been in a religion in which a goddess can become the mother of her father. Egyptian religion is a case of national schizophrenia.

The Great Überwertung, Psychic Magic, God's House, Buddhism, and Tapas

The Great Überwertung

WHEN WE CONSIDER Zoroaster with historical objectivity, we are awed by the enormity of his religious revolution.

He invented a perfectly good god, Ahura Mazda, whom he identified as the Creator and unique source of all moral probity; and since it is hard to imagine a hermit god, he had his god create for himself a court of divine satraps, so to speak, the six Amesa Spentas, who are simply personified abstractions. They are Volu Manah ("Good Will"), Asa Vahista ("Truth" = What is Right, both physically and morally), Xsathra Vairya ("Righteous Government"), Spenta Armaiti ("Piety"), Haurvatat ("Perfection" = Health of all parts), and Ameretat ("Immortality"). These celestial noblemen naturally have their retinues of angelic servants and warriors, but obviously our devotion must be to the one good god. To be saved, we must enlist in his army.

As the antithesis of his good god, Zoroaster invented a god of pure evil, Angra Mainyu, the unique author of all sin and wickedness and of all the suffering of all human beings. This implacable enemy of the good god created his legions of devils to seduce and afflict mankind, and these malignant spirits are simply all the gods of all the peoples on earth who haven't been taught to worship Ahura Mazda. And the votaries of those gods are therefore the mortal soldiers of the immortal enemy of Righteousness.

It follows, therefore, that it is the duty of all who have been Saved by Zoroaster's Revelation to "convert" or annihilate all the peoples of the earth who worship other gods and thus serve Angra Mainyu in his Cosmic War against the Good.

Zoroaster would doubtless have been distressed had he been able to foresee that no lieutenant of Angra Mainyu could have done a better job than he, for his Revelation brought upon mankind the calamitous epidemic of religious mania that characterizes all "revealed" religions, the anæretic fanaticism that dares confidently to say "Gott mit uns!" The more rational polytheism of the Aryans and of other races prevented men from taking leave of their senses in that way. You could never be sure of the favor of any god or of the limits of his power. The Athenians honored Poseidon, but that did not avert the squall that spoiled their naval victory at Arginusæ. Athena was doubtless pleased by her temple on the Acropolis, but she was not able to save the city that had taken her as patroness, or even her own temple, from Xerxes. And if some gods favored you, you could be sure that the enemy also had gods on his side. In the Trojan war, some of the Olympian gods favored the Greeks and some favored the Trojans, but the most that a god could do was give a little help to his favorites in a struggle that was decided by human courage and strategy and by the impersonal power of the Destiny that is greater than the gods. A polytheist might venerate his chosen gods, but he knew that he would nevertheless have to reckon with reality. But a man who has been Saved by a glorious Revelation, achieving solidarity with an omnipotent (well, almost omnipotent god), can run berserk with Righteousness.

By inverting the Aryan religion and turning its gods into demons, Zoroaster invented the arrogant zealotry that reappeared so often and so terribly in all of subsequent history. Thence came, for example, the poisonous fanaticism of the Christians, who never doubted the existence or even the power of Jupiter, Mars, Venus, Apollo, and the other gods of the Classical world, but regarded those august, handsome, and often gracious beings as foul fiends,¹ who could not be slaughtered themselves, but whose beautiful temples could be defiled and destroyed, whose votaries could be terrorized or butchered while their elegant homes were profitably looted, and whose supposed patronage of the arts and sciences gave a welcome pretext for sanctifying ignorance, boorishness, and misogyny. And when the Christians began at last to doubt the existence of the “pagan” gods, we see an ominous fissure in the wall of their Faith.²

Zoroaster and his spiritual descendants, Jesus, Mahomet, and many less successful Saviours, made of the world a vast battleground on which Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu (under these or other names) are waging a perpetual war for dominion, over the whole world, and since the two almost omnipotent deities somehow need men to fight for them, every human being must necessarily take part in the desperate war for the world, and if he does not fight for the good god, he is serving the evil one.

It becomes the duty of every “righteous” man to preach the new gospel to all the world, as was done by Zoroaster and his disciples, but when the evil god’s troops are so perversely obdurate to rhetoric that they will not desert their commander, they must be destroyed. Zoroaster, in other words, invented the jihad, the Holy War, and his invention must be regarded as one of the greatest calamities that had fallen upon our race and even upon mankind. When the Zoroastrian cult is described by scholars who have retained the lees of Christianity in their minds, they expatiate unctuously about “spiritual values” and “lofty morality,” but they never think of counting the corpses.

According to the Zoroastrian tradition – and it does not really matter whether that tradition records actual events or holds up an ideal for True Believers – when Zoroaster succeeded at last in bringing the Gospel and Salvation to a king, Vistaspa, that monarch naturally wanted to save the souls of his subjects and he piously gave them the option of being Saved or having their throats cut. Having thus consolidated the Church Militant (with the aid of his courtiers and officers, who, of course, had immediately perceived the Truth of the new religion on the “conversion” of the king, who was the fount from whom all revenues flowed), he was ready to turn his pious thoughts to the neighboring nations, and we are treated to a long chronicle of

¹ Orthodox Christian doctrine is stated concisely by Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, IV.I: “The false gods, whom they (the ‘pagans’) once worshipped openly and even now worship secretly, are the most filthy spirits and devils, so extremely malignant and deceitful that they rejoice in whatever crimes are, whether truly or falsely, imputed to them ... so that human weakness ... may not be restrained from the perpetration of damnable deeds.”

² Few have perceived the profound significance of the revival of Classical mythology in the Renaissance. The Humanists, who responded to the true beauty of the ancient myths and the noble literature that enshrined them, were able to claim that those gods were only lovely fictions and did not, in fact, exist. That was a drastic weakening of Christian orthodoxy, as was justly perceived by some contemporary Christian misologists, e.g., Giovanni da Sanminiato, whose uncouth *Lucula noctis* was first edited and published by Edmund Hunt (University of Notre Dame, 1950). Coluccio Salutati ridiculed his Latinity, which, while not so painfully barbarous as much Mediaeval stuff, was syntactically and lexically defective. In an age of reviving learning, that was enough to shut up the holy man.

extremely sanguinary conquests, which are actually called the “Wars of Religion” in the Pahlavi annals. The wars and battles are described in considerable detail. In the first great battle, for example, Vistaspa lost 38 of his sons, 1163 noblemen, and 30,000 common soldiers, but the wicked “pagans” lost more than 100,000 men. The result is an armistice, but the war is renewed and, after many peripeties and vicissitudes, the True Faith triumphs and the righteous have learned to grant no quarter and to spare the lives of no “infidels.” Glorious are the heroes who are the Sword of God and do what they can to expunge sin with blood!³

When we turn from legend to history, the monarchs of the Persian Empire were, as we have seen, pious Zoroastrians and attributed their power to the supposed benefactions of Ahura Mazda, but such religious zeal as they may have felt was more or less moderated by political prudence until we come to Xerxes. He has left us proof of his fanaticism in the inscription in which he proudly records his devastation of the Athenian Acropolis: “there was a place in which devils (*daiva*) were formerly worshipped. There, by the help of Ahura Mazda, I demolished that lair of the devils and I issued an edict, ‘You shall not worship devils.’ And in the very place in which devils had once been worshipped, I piously and with Righteousness worshipped Ahura Mazda.”

At Salamis and Platæa the Greeks saved Europe (for a few centuries) from a spiritual pestilence.

Psychic Magic

THE GODLY TRIBE of Ahura Mazda’s clever priests gave us the word ‘Magic,’ but none of their feats of prestidigitation was half so marvelous as the magic Zoroaster says he performed and at the very beginning of his ministry. In one of his *gathas*, he lavishly praises a Turanian named Fryana, and according to the uniform tradition, this man and his family were among the very first converts to Zoroaster’s religion.⁴ They were among the first Apostles and they and their descendants were revered as such. In other words, Turko-Mongolians were transformed into Aryans (or the equivalent) by believing, or saying they believed, Zoroaster’s tall tales about his newly created god. Zoroaster seems to have been the inventor of the notion of a “spiritual transformation” effected by a religious “conversion,” which is, of course, much more marvelous than the conversion of a princess into a white cat or a frog, of which we are so often told in fairy tales. The tales suppose that the princess remains herself, with her mind and character unchanged by confinement to a feline or batrachian body, whereas the miracle of a religious

³ For an attempt to extract some history from the tales, see Professor A. V. Williams Jackson’s *Zoroaster* (New York, 1901). There have been later speculations, of course, but when we go beyond the probability that there was a king of Bactria who believed Zoroaster we are lost in a fog, without a single item of historical evidence to guide us.

⁴ There is an even stranger tradition (not supported by the *gathas*) that the very first person whom Zoroaster tried to “convert” after his conference with Ahura Mazda was not an Aryan! He was a Turanian named Urvaitadeng, a just and honorable man, who would have accepted the Gospel, had he not drawn the line at the theological doctrine of *xvætavadatha*, which recommends as especially pious and meritorious sexual unions between mother and son and between brother and sister (see note 11, p. 84 *supra*). That idea shocked the Turko-Mongolian, so he rejected Salvation and he and his progeny were damned forever and forever. Let that be a lesson to all doubters, who let their own feeble minds interfere with obedience to the Will of God, which is a mystery beyond all human understanding!

“conversion” is said to change character and thus transform the individual into a different person.⁵

The Turanians were transmuted into more than Aryans. By believing Zoroaster, they enlisted in the army of the good God, and they thus became vastly superior to all the Aryans who refused Salvation at the hands of God’s salesman. They acquired a right, nay, a duty to help smite all those Aryans, whom they must regard as agents of the evil god and therefore their deadly enemies. And the Aryans who took to the new religion must accept the equally sanctified aliens as their brothers-in-arms, while the other Aryans, including perhaps those who were a man’s nearest and dearest, have become their enemies, evil beings who, if they do not yield to exhortation and harassment, must be destroyed to help make a Better World. Zoroaster could have exulted, as did Jesus much later, that he had “come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and ... a man’s foes shall be they of his own household.” Religion has become a corrosive acid that dissolves all the natural bonds of society, kinship, family, social status, race, and even government, and replaces them with the factitious and unnatural bond of unanimity in superstition.

A recent writer does not greatly exaggerate when, thinking to praise Zoroastrianism, he describes it as “a universalist religion, advocating spiritual equality between all races, nations, and classes, even between man and woman ... The state was not considered to be the supreme reality... It was to constitute an atmosphere [!] wherein all individuals, irrespective of their sex, or class, or race could achieve perfection [!].”⁶

The Zoroastrian cult and all the cults derived from it can be summarized in one sentence. They replace race with a church. They are a deadly racial poison. They are a bubonic plague of the mind and spirit, which has sapped the vitality of our race for centuries and has now brought it to the point of death.

It is true that we have little information about the racial application of the religion in its early stages. Zoroaster tells us that he hated everyone who did not accept his “revelation,” and a probably authentic tradition adds that Ahura Mazda commanded him to curse all who did not embrace the Gospel and that Zoroaster commanded that in every land persons who reject Salvation must be slain at once. Obviously, there was no thought of sparing Aryans. And on the other hand, Zoroaster rejoices over Turko-Mongolian converts and sends his missionaries into

⁵ Miss Boyce believes that in the time of Zoroaster the Turanians (Tuirya) were one of five related tribes of the same race; that when they are described as the foes of the Aryans (Airya), the reference is not to the race but to one of the five tribes; and that the name ‘Turanian’ was transferred to the Turko-Mongolians when they displaced the Aryan tribe and occupied the territory we know they held in the time of the Persian Empire. This, which seems unlikely in itself, depends on the very early date she assigns to Zoroaster and on her claim that he had no association at all with Medes, Persians, and Magi, so that the traditions about his parentage, travels, ministry, and enlistment of the Magi are all late and baseless inventions. If that is true, we must resign ourselves to knowing nothing about Zoroaster, and it becomes likely that the gathas, which purport to record his pronouncements, are only very clever forgeries, and that the religion was concocted ab ovo by the Magi. This seems to me extremely improbable in the light of what we know about the genesis of “revealed” religions and the tenor of the gathas (cf. supra, p. 71).

⁶ Ruhi Afnan, op. cit., p. 30.

“far lands,” presumably regardless of the race inhabiting them.⁷ The sense of racial integrity was not quickly destroyed, however, for when Darius boasts that he is “an Aryan of the Aryans,” he is obviously speaking of race, and, no doubt, he understood in the same way the Zoroastrian dogma, which probably dates from his time, that only Aryans should rule. What is odd, however is that the only early term for the adherents of the new religion seems to have been *Airyavo danghavo*, which identifies them as the “Aryan people,” but must include converts of other races to the “universal” religion. And there are instances in which the meaning of the noun is ambiguous before we come to the late writings in Pahlavi in which ‘Aryan’ (*Eran*) and ‘non-Aryan’ (*Aneran*) simply mean ‘Zoroastrian’ and ‘infidel.’ As I indicated in an early section of this booklet, I suspect, but cannot prove, that the Magi resorted to a verbal trick, *more theologorum*. The word *arya* means ‘noble, honorable,’ and since the people of the good god must be excellent people and superior to the wicked, they could be described as *aryas*, ‘respectable persons, the better folk’, even if they were not Aryan by race. The studied ambiguity would then be comparable to the verbal tricks employed by the early Christian Fathers.

Unfortunately, we do not know just how the replacement of race by church was treated theologically, or even politically, in the Persian Empire, and we must, as always, lament the destruction of virtually all of the copious writings of the Magi when Persia was conquered by the Moslems in the Seventh Century, and, of course, the earlier loss of the extensive translations of the principal Zoroastrian Scriptures and theological works into Greek, which had been made to satisfy the enlightened curiosity of Alexandrian scholars in the time of the Ptolemies and certainly did not survive the final destruction of the great library at Alexandria by mobs of ignorant and viciously misologic Christians in 389.⁸ We are thus reduced to surmises, but we

⁷ We must not exaggerate. Miscegenation long antedates Zoroaster, and the religions merely sanctified an inveterate vice and eroded an already feeble racial consciousness. Wherever our race has established itself, our men have been unable to keep their hands off the women of other races. Viking expeditions were necessarily small bands of warriors, and when they occupied territory far from home, as in the Western Hemisphere, miscegenation was inevitable, though deplorable, especially in its effect on the resulting mongrels. (Cf. *supra*, p. 46.) In tribal migrations, such as that of the Aryans into India, there was no valid reason for such feckless indulgence in lust, which can be excused only by their ignorance of genetics. The crucial importance of racial heredity, indeed, is a recent discovery, abhorred, of course, by our enemies and by all of our people who profit from ignorance and superstition. It is true that until our race finally succumbed to the “one world” poisons and became crazed with a suicidal mania, we did try to keep our women uncontaminated and there were, from time to time, in various societies some efforts to restrict legal marriages to women of our race, leaving the males free to engender mongrel bastards who could not inherit property or citizenship. Such prudent regulations, however, were not long maintained in practice, even when they were not destroyed by the egalitarian religions, which nevertheless must be recognized as the strongest of all dysgenic forces.

⁸ The Christian rabble, led by an especially disgusting theologian, Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, destroyed the Serapeum, in which the central part of the great Library had always been located, and which appears to have escaped serious damage in the earlier riots and insurrections that so frequently occurred in the city, most commonly incited by the huge colony of Jews. The date for the act of atrocious vandalism is also given as 391 in some sources. After the Christians, there was probably nothing left for the Moslems to destroy when Amr took the city in 640; the famous and oft-repeated story of the Arab commander’s destruction of the Library seems to have been invented by Bar-Hebræus, a Jew and Christian bishop, around 1270. We may especially regret the loss of the writings, whether genuine or spurious, that were probably attributed to Sæna, a successor of Zoroaster who is mentioned in the Avesta and is said to have trained a hundred disciples, and of the works of the evidently eminent theologian Ostanès, who is said to have been a favorite of Xerxes and is credited with a work entitled *Oktateuchos* in its Greek translation. Ostanès, by the way, is cited with approbation by one of the earliest Christian writers, Minucius Felix (26.11). Next

may at least legitimately infer that the “Aryan” religion exerted a great attraction on the other races in the vast and multi-racial Persian Empire, and that the more intelligent and ambitious members of those races adopted the official religion as a means of identifying themselves with the dominant culture, much as in recent times Chinese, Hindu, and other Orientals adopted Christianity to facilitate their relations with us. On the other hand, we can assume that the Persians, who formed the ruling aristocracy and enjoyed certain privileges (e.g., exemption from most taxation) that were not extended to other Aryans, wisely favored politically a religion that provided some bond of unity between the widely different peoples under their rule and encouraged loyalty to their empire. The Persians, like the British in India, admitted natives to fairly high administrative offices in the various provinces; it would have been only reasonable for them to favor, perhaps exclusively, natives who had adopted the religion of their conquerors and thus shown a possibly sincere desire to be assimilated into their culture.

We must also take into account the moral appeal of Zoroaster’s religious confection. He had made Ahura Mazda command conduct that was of the highest social utility, and, especially in its emphasis on manly courage and speaking the truth, corresponded to the code of honor for which the Persian aristocracy was famous.⁹ And prudent governors, whatever their personal opinions, would naturally encourage the practice of a system of psychic magic by which the lower races could be converted to a spontaneous obedience to the laws that sustain the order and domestic peace of a civilized society. There is an obvious analogy to the belief, long cherished in the modern world, that Christianity could abate and control the racial proclivities of negroes and other savages.

The creation of equality among human beings by religious magic has another aspect, social rather than specifically racial. It obviously carries with it an implication of the “classless society” that so fascinates the votaries of the atheistic derivatives of Christianity today, exciting their *Schadenfreude*, which they call “social justice.” This aspect of the religion must have appealed strongly to the “weak and downtrodden,”¹⁰ the proletariat, the very dregs of every society. Although, as we all know, the complexity of human genetics and the vicissitudes of

to Zoroaster, he was the most celebrated Zoroastrian sage, and the numerous references to him in the Greek and Latin writers are collected by Bidez and Cumont in *Les Mages hellénisés*.

⁹ The ethics of the old Persian nobility, and particularly their insistence on always speaking the truth, greatly impressed the Greeks – so much so that Xenophon made Cyrus the hero of his didactic novel, although he himself had narrowly escaped death at the hand of Tissaphernes, a Persian of noble ancestry and a model of treachery and perfidy. To be sure, Xenophon concludes the *Cyropædia* with a chapter on the corruption and degeneracy of the Persian aristocracy in his time, when, he says, no one would trust them. Religion, as usual, seems to have done little good to their morals.

¹⁰ The phrase is taken from the modern Parsee whom I cited above, p. 77, who notes that Zoroastrianism had the same appeal as the later Christianity. He, however, confuses two quite different things, the religion’s appeal to social dregs (such as the Jewish rabble who supply the apostles, etc., in the “New Testament”) and its appeal to women, who are not necessarily weak or of low social strata. He could have drawn a contrast between Zoroaster’s religion, which did give females equality (in theory, at least) and Christianity, which, in the cult that finally attained power, regarded them as inferior and potentially dangerous creatures, and some of the Fathers speak of the “imperfect animal” in terms that suggest a wish to anticipate the Moslem doctrine that women, being without souls, would not survive to plague men in Heaven (where Allah would provide much superior replacements, the houris, a happy idea that did not occur to the Fathers, who saw no use for females outside Hell). But perhaps Anatole France was right when he remarked that women were properly grateful to Christianity: it made them a sin.

human fortune not infrequently produce men of talent and merit from among the poor (and likewise produce biped pests from among the wealthy), it is a simple and obvious fact that the dregs of a population naturally sink to the bottom in every orderly society, and that disaster can be the only result of the modern mania for perpetually stirring up an "open society" so that the dregs on the bottom will become the scum on the top.

It is particularly regrettable that we have no means of knowing when the egalitarian fallacy, which is certainly present in Zoroaster's own gathas, was first logically extended to a practical application to social organization, but we may be sure, I think, that the revolutionary potential of the superstition was perceived long before our earliest record of it. Under the early Sassanids, the Mazdakites, a numerous and popular sect, preached the "social gospel," reasoning, like many Christian sects and their ostensibly secular derivatives (e.g., Marxists), that since all men have been created equal, they must be made equal in income, social status, and perquisites (e.g., access to the more desirable females). They anticipated modern "Liberals" and other communists by specifically advocating taxation as the means of making every one equal. This pious idea appealed strongly to Kavades, who found his treasury almost empty and, like modern governments, found the "underprivileged" an admirable excuse for robbing his subjects. His successor, the great Chosroës, finding himself well-established in power with a loyal army, decided that the Mazdakites were not orthodox Zoroastrians, and proved his point by having all of them hanged (he was averse from shedding blood unnecessarily), unless other methods of practical theology were more convenient. Mazdakites who escaped the extermination in 529, doubtless became discreet, for we hear no more of them, but communism was as inherent in Zoroastrianism as it is in Christianity and it reappears in the Ninth Century in the sect ("brotherhood") of the Khorrami, who flourished in old Atropatene and Media, the regions wherein Zoroastrianism was always strongest, and who represented the last stand of their religion against the Moslems, who finally suppressed them.

Like all "revealed" religions, Zoroaster's invention blighted the minds of all who succumbed to its meretricious and vulgar attraction. It substituted faith, an emotional and irrational conviction, for intelligent observation and reason. It was a baneful deterioration from the relatively reasonable polytheisms it replaced, which did not really fetter and paralyse the brain. In the Graco-Roman world, for example, the Aryan mind perceived that the human species had to be the product of some kind of evolution. As every reader of Lucretius's magnificent poem well knows, the basic principle that determines the survival or extinction of animal species was well known, and the evolution of civilized man from lower, less human stock was recognized, as was the determining factor, the ability and will to civilize themselves. With just a little imagination and journalistic exaggeration, one could see in a passage from a play by Moschion (probably fourth century B.C.) an adumbration of the evolution of our species from the anthropophagous Australopithecii to Greek civilization.¹¹ Even before Democritus, intelligent men saw that the notion of a special creation of human beings by some clumsy god was nonsense, and thinking men tried to account for the existence of our peculiar form of animal life by reasoning logically from such data as were available to them, reaching, in the fifth century

¹¹ The text may be found in Snell's *Tragicorum Græcorum fragmenta* and in the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse*; there is an English translation in Volume III of W. C. G. Guthrie's *History of Greek Philosophy* (Cambridge University, 1969).

B.C., hypotheses more rational than anything known in Christianized Europe before the Nineteenth Century.

For the exercise of intelligence, Zoroaster's "spiritual" confection and all the "revelations" that have been modelled on it substitute an inherently preposterous story on the supposed authority of a Big Daddy who knows everything, since he created it, and tells us, so that the poor in spirit will never have to distress themselves by trying to stimulate as much of a cerebral neo-cortex as they may have in their skulls. So we have the silly story about the twins, Masi and Masani, which is, however, more plausible than the idiotic Jewish story about Adam and his spare rib, which, incredible as it seems *a priori*, the Christians tried to make themselves believe and seem for centuries to have succeeded in attaining the necessary degree of imbecility. And even today we are afflicted with the chatter of pip-squeaks who, having received some technical training in colleges, have the effrontery to call themselves "scientists" and demand to peddle the mouldy old hokum in the schools as "creationism," an antidote to reason. And I sadly observe in passing that they do not have even the good taste to pick out the most reasonable creation myth of which I know: the first human beings were fashioned from clay by the divine sculptor, Prometheus, who, however, did much of his work by night, after he returned from a drinking party with the other gods on Olympus, with the result that his bleary mind and unsteady hand produced the woefully botched work that we are.¹² From the activity of these nuisances one can estimate the devastating effect of Zoroaster's hallucinations or cunning on our race; "the curse remains" and "deep is its desolation."

In the sixth century B.C., Xenophanes of Colophon, whom we mentioned early in this booklet, fully understood that if men wish to improve their lot in life, they can depend only on themselves, not on supernatural beings they imagine in moments of idle fancy. And that realistic understanding of our position in the world was held by good minds so long as the Græco-Roman world remained Aryan, disappearing only when the Roman Empire had been so polluted by the influx of Orientals and the degrading myths dear to their irrational mentalities that the great edifice of civilization inevitably crumbled down into the barbarism of the Dark Ages. The debasing and emasculating superstition concocted by Zoroaster made men dependent on remote gods or the angels and devils that were perpetually swarming about them, and such vestiges of intelligence as men retained had to be devoted to manoeuvring among the invisible and impalpable spooks or to theological logomachies about figments of the imagination.

The whole world went mad, and men wasted and ruined their lives and the lives of innumerable contemporaries in a phrenetic attempt to reserve for their suppositious ghosts a suitable abode in a dream-world, "out of space and out of time."

¹² This creation myth is in Phædrus (IV.15 & 16); it could be original with him. Another explanation of one of Prometheus's blunders is in a well-known Aesopic fable, No. 240 in B. E. Perry's *Aesopica* (University of Illinois, 1952). Our polytheistic religions had many creation myths, of course, but everyone was sensible enough to know that they were only myths, and anyone was free to invent a new one. Incidentally, the yarn about Eve and the loquacious snake may well have been suggested by a common motif in ancient genre-sculpture: a girl looks longingly at a delicious apple hanging on the bough of a tree about which a snake is coiled. The point of the charming composition is obvious, but a Jew would not have understood it. For one such work of sculpture, dating from the third century B.C., see the *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLIX (1945), pp. 430 ff.

Civilization is more of hope and striving than of attainment, and the best that we can achieve is fragile and at the mercy of unforeseen catastrophies and, no doubt, the deplorable vagaries of our own species; it is, at best, a small clearing in an encompassing and constantly encroaching jungle; it may be that it could not long endure under any circumstances, but one thing is quite certain: it is incompatible with “revealed” religions and their howling dervishes.

God’s House

WHEN A RESIDENCE is sold these days, the new owner almost always makes changes: he has it painted another color, he has the interior redecorated and installs new furniture, he may remove a partition between small rooms or divide a very large room, he may have the kitchen remodelled, and he may make other alterations to suit his taste or convenience; but the fabric of the house, its foundations, its beams, and its walls, remain unchanged.

The foregoing description, condensed and summary as it was, will have sufficed to show that the Christians today are living in Zoroaster’s old house. It has been remodelled here and there, but the fabric remains as it was built, twenty-six centuries ago.

The essentials of the newer cult are all in Zoroaster’s invention: the Good God and the Bad God; their armies of angels and devils; the contested partition of the universe between Good and Evil; the Holy War for One World of Righteousness; Heaven and Hell and even Purgatory (*Misvan Gatu*); and the apocalyptic vision of cosmic strife that will end only in a decisive last battle between the hosts of the Lord and the hosts of Satan, which will be followed by the Last Judgement and the end of Time, after which nothing can ever change again. All human beings sprang from a divinely-created original pair, whose descendants, equal in ancestry are made equal by Faith in the Good God, who fathered and sent into the world a Virgin-born Saviour to reveal his will to mortals, whose sins and merits are accurately recorded by the celestial bookkeeping system in preparation for the Last Judgement, when, incredible as it seems, they will be resurrected, so that, so to speak, they can enjoy the life everlasting in their own persons. The Zoroastrians, by the way, explain that when the time comes, Ahura Mazda’s zealous agents will find and reassemble every particle of the man’s flesh, which was eaten and digested by birds of prey centuries or millennia before; Christians attempt no explanation, but in most churches they still recite the Apostles’ Creed (forged at the end of the Fourth Century and subsequently revised), affirming that they believe in “the Resurrection of the Flesh,” but they probably never think of what they are saying.

We could add numerous details of Christian doctrine that were devised by the Magi in the various Zoroastrian sects: confession of sins (*paitita*), penance and absolution (barasnom), ceremonial Last Suppers of bread and wine, observance of the twenty-fifth of December as a divine birthday, and many others, including even terminology, such as use of the title ‘Father’ to designate a priest.¹³

Zoroastrianism and Christianity, however, are not identical, with only a change of names and a few minor details. The remodelling has introduced two really striking differences. When

¹³ Many of these details Christianity took from the Mithraic cult, of which I give a brief account in Appendix II.

Zoroaster emerged from the Virgin's womb, he laughed to signify that life is good and should be enjoyed, and although the Magi, with the normal concern of holy men for their professional emoluments, devised all sorts of sacraments, rites, ceremonies, and religious obligations to keep their customers at work for them, the religion never lost a decent respect for human nature. The first woman had been the twin sister of the first man, and no Zoroastrian ever thought of a woman as an "imperfect animal" with an insatiable lust for sexual intercourse, "an inescapable punishment, a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic danger, a delectable detriment, an evil of nature, painted with fair colors."¹⁴ No Zoroastrian ever had the Christians' morbid obsession with sex or thought he or she would conciliate a ferocious god by thwarting and perverting their own nature and natural instincts or, for that matter, by inflicting discomfort and pain on themselves in an orgy of masochism. No Zoroastrian ever thought that it would be holy to stop the reproduction of our species and leave the world uninhabited. No Zoroastrian was ever infected with the insanity that, for example, made Jerome run out into a desert so that he wouldn't see any of the "evils of nature," and made Origen castrate himself to appease a god's hatred of mankind. No Zoroastrian's mind was ever haunted and distracted by an incubus of imaginary guilt, an Original Sin inherited from a man and woman who had discovered that their creator had equipped them with sexual organs he forbade them to use.¹⁵ No Zoroastrian intelligence was ever so perverted that he felt guilty for living, maddened by morbid obsessions that are sexual in origin, but, by an even fouler perversion, may be diverted into a maudlin guilt because he does not share the squalor of the lowest strata of society or does not sufficiently degrade himself to satisfy the enemies of his race and of his own progeny.

Equally startling is the Christian remodelling of the Good God. Ahura Mazda is a strictly just, honest, and impartial deity: he has ordained certain rules of righteousness for all mankind, and his servants keep a strict account of each individual's obedience or disobedience. Yahweh, on the other hand, is a god who early conceived an inexplicable partiality for a miserable tribe of swindlers and robbers, who pleased him by observing strange taboos, sexually mutilating their male children, and defecating and urinating in the ways he likes to watch. Having created the world, he spent the greater part of its existence in abetting his barbarous pets as they preyed on more civilized people, and he was their confederate as they swindled and robbed their victims or stole a country they wanted by massacring all the men, women, and children, and even their domestic animals. He even tampered with the minds of kings so that he would have an excuse for inflicting on their subjects every sadistic torture he could devise for the delectation

¹⁴ The quotation is taken from Reverend Mr. Montague Summers' translation of the famous *Malleus maleficarum* (London, 1928; Dover reprint, 1971), one of the most impressive monuments of Christian theology. There were many editions of the original in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries and a copy of one or another is likely to be found in any good library, but the Latin is even more painful than the English version.

¹⁵ The Semites' disgusting and obsessive hatred of sex is so repugnant to healthy Aryans that even fear of the terrible god could drive them only to a grudging attempt to obey him, and many must have privately thought what the author of *Aucassin et Nicolette* dared say: that he would rather go to Hell with fair ladies and cultivated men than to a Heaven infested with fat monks and uncouth saints. An occasional gleam of humanity appears even in the most orthodox Scholastics. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa theologiæ* went so far as to decide sexual intercourse must have been exquisitely delightful for Adam and Eve in Eden, where she was yet uncursed with menstruation and the threat of pregnancy, and I should not be surprised if the "Angelic Doctor," who presumably looked forward bliss after his Resurrection, had not in his own mind held the heretical hope that True Believers, having been definitively Saved, could brighten up eternity by enjoying the delights of a new Eden.

of his favorites. And having been the accomplice of the world's parasites for centuries, he unaccountably changed his mind and sent them his only begotten son so that they would kill him and thus give him an excuse for breaking his bargain with them. It is no wonder that Christians so constantly talk of their "fear of God" who wouldn't fear a deity so capricious, ruthless, and unscrupulous?

No unprejudiced observer could fail to conclude that Zoroastrianism was not changed for the better when it was remodelled by its new owners.

It remains for us to account for the spiritual deterioration in the subsequent chapters of this booklet.

A judicious reader may inquire why the Zoroastrian religion, if so markedly superior to its successor, so declined that it now engages the faith of only a small colony of about 120,000 Parsees whose ancestors found in India a refuge from Islam. That is one of the historical questions that can be answered without qualification or uncertainty. The primary cause is obvious: in heaven, as on earth, nothing succeeds like success, and failure is the cause of failure.

Although Zoroaster's invention was a "universal" religion and sent out missionaries to preach its gospel to all the world, it became the official religion of the vast and mighty Persian Empire and Ahura Mazda's fate became inextricably entwined with the fate of the Persian King of Kings. Had Xerxes' huge navy and army been victorious at Salamis and Plataea, the True Faith would have followed the Persian warriors over Europe, much as Christianity later followed the British regiments throughout the world. It is even possible, I suppose, that we should be Zoroastrians today, worshipping a god represented by an eternal flame on the altar of each community, and pestered by "creation scientists," who would try to prove to us that Darwin was wicked to doubt that Ahura Mazda created Gayamart so that he could engender Masi and Masanl, the ancestors of all mankind. But I doubt it: gods, like men, become senescent, and even if they are immortal, if they are too busy or slothful to answer their votaries' prayers and supplications for a few centuries, they have only themselves to blame when they are supplanted by younger and yet untried immortals.

The spectacular defeat of Xerxes must have shocked the True Believers: Ahura Mazda had failed to keep a promise made through his consecrated Magi, so there were only the painful alternatives: either holy men can be mistaken, or Angra Mainyu was more powerful than his great and good adversary had anticipated. The crisis did not come, however, until 334-330, when Alexander the Great, who worshipped the foul fiends, overran the whole Persian Empire, the Holy Land that was dedicated to the service of Ahura Mazda, who had been either unwilling or unable to defend his own righteous nation. Zoroastrianism became the religion of peasants, barbarians beyond the borders, and old fogies, who clung to the discredited god and traditions that had suddenly become obsolete.¹⁶

If Alexander had lived to turn his attention and his Macedonian phalanges to Europe, or if the Greeks, who built their cities throughout the former Persian Empire and overawed their new

¹⁶ See Appendix II below.

subjects as much by their incontestable cultural superiority as by their invincible arms, had not had our race's fatal lack of racial consciousness and had not steadily weakened themselves by miscegenation, excessive tolerance, and interminable civil wars, it is possible, I suppose, that the irrational faith and fanaticism of a "revealed" religion would have been permanently discredited – but I doubt it. As it was, the Greek nations of Asia so declined that they, one by one, fell under the rule of virile barbarians from Scythia, the Parthians, and Ahura Mazda had another chance. Since the Romans, also afflicted with the Aryans' folly, preferred to fight each other rather than extend their empire far into Asia, Zoroastrianism, in various more or less diluted forms, recovered its prestige, and under the Sassanids, the great Chosroës, whose theology was guaranteed by his loyal army, restored the Zoroastrian orthodoxy by forcing the Magi to codify their Scriptures and creed, while his hangmen convinced heretics of their doctrinal errors. But alas, when the hordes of Islam, virile Arabs exalted by faith in their new deity and by the rich plunder he bestowed on them, attacked Persia, Ahura Mazda remained idle and once again proved himself an empyreal *roi fainéant*. He had muffed his last chance to be a great god, and he had to be content thereafter with the impoverished veneration of a few incorrigibly obstinate votaries.

Buddhism

GAUTAMA, who was later called the Buddha ("enlightener"), is said to have been an Aryan princeling in the part of India that lies at the foot of the Himalaya and is now called Nepal. He is reported to have had the distinctive mental trait that makes us distressed by the sight of suffering and sorrow – a racial characteristic that may become a morbid sentimentality in persons who do not charge their reason with strict surveillance of their emotions. In the late sixth century B.C., he elaborated a profoundly pessimistic and atheist philosophy that was, in many ways, strikingly similar to the modern systems of Schopenhauer and Hartmann.¹⁷ It was

¹⁷ If we assume that Gautama formulated a logically coherent philosophy, such as the Aryan mentality demands, his doctrine may be reconstructed with some confidence from the Milinda-panha (which purports to be a dialogue between a Buddhist sage and Menander, the Greek King of Bactria and the Punjab, c. 140 B.C.; translated by Rhys Davids in Volumes XXXV and XXXVI of the well-known series, "Sacred Books of the East," Oxford, 1890-94) and the canonical sutras (pronouncements attributed to Gautama) that do not contradict one another. I shall try to state it as concisely as possible.

The phenomenal world is a succession of empty phantasmagoria, for nothing in the universe is permanent. *Pīnta ,ei* – the world is change, and the discreteness of things and events is an illusory appearance produced in the mind of the spectator. Thus causality is a fiction, for cause and effect are inseparable parts of a continuous mutation. And man himself, for all his vain pride in his own personality, is likewise a mental fiction, for he too is an unremitting mutation: *omnia mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis*. All life, consciousness, experience is pain; this world of ceaselessly changing phenomena is a gloomy labyrinth in whose blind mazes a trapped humanity wanders, to be devoured endlessly, again and again, by the Minotaur of suffering and death. The clue to this labyrinth is knowledge, for humanity, blinded by the evanescent and insubstantial phantasms of pleasure and hope, is the victim, not of circumstances or destiny, but of its own will-to-live, its ignorant desire for life. Since the soul is merely awareness of a flux of phenomena at a given instant, there obviously can be no reincarnation of an individual, but Buddhism assumes, although it nowhere clearly explains, that the will-to-live is an unconscious force which, as in Schopenhauer's philosophy, may undergo a certain palingenesis and thus engender new being. Suicide, therefore, would be self-defeating, since a desire for death is simply an inversion of a desire for life, and that desire will, paradoxically, by palingenesis give rise to another flux of sensations. It follows that the highest wisdom is to destroy in mankind this dread force, the primordially blind and baleful will that produces life and all its manifold misery. And

essentially a repudiation of religion, denying the supposed dichotomy between matter and spirit on which is based belief in the efficacy of worship, prayers, sacrifices, and austerities. He thus negated the claims of the professional holy men, the Brahmins, to power and superiority, thus in effect abolishing the social structure of four primary castes, in which the fakirs had placed themselves at the top.¹⁸ Gautama also denied the traditional values of Aryan warriors and the ruling class to which he belonged; he saw them as vain and futile in the light of the terrible truth that what is best for man is never to have been born.

In an age of lost illusions, when the old beliefs of Aryan man were crumbling under the impact of more exact knowledge and rational criticism, and in an age of political frustration, when many Aryans must have felt themselves mired in the ordure of a multi-racial society, Gautama's counsel of despair must have appealed to many thoughtful men, but it could never have charmed the masses. It had a social value that must have been recognized by many rulers and administrators, who must have been pleased to see thus checked the impudent pretenses and parasitism of the holy men, and who must have welcomed an ethical system which, by deprecating all human desires and ambitions, cancelled the motives of every form of violence and crime.

Gautama's philosophy, perhaps inevitably, fell into the hands of votaries, whose minds were more emotional than logical; of professors, who began to quibble about details and argue about definitions and interpretations, making what had been logically simple and lucid obscure and complex; of popularizers, who in turn began to simplify and distort to gain the assent of the commonalty; and of social reformers, who recognized an avenue to influence and emoluments. Buddhism was finally ruined by its success. The great Emperor Asoka, after brilliant conquests, became a pacifist and a Buddhist around 260 B.C., and although he regarded the philosophy as an ethical doctrine, he made it the official religion, using the resources of his vast empire for works of charity, endowing schools, hospitals, monasteries, and hospices for the convenience of travellers, and erecting stupas to mark the sites made holy by some legendary association

when the last member of our wretched species dies, then shall mankind cease from troubling; then shall the earth be at peace at last.

Gautama's psychology and epistemology are certain. There is nothing in the documents that corresponds to my last sentence, which will have reminded the reader of Flammarion's manly acceptance of an inevitable future in which a frozen and lifeless earth will still circle sluggishly in the gloaming around a dying sun. But that last sentence is surely implied by (a) Gautama's belief that his doctrine is for all mankind and (b) his insistence on the avoidance of all sexual relations and hence, of course, of reproduction.

What Gautama meant by nirvana has been endlessly debated in India and in our time. The word obviously means what happens to the flame when a lamp is blown out. I think it simply means 'annihilation,' as Western scholars once agreed in taking it to mean. The religious sects claimed that it meant only the extinction of desire in our minds, and since the horrendous mass of religious texts in Pali and Sanskrit was, in large part, edited and published, many scholars – doubtless the majority – came to agree with them.

¹⁸ We do not know how fully the caste system was developed in Gautama's time nor can we estimate how strictly it was enforced in the numerous states of India, which doubtless differed greatly among themselves, but it is certain that the Brahmins everywhere asserted their monopoly of religious rites and hence their right to live at the expense of others, as holy men always do. We should not underestimate this aspect of early Buddhism: the doctrine that all human beings were equal in the universal wretchedness of mankind had the deplorable effect of destroying such sense of racial cohesion as the Aryans had left, but that was, so to speak, the price paid for breaking the clergy's strangle-hold on society.

with Gautama or his early disciples. He sent out missionaries to preach the new Salvation to all the world, including, according to his inscriptions, the lands around the eastern Mediterranean, which were all ruled by Greek dynasties.

The atheistic philosophy was converted into a religion, and it is a nice irony that Asoka, before his death, had to convene a Council of Buddhist luminaries in the vain hope of reconciling doctrinal differences. Gautama was converted into a Saviour, complete, of course, with an immaculate conception and virgin birth,¹⁹ and tales of how he had resisted the temptations of an evil god, who had vainly tried to avert the salvation of mankind. What had been a philosophical principle that we must divest ourselves of all property to free ourselves from the illusion that life is worthwhile became a doctrine of salubrious poverty that spawned hordes of monks, assembled in huge monasteries, and of itinerant mendicants whom we may call friars by a valid analogy. What had been an attempt to establish truths by logic became a system of unreasoning Faith (*bhakti*) and the spring of orgiastic emotions. The religion was equipped with all the grotesque paraphernalia of superstition, including immortal souls, gods, devils, heavens, hells, miracles, prayers and other magic spells, relics, and hierarchies of priests absorbed in the business of vending holiness to suckers who craved absolution from the sins they confessed – which were many, since some professionals had classified sins under 250 rubrics! And, naturally, the religion became a chaos of competing sects, each vending the only True Gospel, and collectively providing a spectrum of human folly, a wilderness in which one may find almost any variety of bizarre, belief.²⁰ For example, although Buddhism in general admits women and has nuns as well as monks, and some of the sects even recognize a number of female Saviours, the religion, like Christianity, regards women with suspicion as potential dangers. That, however, is not true of the Tantric sects, in which some of our addle-pated contemporaries want to see “the highest expressions of Indian mysticism.” These sects hold that males and females are equal, except that women are more equal than men, who must seek sanctity in gynaeolatry carried to what some may think extreme lengths. One of their gospels, the *Candamaharosana*, for example, informs us that “Buddhahood resides in vulva.”

We may be certain that if poor Gautama had indeed had powers of prophetic foresight, he would have sworn himself to perpetual silence and kept secret the conclusions to which he had

¹⁹ There are a few slight variations in the standard story about virgin births. The Buddha’s mother, Maha Maya (“The Great Illusion”!), a wife who had remained a virgin until she was forty-five, was impregnated by a “reflection” cast on earth by his celestial father, and she bore the divine child by a kind of miraculous Cæsarian section, for he burst through the side of her abdomen, which was then instantly healed. The precocious infant at once announced that he had come so save the world from the devils, and he took seven long steps towards each of the four cardinal points to show that he was going to save all mankind. He was an old hand at the salvation-business, for that was his five-hundredth incarnation on earth, and the Buddhists soon started scribbling jatakas as facilely as the Christians later composed tales by martyrs and other wonderments. The jatakas were the true histories of the earlier incarnations of Gautama or other Buddhas. Buddhists, however, as befits Orientals, are more patient than Christians: the final salvation of mankind will be accomplished by a Buddha who will appear, in terms of our calendar, in 5,655,524 A.D.

²⁰ What happened, of course, was that all the superstitions spawned in a multi-racial society were imported into the new religion, with a few clever theological twists and adaptations and some additions. It would be otiose to go into the complex details. One thing is certain, that holy men believe that unemployment in their business would be very bad for society, and they always find means of averting it.

come. He cannot be blamed for the religion that was perpetrated in his name²¹ – much less for its pervasive influence on others.

There was a certain Aryan strength in Gautama's cosmic negation.²² It requires fortitude to reject life and to believe that all the things that we instinctively prize and desire, such as health, bodily vigor, sexual love, beauty, culture, wealth, learning, intelligence, and even our own individuality are all empty illusions, and that the greatest good is annihilation. It requires even greater fortitude to accept that belief together with its obscure and dubious corollary, which denies us the immediate release of suicide and imposes on us the painful necessity of dragging out an existence in which we reject everything that healthy men desire and for which they live. That is to endure a death in life. Whether there is truth in that cosmic negation is a problem that each man must solve by his own powers of reason, and a problem that only men of great courage will consider at all.

The rejection of life, however, becomes a cowardly evasion when a perverse superstition enjoins it as a means of appeasing or pleasing a god whom we must believe, by an act of faith, to have promised that if we frustrate every instinct of healthy men and women, he will reward us after death with a blissful life of eternal idleness, which, by an even greater miracle, he will somehow prevent from becoming an infinity of boredom. If we abstain from sexual intercourse to avoid inflicting on others the curse of life and all its miseries, we are behaving rationally and even nobly, if the premise is correct; but if we frustrate our normal desires to please the caprice of a god who presumably endowed us with our instincts to inflict on us the pain of frustrating them to avoid being tortured by him eternally – a god, moreover, who is not even generous enough to help mankind to a speedy extinction, but wants it to reproduce itself and to preserve even its tares and monsters to provide his consecrated dervishes with plenty of business – we have become the cringing slaves of a mad master. If we declare that the manifest differences between races and between the individuals of every race become, for all practical purposes, infinitesimal in comparison with the vast futility of all human life, we are affirming a hope for

²¹ I cannot call to mind a volume that covers all the varieties of Buddhism and its very numerous sects, past and present, but an adequate outline of the principal tendencies in the religion may be found concisely in the English version of Maurice Percheron's *Buddha and Buddhism* (London, Longmans, Green, 1957). I have noted that his sympathy with the religion did not prevent him from admitting at one point (p.40) that Gautama's doctrine was quite different, briar that did not bear the fragrant roses of "spiritual" superstitions.

²² It is true that the distinctively Aryan spirit is a strong affirmation of life, a determination to live to the utmost, "to live, though in pain," and to be undaunted by suffering and sorrow – to confront tragedy unafraid. It is the high code of aristocratic honor that makes Achilles choose valiant deeds and an early death, that makes the Viking hero go to his doom in this world as unflinchingly as his gods will fight their last battle in the foreordained *Götterdämmerung*. "The honorable end is the one thing that can not be taken from a man," said Spengler. And Nietzsche summarized the Aryan code in one sentence: "To die proudly when it is no longer possible to live proudly." For the essence of this code, so much hated by Christians, is the aristocrat's pride in his own self-mastery and indomitable will: it makes Gunnar defiant to the end, even in the snake-pit, and appears in Byron's *Manfred*: "He mastereth himself, and makes / His torture tributary to his will." Note, however, that the aristocrat's pride is in the integrity of his own personality. If he were convinced by Gautama's psychology, which so markedly resembles modern theories of a "labile psyche," he would refuse to be only a flux of sensations, and would be numbered among those of whom Glanvill said, "Certainly, could they have been put to their choice whether they would have come into being upon such terms, they would rather have been nothing forever." And, by the way, the state of being nothing, of being like the light of an extinguished lamp, is precisely what Gautama meant by nirvana.

the annihilation of all species of anthropoids capable of suffering or even of all species of animals that have sentient life; but if we believe that equality is enjoined by a god who so desires a mindless faith that he cherishes idiots and wants us to destroy every form of superiority except clerical wiles, we are simply contriving suicide for our race and a living hell for our descendants.

The Buddhist religion consummated the ruin of India by abrogating the caste system so long as it was dominant, but we are here concerned only with the aspects of the superstition that were contributed to Christianity.

Gautama's philosophical argument for not reproducing our species was debased into a notion that complete celibacy and total abstention from sexual intercourse was in itself righteous and meritorious, generating the "spiritual values" that are part of all holy men's stock in trade. His depreciation of all forms of property as representing and stimulating the will to live that must be stifled before it creates more misery was parodied in a notion that poverty was in itself a proof of spiritual superiority. The union of the two notions naturally spawned a horde of religious mendicants, whose supposed sanctity entitled them to live at the expense of their spiritual inferiors, who were so gross that they earned their own living and engendered children to support the next generation of pious beggars.

Originally, the Buddhist *bhiksu* was a man who, having "slain the five senses" and destroyed in himself "the illusion of individuality," divested himself of all property except a distinctive mantle of coarse cloth dyed to a dark Turkey red (*kasaya*, later changed to show sectarian differences), a bowl in which to collect the food he begged, and a staff, and then, having shaved all hair from his body, he began a perpetually itinerant life (*pravrajya*). The mendicant friars found or were given for shelter at night in huts (*viharas*), which, however, eventually became monasteries endowed by the pious, elaborate and wealthy establishments that provided such ease and comfort that their *bhiksus* forgot to continue their peregrinations and can more properly be described as monks, although Buddhism did not make the Christians' sharp distinction between mendicant friars and cloistered monks.

Buddhism was already waning in India when Hsüan Tsang made his pilgrimage to the land in which his religion had been born, but he found 10,000 *viharas* in Bengal alone; some of these were, no doubt, fairly small and simple buildings, but some were huge edifices that each accommodated more than a thousand ascetics.

The Buddhist ascetic, having "slain his five senses" had to keep them dead, and for that reason he was forbidden to touch a human being, least of all a woman. In one of the finest of the Sanskrit dramas, a Buddhist friar comes upon a woman who has been strangled and left for dead. He can, of course, pour water on her and fan her to revive her, but when he assists her to arise, she must grasp a vine that he holds out to her.

While it flourished in India, Buddhism was not fanatical, and its monasticism was therefore more humane (and perhaps less corrupt) than the Christian version, for the *bhiksu* was never bound by irrevocable vows. I cannot forbear to mention Bhartrihari, one of the most charming (and least translatable) of the lyric poets in Sanskrit. As his verses show, he was an elegant and polished gentleman who indulged with refinement in all sensual pleasures until satiety brought

a craving for tranquillity and leisure for meditation. He is said to have oscillated between the royal court and a Buddhist monastery, and finally to have become so aware of his own fickleness that when he renounced the world once more and entered a monastery, he ordered his coachman to wait outside. His conduct was doubtless thought bizarre, but it illustrates the humanity that Buddhism never lost in India. There could have been there no parallel to the tragedy of Martha Dickinson's "Father Amatus, cloistered young." As the Buddhist institution was carried westward and imitated by Semites, it naturally acquired a savage fanaticism that was transmitted to Christianity.

Tapas

BEFORE LEAVING INDIA, we should perhaps mention another element that is sometimes thought to have had an influence on Christianity.

Ayans (and some other races, notably the American Indians) instinctively admired the spiritual strength and fortitude of men who can bear intense physical pain without flinching and without yielding to the normal physical reactions. The ability stoically to endure pain always arouses admiration, but it can usually be exhibited only in some worthwhile undertaking, such as war or comparable situations, as, for example, by the justly famous and honored C. Mucius Scaevola. In post-Vedic India, however, admiration for such fortitude was distorted into the doctrine of *tapas*, the belief that by simply enduring pain inflicted upon himself a man automatically acquired a spiritual (i.e., supernatural) power. We should particularly note that *tapas* produces such power by a kind of natural law, which operates independently of the wishes of the gods and is not in any way affected by the motives of the man who practices the austerities.

The power of *tapas* is illustrated by the story that is exquisitely retold by Lafcadio Hearn in his *Stray Leaves*: Two evil princes, determined to obtain ascendancy over even the Thirty-three Gods, practice austerities on a mountain top, remaining absolutely motionless, standing on their great toes only, and keeping their eyes fixed upon the sun. After many years their self-mortification gave them such divine power that the weight of their thoughts shook the lands, as by an earthquake, and the mountain smoked with their holiness. They were thus able to destroy cities and make deserts of populous lands. (The world and the gods were saved only by the creation of Tilottama, the most beautiful of all women.)

Ahura Mazda

(Appendix 1)

IN MY highly condensed summary of the Zoroastrian religion, I have assumed that when Zoroaster tells us there is only one supreme god of good, he means what he says, and that when he gave to that god an unprecedented name, Ahura Mazda, he coined that name for his deity to show that his god differed from all gods previously known.

Ahura Mazda therefore, is his invention. It goes without saying that Zoroaster's theopoeic imagination would have been influenced by what he knew of the gods in vogue in his time, and that if some of those gods had traits which suited his ethical purposes, those particular traits would reappear in the god whom he fashioned, to the exclusion, of course, of traits of which he disapproved. Very limited similarities can therefore be discovered, but Zoroaster refers to his god *only* by the name Ahura Mazda, and common sense tells us that he devised a new name for his god precisely because he wanted to show that his god was fundamentally different from all others.

My conclusion, however, differs substantially from what you may find in references to Zoroaster that are based on the work of some very recent scholars, who read into what Zoroaster said (so far as this can be determined from the *Gathas*) elements of the old Iranian religion as they have reconstructed it, largely on the basis of the Sanskrit *Vedas*, a few references in the *Avesta*, and the lucubrations of the Pahlavi theologians, of whom the earliest must be many centuries later. I feel obliged, therefore, to defend my position as briefly and perspicuously as I can.

The two major works of modern erudition are:

Marijan Molé, *Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans l'Iran ancien: le problème zoroastrien et la tradition mazdéenne* (Paris, 1963 = *Annales du Musée Guimet*, Bibliothèque d'études, t. 69). Dr. Molé is primarily concerned with the late Pahlavi writings, froix. which he quotes copiously and from which he tries to reconstruct, "à la lumière de la phénoménologie religieuse moderne," not the actual creed of Zoroaster so much as "l'image que se font les mazdéens de leur Prophète," using texts of which the earliest cannot be earlier than the Seventh Century (A.D.) This is a very learned and valuable work, but may be misleading, if one does not bear in mind how much time and how many vicissitudes of history intervened between those writings and the presumed date of our text of the *Avesta*, which itself includes and expounds the *gathas*, which are very considerably earlier and which are the only texts that can be supposed to report some approximation of what Zoroaster actually said. That the late writings in Pahlavi preserve vestiges of the early theology may be granted, but how far they are separated from Zoroaster and from the time of the Persian Empire may be judged from the fact that the name of Ahura Mazda has been corrupted to Ormazd (Ohrmazd, Ormuzd, Ormizd, etc.) while the name of Angra Mainyu has been corrupted to Ahraman/Ahriman or Enak Meñok.

Mary Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, Vol. I (Leiden, 1975 = *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, I. Abteilung, VIII. Band, I. Abschnitt, Leiferang 2, Heft 2A). The very learned lady's work will be completed in four volumes, but only the first, which deals with the time of Zoroaster, need concern us. Her work is the most thorough treatment of the subject known to me, and forms part of what is likely to be the standard reference encyclopedia for many decades. Some of her interpretations differ widely from those given by Dr. Molé, but fortunately these are matters of detail which we need not discuss here. The crucial questions are (1) the identity of Ahura Mazda, (2) the significance of *ahura*, and (3) Zoroaster's conception of certain Indo-Iranian gods.

1. We are told, on the basis of some similarities and much theory, that Zoroaster's god was really Varuna, one of the numerous gods mentioned in the the hymns of the two early Vedas,¹ and we are even given a linguistic reconstruction of what Varuna's name would have been in Avestan, *if* he had ever been mentioned in the *Avesta*. The identification is based on two considerations: Varuna is one of the several gods who are given the title *asura* in the Vedas (a point that we shall discuss below), and some aspects of Varuna, as he is depicted in the Vedas, resemble attributes of Zoroaster's god.

It is true that in one hymn of the *Rigveda* (4.42), Varuna and Indra define their respective spheres of authority, and the former represents himself as the deity of law and order, of what is morally right, and so resembles Ahura Mazda, while Indra, a god whom Zoroaster particularly reprobated and denounced by name, says that he is the patron of the aristocracy that delights in war and poetry. It must be noted, however, that the two gods appear in the hymn as friendly colleagues in the pantheon, and there is no hint of rivalry between the two, neither showing the slightest disposition to trespass on the other's divine territory. Varuna does boast that he is the greatest of the *asuras* (whatever he may mean by that) and his will (i.e., law and order) is obeyed by other gods, which no more proves his supremacy than Zeus's notoriously numerous affairs with mortal women prove that Aphrodite, who inspires the sexual desires of gods as well as of men, is supreme on Olympus, where Zeus, Poseidon, and all the other gods who indulge in erotic and amatory adventures obviously obey her *will* when they do so. Varuna says no more than that the gods, who have an orderly society of their own, thus accept the social principle he represents.

Some aspects of Varuna do appeal to the religiosity that was formed by Zoroastrianism and its derivatives. Moderns are apt to be unduly impressed by the "spirituality" of such hymns as Atharvaveda 4.16, in which Varuna is credited with knowing every man's inmost thoughts and also with maintaining (unnecessarily?) an army of invisible spirits who, like Hesiod's thirty thousand agents of Zeus, report on all the actions of men; and Rigveda 5.85, in which the worshipper begs Varuna to forgive his sins, if ever he sinned against a "loving man" (i.e., a man's 'best' friend, with whom he has an especially close and intimate relationship; there is no implication of homosexuality) or wronged a brother, friend, comrade, neighbor, or even stranger. Christians like to think such ideas were wonderful discoveries made by their deity

¹ The oldest hymns in the Rigveda are by far the earliest expression of the primitive Aryan religion; the Atharvaveda is later, but still very early. For our purposes here, it will suffice to say that both must be considerably earlier than Zoroaster. I am not so temerarious as to try to determine precise dates for their composition.

many centuries later, and are usually perplexed or angry when they find that Jesus was a late-comer in the field of moral exhortation.

Very well, but let us not forget to balance such traits against others that were also attributed to Varuna. Take, for example, a hymn in the Atharvaveda (3.25) by a man who wants the gods to make a woman love him so that he can take her away from her parents and home. He very reasonably asks Kama (the god of sexual love) to inspire her with a burning desire for his embraces, but then he asks Varuna and Mitra to brainwash her, so that she can think of nothing else and will have no will of her own and thus cannot refuse to elope with him. Can we imagine a Zoroastrian's asking Ahura Mazda to help him seduce a woman? If not, then Ahura Mazda is a *fundamentally* different god.

2. Zoroaster called his good god Ahura Mazda, and the second of these words means 'illustrious, bright' (and was consequently used a few decades ago in the United States to designate an improved kind of electric-light bulb), and 'bright' always suggests 'wise' when applied to persons. The new god was 'the brilliant *ahura*,' and an *ahura* is a great supernatural power, i.e. a god. Avestan *ahura* is obviously a dialectical form corresponding to the Sanskrit *asura*, which is applied in the Vedas to some of the gods honored in them.

Now the generic word for 'god' in Sanskrit is *deva*, which becomes *dæva* in Avestan, and Zoroaster, by his drastic and epochal *Überwertung*, transformed all the *devas* into evil beings, the servants of Angra Mainya, so that in his language *dæva* means 'devil,' a foul fiend whose worship must be suppressed.² He vehemently denounces veneration and even respect shown to such agents of pure evil, and while he singles out for special obloquy Indra, who was the equivalent of Odin for the Aryans of India, he certainly includes in his irate reprobation all the other *devas* of whom he knew and, by implication, all the gods of whom he had never heard. Recent scholars have argued, however, that while Zoroaster damns all the *devas*, he makes an exception for the gods who are called *asuras* in the Vedas, since he calls his own god an *asura*.

The generic word for 'god,' *deva*, seems originally to have meant 'shining one, bright being,' presumably with special reference to the bright sky, while *asura* seems to mean 'lord', although its derivation is uncertain.³ So the question is, In the old hymns of the Vedas (and hence in

² When Zoroaster made *dæva* a word denoting utter evil, he was, in the vernacular phrase, cutting it fine, for he had to retain the obviously cognate word, *dæna*, usually translated as 'religion,' as a term for a praiseworthy activity. The Avestan *dæna* becomes *den* in Pahlavi and forms part of the extremely common term for Zoroastrianism, *Veh Den*, i.e., "the Right Religion." In Avestan, however, some learned perplexities could be avoided by translating *dæna* as 'spiritual' and supplying from the context either 'things' or 'nature' as the accompanying noun. In some contexts the word does mean a reverence for spiritual matters, but in others it must designate the 'spiritual nature' that a man creates for himself by righteous or sinful conduct as he passes through life. In the Zoroastrian eschatology, which must be Zoroaster's, the soul of the dead man must go to the Cinvato Bridge, where it is judged: the True Believers pass over the bridge to Heaven, but the wicked (including, of course, all infidels) slip from the bridge and fall into the abyss of Hell. How this happens is explained in several ways, but a common explanation is that the soul is accompanied by its *dæna*, which is hypostatized as an attendant maiden or female genius; if she is righteous, she sustains him as he walks across the very narrow bridge, but if she bears the accumulation of his evil deeds, her weight, as she clings to him, causes him to lose his footing and fall to his terrible doom.

³ A common etymology derives the word from Ashur (Assur), the Assyrians' name for their country, their capital city, and its tutelary god; it would thus have designated the gods of an enemy nation, which would explain the later use

Zoroaster's understanding) was *asura* a word that designated a kind of being different from a *deva* or was it simply an epithet like *adityá*, which was applied to various gods without implying that they were a special class of being?

Although *asura* seems most frequently applied to three gods in the old Vedic hymns, Dyáus, Váruna, and Mitrá, it cannot be shown that any generic distinction is intended. There is certainly no indication of antagonism or rivalry. I have already mentioned the hymn in which Varuna and Indra as friendly colleagues define their specialities in the celestial faculty. The gods who are called *asura* are included in the *visve devah* ('all-gods,' i.e., the pantheon). And in the hymns, the gods who are often called *asura* are worshipped by the same rites and by the same priests as the other gods. Of the three gods to whom the term is commonly applied, Dyaus becomes the Greek Zeus but fades out of the Indian pantheon in later times; Mitra likewise fades out, but appears in the later Zoroastrian cult as Mithra; but Varuna continues to be worshipped as one of the Thirty-Three Gods and is assigned jurisdiction over the ocean (he is the Hindu equivalent of Neptune) and is the Regent of the West (i.e., one of the four *Lokapalas*, the gods who preside over the four cardinal points of the compass and foreign lands that lie in the indicated direction).

Obviously Zoroaster intended *asura* to mean something radically different from *deva* when he applied it to his god, but having decided to call the latter 'brilliant,' he needed a noun that would take the place of *deva* and his choice was limited. I can think of only two available alternatives. The Sanskrit *aditya*, 'heavenly being', would have suggested the vague Vedic myth of a goddess, Aditi, who was their mother, and if Zoroaster's god was to have existed from all time, he couldn't have parents. The word *bhaga* (Avestan *bagha*, Old Persian *baga*) seems originally to have meant 'giver of gifts, bestower of good fortune', and was, like the English 'lord,' a term applicable to both human and supernatural beings. It does mean 'god' in Old Persian and so was applied to Ahura Mazdi, but Zoroaster would probably have had a different sense of the word's connotation; it occurs very frequently in the *Rigveda* (e.g., 3.62.11) as an epithet of the god *Savitr*, who, whether or not he is to be identified with Indra, was presumably a *deva* in Zoroaster's opinion, and the word also occurs at least once (10.85.36) as the name of a god 'who evidently presides over marriages to assure the prosperity of the wedded couple, thus providing another connotation Zoroaster would have wished to avoid. So far as I can see now, *asura*, meaning something like 'lord,' a word not associated with any one earlier god and not connected with any attribution of genealogical descent, was about the only word connoting divinity that Zoroaster had at his disposal.

What causes the trouble, of course, is that in post-Vedic Sanskrit the word *asura* does become the generic name of a race of supernatural beings who are the enemies of the Indian gods, although it must be carefully noted that the gods who are called *asura* in the early Vedas never appear among the *asuras* of the later myths. It is hard to say how *asura* acquired this different meaning.⁴ I have toyed with the idea that Zoroaster really caused it, that what we find

of the term *asura* that I shall mention shortly – but why would the Aryans have applied the word to their own gods? It is possible, of course, that we have two words of entirely different origin that came to be pronounced alike and so confused.

⁴ One explanation is given in the preceding note. Another possibility is that *asura* was originally a word of very wide meaning in its application to supernatural beings, as are some comparable words in English: the average Christian

in India was the reaction of the Hindu Brahmins to his attack on their *devas* as evil beings and his attempt to supplant them with an *asura* of his own creation. We all know how holy men react to a threat to their business, and the reaction would have been violent even among the common people, if the early Zoroastrians were as active in trying to promote godliness with swords as their traditions suggest or even if the Hindus were pestered by missionaries.

In the later Hindu theology, it is an axiom that the Asuras are the enemies of the gods, just as the numerous races of demons are the enemies of mortal men. Most of these demons, who are chiefly conspicuous in the literature because the Aryan heroes slay so many thousands of them, obviously represent the alien races of aborigines whom the Aryans encountered in India when they invaded that sub-continent or later.⁵ One could accordingly think of the Asuras as foreign gods, although that does not necessarily follow. I think it worthy of note that the Asuras are anti-gods, not devils, and they retain their dignity in the best Sanskrit literature, a cultural amalgam in which distinctively Aryan elements long survived, so that they are treated with the respect that our race accords to valiant enemies.⁶ But I see no reason for reading into the very early hymns of the Vedas, and hence into Zoroaster's consciousness, a meaning of the word that is attested only much later. I therefore reject the views of many contemporary scholars.

For what interest it may have, I add the conjecture that the transformation of the concept of *asura* may have been facilitated by a kind of religious evolution that is of some interest in itself. The Vedic gods became commonplace and, so to speak, were becoming worn out, since even pious votaries must eventually have come to suspect that they importuned in vain deities who could not answer their prayers. As the Brahmins consolidated their lucrative monopoly of religion, they subordinated the old pantheon, often called the "Thirty-Three Gods," to the newer and greater divinity of a Trinity, Brahman, Visnu and Siva. And, oddly enough, the Brahmins shared some of Zoroaster's animus, for they particularly exerted themselves to denigrate Indra, who had been the Aryan god par excellence, and reduce him to the status of a second-class god, who, while retaining a limited jurisdiction in his own heavenly principality, sins and is punished for his sins by a superior power. The professional venders of Salvation vented on Indra their venomous hatred of the Aryan aristocracy – an animosity that may also have been racial, as we surmised earlier.

does not, in his own mind, connect his Holy Ghost with the innumerable ghosts who haunt houses and gibber in the night to scare foolish women.

⁵ This is most clearly seen in the Dasas, who are a race of demons but obviously represent the dark-skinned aborigines, since the word always retained the meaning of 'slave' or 'Sudra'. The Raksasas may originally have been Mongolians, whose characteristically slant eyes were exaggerated into the vertical eyes of the demons, while their yellow complexion was supplemented by other colors. The Pisitasins (Pisitasas) were obviously anthropophagous native tribes before they became ghouls. The Pisacas were barbarians who had a language capable of literary expression; I have often wondered who they may have been.

⁶ For one example, see above, p. 99, n. It is true that Asuras appear in some myths as destroyers, but they are never degraded to mere devils. In the Kathasaritsagara, for example, we are twice told the story of the Asura Angaraka, father of the most beautiful woman in the world. She, smitten with love for King Mahasena, eventually betrays her father, as libidiously impulsive as Scylla, who betrays Nisus in the Vergilian poem, but until she does, Angaraka slays Mahasena's police officers and, in the guise of a great boar, ravages the countryside, but he does so, we are told, because a divine curse forced him to become a Raksasa to expiate a sin. That preserves the purity of his daughter's præternatural lineage and saves the dignity of the Asuras.

Indra was left in possession of his own special heaven, Svarga, which is the highest paradise accessible to those who have not become "pure mind." It is the Hindu Valhalla, to which Indra welcomes the souls of warriors who have died in battle, and it is also a heaven worth attaining, for it abounds in all luxuries and sensuous delights, from magic trees (kalpapadapa, etc.) that produce whatever is asked of them to the radiantly beautiful Apsarasas, who are the courtesans of heaven. But poor Indra was reduced to an almost comic figure, for he was taught that even a god of his rank must respect the sanctity of holy men. There is, for example, an Hindu analogue to the well-known story of Zeus and Alcmena: Indra impersonated Gautama, a great sage, and thus seduced Ahalya, the sage's wife, but Gautama, a holy man who had acquired great spiritual power by his piety, cursed the amorous god, whose body was accordingly covered with one thousand miniature representations of the female sexual organs, and the disgraced god had to hide in shame until the holy man was finally persuaded to relent and change the stigmata to eyes. Indra, who had once been the Aryans' *pater hominum divomque*, even became guilty of the most horrible, abominable, and almost unspeakable of all sins: he accidentally killed a Brahmin! He fled in terror to the end of the earth and hid among the lotus blossoms that float on the waters of the abyss, and he remained in hiding, trembling, until Brhaspati, the Priest of the Gods, by sacrificing many celestial horses in the *asvamedha* rite and performing many other powerful liturgies and invocations, finally cleansed the terrified god of his awful crime. In India, the clergy entrenched themselves in power even more ingeniously than their counterparts in the West.

3. We are told that Ahura Mazda was not Zoroaster's only god, because he "must" have admitted the worship of certain gods supposedly favored by his contemporaries, since they (e.g., Mithra) turn up in the pantheon of later Zoroastrian sects. Now I think it would have been odd indeed if Zoroaster not only forgot to mention the favored deities, but invented the six Ameša Spentas as the immediate subordinates of Ahura Mazda and the only ones he mentions. There is no mention of Mithra in any *gatha* or other text that could conceivably go back to the time of Zoroaster, who very frequently mentions his six great archangels. Miss Boyce tries to read Mithra into two words (*mazda ahurañho*) in a line that could be ancient. The grammatical relationship of the two words is puzzling and the text is probably defective or corrupt. But however that may be, if you had a text that constantly invokes Yahweh and constantly appeals to Gabriel, Michael, Ithuriel, Raphael, and other archangels, but never mentions Jesus, would you believe that when the author wrote "god & co" in one line, he intended thereby to express his veneration of Jesus? As for the common argument that Zoroaster must have permitted the worship of Mithra because he does not specifically forbid it – well, I shall not be so unkind as to comment.

I cannot think the question important. If Zoroaster did, perchance, accord grace to a few of the supposed Iranian gods, he made them subordinate to the six great archangels. Miss Boyce admits (p. 192) that "the core of Zoroaster's new teachings" was his claim that "in the beginning ... there was only one good God ... namely Ahura Mazda," who created the six archangels to help him in the war against Angra Mainya. It would follow, therefore, that any Iranian gods that Zoroaster may have exempted from his general damnation of all other gods were created by Ahura Mazda (or the archangels) as spirits (*yazatas*) subordinate to the six and therefore subordinate in a second degree to the supreme god.

Miss Boyce admits (p. 255) that Angra Mainyu, the supreme god of evil, is entirely Zoroaster's invention, and that he made all the Vedic *devas* into devils (Avestan *dævas*), the creations and servants of his one supreme god of evil. If Zoroaster permitted a few Iranian gods to serve his good god, that does not alter in the least his great and enormously important innovation, the transformation of the whole world into one divided between two gods, one of pure good and the other of pure evil, with all (or almost all) of the gods previously worshipped by men, no matter how fair and gracious they were, made the malignant servants of the god of pure evil and therefore the enemies of all righteous men, who are thereby obligated to convert or exterminate every worshipper of those gods.

That, I submit, was an epochal innovation and a disaster to the civilized world – a cataclysm of which we still suffer the terrible aftermath.

Later Zoroastrianism

(Appendix II)

SINCE one of the later Zoroastrian sects exerted a great influence on early Christianity, some mention of it in these pages seems called for.

A first-rate theologian always wants to rise and shine by devising some novel twist or application of doctrine, and it is safe to assume that in the time of the Persian Empire, many an ambitious Magus tried to make himself prominent. But we do not know what checks there were on heresy. We do not know how the Magi were organized, by what discipline they maintained a reasonable uniformity of dogma, or whether they could make the usual appeal to the "secular arm" in cases of contumacy. In the history of all religions, a heresy is a doctrine disapproved by theologians who are "orthodox" because they have the power to enforce their opinions, especially when their orthodoxy is guaranteed by the police and hangmen. When those indispensable guardians of the True Faith are lacking or ineffectual, the usual result is a schism and an enormous waste of ink and papyrus or paper. But it would be temerarious to guess either that religion evolved normally in the Persian Empire or that it did not.

There is some evidence that the religion's centre of gravity shifted to Babylon at some time after the Persian conquest. In that large and opulent city the Magi would have come into contact with Semitic superstitions, especially the cult of the god Marduk, and it is only reasonable to assume that they urged or applauded the action of Xerxes when he desecrated the god's temple and confiscated his huge effigy, reportedly of solid gold. They came into contact (assuming that there was no earlier relation) with the city's large and wealthy colony of crafty Jews, but we do not know in what ways the Jews tried to exploit them. The Zoroastrian holy men in Babylon also found themselves in the very capital of one of the world's oldest and most lucrative superstitions, astrology. It was, furthermore, a superstition which at that time, and indeed for many centuries thereafter, could plausibly claim to be a scientific observation of the real world.¹

¹ In antiquity, the fallacies of most of the astrologers' hocus-pocus were apparent to good minds long before Carneades and the Academics systematically demolished the hoax, but, as Cicero had to concede in the *De divinatione* (II.43.90), there was one argument for planetary influences on human life that could not be dismissed or refuted, so that candid and objective students, such as Diogenes of Seleucia (whom Cicero quotes *ad loc.*), had to concede to astrology a considerable element of probable truth. It has always been a matter of common observation that the children of one man by one woman, if not identical twins, always differ from one another, and often differ radically, not only in physical characteristics, such as features, stature, and figure, but also in temperament and mentality, although they receive the same nurture and the same education. The great differences between the offspring of one pair of parents, observed in circumstances that excluded all suspicion of adultery and even between the children of a brother and sister (as in Egypt or among the Magi) had to be explained by the operation of some variable factor, and before the genetic processes that ineluctably determine innate qualities were scientifically determined in our own time, the significant variables seemed to be the times of conception and birth, and hence astral influences, since observation would quickly exclude such factors as weather and the seasons. The alternatives were (1) unperceived causes, (2) metempsychosis, and (3) special creation of individuals by a god or gods who artistically avoided duplication in their handiwork. The first of these was simply a confession of irremediable ignorance and the third was fantastic, leaving, for all practical purposes, the second; and the hypothesis that there were invisible and impalpable souls that could accumulate in successive lives experiences they could not remember

The premises of Zoroaster's religion, and indeed of most religions, should exclude astrology, but it is a poor theologian who cannot make his Scriptures say whatever he deems expedient. It would be interesting to know to what extent astrology penetrated the doctrines of the presumably orthodox priests in the Persian Empire, but all that we know is that the Chaldæan astromancy was taken up by the Magi who were operating in the Greek cities along the Mediterranean and who, if we conjectured rightly above, gave their Saviour's name the form in which it is now familiar.

The preaching of Zoroaster's gospel to all the world was interrupted by one of the climacteric events of history, the conquest of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great and the consequent Greek colonization of Asia from the Mediterranean to the borders of China and from the Caspian Sea to the Ganges. From its status as the official religion of a mighty empire, Zoroastrianism suddenly fell to the abject position of being only the faith of conquered peoples, discredited by the crushing defeat of its pious monarchs, and abandoned by a large part of its former adherents because they had lost faith in an impotent god, or because they recognized the cultural superiority attested by the conquerors' military superiority, or because they saw the advantages of joining the victors, or even because they had adhered to Zoroastrianism only because it was fashionable. To the Magi, it must have seemed as though the end of the world had come, and we may be certain that they then began to devise the theology that explained the catastrophe as the result of some bargain between Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu whereby the latter was granted a stipulated period of dominion.²

Zoroastrianism was eclipsed, but it would be an exaggeration to say that it went underground. There was, of course, no persecution, no opposition to it, no official disapproval of it by the Greeks, who were too intelligent and civilized to be susceptible to the fanaticism

was, objectively considered, much less likely than the hypothesis that some influence from the planets, invisible as the influence of a magnet on iron is invisible, acted on the foetus in the womb from the very moment of conception. Thus the abilities and characters of men and women were to some extent, and perhaps almost entirely, determined by the planetary influences before and during birth; and character within certain limits does determine an individual's fortunes. This opened the door for a claim by the soothsayers that the planetary influences which had determined character could throughout life exert at least some influence on the being they had formed. Before the modern science of genetics, there was a real problem, and we should not feel for all consideration of astrology in antiquity the contempt that we feel for the practice of it today, when it is simply a notorious imposture on the gullible and superstitious. It is not remarkable that the astrological racket has become so lucrative today: minds that have been so sabotaged that they can believe in the equality of races can believe in anything.

² The most generally accepted explanation was that at the very beginning of time Ahura Mazda established a preordained chronology and a series of epochs during which Angra Mainyu was to be dominant. The first era ended when God sent Zoroaster to restore righteousness, but the schedule called for a relapse into sin until, at the end of the next period, one of Zoroaster's belated sons would be engendered by the miraculous process we described earlier. This notion reappears, of course, in the various Christian doctrines that Yahweh had allotted to Satan a certain period of prosperity, but the Christians do not commonly suppose a bargain between the two gods. In the common version of the Gospel of Thomas, that apostle encounters the snake that seduced Eve in the Garden of Eden and compels him to restore a dead man to life by sucking out the venom with which he killed him, and the snake, infected by its own deadly poison, swells up and bursts, but not before complaining that Thomas is destroying him before the end of his allotted time; similar complaints are made by devils whom Thomas coerces by what they regard as a "tyrannical" violation of their rights, but it is never explained who did the allotting of time. It would have been embarrassing to admit that the good god was directly responsible for the successes of the evil god and also embarrassing to admit that he was powerless to prevent them. That is the inescapable dilemma of all ditheisms.

and pious delirium excited by “universal” religions. What happened was that the better part of the population spontaneously recognized the superiority of Greek civilization and adopted it, including its incomparable language, its elegant culture, and the Aryan attitude toward religion. It must not be forgotten that the dominant part of the population of the Persian Empire was composed of Persians, Medes, and other Aryans, the racial kin of the victors and therefore sharing their basic racial instincts.³ I can imagine that many a cultivated Persian had only to become acquainted with Greek literature and philosophy to free himself from the harlotations of a “revealed” religion and to enjoy kicking the Salvation-peddlers from his door. As for the non-Aryan subjects of the former empire, they had new masters to conciliate and to exploit.

The Greeks built Greek cities throughout the lands Alexander had conquered, and Greek became the language of all persons who had any pretensions to culture. Aramaic, the Semitic language which had been the *lingua franca* of the Persian Empire, became largely the language of illiterates, spoken by the Semites among the ignorant peasantry of the countryside and the mongrel or alien proletariat that formed the most debased social stratum of the cities. Ahura Mazda, his name modernized to Horomasdes, lost his universal empire and became just a commoner in a supernatural world already crowded with a plethora of gods. His gospels could not be marketed in polite society: fanaticism had become uncouth. The Magi, who had been God’s terrestrial representatives and the authorized salesmen of eternal life and *post mortem* beatitude, were reduced to the status of the swindlers who pose as “evangelists” and “psychics” in our society. They had to adapt their sales-pitch to their customers, the ignorant and gullible, and their skill in tricks of prestidigitation, psychological impostures, and applied chemistry gave the word ‘magic’ to all modern languages.

During the period of Greek dominion, however, alien superstitions seeped upward from the multi-racial soil on which the Greek society was built in Asia, thus providing a confirmation of Günther’s hypothesis, which we mentioned above.⁴ The Aryan’s lack of fanaticism makes him tolerant of alien superstitions, and it is supplemented by what we may call a geographical relativism in religion, which we commonly so take for granted in the modern world that we overlook it.⁵ It does startle us, however, when we first encounter it in the ancient world, where

³ It is extremely odd that even so diligent a scholar as Tarn should have overlooked this obvious fact and attributed to Alexander an itch for race-mixing and a universal brotherhood of mongrels. The plain fact is that Alexander encouraged intermarriage only between his followers and high-born Persians, who were of pure or relatively pure Aryan ancestry. Not being stupid, Alexander would have perceived that fact, if he did not already know it, from their features and bodily conformation; their language, furthermore, was Old Persian, which did not differ from Attic, Ionic, and Doric Greek very much more than did some of the epichoric and contaminated dialects of Greek that may be inspected in A. Thumb’s *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, revised by Kieckers and Scherer (Heidelberg, 1932-59). What Alexander proposed was nothing more radical than marriage between Anglo-Saxons and Irish or between Germans and northern Italians. There is no evidence at all to support the entirely gratuitous assumption that Alexander would have favored racial miscegenation. Propaganda that he had done so was concocted in the centuries that immediately followed his death, probably by Jews. One audacious forgery was a purported letter from Aristotle to Alexander advising him to interchange the populations of Asia and Europe to produce a mongrelized One World; it is now extant only in an Arabic translation. See S. M. Stern, *Aristotle on the World State* (Oxford, Cassirer, 1968), in which you will also find copious references to the Jews’ exploitation of the hoax.

⁴ *Supra*, p. 45.

⁵ We usually read Chaucer’s greatest poem when we are young:
When that Aprile with his shoures soote

it usually takes the form of a theocracy that, at first sight, seems to us incredible. We, habituated to Christian dogma and its pretensions to know the "truth" about its triple deity, simply gasp when we first see Herodotus give to the Egyptians' cow-headed Hathor the name of the Greeks' gracious and beautiful Aphrodite. To us, who believe in neither, that seems a profanation; it did not to Herodotus, who identified them as aspects of a single *numen* in whose existence he was willing provisionally to believe. When we first read *Iphigenia in Tauris*, we wonder why Euripides' fellow Athenians did not accuse him of the most outrageous blasphemy against Artemis when he portrayed that fair maiden as the barbarously sanguinary goddess of blood-thirsty barbarians. That puzzles us until we realize that a Greek was willing to regard an alien deity as the equivalent of the traditional Greek god from whom he or she least differed, and to believe that, if supernatural beings did exist, since they were by nature unknowable, the exotic gods might well represent the same religious concepts as adjusted to a radically different culture of radically different human beings in a remote part of the world.⁶

A striking and fresh verification of Günther's hypothesis is provided by the current excavations at the site of a great Greek city at the confluence of the Oxus and the Kokoha in the northeastern corner of Afganistan, three thousand miles from Greece.⁷ The city is probably Eucratidia, one of the many cities founded by Greek colonists in the then fertile land of ancient Bactria. The Greeks, who, for several centuries, civilized that distant land, may have weakened themselves by miscegenation, although their rulers, as shown by the portraits on their coins, were handsome Aryans to the end. The Greeks of Bactria certainly weakened themselves by almost incessant wars against their fellow Greeks, the Seleucid Empire, from which they had

The droghte of Marche hath perced to the rote, . . .

Then longen folk to goon on pilgrimages.

The pilgrims are taking a vacation to enjoy travel through the vernal countryside. But why do they go to Canterbury, "the holy blisful martir for to seke"? Isn't Thomas à Becket up with Jesus in his paradise somewhere above the clouds? Or is he still in his tomb in the Cathedral? The pilgrims are glad of an opportunity to be out on the open road, and naturally refuse to worry about such nice points in theology. Many years ago, I visited the famous shrine at Guadalupe Hidalgo and chance permitted me to converse with a cultivated lady of Spanish ancestry who had come from Guadalajara, half-way across Mexico, to solicit a favor from the Virgin. She admitted that there were shrines of the Virgin in Guadalajara, and she agreed that the Virgin was the same Virgin everywhere, but she was nonetheless convinced that the Virgin at Guadalupe would do things that the Virgin wouldn't do in Guadalajara. Our feeling for religious geography is stronger than the abstractions of dogma. Many men and women go to Lourdes and are healed of psychosomatic maladies by the strong emotions that are excited by their inner conviction that the Virgin will perform there miracles she is unwilling or unable to perform elsewhere, even though she must now be looking down on the earth from an abode far above it. The Virgin at Lourdes is as efficient as was the goddess Sequana at her shrine, which was uncovered by archaeologists some years ago, but the polytheist who journeyed to Sequana's temple nineteen centuries ago did so quite logically: she was a local goddess and, though invisible, resided where she was worshipped. You couldn't expect her to leave home and come to you, so you naturally had to go to her. Her therapeutic powers were very great, no doubt, but all her powers were limited to the small area that belonged to her.

⁶ This intelligent attitude was, of course, favored by the diversity of their own gods which posed the questions that Cicero noted in the last book of the *De natura deorum*. There are, for example, five different stories about the parentage and birthplace of Minerva: does this mean that there actually are five homonymous goddesses? If not, why not? A Christian theologian, accustomed to making Trinities, would have had no difficulty in making a Quintity out of Minerva, but he would have been laughed at. A polytheist would have reasonably asked the theologian how he knew and such impertinence always sends holy men into fits.

⁷ See the report in *The Scientific American*, CCXLVI #1 (January 1982), pp. 148-159.

declared independence, and the Greek kings of India, who were determined to remain independent of Bactria if they could not conquer it. The Greeks further weakened themselves by some civil wars in which, we may be sure, the lower races profited at the expense of their Greek masters. Thus the Greeks and civilization in Bactria eventually succumbed to hordes of barbarians who poured in from what is now part of China. The excavations show, however, that to the end the Greeks kept and cherished their elegant language and their incomparable literature; they maintained their distinctive institutions, such as gymnasia, so repugnant to Oriental vulgarity and prudery; they ingeniously adapted their architecture to the climate of a region in which stone suitable for building was rare; and, significantly, the only evidence of cultural miscegenation is in religion, the few divinities thus far found are all patently non-Greek, and thus far no inscriptions have been found to tell us what names they were given. The chances are that Greeks thought of them as local varieties of their own gods.

The Magi, in a world grown so evil that their incomes had dropped drastically, had to adapt their Glad Tidings to the market. They, no doubt, still had customers among the peasantry and the urban proletariats, both, alas, impoverished. Astromancy, which even good minds had to accept as possible, was, of course, a staple for which there was always a fair demand. But Zoroastrianism really survived in heresies that would have made Zoroaster speechless with horror. The Greeks would listen to no nonsense about a supreme god who had made devils out of all the amiable and companionable gods of the whole world, but they were quite willing to believe that Zeus was also Horomasdes in inner Asia. Why not? He was Amun in Egypt, and it was only reasonable that he would seem different to a different people.

One consequence of the Greek conquest of Asia was that Zoroastrianism survived in bastard cults that would have given its founder apoplexy.

A very good example is the spectacular monument, which has partly survived the depredations of two millennia, on the high mountain which the Turks call Nemrud Dag, close to the upper course of the Euphrates and about 365 miles east-southeast of Ankara.⁸ There, as close to heaven as men could climb, Antiochus I of the small buffer kingdom of Commagene, who claimed both Alexander and Darius as ancestors, erected, on both sides of an artificial hill added to the summit, colossal statues of his gods, who wear Oriental robes and Persian headdress above features that are portrayed in the Greek style and which, if viewed apart from their accoutrements, could pass as Greek. One of the two principal gods, who sat in majesty, looking out over the wide valley below, is a fusion of Zeus and Oromasdes (= Ahura Mazda), bizarre as that seems to us. The second, equally august, is a blend of Apollo, Helios, and Mithras (with a bit of Hermes thrown in for good measure). The three assistant gods are equally hybrid.

We need not smile at this example of religious bastardy nor amuse ourselves by imagining what execrations the great monument would have evoked from Zoroaster, who had taught that we should worship only Ahura Mazda and represent him only in aniconic form as fire, the pure element that is the essence of divinity. The shrine, despite the Greek camouflage given it by Antiochus, is late Zoroastrian and even included a massive altar on which the sacred flame could

⁸ A concise account of the monument with excellent photographs may be found in an estimable periodical published at Zürich, *Antike Welt*, Sondernummer 1975.

be kept burning. Antiochus, a relatively petty king who, under Roman patronage, ruled his client kingdom from 64 to 38 B.C., undoubtedly spoke a fairly pure Greek and would have stared uncomprehendingly at a text in Old Persian, Avestan, or Aramaic; what he himself believed, we have no means of knowing, but it is most unlikely that he was fooled by his own pretenses. He knew that kings should hedge themselves about with divinity, and that it was expedient to associate himself with the Zoroastrian religion, which had been revived by the Parthians after the collapse of Seleucid (i.e., Greek) power in Asia.⁹

To the southeast of Nemrud Dag may still be seen, stripped of its once lavish ornaments, a remarkable shrine that was probably built and excavated by Antiochus for an annual commemoration of the miraculous birth of the Son of God, Mithras, who, like the later Jesus, was born in a cave,¹⁰ saluted by choirs of rejoicing angels, and first adored by understandably-amazed shepherds. Mithas, however, was born an adult, so that his Epiphany immediately followed his Nativity as he emerged from the maternal cave.

⁹ Antiochus I of Commagene was doubtless a cultivated man, who could not repudiate Greek culture or ignore the gods traditionally associated with it. His kingdom was a buffer between the Roman Empire on one side and on the other the aggressive Parthian Empire, whose greatest king, Mithridates VI Eupator (a votary of Mithra, as his name indicates), had waged a series of bloody wars with Romans from 88 to 66, when he was finally defeated decisively by Pompey and fled to his territories in the Crimea, where he committed suicide. The Parthian power was still formidable, as Crassus was to learn at Carrhæ. It is likely that the greater part of Antiochus's multi-racial subjects were given to some form of Zoroastrianism, so that his theocracy was obviously a political necessity. Scholars differ in their estimates of the extent to which it may have been his own invention. In an extant inscription, he affirms that when his body is placed in the tomb he has prepared for it (and which archaeologists have not yet found), his soul will ascend to Heaven to join the other gods. The gods, however, neglected to give him advice that would have saved him from making a bad guess during the Roman civil wars that followed the assassination of Julius Cæsar.

¹⁰ It is well-known, of course, that in the early form of the Christian myth, preserved in the several recensions of the Gospel of James, purportedly composed by the brother of Jesus (who should have known!), Jesus was born in a cave. This was the story known to the early Fathers of the Church, including Tertullian and Eusebius, and the latter, in the biography of Constantine that he concocted to spread the fiction of that emperor's "conversion" by the miracle of "in hoc signo vinces," implied that Constantine had built a church in front of the sacred cave. Until recently a cave was, and perhaps it still is, exhibited as the scene of the Incarnation to gawking tourists who visit the Church of the Nativity in Jerusalem. All this suggests that the shift of the scene to a house in Matth. 2.11, and to a stable in Luc. 2.7, were late retouches of the tales, introduced when it was thought best to play down the story about the Magi and Zoroaster's Prophecy. One can see why it was thought desirable to minimize similarities to the Nativity of Mithras, but one cannot imagine why the Fathers did not make the stories in the two gospels agree before incorporating them in their anthology. The only explanation seems to be sheer carelessness on their part. In the gospels of James, one of the gospels attributed to Matthew, and others, the Nativity in a cave is logically accounted for, since Mary is overtaken by labor pains when she and Joseph are in a desert, some distance from the nearest town. A very amusing example of theologians' carelessness may conveniently be found in the two Latin Infancy Gospels edited by M. R. James (Cambridge, 1927). Both gospels are obviously the work of holy men who are fixing up the story to suit their somewhat different tastes. In both tales, Mary, her husband, and her stepson are walking to Bethlehem, and since Mary is far advanced in pregnancy, she has to walk very slowly. Joseph therefore goes ahead to the town and, since he cannot find room in an inn, picks out an empty stable and prepares it for Mary. In both versions Mary finally arrives under the care of her stepson, who explains that she had frequently to stop and rest on the way, but in one version she then dismounts from an ass! In both versions, Joseph takes her into the place he has prepared, which, by an editorial miracle, is suddenly transformed into a cave! The stable becomes a cave within the space of a printed page in both versions, thus giving us a measure of the retentiveness of evangelists' memories.

The shrine was a large cave in the side of a mountain. A wide terrace was built up in front of it, and the entrance made an arch in walls covered with sculptured reliefs and inscriptions, which have long since disappeared. From the floor of the cave, engineers sank a tunnel, at an angle of 45° downward, into the mountain for 520 feet and enlarged it to a room of considerable size at the bottom. In all probability, the shrine was used for, a reënactment of the Saviour's Epiphany, doubtless at the rebirth of the sun on the twenty-fifth of December, after the Winter Solstice. In the room at the bottom, Antiochus probably performed religious rites to renew his own participation in divinity, put on suitable garments to impersonate Mithras, and manifested himself, probably at the dramatic moment of sunrise, on the terrace as the *theos epiphanes*, suggesting to the assembled worshippers that he was, if not a reincarnation of Mithras, at least the Saviour's divinely-appointed representative on earth. He was doubtless adored by shepherds, who had been carefully rehearsed in their rôle, and received the plaudits of a multitude assembled from far and wide to witness the iterated miracle, which must have stirred their pious hearts.¹¹ The choirs of angels (*fravas*) had unfortunately to be omitted from the performance, but it may be that Antiochus had suitable background music provided in the ceremony by which he convinced the common people that he was indeed the Vicar of God on Earth, hoping, of course, that the True Believers were too ignorant and stupid to perceive that he, in his relatively constricted domain, was only the vicar of whatever Roman general held the proconsular imperium in Asia.

Besides doubling for Mithra in the annual celebration of the Nativity, Antiochus had himself portrayed in the favorite pose of most Oriental kings, *tête-à-tête* with his god. He and Mithra, both stalwart figures in Persian dress (loose trousers and tunic) stand facing one another and joining their hands, doubtless sealing an agreement with a handshake. Antiochus is distinguished by his crown, Mithras by the rays of the sun, which appear behind his Phrygian cap. The two appear as equals: Antiochus was not a megalomaniac, just a good politician. He also had himself portrayed as shaking hands with Ahura Mazda, who remains seated on his throne, since the supreme god is entitled to that social precedence. That preëminence, however, was threatened by two developments in Zoroastrian theology that we must mention here.

Some earnest theologians were evidently puzzled by the coëxistence of a supreme god of good and a supreme god of evil. It did not seem right for the former to have created the latter, for a respectable god really should not be so stupid as to create, whether voluntarily or by inadvertence, an implacable adversary as powerful as himself. The problem, like the equivalent one in Christianity and similar religions, is insoluble, of course, but it was felt that it would be less objectionable to make the divine antagonists brothers, so a father was created for them out of the concept of time (*zurvan*). This primordial god, Zurvan, later Zervan, was commonly called, in Greek and Latin, Aeon or Cronos (i.e., Saturn, but the name was confused with Chronos);

¹¹ The priests must have had their part in the ceremony, of course, but it is hard to guess what it was. The Magi cannot have brought gifts, for there is no precedent for that act in the Mithraic myth, according to which it is the shepherds who bring the first fruits of their flocks and fields as gifts for the new-born god, and the Magi do not appear on the scene at all, since they were first given the glad tidings of Salvation by Zoroaster, long afterwards. Mithra was the divine Mediator (Greek *mes...* the title later given to Jesus in the "New Testament") between the Creator and his creations, but the priests had, as usual, acquired a monopoly of mediation between men and the Mediator, so they cannot have been left out. Only Magi, for example, could tend the sacred fire, which keeps demons away.

originally conceived as hermaphroditic and thus able to engender children by himself, he was eventually depicted as a nude male figure having wings and the head of a lion, and having a serpent coiled many times about his body. Needless to say, this theological device merely pushed the dilemma one step farther back: Who was Zervan's daddy? And for that matter, since his sex is unmistakable in most representations of him, where did he find a mama for his boys when he was the only being in the whole universe? And why did Zervan fecklessly or maliciously engender an evil son to hate and strive to destroy his good son, to say nothing of raising hell on the earth that the good son was going to create? As in all religions, the answer, of course, is that it is damnably wicked to bother theologians with embarrassing questions. You must have Faith.

Zervan, however, created another difficulty that even oodles of Faith could not completely overcome. It was fundamental Zoroastrian teaching that after the Resurrection of the Dead and the Last Judgement, the triumphant Ahura Mazda would put an end to time, and if Time was his father, that would be patricide. One could, of course, give the standard explanation that this was a "mystery" that the human mind must not think about, but the doctrine was so fundamental in Zoroastrianism that the paregoric did not always work. When the Christians grabbed the idea of a Resurrection and Last Judgement, they were content with the phrase, "time shall be no more," without trying to understand it. In Zoroastrian eschatology, however, the distinction between time and eternity must be understood. Time is what causes the distressing state of affairs in the world, in which it produces change, happenings, events and thus creates history. Time is thus the fatal flaw in the world that permits the powers of evil to afflict mankind. After the Last Judgement, therefore, Ahura Mazda will abolish it and restore the universe to its state of timeless perfection, and since perfection admits of no change, that will be an eternity in which nothing can ever happen again. Just how the good can enjoy this bliss and the wicked can suffer exquisite torments if they are as changeless as marble statues is not explained.

Zervan virtually replaced Ahura Mazda, who was thus reduced to a mere link between his Father and his Son, and one can see why many Magi did not hold with the innovation. The Zervanists flourished, however, until c. 531, when the "orthodox" Magi got the ear of Chosroës (Khosrau) I, the greatest of the Sassanian kings of Persia, who ruled that the Zervanists were heretics. Since there was no question about the loyalty of his army, he and God were clearly in agreement on that theological point.¹²

¹² Chosroës had already proved his infallibility as a theologian by exterminating the Mazdakites, a numerous and popular sect that had been his father's favorites. To save his subjects from future mistakes, Chosroës authorized his orthodox Magi to compile an authoritative text of the Avesta and gave it his approval, which, naturally, carried great weight. This is the version that was the basis of the text that we now have.

Chosroës protected the Christians in his domains, even after many of them were caught in an unsuccessful conspiracy to replace him with his son. He may have been influenced by the consideration that almost all of the Christians in Persia were Nestorians, whom his principal enemy, Justinian, the pious Christian emperor in Constantinople, was eager to exterminate. One of Chosroës's acts is greatly to his honor and should be remembered. In 529, Justinian closed the "university" in Athens to extirpate the last, degenerate vestiges of Greek philosophy; the seven Neoplatonist teachers there, deprived of a livelihood and probably attracted by the talk about "social justice" in Persia during the ascendancy of the Mazdakites, migrated thither in 531, perhaps with the illusions that made

Poor God was squeezed from above and below, for his Son, having become the Saviour of mankind and the god who must be contacted for favors, reduced him to a mere figurehead in many of the Zoroastrian denominations, including the Zervanists and others.¹³ Mithra's votaries early provided him with an indubitably immaculate conception, having him born from rock of a sacred mountain, and gave a distinctive explanation of his work as the Saviour. He slew the Cosmic Bull, and if I understand the ambiguous references aright, it was from this bull that he obtained the "eternal blood" that was shed for the Salvation of mankind. The blood may originally have been thought to be the hallucinatory drug *haoma* but the common tradition reported that Mithra and his companions drank wine at the Last Supper, when they celebrated the completion of his work of Salvation; and when his votaries assembled for the love-feasts at which they celebrated that Last Supper, wine was the soteric blood. Mithra either was the sun or the hero who delivered the sun from darkness or the hero who conquered the sun and made it attend to its business. The theologians disagreed about that rather important article of Faith, as may most readily be seen from the very large number of votive inscriptions in Latin, many of which are to "Mithra, the Invincible Sun," while as many others regard Mithra as the companion of that Sun."¹⁴ The latter conception is in agreement with the usual form of the myth that Helios was the coadjutor of Mithra in the struggle to save mankind from the powers of darkness and that he even saved Mithra by carrying him safely over the demon-infested ocean; after their victory the two celestial companions and their assistants shared the sacred repast we have mentioned, and faithful Mithraists imitated it in their holy suppers, which were a pledge of their comradeship and reciprocal affection in their common struggle against the evils of the world. The third interpretation comes from a supplemental myth to the effect that soon after he was born, Mithra was attacked by the jealous god of the sun, but overthrew him in a wrestling match,

unintelligent "intellectuals" flock to Russia after 1918. Chosroës welcomed them, but they were naturally disappointed by the discovery that Persia was not an Earthly Paradise and probably by the discovery that the hangmen had just corrected the Mazdakites' theological errors. When Justinian in 533 negotiated with Chosroës a treaty for "eternal peace" (it did last almost seven years, which is about par for such treaties), Chosroës insisted on a clause which provided that the seven Neoplatonists were to be permitted to return home and live thereafter without molestation from the pious. One of the seven was Simplicius, who later wrote the well-known commentaries on Aristotle and Epictetus that have preserved for us important fragments of Greek philosophers whose works were subsequently lost. We are therefore indebted to the Zoroastrian "tyrant" for both information and an example of concern for humane scholarship.

¹³ An inscription, unfortunately mutilated, in the Mithræum beneath the church of Santa Prisca on the Aventine in Rome, is a prayer to Mithra containing the praise, "*nos servasti eternali sanguine fuso.*" Professor Schwertheim, in the issue of *Antike Welt* that I cite below, quotes a late and odd Mithraic text in which Mithra says: "He who does not eat of my body and drink of my blood, so that he partakes of me as I am [thereby] commingled with him, will never attain Salvation." I think this must be an heretical idea in Zoroastrianism, for there is, so far as I know, no other evidence that the votaries of Mithra thought of their holy suppers as theophagous, with the cannibalistic implications of the Christian imitation of them. Their Last Suppers commemorated, and hence doubtless imitated, the sacred meal at which Mithra and his assistants, celebrating their victory over the powers of evil, partook of bread and wine, the bread being made from the wheat that sprang from the spine of the slain Bull, and the wine from the grapes that sprang from the Bull's blood. The Mithraic concept of Redemption by blood appears in the taurobolia so frequently celebrated by the religious in the waning Roman Empire: they were cleansed of their sins by the blood of a bull that was slain in obvious imitation of Mithra's slaying of the Cosmic Bull.

¹⁴ The dedications usually give the name of the god in the dative, so we have "Soli Invicto Mithræ" as opposed to "Soli Invicto et Mithræ." I cannot say offhand which form is the more common. In sculpture representing the great Tauroctony, the side panels, if they include Helios, sometimes show him clasping the hand of Mithra in friendship and sometimes as kneeling humbly before his new master.

forced him to do homage, and compelled him to traverse the heavens and shed light on the world regularly. Mithra crowned his defeated rival with the radiance that the sun has had about his head ever since and gave him the right hand of friendship, thus forming an alliance that both have ever since loyally observed. This myth, obviously, was devised to prove that Mithra had subdued and annexed the Babylonian sun god, Shamesh, who is known as Shemesh to readers of the "Old Testament" in the common English version.¹⁵

We cannot enter into the intricacies of the Mithraic theology, but may note a curious detail which may show some propensity to trinitarian thinking. In most of the sculptural representations of him, Mithra is accompanied by two figures whose names, of uncertain derivation and meaning, are *Cautes* and *Cautoptes*, and who are commonly called the *dadophori* because they are carrying torches; one has the torch elevated, while the other holds it reversed. They look like replicas of Mithra and doubtless represent aspects of him (rising and setting sun?) that were explained to the Faithful in the prolonged instruction they were given before they were initiated into each of the several degrees of the cult, for it had become a "mystery religion," in imitation of the Eleusinian and other early Greek mysteries.

As is well known, since Mithra was born in a cave, the *Mithræa*, the "churches" of the cult, had to be located underground, and if no natural cave was conveniently available, an area of ground was excavated and roofed over, a fact which accounts for the partial preservation of so many of the *spelæa*, since the Christians, when they took over, were content to desecrate a shrine and then built one of their churches on top of it to make sure that the Devil's magic would remain permanently buried and inaccessible. A normal *Mithræum* would accommodate only thirty or thirty-five worshippers at one time,¹⁶ and there can be no doubt but that the size of a congregation was deliberately limited to ensure that its members were truly united as comrades, feeling the close fellowship and reciprocal trust and affection that were so large a part of the cult. One may think of an analogy to the "lodges" of the Masons and perhaps other basically religious "fraternal" societies of the present day.

¹⁵ The name of the god is *Samsu* in theophoric names from the time of Hammurabi (including that of his son and successor), and *Šamšu* on the tablets from Mari, and the latter form is the more common generally. The pronunciation of the Hebrew equivalent in the second and first centuries B.C. is shown by the spelling in the Septuagint, *samúj*, but the Greek alphabet at that time had no means of distinguishing between *s* and *š*. The Babylonian god was undoubtedly the hero of the legend about a praternaturally strong man, who is called Sampson in the Jews' adaptation of the myth. The strong man's name admittedly means 'of the sun, solar' in Hebrew, as it doubtless did in the Babylonian original, i.e., 'son of the sun.' In the Hebrew myth, he was born and buried near the temple of the Babylonian god (Beth-Samus), and the Jewish tale of his miraculous birth with celestial annunciations and influence, as in the later tale about Jesus, is probably an expanded amplification of the Babylonian account of the birth of a hero who, like Enkidu, fell a victim to the wiles of a prostitute. Students of religion may speculate endlessly and dispute about whether or not the Mithraic tale about the Cosmic Bull was ultimately derived from the Babylonian tale of the heavenly bull that was slain by Gilgamesh and Enkidu as an offering to Shamash or was a natively Aryan idea suggested by the well-known Aryan regard for cattle, which has now left a conspicuous trace in Hindu superstition.

¹⁶ A *Mithræum* into which a hundred votaries might have crowded has been found in Rome, but, so far as I know, it is exceptional. Many *Mithræa* could have accommodated only twenty or so celebrants without intolerable crowding. Whether a given *Mithræum* was used by more than one congregation of Brethren is an open question.

The Mithraic worship was exclusively for men. Their wives went to the temple of the Magna Mater (a development of Cybele), which was usually located just across the street for their convenience and, being entirely above ground, was usually effaced completely by the fury of the Christians when they were at last able to take over. There was necessarily a close alliance between the cults of Mithra and the Magna Mater, of which the details escape us, and there was to some extent an interpenetration of the two theologies. As numerous inscriptions attest, women could indulge in a *taurobolium* and have their sins washed away by the magical blood of the bull who was slain in memory of the Cosmic Bull and whose blood was doubtless believed to be charged with religious efficacy by a kind of simple transubstantiation. They were also acquainted with the use of holy water for ritual purification, and one or two scholars have guessed that the Magna Mater might have been thought of as corresponding to the Anahita of the divine trinity recognized by Artaxerxes in the springtime of the religion.

The reader will have observed an impressive religious evolution. We begin with a religion in which Ahura Mazda, represented only in aniconic form by the sacred fire, is the only god to be worshipped, and there is no hint of a suggestion that he might have a son.¹⁷ In the Mithraic cult, the Son has, for all practical purposes ousted the Father, who survives only as a link between Zervan and Mithra, so that it would have been easy to dispense with poor old Ahura Mazda without a significant change in the cult or even its theology, and the sacred fire has been replaced by sculpture, some of it of fair quality, and such rites as Last Suppers.

The reader will also have observed that in the course of our discussion of Mithraism we moved from Persia to the Roman world. That was because it is only in the latter that we have any secure information about it.¹⁸ It almost certainly arose in or near the old Persian territory, and it could most easily be explained as a heresy of a heresy. It retained the theology of the Zervanists, and so must be an offshoot of that cult, showing an even greater devotion to the Son of God and perhaps adopting a new religious organization, limiting membership to male proselytes who were willing to form groups comparable to the lodges of modern religious clubs, such as the Masons, and to proceed through several degrees of initiation, learning and memorizing fresh "secrets" at each stage, to full membership.¹⁹

¹⁷ I dealt with this point in Appendix I.

¹⁸ An admirably concise and handsomely illustrated account of Mithraism in the Roman Empire by Dr. Elmar Schwertheim forms the 1979 Sondernummer of the well-known journal of general archaeology, *Antike Welt*. Good photographs show many of the best-preserved Mithraic sculptures and, what is not common, portraits of two Magi, in which historians of art may see an anticipation of the style of Byzantine religious paintings. Also shown is a trick arrow, one of the devices used to make simpletons gawk in pious awe; it is, of course, an anticipation of the device now commonly used on the stage and in the cinema when it is desired to show a man slain by an arrow or sword through his body. For the English reader, there is a compendious account in the translation of Franz Cumont's *The Mysteries of Mithra*, which is available in a Dover reprint. A series of scholarly volumes devoted to Mithraism is in course of publication at Leiden as part of the collection of "Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romaine." The inscriptions are collected in the *Corpus inscriptionum et monumentorum religionis Mithriacæ*, edited by M. J. Vermaseren. For a basic bibliography of other works, see the notes to Dr. Schwertheim's long article.

¹⁹ Masonic rituals and the bizarre myths about Yahweh, Solomon, Hiram, and a trio of malefactors, Jebulo, Jebula, and Jebulum, may be found in the Reverend Mr. Walton Hannah's *Christian by Degrees* (London, 1964) and *Darkness Visible* (London, 1966). The myths are said to be understood symbolically, rather than literally, by the adepts, but Christians are exercised over the question whether the symbols are compatible with their religion.

After the gradual revival of Zoroastrianism under the Parthians, the Zervanists, as we have already said, flourished in the old Persian territories as one of the Zoroastrian sects until Chosroës ruled them heretical. We have, so far as I know, no information about the Mithraic sect that we have described in the same territory, and that suggests that it was either a relatively minor sect or underwent considerable modifications for export. Given the limitation of our sources, however, that is not necessarily true. I have often thought that the Mithraic cult, in the form in which we know it, would have particularly appealed to the Parthian aristocracy, whose special devotion to Mithras is attested by their use of such common names as Mithridates. They were officially Zoroastrians and maintained Magi at their courts to keep the sacred fires alight and provide holiness when needed, but they were so negligent in their observation of the Zoroastrian proprieties that the Zoroastrians of the Sassanid period regarded them as little better than infidels. They, like the Mithraists of whom we know, had so little godliness that they never felt a yen to persecute and kill *ad maiorem gloriam Dei*. So marked was this lack of zeal among the Parthian aristocracy that Professor Tarn remarks that "one gathers the impression that they thought all religions useful, none material; what mattered to a man was his horse, his bow, and his own right arm." But perhaps that goes too far. Would not their chivalry have found a religious satisfaction in a kind of mystery cult that formed them into small congregations of comrades, bound together by a kind of military sacrament, for the worship of the heroic Son of God, who had subjugated even the sun, and who was ever ready to fight evil? The speculation appeals to me, but I know of no evidence to confirm or even bolster it.²⁰

We first hear of the Mithraic cult in Cilicia early in the first century B.C. So manly a religion had an obvious attraction for military men, and it is believed no doubt correctly, that it was spread throughout the Roman world by Roman soldiers, to whom it offered a double chance of immortality: a man's soul, which had come down from Heaven to be imprisoned in the flesh, could, if he had sufficiently kept it pure from falsehood and evil in this life, ascend directly to heaven, perhaps a sequence of seven heavens, when he died; otherwise, as in Christian doctrine, his soul would sleep until the final Resurrection, when it would rejoin his reconstituted body for the Last Judgement, after which, if found worthy, he could dwell in God's Paradise, or if found stained with ineradicable evil, he would be annihilated, since the cult did not have the sadistic urge that made Christians hope to see unbelievers and sinners tortured with the utmost of fiendish ingenuity forever and forever.

To Zoroastrians who preserved any knowledge of the religion that had been proclaimed by Zoroaster, Mithraism must have seemed a shockingly wicked perversion, even more ungodly than the Zervanism from which it had sprung. If there were Mithraists in Persian territory in the time of Chosroës, they undoubtedly vanished with the Zervanists. The great king undertook to restore and enforce an orthodoxy based on what had survived, or was assumed to have survived, of the old Zoroastrian scriptures. To Zoroaster, *mithra* seems to have been only a noun meaning 'compact, agreement,' but Mithra as a spirit of some sort was mentioned in the *Avesta* and he

²⁰ To my mind, a Parthian origin is suggested by the fact that the proselyte could advance through seven degrees of which the fifth was "Persian." (The sixth was "Messenger of the Sun," i.e., Mithra, and the seventh was "Father," i.e. a consecrated priest.) This corresponds to the respect that the Parthians had for the Persians over whom they ruled.

was too firmly established to be expunged, but the orthodox Magi quickly cut him down to size. The Father returned in glory to his old supremacy.

It is a nice irony that Christianity, which was a remodeled Zoroastrianism, also borrowed many of its trappings and decorations from a Zoroastrian heresy with which it had to compete in its formative years.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CHRIST MYTH

by Revido P. Oliver

Professor of the Classics, Retired; University of Illinois, Urbana

Introduction

Christianity is a fusion of two myths. The Jesus myth requires no explication. It is clear that the stories collected in the "New Testament" are versions of a folk-tale formed, like the legend of Robin Hood, by the accretion around a central figure of episodes in the careers of a number of minor figures. The Jesus of that legend was a composite formed from tales about Jesus ben Ananias,¹ Jesus ben Pandera,² the agitator, whose name may have been Jesus, who led a party of his followers into Jerusalem during the celebration of the Passover and was well received by the populace, but soon suppressed, and Judas the Gaulanite.³ And it is possible, of course, that there was an otherwise forgotten Jesus who also tried to start a Jewish revolt against civilized rule and paid the penalty. The composite Jesus was, of course, a would-be Christ and interested only in his own barbarous people. The stories in the "New Testament" have been embellished by Christians, and that is what is remarkable.

The Christ myth is puzzling, an historical problem that is still unsolved. Indeed, if considered *a priori* as an historical phenomenon, it is astounding. The Jesus of the composite legend was a would-be Christ, who anticipates the basic doctrine of the Talmud, that Jews are a unique form of life, vastly superior to all other peoples, who, at best, if totally submissive to God's People, may aspire to the status of dogs. He boasts that he brings not peace, but a sword, so he probably wanted to rouse the Jews scattered throughout the world as well as those in Palestine to start slaughtering the civilized peoples, as did his successors in the great Jewish Conspiracy of 117. Yet this implacable enemy of the Aryans was transformed by the Christ myth into a god that Aryans worshipped!

The Jews, naturally and, from their standpoint, reasonably, hate all Aryans, but they feel a specially intense hatred for Aryans who are so intelligent and manly that they resent being herded and fleeced by their Jewish shepherds and refuse to believe in the enormous racial superiority that entitles Jews to own the entire planet. When the Germans tried to have a country of their own, international Jewry sent against Germany their stupid British hounds and eventually their rabid American mastiffs, who obediently and foully murdered the German leaders to prove to the world that resistance to God's People is an unforgivable sin that is punished by torture and death. That we all know.

Now, if, in the coming century, say by the year 2100, the Jews begin to venerate Hermann Goering or Alfred Rosenberg or Julius Streicher as their divinely inspired Savior and worship him as a Son of God and an incarnation of their Yahweh, that would be astounding, wouldn't it? Yes,

¹ The obvious source of at least the "prophecy" about the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. We cannot be certain about the doctrine for which the Sanhedrin tried to persuade the Roman governor to consent to his crucifixion, but after the governor released him, he became a prophet of disaster until he was appropriately killed by a Roman missile during the siege of Jerusalem in 59-60.

² The probable source of at least part of the story about a crucifixion and resurrection. The tradition about him, which was known to Celsus before the year 180, probably had an historical basis in the career of a Jewish *goes* who won, and then lost, the favor of Queen Alexandra Helene (Salome), the widow of Alexander Jannæus, c. 70 B.C.

³ See Josephus *Antiquitates*, XVII, 4; XX, 102.

but not more incredible than the transformation of a Jewish christ into a Savior of Aryans and a god.

It is to solve this historical paradox that Nicholas Carter has written his new book, *The Christ Myth*.⁴ Mr. Carter will be remembered for his excellent book, *The Late Great Book, the Bible*⁵ in which he reached and enforced the conclusion that "the establishment of Christianity in the West represents one of the greatest tragedies that has ever befallen the human race."

He persuasively finds the key to the paradoxical enigma in the effect of Greek civilization on the barbarous Jews. It will be necessary, therefore, to begin with the sixth century B.C. As we all know, Cyrus the Great, the founder of the Persian Empire, showed great favor to the Jews, probably to recompense their work in subverting the Babylonian Empire and betraying the city of Babylon into his hands. The Jews so needed his protection that they flattered him by calling him their christ,⁶ i.e., a being divinely sent and inspired by Yah to save his people. Soon after 538 B.C., Cyrus rewarded them (as the British were to do much later) by giving them permission to take over for themselves a part of Palestine. Soon after they were established in Jerusalem, a contingent of wealthy Jews from Babylon undertook a drastic reformation of their tribal religion. They eliminated their goddess and three other gods, and recognized Yah (or Ya'u), a god they had taken over from the Canaanites, as the patron god of their race.⁷

⁴ Available from Historical Review Press, PO Box 62, Uckfield, Sussex, TN22 1ZY, UK. Please send SAE for details of price/availability of this and other titles.

⁵ Available from Historical Review Press, as above.

⁶ A crucial text is quoted in *Liberty Bell*, September 1993, p. 6, n. 9.

⁷ Conclusive evidence about the earlier form of the Jews' religion is provided by documents from the Jewish colony at Elephantine, an island in the Nile below the First Cataract, now submerged by the Aswan Dam. The Jews of that colony believed themselves perfectly orthodox in worshiping their five gods, including Yah's consort, 'Anath. The documents were edited and translated by A. E. Cowley of Magdalen College (Oxford) in his fundamental book, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923). For a learned but frantic and at times ludicrous attempt to explain away the evidence, see Bezalel Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (University of California Press, 1968).

Hellenism

The special protection of the Jews by Cyrus was continued by his successors until the Persian Empire was conquered by Alexander the Great. That was a truly epochal event. The entire Near and Middle East was transformed. The vast and incontestable superiority of the world's first rational civilization, made evident to all by its invincible military power, was apparent to all the diverse populations of those lands. The Greeks built cities that were the focus of a truly great and rational culture. Everyone above the peasantry sedulously imitated Greek customs, including athletic contests and games. The conquered populations hastened to learn as much Greek as they could, and Aramaic, the Semitic language that had been the *lingua franca* of the Orient and used even by the Persians as the language of administration, became a vulgar and despised dialect, used only by the lowest and most ignorant classes.⁸

Even the Jews, whose language was Aramaic (Hebrew was known only to the more learned members of the priesthood), were affected by their forced exposure to civilization. Jews who had any capacity for assimilating or simulating culture learned Greek, and usually changed their Canaanite names for distinctively Greek names by a kind of fixed conversion; e.g., a man named Jesus called himself Jason, by allusion to the famous Argonaut, and Matthew became Menelaus, in honor of the celebrated husband of Helen. The names of cities were likewise changed; e.g., Amorah became Ariopolis, and Akko became Ptolemais. Even in the Temple at Jerusalem the signs regulating admission to the sanctuary were written in Greek. This process of real or simulated conversion to civilization was facilitated by the fact that the Jews continued to enjoy under Alexander and the Diadochi who succeeded him the privileges they had been given by the Persians. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* (12 vols. quarto; New York, Funk & Wagnails, 1901-1906) admits (s.v. 'Hellenism') that "Alexander ... and the first Ptolemies and Seleucids ... treated their Jewish subjects with much benevolence."⁹

What Christians call the "Old Testament" (including books and parts of books that are omitted in most Bibles), originally written in Hebrew and Aramaic,¹⁰ had to be translated into Greek for

⁸ The disastrous consequences of Alexander's victory soon became apparent. Alexander encouraged his men to marry women of the Persian aristocracy, who were Aryans and, so to speak, racial cousins of the Greeks, and who spoke a language (Old Persian, which must be distinguished from Avestan, the dialect of the Zoroastrian Scriptures) that was cognate with Greek and had basically the same syntax. But the Greeks who settled in the new Greek cities in Asia brought comparatively few women with them and married more or less indiscriminately wives who were often Semites or from some of the many racial conglomerates. The result was many children of Greek fathers who were only partly Greek and, in themselves and their increasingly hybrid descendants, reflected the contamination in their thinking. Intelligent White natives, furthermore, had their children well educated in Greek, producing generations of pseudo-Greeks. One result of this racial agglomeration was Stoicism, on which see the Appendix below.

⁹ The encyclopædia naturally does not inquire how the Jews alienated such benevolent patrons, as they have alienated every civilized nation on which they fastened themselves.

¹⁰ As everyone knows, the Book of Daniel was written in Aramaic but only partly translated into Hebrew. It is likely that other texts, now in Hebrew, were first composed in the Aramaic with which the writer was much more familiar and then translated, much as you might write a letter or essay in English and then translate it into the Latin you

the benefit of Jews who could not read Aramaic, which had once been their native tongue.¹¹ The result was the Septuagint, which takes its name from a typical Jewish forgery, the letter concocted in the name of Aristeeas (supposedly a Greek who could not write really correct Greek), which certifies that the Septuagint was directly inspired or rather dictated by Yah himself (his name may have been by that time Judaized by changing it to Yahweh).¹²

Educated Jews, wishing to make their tribe respectable in the eyes of civilized men, followed their racial proclivity and invented sons of Abraham who had been companions of Hercules, and descendants of Isaac who had sailed with the Argonauts. Later, growing bolder, they identified Moses with Musæus, the mythical son of Orpheus (or of Linus, the mythical inventor of sustaltic music), who lived long before Homer, wrote didactic verse and hymns, and, being a divinely gifted seer, like Tiresias, left a collection of oracular utterances.

To a modern reader, this will seem to be mere trifling, but when Jews identified their Yahweh with Zeus, the consequences changed history. Somewhere along the line, Zeus was identified with the Zeus of Cleanthes' hymn, i.e., God in the Christian misuse of that word; he was the god of Stoic monotheism, also called Providence and the Mind of the Universe (*animus mundi*). That converted Yahweh from a tribal deity, who fought for his race and overcame the gods of other nations, into the unique and supreme god of the universe. That was an arrogant claim that altered Jewish consciousness, and was maintained even by the Jews who most resented civilization and returned to their primitive barbarism.

With even greater effrontery, educated Jews began to claim that one or another aspect of civilization was of Jewish origin. They had learned the method of allegorical interpretation from the Stoics,¹³ and by outrageously twisting the texts of their sacred books (in Greek translation), they proved their point with the facility of a shyster lawyer. This impudent hoaxing reached its fullest development with a Jewish "philosopher," Aristobulus,¹⁴ who, c. 150 B.C., brazenly

learned in high school. The later books were written in sloppy Greek and, it seems, never translated into Hebrew to give them an air of sanctity.

¹¹ In Palestine the Jews first adopted Canaanite (commonly called Old Phoenician, a dialect of Western Semitic), which is what we call Hebrew, although the Jews never did (they called it correctly "the language of Canaan.") When Aramaic became the common language of the Near East, the Jews adopted it and Hebrew became a holy language known only to holy men.

¹² According to the silly story, seventy-two learned rabbis were immured, each in a cabin of his own, so that they could independently translate the farrago of the "Old Testament." Yahweh saw to it that the seventy-two independent translations were identical, even to the smallest jot or tittle. Unfortunately, Yahweh must have studied Greek under a hopelessly incompetent teacher, for no one who has a real comprehension of the Greek language can read the Septuagint without a sensation of nausea.

¹³ The Stoics derived it from the concept of *ὑπόνοια* (perhaps best translated as 'underlying meaning') with which we are familiar in the writings of Plato. It may be traced back to Pherecydes of Samos (c. 544 B.C.), who wrote in Greek but may not have been a Greek by race and could have been a Semite. He is sometimes credited with having introduced to the Greek world the Hindu notion of metempsychosis and thus of an immortal soul, but that idea is present in the Orphic religion, which is probably older and attains a beautifully poetic expression in the odes of Pindar. On Stoicism, see the Appendix at the end of this article.

¹⁴ Not to be confused with the Hasmonæan (Maccabæan) Aristobulus, eldest son of John Hyrcanus, who became King of the Jews (in 103 B.C.) by imprisoning and murdering his mother, or with the matricide's nephew, the second Aristobulus, who revolted against his mother, became King in 67B.C., and tried to suppress his elder brother, who

claimed that the philosophy of Aristotle and, indeed, the whole of Greek culture was derived from the "Old Testament"! He naturally forged some Greek verse, purportedly from early Greek poets, to prove some of his points.

A far more moderate and intelligent practitioner of the allegorical method was Philo Judæus (c. 20 B.C.- c. A.D. 50), on whom Mr. Carter concentrates his attention. Although his enemies may have exaggerated when they claimed that he did not know a word of Aramaic (to say nothing of Hebrew), it is true that all his knowledge of the Jews' holy books came from the Septuagint. He was a learned man, and, if I am not mistaken, acquired a command of Greek that no other Jewish author ever attained.¹⁵

We especially remember Philo for his candid admission that the tale in the "Old Testament" about an armed conquest of Palestine led by Jesus (alias Joshua) is preposterous, and that what must have happened is that the Canaanites, their minds muddled by old Yahweh, admitted the Jews to their country as eminently pious refugees and permitted the immigrants to organize their synagogues and flourish until they were ready to take over the country of their enemies – for the Jews considered the foolish Canaanites as their enemies and entered Canaan intending to kill or enslave their stupid hosts as soon as they had sufficiently penetrated the fools' country. American boobs will soon learn that the barbarians never change their tactics or their nature.

We should also remember Philo for his formulation of the 'One World' hokum that is now so widely used as sucker-bait for dim-witted Aryans. He affirmed that the Divine Plan (λόγος ὁ Θεῖος) arranges the rise and fall of nations "to the end that the whole of our world should be as a single state, enjoying that best of constitutions, democracy."¹⁶

Philo was a well-educated and learned man, admirably well versed in Greek literature and philosophy, and Mr. Carter rightly takes him as a model of 'Hellenized' Jews, all of whom he

was high priest, thus starting the civil war that finally forced the Romans to intervene and restore order in Judæa. A number of other Jews also took the common Greek name.

¹⁵ There is a good edition of the Greek texts by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, accompanied by a reliable translation (I have checked it in many places; the only error I noticed is a systematic one. One of the translators was a prominent clergyman, so wherever Philo wrote 'Jesus' (Ἰησοῦς), the name is dishonestly changed to 'Joshua,' to prevent Christian sheep from wondering about their "Old Testament.") Text and translation were published in ten volumes (1929-1962) with two supplemental volumes (1953) of writings for which Philo's text is lost, but which are preserved in an Armenian translation that was translated into English by Ralph Marcus. The fourteen volumes form part of the Loeb Classical Library, which is now distributed in this country by the Harvard University Press. I need scarcely add that Philo's various works are always cited by the first words of Latin translations of their titles.

¹⁶ *Quod Deus*, 176. ἵνα ὡς μία πόλις ἡ οικουμένη πάσα τῆς ἀρίστην πολιτειῶν ἀγὴ δημοκρατία. I quote the translation in the edition cited above, but reject Colson's suggestion on that Philo may have meant that democratic equality was attained by the successive rise and fall of nations by which each had its turn at hegemony. Philo is continually preoccupied with the future that God is preparing, and, as I suggested in a review published in 1949, the somewhat confused construction of the preceding phrases about the fall of nations probably shows Philo's sedulous avoidance of any possible offense to Roman sensibilities. (It would have scarcely been tactful to speak of a coming fall of the Roman Empire!) I am convinced, therefore, that he meant that the Divine Purpose was to be realised in some future Utopian era in which, after the fall of empires, all nations will dwell together in some kind of spontaneous concord under the supervision of old Yahweh, alias the *animus mundi*. I cannot take time to discuss the special meaning that Philo gives to δημοκρατία.

lumps together as the *Letzim*. But we must remember that he remained a Jew. You cannot read very far in Philo's rather copious writings¹⁷ without becoming aware of an alien mentality. He had, as I have said, a good command of the noble language, but when he writes ἀλήθεια, the corresponding adjective, ἀληθής, - ές, and their derivatives, he does not mean what the words mean in respectable Greek. To the rational Greek (Aryan) mind, truth is something that can and must be objectively determined: it denotes veracity as opposed to lying, facts as opposed to fancies, reality as opposed to illusory appearances. Truth is factual and must be determined by observation and reason. For Philo, however, 'truth' is what he thinks Yahweh said in the Scriptures he wrote and what he therefore wants. 'Truth' for Philo is not what is, but what ought to be. It is the Jewish religion, as he understands it, after revising it with his allegorical interpretations.¹⁸ It is Faith and therefore irrational. There can be no greater antithesis than between the Greeks' rational and objective truth and the "truth of unreason," as Bertrand Russell aptly termed faith in religions, fictions about supernatural beings that soothe and comfort weaklings who are afraid to contemplate the grim world of reality.

Philo was really uninterested in truth as the Greeks and all rational men conceive it. Since Philo constantly tries to equate his religion to Stoicism,¹⁹ you should particularly notice that no Stoic would ever have countenanced his faith in the "truth of unreason." (See the Appendix on Stoicism).

Philo and all of the *Letzim* we have mentioned thus far differ radically from other *Letzim*, whom we must now consider.

HEROIC FAILURE

It is the great virtue of Mr. Carter's book that he forces us to consider critically a Jewish and Christian generalization about the history of Judæa in the second century B.C. He makes us aware that it is highly probable that, besides the *Letzim* mentioned above, who tried to salvage Judaism by forgery, hoaxes, and sciolistic distortions of evidence, there were educated and enlightened Jews who faced the problem candidly and saw that the only solution was to abandon Jewish claims to immeasurable racial superiority, to jettison the barbaric cult, and to adopt civilization wholeheartedly.

The detailed history of this period is a Gordian knot, depending principally on Josephus (*Antiquitates*) and the second book of Maccabees (which is found in some Christian Bibles); both were bitter enemies of the Hellenizing faction, but contradict each other and are also at

¹⁷ If you are interested in his peculiar mentality, observe Philo at work on the opening chapters of Genesis in his *De opificio mundi* and *Legum allegoriæ*.

¹⁸ An admirably clear and comprehensive analysis of Philo's misuse of the Greek words, by Dr. Thomas E. Knight, appeared in the *American Journal of Philology*, CXIV (1993), 581-609.

¹⁹ Philo even adapted to his religion the famous Stoic paradox that the vast majority of men are slaves, since they are enslaved by their desire for such trumpery things as pleasure, wealth, or glory, and that only a wise man (i.e., Stoic sage) is free, because, even if he is in chains and being tortured, he retains command of his own mind and his moral integrity. Philo substitutes righteousness for Stoic wisdom; see his *Quod omnis probus liber sit*.

variance with the few indications to be derived from trustworthy historical sources.²⁰ What is clear, however, is that, as a result of some one of the continual upheavals in Judæa, a Jew named Jesus, who had adopted a civilized name, Jason, became the high priest in Jerusalem, probably in 173 B.C. although possibly several years earlier. He represented *Letzim* who wanted to introduce Greek culture into Jerusalem, and he evidently cleared an area in the city and founded what seems to have been a kind of Greek-style gymnasium, serving both for athletics (which orthodox Jews abominated) and as a kind of open club in which educated men could meet for intelligent and often philosophical discussion (which the orthodox also abominated).

In 171 and for reasons which are not quite clear but may be related to family feuds, Jesus-Jason was succeeded by a man who may have been a relative and who changed his name to Menelaus.²¹ He is the focus of Mr. Carter's cogent revision of the Jewish and Christian story which had never been effectually challenged.

According to that story, Menelaus was a Jew so wicked that he became the instrument of the awful pagan king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who wanted to persecute God's sweet little lambs and suppress worship of the One True God (beastly old Yahweh). That is patently absurd. Although it is true that the Seleucids, descendants of one of Alexander's generals, were not only cultivated men themselves, but doubtless perceived the value of a dominant civilization in promoting some sort of unity among their multi-racial subjects, Antiochus, as a prudent ruler, was primarily interested in finding a way to end the perpetual turmoil in Judæa, where normal communications along the major trade routes were often made almost impossible because the sweet little lambs were perpetually rioting and killing one another, using religious pretexts to justify a perpetual succession of petty but destructive civil wars. And the attribution of wicked "pagan" purposes to Antiochus becomes absurd when the enemies of Menelaus charge that he was so corrupt that he *bought* the support of Antiochus with an enormous bribe. That sufficiently shows who took the initiative and vindicates Menelaus's sincerity.

Mr. Carter's work reminds us that we have no reason to doubt that Menelaus was a cultivated and highly intelligent Jew who saw that the only remedy for barbarism is civilization, and that the only way to civilize the Jews was to abolish their disgusting superstition. That attitude won him the sympathy of Antiochus and a measure of support that was soon greatly increased.

Antiochus was at war with Ptolemaic Egypt and invaded that country. In 168 a rumor reached Palestine that Antiochus had been defeated and killed. Menelaus was expelled by Jesus-Jason and his faction, who had been engaged in treasonable intrigues with the Egyptians, in preparation for an Egyptian occupation of Jerusalem. What had really happened, however, was that Antiochus had won what should have been a decisive victory, but had been prevented from

²⁰ I limit myself here to the bare essentials, wasting no time on problematic details. If you have nothing to do for the next few years, I suggest that you collect all available information about the history of the Seleucid Empire in the second century B.C. and then sit down to winnow the stories in Josephus and Maccabees in hope of extracting a fairly plausible resolution of all the conflicts in untrustworthy narratives - if you think that worth having.

²¹ Josephus says that he was Onias, the brother of Onias. Such duplication of personal names within a family seems unlikely and suggests confusion in either Josephus's mind or the extant text. The man's Jewish name may have been Matthew.

following it up by the intervention of an envoy from the Roman Senate, Popilius Lænas, who, in effect, made Egypt a Roman protectorate.²²

As soon as the truth was known, Jason fled and Menelaus was restored to his priestly dignity. We should note, however, that both Hellenizers had large popular followings.

The net effect of this was to make Antiochus, who had been humiliated by the Romans and prevented from ending the menace to his kingdom from Egypt, willing to use his army to support Menelaus, who, officially the high priest of the Jews, proceeded to abolish all the innumerable and vulgar regulations of "the Law," the superstition about the Sabbath, and, above all, the savage sexual mutilation by which the Jews differentiated themselves physically from civilized mankind. Menelaus was undoubtedly supported by a sizeable minority of educated Jews, many or most of whom engaged surgeons to uncircumcize them.

He is a man whom we should honor and whose failure we must regret.

It is hard to say in what proportion piety and political ambition dominated the wealthy Jewish clan who were descended from a man whose name, passing through Greek, was Hasmonæus (Asamonæus in some sources). A member of this clan murdered a priest who was about to perform a sacrifice in accordance with the new rule, and fled to the wilderness, where he organized gangs of bandits who flourished by raiding towns, slaying educated Jews, and grabbing their property. They won the support of the lower classes, already jealous of their betters, and, as you know, it is almost impossible to suppress such banditry without helicopters. Antiochus' governor, Lysias, underestimated the difficulty and made ineffectual attempts to suppress them, which the Jewish writers have naturally magnified into great victories for Yahweh's people. These Hasmonæans, now more commonly known as Maccabees from the epithet given them, derived from an Aramaic word meaning 'hammer, mace,' were for a considerable time merely outlaws and pests.

There can be no doubt but that Antiochus was now prepared to give Menelaus full support, and there is no doubt but that no amount of barbarous fanaticism could have prevailed against an army that was still organized with Macedonian tactics and discipline. The Jewish problem would have been solved forever if Antiochus had not been distracted by the need to protect his eastern borders against the Parthians, and not even then, if he had not died, evidently from poison or a contagious fever, at Gabæ, in or near what is now Afghanistan.

Lysias, Antiochus's governor of Syria, was evidently a mediocre man. When he failed to suppress the bandits, he had the foolish idea that he could end his troubles by forcing on Menelaus a compromise. The bandits were given amnesty; the Hasmonæans were admitted to

²² It would be vain to speculate to what extent the Senate had been covertly influenced by the large colony of Jews who had planted themselves in Rome, many of whom had become very wealthy. When Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispallus was the Prætor Peregrinus in 179, he tried to run all the offensive aliens out of town, but was, of course, powerless against Jews who had taken the precaution of buying themselves Roman citizenship by having a fellow Jew who was a slave dealer "sell" them to some venal and well-paid Roman, who then emancipated them, making them legally members of his own polluted family. The other Jews, we may be sure, crawled back into Rome as soon as Hispallus's term of office was ended.

the city; the traditional rites of Yahweh were largely restored with only an addition to content the Hellenizers; and, of course, the situation became more intolerable than ever, since the Hasmonæans used their new position for aggression on the civilized minority everywhere.

When Lysias finally saw the consequences of his folly, he took the requisite action. He mobilized his army, occupied Jerusalem and other cities, and restored order.²³ He would probably have solved the Jewish problem permanently, if the barbarian rabble had not again been saved by a perverse fate. Antiochus's heir was a boy of ten,²⁴ who had been left in the care of Lysias, but Antiochus, shortly before his death, discontented with Lysias's blundering, named one of his friends, Philip, the regent for the boy and governor of Syria. The news of Philip's advent reached Lysias in Jerusalem and, in a panic, he negotiated another shameful compromise with the Hasmonæans and their rabble, sacrificing even Menelaus to their hatred, and hastened home in a vain attempt to retain his governorship and take the regency for himself.

Thus ended one of the great tragedies of history with a catastrophe from which we still suffer today.²⁵

We need not linger over the intricate history of what followed. The Hasmonæans ruled Judæa, profited from the weakening of the Seleucid Empire to make their country independent, and occupied themselves with wars of aggression against their neighbors to increase the territory under their rule.²⁶ It is noteworthy that they soon assumed Greek names, from Hyrcanus and Aristobulus to the last of the line, Antiochus.²⁷

The surviving Hellenizers either escaped from Judæa or became Sadducees, who observed the Jews' "Law," at least outwardly, but intelligently refused to believe in immortal spooks or the other superstitions dear to the Pharisees, who eventually attained complete dominion over the Jews.

We have now sketched, as summarily as I could, the antecedents requisite for an understanding of our problem.

²³ The Jews never miss an opportunity for Holohoaxing, so they produced lurid accounts of the thousands and thousands of Yahweh's darlings who were martyrs to the True Faith and slain by the awful "pagans." See especially the later part of Book IV of Maccabees. Book III, incidentally, is a gospel about a wicked Egyptian king who wanted to oppress God's Own and mobilized his army for that purpose, but Yahweh sent a couple of angels who made the war elephants trample the soldiers to death. The author of the gospel does not explain why Yahweh never despatches a bevy of angels to protect his darlings in historical situations. For True Believers, that is still a problem; see Dr. Charles E. Weber's review of *Why Did The Heavens Not Darken?* in *Liberty Bell*, March 1989, pp. 36-41.

²⁴ The minority of Antiochus V also gave an opportunity to his uncle, Demetrius, to claim the throne with Roman support, thus initiating a series of civil wars that fatally weakened the Seleucid Empire and led to its downfall.

²⁵ The world had another chance during the short reign (138-129) of Antiochus VII (son of Demetrius), but the Jews' were saved, first, by the naïf young king's refusal to heed the advice of his wise councillors and his older wife (Cleopatra Thea, who, in her previous marriages, had acquired political experience), and then by a Parthian invasion of his diminished realm.

²⁶ Cf. *Christianity Today* (reprinted from *Liberty Bell*, November 1987), pp. 3-7.

²⁷ Incidentally, the author of Book II of Maccabees was another Jesus who had changed his name to Jason!

The New Age

We have also reached the beginning of the historical era established by a Scythian monk who had come to Rome, Dionysius Exiguus, c. A.D. 540. According to his calculations, the supposed birth of Jesus marked the beginning of the First Century²⁸ in the era now in common use.

Mr. Carter disposes of that century correctly: "There were no Christians, either Gentile or Jewish, living during the first century."²⁹

In fact, we have no secure traces of Christians before 135, the year in which the last Christ of any importance, Shimeon ben Kosiba, commonly called Bar-Kokhba, was suppressed.³⁰ His failure conclusively proved to intelligent Jews that while their god might help them treacherously attack unsuspecting *goyim* and torture them to death, old Yahweh always skedaddled when the Roman legions moved in. Whether it is more than a coincidence that, so far as we know, the promotion of Christianity began soon after 135, is anybody's guess.

Christianity presupposes the Christ Myth, which must, therefore, have been invented shortly after 135, if not before. What can have been the origin of that amazing myth? It cannot have been derived from any Jewish sect, least of all, from that of the Essenes.³¹ While it is likely that

²⁸ I think it best to capitalize such terms when they refer specifically to the era fixed by Dionysius, especially when "A. D." (*anno Domini* or, if you prefer, [*anno*] *apud* [= *secundum*] *Dionysium*) is omitted.

²⁹ There is no historically valid evidence for the existence of such beings during the First Century. The arsonists executed by Nero were, of course, Jewish Bolsheviks, followers of an agitator and, no doubt, would-be Christ, who bore the extremely common name of Chrestus; they tried to bum Rome to validate one of the prophecies in the Pseudo-Sibylline Oracles, which had been forged to demoralize the hated *goyim*. As for the famous letter of the younger Pliny, if it is not a forgery or grossly interpolated by Christians, as some scholars believe, it refers to a sect in Bithynia, c. 112, who were suspected of being members of a criminal organization but convinced Pliny they were innocent heliolaters. As such, they cannot have been Christians in the accepted sense of that word. As Mr. Carter remarks, there were many would-be Christs. - The text of Pliny's letter depends on copies made from a manuscript of uncertain date, discovered by a Dominican holy man, Lucundus of Verona, at the very end of the Fifteenth Century; it disappeared in 1508, so we cannot examine it now. The cardinal evidence for the authenticity of the letter is a statement by Tertullian in 197 that Pliny had written such a letter, which was proof that the wicked Romans had persecuted Christian lambs for their piety. Tertullian also glibly refers to an imaginary document which he said was in the Imperial archives at Rome (where, he knew, no one who could obtain access to the archives would have the patience to look for it). Tertullian also had an interesting conversation with a ghost who had come down from Heaven to give him valuable information. The ghost had been a woman so staunch in the True Faith that the vile "pagans" made a martyr of her in the arena, but as soon as her soul left her body, Jesus equipped it with male sexual organs, so that she, become he, would feel at ease in an all-male Heaven.

³⁰ For the real name of this Christ, recently ascertained from documents found near the Dead Sea, see Yigael Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba* (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971). He called him-self 'Son of the Star' to suggest his divine mission as the long-awaited Christ. He made his last stand in the little town of Bethar, where, as you will remember from the admirable book by Professor Butz (*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*), if not from other sources, occurred a really great "Holocaust." We are solemnly assured in the Talmud that the wicked Romans mercilessly slew in Bethar, a town which had an area about equal to that of five city blocks, a total of eight hundred million (800,000,000) of God's Masterpieces.

³¹ It is a curious fact that no one has found an Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent of the name of this sect (variously spelled in Greek, but the forms Ἑσσηνοί and Ἑσσαιῶν are best attested). The derivation of the word is unknown; for

at least one of the figures that contributed to the composite hero of the Jesus Myth was an Essene, who denounced the Pharisees, the Essenes, as Mr. Carter has shown, were fanatically and exclusively Jewish, and would no more have thought of saving the souls (if any) of *goyim* than they would have banqueted on roast pig.

The very foundation of the Christ Myth was borrowed from India. It created a Christ who was modeled on Krishna (*Krsna*) who was the eighth avatar of Vishnu (*Visnu*). This presupposes the Hindu doctrine that gods may become incarnate as mortals to act as Saviours of mankind – a notion that every religious Jew would have rejected with horror. The Hindu concept also includes metempsychosis, and pious Jews would have been made furious by a suggestion that men have souls that survive death by being reincarnated. As shown by the presence of Magi at the birth of the non-Jewish christ, there was also an influence of the Zoroastrian cult, which by that time had assimilated both astrology and the notion that a Saviour (*Saosyant*) would come to deliver the world from evil; and, as everyone knows, the shepherds who witnessed the Nativity of Jesus were copies of the shepherds who witnessed the earthly birth of the Zoroastrian Son of God, Mithra. A god who could be concerned with anyone but the Chosen was utterly repugnant to the Jewish mind and a christ who could interest himself in *goyim* was an abomination as well as an impossibility.

The Christ Myth was obviously invented to create a christ (necessarily Jewish) who could be made acceptable to non-Jews, and the Jesus Myth was crudely amended and refashioned for that purpose.

That brings us to another puzzle. Once devised, the Christ Myth spread with amazing rapidity. Thirty years after 135 we find little groups of Christians all over the landscape, and by the end of the Second Century they are divided into large sects, furiously damning one another to Hell, scribbling innumerable gospels and forged documents,³² and even able to exert some influence in the tolerant Roman Empire and to concoct lurid tales about the persecutions which they, like the Jews, liked to pretend they had suffered. That rapid spread of a strange superstition required intensive and expensive promotion.

Christian tradition speaks of a Jew named Saul (Σαουλ), who must have been in some way regarded as an innovator, since many of the Christian sects produced

a variety of guesses, including a rather startling new one, see the little book by Allen H. Jones, *Essenes: the Elect of Israel and the Priests of Artemis* (Lanham, Maryland; University Press, 1985). The absence of an Aramaic equivalent is not really remarkable, however, since the Jews did not begin to revive use of that language until the last quarter of the First Century, when the ruling rabbis even tried to forbid Jews to learn Greek which was like trying to order Jews in this country not to learn English! Some Jews did learn the sacred languages, much as some Jews in Israel today use a simplification of Hebrew called 'Modern Hebrew,' but around 200, when the Christians began to use some readings in the Septuagint as confirmation of their doctrines, the ruling Jews had to provide two translations of their revised scriptures into a kind of pidgin Greek for the benefit of the many Jews who refused to learn the Semitic languages.

³² I have always wondered why the salvation-mongers who put together the "New Testament" in the Fifth Century overlooked such gems as Agbar's letter to Jesus and the latter's reply (proving that he was literate) and Paul's rather extensive correspondence with Seneca.

letters attributed to him to attest their orthodoxy. And a book included in the "New Testament," Acts (*Acta Apostolorum*), contains stories about itinerant evangelists which, though displaced chronologically, may correspond roughly to part of the promotion. But that promotion obviously required organization – and money. We are asked to suppose that hordes of proletarians and a few eccentrics flocked to the "glad tidings" because they were so charming. That is fiction. Millions of dollars have been spent to promote L. Ron Hubbard's invention, Scientology, but despite all the facilities for almost worldwide propaganda provided by the press, radio, and rapid travel, the cult still has only a small and scattered band of converts.

Yet it is not more alien to the general tenor of American society or more dissident from the beliefs of all the current religious sects than the cult of a Jewish Christ was alien to the tenor of society in every part of the Roman Empire or more strongly opposed to the religion and superstition of every region in it. Even the Christian evangelists, who can use the boob-tubes to rake in hundreds of millions of dollars from superstitious suckers, have to be lavishly financed before they can begin operations."³³

The promotion of Christianity must have required, as I have said, a fairly large organization and ample resources. But *cui bono?* Who stood to profit in one way or another from that effort to impose an alien superstition on the population of the Roman Empire?

Mr. Carter has the first plausible answer that I have seen: the *Letzim*, that is, the Jews living in their colonies outside Judæa and in Hellenistic cities. This is certainly an adequate and attractive explanation. We must, I think, accept it.

When, however, we try to determine the purposes of those *Letzim*, we must choose between two almost antithetical theories.

³³ A journalist with whom I was acquainted years ago claimed to have proof that the famous hokum-peddler, Billy Graham, was financed by the Mafia as a good investment (i.e., for a percentage of the take).

One Hypothesis

Relations between Jews and *goyim* outside Judæa have always been strained and precarious, except when one has attained such complete dominance as to force the other into hypocritical submission. The Jews, in their scattered colonies throughout the civilized world, needed to ensure themselves against resentment, and this need became urgent after the decisive failure to take over the world by force with the putative assistance of a Yahweh who always ran when there was danger.

In the simplest terms, making Judaism respectable in the eyes of their “pagan” neighbors was no longer a matter of inventing sons of Abraham who had been companions of Hercules or of forging letters from a Lacedæmonian king to prove that the Spartans were really a “lost tribe” of Jews. What could be more effective than a Christ sent by Yahweh to save the souls of Gentiles?

And if the stupid *goyim* could be made to believe that a Jewish god was the *animus mundi* of the Stoic monotheism, and that he had sent his Jewish Son into the world to bring Salvation to the lesser breeds “outside the Law,” this notion could be made the basis of a theology that would sap the virility and rationality of the more intelligent *goyim* and destroy their ability to detect and resent the depredations of their parasites and their own gradual descent into slavery. The new religion, which would, of course, have to be distinguished sharply from the racial exclusiveness and arrogance of the Judaism with which everyone was then familiar could be made an hallucinatory drug, an enslaving opiate, that would eventually make its addicts helpless sheep, to be herded for the profit of their shepherds.

If the inventors of Christianity did not envisage this use of it with a foresight and cunning that may seem superhuman, they must have realized in subsequent centuries what a marvelous weapon they had inadvertently forged. This is a drastic hypothesis and will seem novel and implausible to many, but it can be supported by one datum for which it would be hard to suggest another explanation. Once Christianity was launched, the Jews were evidently determined to retain control of it.

That is the most reasonable explanation of the eventual failure of the Marcionist Church, which was a form of Christianity far more plausible than the doctrine that finally triumphed.

Marcion was a wealthy shipowner at Sinope, now the Turkish town of Sinop on the south shore of the Black Sea, but then the largest port and commercial center east of Byzantium. Sinope was founded as a Greek colony and long remained a Greek city, but there had been a continuous influx of other peoples. We have no information about Marcion’s ancestors.

When Christian propaganda reached him, he saw, as all reasonable men must, that the ferocious, vindictive, and cruel god of the “Old Testament” was utterly incompatible with the god of mercy and love preconized by Pauline Christianity, and he accordingly decided that

Yahweh was only the Demiurge, creator of the material world, but inferior to the good and supreme god who sent his Son (an avatar of himself) to save mankind from the Demiurge.³⁴

Jesus made his appearance in the guise of a man of about thirty, but the ignorant apostles mistook him for a Jewish Christ, and the Jews showed their irremediable perversity by crucifying a simulacrum of him (of course, a god could not be killed). He had, however, been recognized by Paul. Marcion had a version of the gospel attributed to "a man from Lucania" (Greek Λουκάς, Latin *Lucanus*, commonly 'Luke' in English, as though it were a man's name), and a collection of letters attributed to Paul that justified Marcion's theology. He may have had other holy books, and he wrote a work, *Antitheses*, conclusively proving that Yahweh was the very antithesis of the Pauline god, and that the "Old Testament" was incompatible with Christianity.

He went to Rome, then the capital of the civilized world, but found Judaizing Christians already established there. He founded his own church (c. 150), which naturally appealed to persons susceptible to the new religion but not incapable of thought. His was a comparatively innocuous form of Christianity – one that the late Dr. Hamblin, an erudite and highly intelligent man, tried to revive in our time to provide for the populace a form of Christianity that was not culturally and racially poisonous.

Marcion's Church did attract a numerous following and it may have been, for a time, the largest Christian sect, with congregations throughout the Empire, but it was the target of the most bitter animosity of the well-financed gang known as Fathers of the Church, who were determined to keep the "Old Testament" as the basis of their cult. The Marcionist Churches declined in the Third and Fourth Centuries, perhaps because they were not sufficiently fanatical and skilled in intrigue, but they survived even after the Fathers of the Church were at last able to start persecuting with the police powers of the captive state at their disposal.³⁵

Why the Fathers should have chosen to burden their cult with the onerous and malodorous bundle of fictions of the "Old Testament", which blatantly contradicted the very doctrine they were peddling, is almost inexplicable, except on the assumption that it was made profitable for them. And we must not forget that, with very few exceptions, we really do not know which early Christian theologians were "converted" Jews or stooges for the Jews, like the contemptible hirelings who now misgovern Germany.

So much for one interpretation of the admittedly fragmentary evidence (as distinct from inferences).

³⁴ One unfortunate consequence of this theory was a dichotomy between the body (material and therefore subject to the Demi-urge) and a soul (purely spiritual and so in the domain of the Supreme God). That led to the asceticism and denial of nature that characterized most of the Christian sects and makes them so repulsive to healthy men.

³⁵ The Marcionists were gradually absorbed by the more drastic (and ascetic) church founded by "Manichæus, the disciple of Jesus Christ," but Prudentius, a Christian versifier of some talent, writing at the opening of the Fifth Century, could lament in his *Hamartigenia* that the secular powers had not yet killed all the vile heretics who had been trapped by Marcion's evil insanity (*attoniti phrenesis manifesta cerebri*). Modern holy men like to pretend that Mani was not a "Christian," forgetting that he has as much right to the title as they have.

An Alternative

Mr. Carter presents a radically different theory about the origins of Christianity sometime in the First Century.

He takes his departure from the Stephen who appears in Acts, 6,5 -7,60, and is mentioned occasionally in subsequent chapters. The man's Greek name does not prove that he was a Hellenistic Jew, and we are told that he "did great wonders and miracles (τέρατα καί σημεῖα μεγάλα) among the people," which sounds as though he were just another of the *goētai* who swarmed through Asia Minor at that time.³⁶

In Acts, Stephen delivers a summary of the Jewish tradition about Abraham and his successors, and then upbraids the orthodox for their rejection of Jesus. His speech receives divine approval, for, looking up through a rift in the atmosphere, he sees God with Jesus at his right hand. The Sanhedrin, however, condemn him and the mob stones him, a particularly brutal form of killing, which they enjoyed on the pretense that it did not involve bloodshed.

Mr. Carter dismisses the story in Acts as a Christian concoction. He believes that Stephen and his companions (all of whom bear Greek names) were members of the "New Letzim," who had assimilated the Stoic doctrine with its emphasis on all humanity and wished to bring Judaism into accord with it, insisting that "the One God of the Universe is everybody's God." And he composes (p. 79) the speech that Stephen would have uttered, if he could, before he finally died. It is worthy of Epictetus.

Saul-Paul was a man who first approved the murder of Stephen, but reconsidered

and joined the "New Letzim," whose doctrines, a fusion of Judaism with Stoicism, Mr. Carter adumbrates with the proviso that "the Mystic Gospel of Jewish Hellenists" cannot be reconstructed in detail. "We cannot measure the complexity of the involvement of the protagonists – the degree, that is, to which the Hellenic Jews may have tried to fuse Greek and Jewish speculations. For the purpose of this study it is enough to conclude that Gentile ethics were the driving force behind the activities of the Letzim."

These Letzim may have come to regard Stephen as a messianic figure, thus resulting in "the transformation of the martyred Stephen into both a JESUS³⁷ and a CHRIST in the minds of his worshipers, by at least the turn of the second century."

There was really no reason why the *Letzim* should not have sponsored such a novel cult. For one thing, the real center of Jewish power was not in Judæa, but in Babylon, which, except for a very brief time, was outside the borders of the Græco-Roman world, which was increasingly centered in Rome. The greater part of the wealthy Jewish colony in Babylon in 538 B.C. had

³⁶ On these, see Professor Morton Smith's *Jesus the Magician* (New York, Harper & Row, 1978), especially Chapters 6 and 7. He concentrates on their psychological tricks; the mechanical tricks can be explained by any competent magician.

³⁷ He regards 'Jesus' as being, in this connection, not the name of a man, but a descriptive term, meaning 'savior.'

never thought of migrating to Judæa, and their opulent descendants continued to flourish in the city.³⁸ For another, despite what the Jews want us to believe today, Judaism in the First Century was not a unified set of doctrines, but included many groups of Jews who were heretics according to the standards of the Pharisees, but whom the rabbinate dared not suppress.”³⁹ And finally, archaeological excavations have shown that opulent synagogues in Asia outside Judæa took their orthodoxy lightly, ignoring even the famous injunction about not worshipping other deities in the presence of Yahweh. If Greek gods were not worshiped in those synagogues, and there is at least one example of a prayer to Helios, composed in Greek but written in the Hebrew alphabet, they were at least sufficiently venerated to be given iconic representation.

Everyone was astonished when the excavations at Dura-Europos reached the remains of a monumental Third-Century synagogue in which at least two Greek deities were portrayed on the walls. More recently and more astonishingly, a synagogue built, regardless of cost, in the Fourth Century at Tiberias, on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee and hence in Judæa itself, had a finely-wrought central mosaic, in which Helios is encircled by the zodiac, with its constellations represented by the customary figures.⁴⁰ Three of the four corners of the mosaic are preserved. In one corner is the head of a woman wearing a radiant crown (hence a goddess), holding a sickle; in the opposite corner a maiden with the white headdress of a virgin is pouring water from an ewer; in the third corner, a woman, perhaps garlanded, seems to be holding up a bowl of some fruit.⁴¹

Finally, we may note that some scholars believe that “Hellenistic Jews” were the creators of Gnosticism as a Jewish heresy from which the Christian Gnosticism was derived.⁴²

We have therefore no reason to doubt the possibility that a group of “New Letzim” – necessarily a tiny minority, as Mr. Carter points out – did exist and flourish with impunity in Græco-Roman territory so long as they kept themselves out of the power of the Jewish priesthood.

I cannot here do justice to the argument that occupies a large part of this book, and I must limit myself to noticing his conclusion that “Beginning around eighteen hundred years ago, a cabal of power-hungry Gentile churchmen labored to bring forth upon the land of western Asia a mystical system destined to crucify the whole of the Western world for centuries to come.”

This cabal saw an opportunity in the fact that “there was no place in the significant Gentile religions, or in Judaism, for the common people, or for the lowest of the low, the *Am-ha-aretz*, as the Judæans characterized those who worked with their hands ... or for slaves ... or for the

³⁸ See especially Jacob Neusner, “The Jews East of the Euphrates and the Roman Empire: I, 1st-3rd Centuries A.D.,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band IX, Halbband 1, pp.46-69.

³⁹ For a very quick summary, adequate for our purposes here, see Michael E. Stone, “Judaism at the Time of Christ,” *Scientific American*, CCXXVIII (1973) #1, pp. 80-87.

⁴⁰ See the photograph in the *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July-August 1993, pp. 28-29.

⁴¹ Each figure is identified by a word in an alphabet that is evolving toward the Hebrew letters with which we are all familiar. The characters are too small and, in the photograph, not sufficiently distinct for my aged eyes to read them.

⁴² See R. E. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (Oxford University Press, 1959); R. M. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem* (London, Mowbray, 1958). Both authors sedulously avoid offending Christian theologians.

diseased, the crippled, the feeble and the old ... or for the blind and dumb." There was therefore a huge market for "a salvation religion that might appeal to the masses."

"The scheme they [the cabal] decided upon was both shrewd and unique. They would fuse Gentile and Jewish religious speculations by assimilating a Jewish messianic figure [Stephen] to the savior gods of Asia; they would validate his existence with 'prophecies' culled from the ancient and sacred writings of the Isrælites; and they would promise to open the temples of holiness to everyone, including the unholy – thereby providing the masses with a broader-based creed than any existing in western Asia."

He discusses the way in which the conspirators selected from various mythologies the elements of the religion they were concocting, and the points on which they had to decide and about which they quarreled, thus precipitating the wild squabbles of the ninety Christian sects that were in existence in the Fourth Century. And he reviews summarily the Christians' unparalleled achievement as habitual Liars for the Lord and incorrigible forgers.⁴³

Mr. Carter therefore vindicates the Jews from any imputation of guilt, and indicts the presumably non-Jewish Christians: "The Catholic Christians are guilty of committing the moral crime of appropriating the sacred writings of another people in order to validate the existence of their divine hero; they forged and otherwise fabricated the entire literature of their church in order to provide an historical foundation for their faith; and along with their fellow Christians (Protestants, Episcopalians, *et al.*) they have corrupted the minds of countless millions over the centuries."

You may not accept Mr. Carter's thesis, but you must accept his demonstration that the authors or redactors of the tales about Jesus in the "New Testament" had only a superficial knowledge of conditions in Judæa at the long past time at which the fictitious events were supposed to take place.

⁴³ For a fuller conspectus of this flagitious record, see Joseph Wheless, *Forgery in Christianity* (New York, Knopf, 1930).

Appendix

The most important fact about Stoicism is that it was not a product of the Greek mind and was therefore an alien doctrine foisted onto the Aryan peoples of Antiquity.¹

Stoicism was founded in the last years of the fourth century B.C. by Zeno, a Semite ('Phoenician'), who was a native of Citium on the eastern shore of the island of Cyprus. He had a very swarthy complexion and an ungainly body, squat, disproportionately obese in places, and flabby. Since Jews often took cover as 'Phoenicians' or 'Syrians,' it is not impossible that he was a Jew.²

He was a merchant engaged in the export trade, and when he was more than thirty years of age, he brought a cargo of dye-stuffs to Greece, but was ruined when his ship was wrecked in or near the Piræus, the harbor of Athens. He walked to the city, where he listened to the lectures of philosophers, doubtless trying to become fluent in Greek, a language which he seems to have spoken with a heavy accent and of which he evidently knew only enough for bargaining in commercial transactions.

Zeno soon decided to become a philosopher himself and impudently suggested that he was the new Plato by giving to his book (probably written with the help of someone at home in Greek) the title of Plato's most famous work. Πολιτεία (Latin, *De republica*, whence English 'The Republic,' meaning 'Concerning the constitution of an independent state, without implying any particular form of government). The later Stoics tried very hard to sweep this book under the rug and then nail the rug down, but a description of its contents has come down to us.

Zeno's book was pure Communism – not the practical Communism of Lenin and Stalin, but the Utopian communism that was so successfully used as suckerbait in the later Nineteenth Century and was scarcely distinguished from anarchism before Marx's quarrel with Bakunin, which promised that after the Revolution the state would "wither away" and mankind would become one glorious mass of raceless proletarians. We do not know whether Zeno candidly faced the problem of how a nationless and raceless world was to be created and admitted that it would be necessary to slaughter the better part of every civilized society, but he taught that men would somehow become so reasonable that states, governments, courts, police, religion,

¹ You will find a fairly complete account of the evolution of Stoic doctrine in any history of ancient philosophy, and it has been the subject of innumerable books. The fullest account that I have read is by Max Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (2 volumes, Gottingen, 1948). The modest little book by Professor Edwyn Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics* (London, 1913), may always be read with pleasure as well as profit. The works of most of the early Stoics are lost; the extant scraps of their many writings were collected and edited by J. von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1903-1905). Biographical information about them depends almost entirely on the seventh book of Diogenes Laërtius, who cites his now lost authorities; where there are variant accounts, I choose what seems most reasonable. I here undertake the hazardous task of trying to summarize what seem to me to be the minimum essentials for an understanding of a philosophy that would have been a religion, had it built churches and staffed them with swarms of holy men.

² Cf. Note 3 below.

money, private property, and marriage would be abolished, and the world would be filled with a mass of raceless proletarians, all cuddling one another, freely exchanging the products of their labor, and having all women in common.³

This absurd farrago apparently found some response in the demoralized society of Athens, racked by economic and political crises, familiar with all the vices of democracy, and accustomed to romantically unrealistic social theories.⁴ But after Stoicism became respectable and accepted by the upper classes, it was a perennial embarrassment to Stoics, who did not want to be reminded of their Semitic founder's folly.

The next Stoic of any importance was also a man of little culture. Cleanthes was a native of Assos, a town in the Troad, opposite the isle of Lesbos, now the Turkish town of Behra. The town was a Greek foundation, and it is likely that Cleanthes was at least partly a Greek, but his father must have been poor, for he became a professional boxer, until, evidently down on his luck, he came to Athens with the equivalent of four present-day dollars in his pocket. He attached himself to Zeno, and supported himself by serving as a porter during the day and watering the plants in gardens at night. He is remembered for his famous Hymn to Zeus, one of the noblest prayers ever addressed to a deity. Zeus is the Universal Mind, but yet a personal god, whom Cleanthes exhorts "Lead me on," promising to follow willingly whithersoever the god leads, but adding that if he were unwilling, it would make no difference, for he would be compelled to follow. Zeus thus becomes destiny, and the idea is restated in Seneca's oft-quoted line, *Ducunt fata volentem, nolentem trahunt*, with which, by the way, Spengler appropriately concluded his *Untergang des Abendlandes*.

Chrysippus was a native of Soli in Cilicia, a city of which the ruins were plundered to build the modern Turkish town of Mersin. Soli was a Greek foundation, but its inhabitants so deteriorated that their many errors in Greek gave us the word 'solecism.' He is said to have become a long-distance runner, evidently as a professional, which suggests that he, like Cleanthes, came from a low-class and impoverished family. Coming to Athens after some reverse of fortune, he took over the leadership of Stoicism, which had become a recognized philosophy, but he drastically revised it, discarding most of the teachings of Zeno and Cleanthes and elaborating in their stead an elaborate system of dialectics, which he expounded in a series of seventy-five books, all now lost. He was the real creator of subsequent Stoicism. He evidently prospered from the philosophy, for it is recorded as remarkable that he was content with one slave girl as a concubine.

³ It would be possible to argue persuasively that Zeno merely extended to the whole world the social organization that prevailed within the small, tightly organized, and exclusive groups of Essenes, with only a few needed modifications, e.g., he permitted sexual intercourse with females, as was obviously necessary if the planet was not to become uninhabited. The later Stoics claimed that Zeno's book was written before he had worked out his philosophy.

⁴ On communism and revolutionary socialism in the ancient world, see Robert von Pöhlmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt* (3d ed., 2 vols., Munich, Beck, 1925). This is a revised and greatly expanded edition of his *Geschichte des antiken Kommunismus und Sozialismus* (1901), and is the only thorough treatment of the subject known to me. I have not heard of an English translation.

I have thought it worthwhile to insist, as most writers on Stoicism do not, on the plebeian, lower-class, and mostly alien origins of the philosophy. As it attained some popularity, there were many Stoics, but almost all of them probably had little or no Greek blood, some coming from such remote places as Seleucia and Babylon. The philosophy was a product of Hellenistic Asia, and of the scores who attained some distinction as Stoic philosophers, we cannot find one whom we can recognize as probably of respectable Greek ancestry until we come to Panætius of Rhodes. Unlike Epicureanism and the New Academy, which were philosophic products of the Greek mind and expounded by Greeks, Stoicism was *an* imported and essentially Asiatic doctrine, and, before Panætius, appealed chiefly to non- Aryan aliens and hybrids.

Panætius (c. 185-109 B.C.) made Stoicism respectable and partly naturalized it. The scion of a Greek family at Rhodes, at Athens he studied under the head of the Stoic school, a Semite (Jew?) known as Diogenes of Babylon, but he was strongly influenced by the more reasonable works of Aristotle. Going to Rome, he joined the circle of cultivated and young Romans around "the younger Scipio" (P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, Africanus, Numantinus), whose intimate friend and guest he became, accompanying him on his travels. Panætius had the good sense to neglect the formidable dialectics of the Stoic school, a chain of rigidly logical deductions from false premises, and to adapt Stoic ethics to the creed of the Roman aristocracy, with its insistence on duty and patriotism. He could thus show that the heroes of the early Roman republic, celebrated for their stoicism (in the modern sense of that word) had really been Stoics without knowing it. After Scipio was murdered in 129, Panætius went to Athens and became head of the Stoic school. His treatise on duty (Περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος) is paraphrased in the first two books of Cicero's *De officiis*, but his other works are lost, except for a few fragments. His revision of Stoicism was continued by his distinguished pupil, Posidonius.⁵

It is easy to see why Stoicism, which Panætius had endowed with the great prestige of the Roman aristocracy, became established as a major philosophy. And it is easy to see what commended it to Romans and statesmen everywhere. I have often commented on the last paragraph of Cicero's *De natura deorum*, in which Cicero, the statesman, overrules Cicero, the philosopher, with a *raison d'etat*. Of the three major philosophic systems, Stoicism was the only one that enjoined patriotism and political action on men who had responsible positions in society. The Epicureans were interested only in the content and happiness of individuals, and

⁵ Posidonius (c. 135-50) was born in Syria, at Apamea, which had been founded as a Greek city by Seleucus Nicator and named in honor of his wife. It is unlikely, but not impossible, that Posidonius was of pure Greek ancestry; he seems to have come from a prosperous family, but how much Greek blood he had is anyone's guess. He studied under Panætius and at Rome became the teacher and friend of Cicero. He continued Panætius's Aristotelean interests and conducted research into such varied problems as the diameter of the earth, the distance and size of the sun, the effect of the moon on the tides of the Atlantic Ocean, ethnic and racial differences, and the cause of racial decline. He elaborated a theory that the Universal Mind had brought forth the Roman Empire, which was civilization. (This may have suggested to Christian propagandists the silly notion that Yahweh fostered the Roman Empire so that the Jesus-cult could become epidemic.) He wrote a long history (52 books) to continue the work of Polybius to his own time, the loss of which we must bitterly deplore.

they specifically counseled abstention from politics: their most famous maxim was λάθε βιώσας ('live obscurely,' or 'avoid attracting public attention,' or 'stay out of the limelight').⁶

The New Academy, founded by Carneades (214-128), who revised the radical scepticism of Arcesilaus, was philosophically the finest product of the Greek mind,⁷ and was concerned with elaborating what is now known as the scientific method and establishing a valid epistemology. Its cold rationality and keen criticism thoroughly demolished the whole system of Stoicism, reducing it to the status of a religion. Like all true scholars and scientists, the members of the New Academy regarded politics, even political philosophy, as rather vulgar and tedious, an interest in merely contemporary and ephemeral matters that are trivial in comparison with the eternal truths of nature and human history.

The elements of Stoic doctrine which I think you should particularly notice are:

IV. The Stoics claimed to consider only the observed realities of the physical world and to reject all superstitions about the supernatural, but they began by assuming that the universe (which, remember, was for them the earth with its appurtenances, the sun, moon, and stars that circled about it), was single living organism of which the *animus mundi* was the brain. It followed, therefore, that we are all parts of that organism and so members of the same family and essentially equal, with an obligation to help one another, especially the unfortunate.⁸ But the

Stoics were saved from sentimental slobber about "the brotherhood of man" by the next proposition.

(2) Since all things happen "according to Nature" (which is controlled by the Universal Mind), there can be no evil or injustice in the world. Whatever seems unjust or wrong to us is only part of a whole which we do not see and conforms to a purpose we cannot comprehend. The lungs or liver, considered by themselves, are ugly, but they may form necessary parts of a beautiful woman or wise man.

(3) Good and evil, pain and pleasure, are therefore only in the mind, and what makes the difference is your attitude toward events: it would be wrong as well as futile to resist the Divine Plan, no matter what it ordains for you. The only important thing is to maintain your moral integrity, and so long as you do that, events have no power over you. Thus a wise man, conscious

⁶ Of course, not all Epicureans were wise enough to heed their founder's warning. C. Cassius Longinus, the famous tyrannicide, professed Epicurean principles, but was a brilliant military commander and tried to save the Roman Republic. He was also more perspicacious than Brutus, who was a Stoic, and whose scruples contributed to, and may have caused, the eventual defeat of the faction that tried to preserve the Republic.

⁷ We must, however, note that Carneades' most famous disciple, Clitomachus, was a Semite or possibly of mixed Punic and Berber ancestry. He was a Carthaginian and he was a namesake of Hasdrubal, the famous brother of Hannibal.

⁸ This was neatly stated by Seneca in his *Epistulae morales*, 95 (=XV,3), 52: 'Omne hoc quod videtur, quo divina atque humana conclusa sunt, unum est: membra sumus corporis magni; natum nos cognatos edidit. ... Hæc nobis amorem indidit mutuam et sociabiles fecit.' "Liberal intellectuals" are wont to sneer at Seneca, because he spoke of human equality while he was one of the wealthiest men in Rome and owned many slaves. One expects such "intellectuals" to be ignorant, but note that their cavillation is canceled by the proposition I list as (2).

of his moral integrity, would be perfectly happy, even if he were being boiled in oil. (I am sure that many intelligent men must have thought of popping a declaiming Stoic into a pot to ascertain whether the boiling oil would alter his opinion, but the experiment seems never to have been performed.)

There is much truth in the observation made by Professor Gilbert Murray in his well-known *Five Stages of Greek Religion* (3d ed., Boston, Beacon Press, 1951; reprinted, New York, Doubleday, 1955). Reporting the anecdote that an impressionable Greek, who had attended lectures by the Aristotelians and then heard the Stoics, said that his experience was like turning from men to gods, Murray remarks: "It was really turning from Greeks to Semites, from philosophy to religion."

That criticism may make you uneasy. I understand. We all respect Stoicism because it was endowed with a glamorous prestige by the great men whose creed it was. We are Aryans, and by a racial imperative inherent in our blood, far stronger than ratiocination, we admire heroism and fortitude. Stoicism was in practice the creed of Cato of Utica and many another Roman aristocrat who lived bravely and died proudly, meeting his fate with unflinching resolution. We instinctively pay homage to such men, and we venerate even more women of exemplary courage, like Arria, the devoted wife of A. Cæcina Pætus ("*Paete, non dolet.*") Panætius did make of an originally Semitic doctrine a creed that includes much that was consonant with the spirit and mentality of our race.

But much as we admire great Romans, we must remember that, as Gilbert Murray remarked, Stoicism retained from its origins a latent fanaticism and religiosity, professing to offer a kind of Salvation to unhappy mankind. Despite its ostentatious appeal to reason, it was a kind of evangelism "whose professions dazzled the reason." And it was fundamentally irrational when, for example, it claimed to deduce from Nature an asceticism that was inhuman, limiting sexual intercourse to the begetting of offspring. And it could too readily be turned into poisonous slop about "One World" and "brotherhood." Although it was the creed of heroes, we cannot but feel that there was in it something sickly and deformed. It was, for our race, an intellectual disaster.

ADDENDUM

Further Writings of Revilo P Oliver, on the themes of
race and religion, taken from *Liberty Bell* magazine.

Theological Claptrap

I continually have to marvel at the rarity of common sense in our people generally and particularly in Christians, including, of course, the Marxist and "Liberal" sects. The latest example is the *Christian News* for 1 December 1986.

Christian News, by far the best single source of information about all developments in the salvation-business, is the one Christian publication which I respect for its editor's sincerity and self-sacrificing devotion to principle. Although I cannot understand how he can believe that the Bible is the "infallible word of God," I recognize the integrity of a publication that is free of the oleaginous equivocation and sneaking evasions that are the stock in trade of Christian dervishes today.

The greater part of this issue of the *Christian News* is devoted to defending the reading in the King James version of the Jew-Book, *Isaiah (Hēsaiās)*, 7.14: "The Lord himself will give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son." The operative word in the Hebrew text is 'LMH, now usually vocalized as 'almah or 'alēmäh, which is rendered as "virgin," where most modern translations, following Jewish authorities, translate, "a young woman shall conceive."

Note that the only point at issue here is the meaning of the word in the context in which it occurs. All of the vexed and alembicated controversies centered about that text by theologians and scholars are irrelevant to that one point. It does not matter who wrote the ravings attributed to "Isaiah" (probably three, possibly four, forgers), when the book was written (probably around 400 B.C., possibly later), why it contains statements about Cyrus the Great as the only gog whom the Jews called a christ (45.1, covered up in the King James version, but honestly translated in the Vulgate), or to whom the purported "prophecy" was intended to apply. The one point to be decided is the meaning of the passage.

A moment of logical thought suffices to make the meaning obvious to anyone who has not put his common sense in cold storage. According to the text, old Yahweh himself is promising a (probably fictitious) king named Ahaz or Achaz that he, Yahweh, will produce a miracle to convince him that he should obey his god. Now hundreds of young women become pregnant every hour of the day and approximately half of them will bear male offspring. There is nothing more commonplace and unremarkable than a pregnant woman, and if the word means 'young woman,' the promise is a bad joke, and Yahweh is a jackass as well as a four-flusher – and surely the pious author of the story cannot have intended that. If the meaning is 'virgin,' Yahweh is promising a real miracle, something contrary to nature and therefore necessarily the work of a supernatural power. Now that is something that should impress Ahaz, and Yahweh thereby will prove that he's got as much divine power as the hundred other gods and demigods throughout the world who make virgins pregnant with godly offspring. That is precisely the

meaning that a priest peddling holiness would want to convey, so there can be no possible doubt about the meaning which the author intended when he wrote 'LMH.

In the foregoing paragraph I have labored the obvious and wasted space on explaining what anyone with a modicum of common sense would perceive at once as a datum about which there can be no question. But shiploads of paper and hogsheads of printer's ink have been wasted on that nugatory question, as well as, in the aggregate, decades of scholarly effort that could have been devoted to useful tasks. Christians can be erudite, but that does not stop them from having Faith and trying to rake the moon out of a pond.¹

But let's waive common sense on the first try and try again. The meaning of 'LMH is made obvious by the Septuagint, which translates the word by *parthenos*, and that word in Greek indubitably means 'virgin.'² Now the Septuagint is so called because, as is certified by a prefatory letter written by Aristeas, a Greek official at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who ruled from 285 to 247 B.C., seventy-two (septuaginta duo.) learned rabbis were immured in separate cells with copies of Holy Writ, all of which each translated into Greek, and when the seventy-two independent versions were compared, they were found to be identical, with no jot or tittle of difference. That proves that old Yahweh was supervising the work and the translation *parthenos* must be really his; and we have to suppose that Yahweh knew what he was talking about and was proficient in at least *koine* Greek.³ That's as good a story as any in Holy Writ, and I don't know why Christians who want to exercise their ability to stop thinking and have Faith now disbelieve it.

To be sure, everyone knows that the letter of Aristeas is just a crude forgery, like "Anne Frank's Diary," and that the whole story about the LXXII rabbis is just a characteristic Yiddish hoax, like the Holofoax that venal "educators" are ramming into the minds of Aryan children

¹ Not long ago I mentioned the village of Fatima in Portugal, where the shy Virgin Mary, having made sure that no one was watching, sidled up to some adolescent Portuguese peasant girls and whispered to them the secret of what awful things were going to happen to the earth. A correspondent kindly informs me that in 1941 one of them, then an old woman, remembered Mary had told them an extra-big secret that was to be disclosed to the world in 1960. Now it wasn't made public for some reason, and since Mary hasn't done anything about the disregard of her instructions for a quarter of a century, True Believers are just dying of curiosity to know the worst. My correspondent tells me that a learned French monk, P re Michel de la Sainte Trinit , has tried to surmise the secret by research and ratiocination, and has published the evidence and his conclusions in *three* volumes, evidently imposing tomes, for the third, the only one my correspondent has examined, contains *six* hundred pages. As Weishaupt used to say, "O marvellous mind of man!"

² The Greek word always means 'virgin'. The latest edition of the standard Greek-English lexicon (Liddell-Scott-Jones) lists a few passages as apparent exceptions, but in these the word is used retrospectively, e.g., in the *Trachiniae*, 1219, where, as the context shows, the dying Hercules wants his son to understand that Iole was a virgin before she became his concubine. Cf. the term *parthenios an r*, which designates the man whom a woman married when she was a virgin. The Latin equivalent is rare because Latin had a special term, which many women, especially under the Empire, proudly had inscribed on their tombs, *univira*, i.e., a woman who was a virgin when she married and never committed adultery or remarried. (I apologize for transliterating Greek, but a transliteration is readily intelligible when only one or two words are concerned and the use of Greek types would unnecessarily burden the printer.)

³ Impious persons wonder why Yahweh didn't take the trouble to write Greek as good as Xenophon's or Plato's. Even his *koine* is marred by Jewish dialect, but that may be because he is a Jew himself. (As Maurice Samuel remarked, Jews always think of him as a member of their own race, and they should know; they created him.)

today in the boob-hatcheries that we are taxed to support so lavishly. And that racial characteristic should make reasonable men doubt other incredible hoaxes in the Jew-Book, such as the tales about Joseph in Egypt, and about an *armed* invasion and military conquest of Canaan. But although the story about the divinely inspired *septuaginta duo* Yids is just a hoax, the reading in the Septuagint is conclusive proof of what the Jews in the first century B.C. thought the verse in Isaiah meant. Whence it follows that in attributing another meaning to it in the Third Century, when they were trying to differentiate themselves from their auxiliary for *goyim*, they were just perpetrating another hoax, in keeping with their racial instincts. The evidence of the Septuagint fixes the meaning in *Isaiah* for anyone whose common sense has not been muzzled, and there should be no more ado about it.

But let's try for another simple solution. The appendix to the Jew-Book called the "New Testament" consists of a few selected gospels about a Christ named Jesus. Now if these gospels are veracious and infallible, the question is summarily settled by the quotation from *Isaiah* in the gospel attributed to Matthew, 1.24, where the translation is again *parthenos*. If these gospels are not veracious, and that passage is just a folk-tale or an outright lie, nothing in the gospels warrants belief. Except for other gospels (many of which flatly contradict them), the gospels included in the "New Testament" are our only evidence that the Jesus who appears in them ever existed, since we have no valid historical evidence about him. In pseudo-historical fiction, such as Forester's well-known novels about Midshipman, later Admiral, Homblower, the historical record enables us to distinguish between historical and imaginary events, but when we consider the stories about Sherlock Holmes, for whom Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is our only authority, the recognition that one character or incident is fictitious creates a presumption that none of the events reported actually occurred. If the "New Testament" is part fact and part fiction, we have no means of distinguishing one from the other, and the only reasonable and safe attitude is to accept no part of the story as factual. But that again is irrelevant to the question at issue. The text of "Matthew" is incontrovertible proof of what the author of that gospel thought the passage meant, and he was presumably a literate Jew, probably of the Second Century, making a statement he thought his contemporaries would accept. So here, for the third time, a simple criterion and common sense suffices to settle the question. But Christians have to keep their common sense in abeyance.

Theologians, proud of their immunity to common sense,⁴ have squandered paper and ink on all sorts of intricate figments of their imagination. Some, for example, have contended that the author of that part of *Isaiah*, whoever he was, meant 'LMH to designate his own wife! That

⁴ It is part of a theologian's business to disregard common sense, but I do not mean to imply that such obtuseness is limited to their profession. The subject of my comments above reminded me that a month or so ago I examined the latest edition of Horace. The editor is a very learned man, but he was at times carried away by a desire for novelty to make his edition differ the more from earlier ones. On the basis of flimsy palaeographic and flimsier lexical evidence, he wants to emend *Carm.* 111.6.22 to read *innupta virgo*, ("unmarried virgin") instead of the traditional and accepted reading, *matura virgo* where *matura* = *nubilis*, i.e., she is no longer a child but of an age to be married, as before long (*mox*) she will be, according to the next stanza, which describes her conduct when married. Now obviously, "unmarried virgin" is simply a tautology and a grotesque one of which no poet or even moderately intelligent versifier would be guilty. So we have here a violation of common sense that is astonishing in a scholar who is not in the holy business.

would logically mean that he was trying to put over a hoax, and make him comparable to the eunuch, mentioned by Josephus, who tried to get into the christ-business by claiming that his pregnant wife was a virgin, whose fetus must have a superhuman father. There is no evidence of that, but it is possible, of course, and would make the scribbler a scoundrel and swindler. What is almost as incredible is that the theologians who believe it also claim that they take Christianity seriously and think it more than a collection of vulgar impostures.

After so much theological ado about nothing, the pages of the *Christian News* are perforce filled with idle discourse. They include, however, a reduced but still legible reprinting of a scholarly article by Dr. John E. Steinmueller, who examines philologically all occurrences of 'LMH in the Bible, and a comparable article by the late Dr. William F. Beck, printed, it seems, for the first time.

They, by the way, convinced me that the Hebrew word 'LMH had the specific meaning 'virgin,' and that I was wrong in my "Postscript" in February 1986, in which, apropos of the story of Jesus ben Pandera, who claimed to be born of a virgin in fulfillment of the "prophecy" in *Isaiah*, I suggested that the Jews tampered with the Hebrew text some two centuries after they had endorsed the Septuagint as divinely infallible. What they did was change the meaning of the word when they wanted to make the Roman government discriminate between them and their Christian dupes.

Incidentally, since the Fathers of the Church made much of the virgin birth, which, of course, is a prerequisite for Saviours, I have always thought they blundered when they did not include in their collection a gospel by James commonly called the *Genesis Mariæ*. (An early papyrus of this gospel is now in the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana and was published in volume five of that library's papyrological series.) According to the Apostle James, shortly after the birth of Jesus, Salome refused to believe that Mary was still a virgin. So she insisted on thrusting her finger into Mary's vagina to ascertain whether or not the hymenal membrane was intact. It was, but the residue of divine energy burned Salome's finger to a crisp, and she was in quite a fix until an angel popped into the cave and told her to touch the divine babe; she did, whereupon her finger became every bit as good as new. That gospel, you see, would have settled the matter once for all – unless some wicked person perversely insisted on using his common sense. But only nasty sceptics would do that, so the Fathers would have had an ace in the hole when they played theological poker.

Jews and Islam

There is a neatly ironic symmetry behind the current scandal, which was precipitated by the disclosure that the Jews were using their American subjects to supply and subsidize the Iranians in their war against Iraq, a nation whose territory the Jews intend eventually to occupy after driving out the Semitic inhabitants, as they have done in Palestine.

As Christianity is divided between Catholics and Protestants, so there are two main divisions of Islam, the Sunnis, who follow Tradition (*sunna*), and the Shí'a (the party of 'Alí'), who have a different Prophetic Tradition. Both of these major divisions, needless to say, are split into a

large number of sects. Muhammad⁵ is said to have predicted that his religion would be split into seventy-three competing sects; that may have been the number when the prophecy was forged. I shall not try to enumerate, describe, and distinguish the varieties of Moslem theology: that would take all the pages of *Liberty Bell* for the rest of the year.

There are sects of the Shi'a in many parts of the Moslem world, but that great division is centered in Persia (now called Iran), where the doctrines of the Shi'a have long been incorporated in government. The recent revolution, which brought Khomeini⁶ to power, deposed the Shah on the grounds that he, who was the servant of the occulted *imam* had become a heretic and thus disqualified himself for his sacred office.

When Mohammad's religious revolution got under way in A.D. 622, the Jews had been preying on the Arabs for about twelve centuries. It is virtually certain that the last King of Babylon, Nabonidus (Nabu-na'id), installed the predatory race in the commercially strategic oases of the Arabian Peninsula shortly before they betrayed him and his nation into the hands of Cyrus the Great of Persia in the sixth century B.C., when Cyrus rewarded them, as the British were to do twenty-five centuries later, by permitting a contingent of Jews to establish themselves in Palestine and start kicking the inhabitants around.

The Jews in Mecca and Medina helped Mohammad at first, when he seemed merely to be creating local turmoil, but naturally had their own ends in view, and when Mohammad, like Luther, belatedly discovered that they were using him against his own people, he became wary. He frustrated a plot of the Jews to betray him to his enemies during the siege of Medina, and he executed some six hundred of the treacherous brood in an "atrocious" about which the international predators still wail when they think it expedient.

Muhammad's religion unified the Arab tribes and started them on their amazing conquest of a large part of the world. During his lifetime, he was the Prophet of God, and the great military expeditions were commanded by men who formed a small oligarchy and, when he died, elected Abu Bakr as the Caliph (Khalifa), ruler of the newly formed state and so *ex officio* commander in chief of the armies, it being assumed (naively) that the religion had been forever fixed by the Koran and the Prophet's recorded pronouncements. When Abu Bakr died, 'Umar was elected his

⁵ Although I prefer the traditional English form 'Mahomet,' I use the now established compromise between it and the Arabic *Muhammad*. For names in common use in English, such as Mecca, Medina, Moslem, Koran, I use our common (and incorrect) spellings; for the rest, I use the standard transliterations from the Arabic, ignoring some very minor problems they present. For the convenience of the printer, I mark Arabic 'long' vowels with the acute, as was commonly done in standard works (e.g., R. A. Nicholson's *Literary History of the Arabs*) down to the 1930s, instead of the macron, which has now replaced it in scholarly writing. (The diacritics distinguish between two different vowels, and do not indicate either stress or duration.) Readers should remember that the rough breathing (') stands for a letter, 'ayn, which represents a deep guttural sound, it is said we can pronounce it by trying to gargle for a split second.

⁶ As I mentioned in a much earlier article, at the time of the revolution against the Shah of Persia, it was reported that the Khomeini who "returned" to Persia was not the Khomeini who had come thence to Paris as a "refugee." I never learned what was the basis or origin of that report.

successor, and he in turn was succeeded by 'Uthmán. It was accepted that the next in the line of succession would be 'Ah', the husband of Fatima, Mohammad's daughter.

It was at this point that a Jew, 'Abdulláh ibn Sabá, was converted to Islam and, in obedience to his racial instincts, immediately began to make trouble by paying quasi-divine honors to 'Alí, which, at least at first, acutely embarrassed that man, and proclaiming that 'Alí, as Mohammed's heir, had been intended by God to be Mohammad's successor. With typically Yiddish industry, he traveled about the Moslem world, enlisting notables in a conspiracy to help God carry out his intention. Although there is no proof, it is a reasonable inference that the enterprising Sheeny arranged the assassination of 'Uthmán, having in some way acquired an ascendancy over 'À'isha, who had been the favorite wife of Mohammad, and who, as a widow, was implicated in the conspiracy and assassination.⁷

After the murder of 'Uthmán, 'Alí, the already designated successor, became the fourth and last of the "orthodox Caliphs." 'Abdullah's party (Shí'a), however, continually stirred up trouble with claims that the first three calíphs had been 'usurpers,' since they held command in violation of God's will, and that the succession must always go by heredity to the descendants of 'Ah'. 'À'isha now joined in a conspiracy against 'Ah', which paradoxically undertook to avenge the murder of 'Uthmán, and thus precipitated a civil war, in which, no doubt, the parasitic race profited as usual from the losses of both sides. When 'Alí was assassinated, his succeeding son was still a stripling, but was recognized as the legitimate calíph by the Shí'a, which, when he was killed in battle, proceeded to maintain that the office of Imám, the divinely-ordained religious head of Islam and also ruler of the state, must descend by heredity in the family of 'Alí, thus assuring perpetual civil war in Islam.

Now I do not mean to imply that without the intervention of the "converted" Jew, there would not have been, sooner or later, violent contests over succession within the calíphate. And without 'Abdulláh, there would doubtless have been an endless succession of doctrinal heresies,

⁷ In A.D. 878, the Imám who was the twelfth in the series of divinely ordained successors of Mohammad, "disappeared" in a mosque at Samarra, retiring from the world and going into hiding (occultation) under that building or elsewhere, whence, when the time is ripe and he feels like it, he will return and conquer the world for True Believers. This is the faith now held in Iran. There is a sect of the Shí'a (the Ismá 'íliyah) that holds that the seventh Imám was the last; they naturally split into sub-sects, and are now represented by various scattered groups, including, I am told, some now active in Lebanon. In their prime, in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, however, they were a major power in Islam, having been organized as one of the world's greatest secret conspiratorial societies by a certain 'Abdulláh, the son of Maymún al-Qaddáh, an oculist who practiced in Jerusalem and is said to have been a "converted" Jew. 'Abdulláh and his coadjutor, Qarmat, who gave his name to the sect, made the secret society, which much after served as a model for Weishaupt's Illuminati, a conspiracy that aimed at the establishment of out-and-out Bolshevism and One World in which there would be no discrimination, since all races and all religions were equal, and all mankind should enjoy perfect brotherhood and equality (in servitude to the hidden Masters of the Conspiracy, of course). Being extremely righteous, they naturally promoted social goods with secret assassinations and open terrorism. They organized niggers to revolt against White people and massacre them for social justice. The Qarmathians were temporarily brought under control, except in Egypt, but their conspiracy, with its twin techniques of underground subversion and terrorism, was revived in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, when it was known to the Western world as the Order of Assassins. It is only reasonable to suppose that many "converted" Jews were active in the perennial conspiracies and may have supplied the most effective agitators and secret agents. Yahweh's race has a special and incomparable talent for such humanitarian work.

such as are simply normal in evangelical religions. His heresy was carried on by true Moslems, and I may exaggerate in seeing a distinctively Jewish trait in the Shi'ite doctrine of taqi'ah ('dissimulation'), which authorizes members of the sect to profess different and even antithetical beliefs whenever they deem it expedient – but how Jewish that is!

The success of the Shi'a in attaining a permanent base in Persia and dominating that country was less a consequence of religious doctrine than of racial disparity. The people of Persia at the time of the Arab conquest retained a large element of Aryan blood, thought of themselves as Aryans ('Iran' means "land of the Aryans"), and spoke an Indo-European language.⁸ They resented their Semitic conquerors, by whom they were forced to accept the Semitic religion, and the heresy 'Abdulláh had founded gave them a way of opposing the orthodoxy of Semitic Moslems. In the end, they thus succeeded in making Persia independent of the rest of Islam.

I think it neatly symbolic, however, that the modern Iran became available to Jewish manipulation as the result of a politico-religious sedition begun by a member of their versipellous and insatiable race. 'Abdulláh need not have operated by an elaborate plan; he simply applied instinctively his race's normal technique, which was set forth in the Jew-Book and presumably approved by all Christians. Yahweh, who promised to help his Chosen Bandits destroy all the people whose country they invaded, describes his method specifically in the screed called *Isaiah* (Hesaias), 19.2, where Yahweh promises to "set Egyptian against Egyptian" and make the *goyim* kill one another in a glorious civil war for the profit of his Chosen Predators. 'Egyptian,' of course, stands for any nation of *goyim* God's People want to invade and exploit. And, for that matter, after they had, by instinct or calculation, infected our race with the Christian superstition, they had, century after century, the joy of watching the despised and hated Aryans butcher one another over figments of theologians' perverted imaginations. As for the scandal in the District of Corruption, we shall have to wait until it becomes clear whether the Jews' use of their Americans to arm and subsidize Iran was disclosed to the public by some American who does not know that Social Justice is whatever profits God's Supermen, or was instead precipitated by the Jews themselves to stage another forced resignation of a stooge they have put in the White House. Readers of Mr. Taylor's articles may even wonder whether the Master Race is punishing their stooge because the terrorists whom he sent on an Apache-style raid on Libya failed to massacre the entire population of Semites.

⁸ Modern Persian is a language descended (a long ways!) from the Old Persian of Darius and Xerxes.

Creation

It has, of course, long been obvious to rational men that the only explanation of the existence of organic life, including our own precious and unique selves, is biological evolution. Men capable of ratiocination and willing to think will always honor Darwin, to whom we owe the formulation of the theory which, modified in some details by subsequent knowledge of genetics, definitively ended uncritical acceptance of theological hokum.

Biological evolution is not a recent discovery. When our race first emerged from the fogs of primitive superstition, men who thought about nature objectively perceived that organic life must have been generated from inorganic matter by some natural (chemical) reaction; that the forms of organic life multiplied and evolved to ever increasing complexity, winnowed by the inexorable law that decrees the survival of the fittest; and that the blind forces of nature eventually produced the several species of anthropoid mammals that are called human. Even a superficial knowledge of Greek philosophy will bring to one's mind the names of Empedocles, Anaximander, Anaxagoras, Archelaus, and Xenophanes; and everyone who knows anything of Latin literature will remember Lucretius, V. 780-1150.

The religions of the world have produced innumerable myths about a 'creation' by some of the supernatural beings imagined by primitive peoples – myths which deal almost exclusively with the species called human, for the crude minds that entertain such stories are not really interested in mammals other than themselves. And all the myths told by literate or semi-literate peoples are as good as, and usually more intelligible than, the tale told in the Christians' Holy Jew-Book.¹ For example, when Odin and his brothers had a whim to create human beings, they selected the trunks of two ash trees and fashioned Ask and Embla, the first man and the first woman. In the Egyptian story, Khepera created men and women simultaneously from his tears and genesic power. In what is probably a Sumerian myth preserved in a Semitic (Akkadian) text, the goddess Mami simultaneously incubated seven males and seven females. But in the Jews' story, the old Sheeny, Yahweh, mixed up a mud pie and made a man, complete with the male sexual organs, but didn't perceive how stupid he had been until the man complained, whereupon Yahweh took one of the man's spare ribs and made a female out of it.² The male

¹ I here appraise creation-myths as intelligible explanations of the origin of our species. My comparison, however, holds true (for our race) if we take as a criterion either moral quality or literary and aesthetic value. I know of no other creation-myth that is as grossly immoral in its implications as the tale in the Jew-Book. It is also ugly. From the aesthetic standpoint, few creation-myths can match the story of DeucALion and Pyrrha, which we read in the sonorous hexameters of a poet who combined elegance with wit. The episode in the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* inspired Lorado Taft, one of the most distinguished of American sculptors, when he planned the 'Fountain of Time' which was to be the crowning masterpiece of his artistic life. He unfortunately did not live to complete it, but the *disiecta membra*, now scattered over the campus of the University of Illinois, enable one to perceive what the completed work would have been.

² The story about Eve comes from a confused recollection of the Sumerian story about Ninti, the 'rib-woman,' created by the goddess Ninhursag to relieve pains in the chest. 'Eve' (Hebrew, HWH) in the meaning given to it by the Jews when they produced the Septuagint, is a translation of ninti, but the original meaning of the word was probably 'snake' and in the earlier form of the myth (cf. *Genesis*, 1.27), in which either Adam was an hermaphrodite or, as is more probable, it was admitted that the several gods ('LHM) who did the creating were a divine consortium that

and female he created were so dim-witted, however, that their reproductive organs would have been useless, if a clever snake had not told the woman about the famous apple tree that malicious old Yahweh had planted to tempt his creations to damn themselves. This foolish and grotesque story, the Jew' vulgarization of the Babylonian adaptation of a Sumerian creation-myth, was, of course, distorted by the Jews' morbid and nasty preoccupation with sex, but there are people who read it without disgust and without ribald laughter.

The most reasonable creation-story that comes to my mind is one told in the fables of Phædrus. Human beings were created as in the Egyptian picture of a creation that was reproduced in *Liberty Bell*, September 1984, p. 16, but in the Greek tale the sculptor was Prometheus, who did much of his work at night after he staggered home from drinking parties on Olympus, and his befuddled mind, bleary eyes, and unsteady hands almost ruined both of his artistic creations by incorporating in them the anatomical and physiological blunders that make our bodies so inadequate and now distress us – which, needless to say, no decent god would have inflicted on us, if sober and in his right mind. As Mæterlinck, who believed in immortal souls and a divinity, re-marked, 'If I were God, I would be ashamed of having created man.'

Now all this should not need to be said, and no educated person would pay any attention to the chicanery by which 'creation scientists' try to peddle their hokum to the suckers, if the rabble-rousing barkers who so lucratively vend salvation over the boob-tubes were not becoming a menace to our race, and if it were not obvious that the Jews, who poisoned our race with the Christian virus fifteen centuries ago, are now relying on the terminal phase of that disease to drive to suicidal insanity and extermination the race on which, above all others, the *hostes generis humani* have focused for millennia their rabid hatred of civilized mankind.

It is ominous that recently two judges in the Revolutionary Tribunal wrote a dissenting opinion in which they hypocritically devised a legal justification of the corrupt legislature of Louisiana's hypocritical attempt to inject into the public schools the hypocritical sophistry of 'creation science.'

What is most disgusting about the promoters of the fraud is the glib hypocrisy with which they pretend that they want to teach 'creation' without teaching a religion. They assume Americans are so stupid that they will believe that the shysters will offer the helpless children, as alternatives to biological evolution, at least a selection of two dozen or so representative creationmyths and leave them free to select any story they prefer, such, for example, as the really elaborate ones told in India, which make the Jews' silly tale seem fit only for vulgar and sub-normal children, but everyone knows that once the conspirators have got their camel's nose in the tent, they intend to crowd out all factual knowledge. Their only purpose is to ram the Yiddish garbage into every moppet's mind.

The deceit of the contrivers of 'creation science' places them beneath contempt, but one has to respect honest Christians who say what they mean, such, for example, as the Reverend

included both gods and goddesses (as did the pantheon of five deities whom the Jews worshipped at Elephantine in the fifth century B.C.), HWH was probably the snake who made trouble for mankind.

Mr. Dale Cowley, Jr., who, in an article printed in *Christian News*, 20 July 1987, frankly avows the Christians' purpose: 'Throw Evolutionism out of our tax-supported schools and museums.' (Museums are mentioned with reference to the Smithsonian Institution, which should probably be abolished for having published a scientific account of the development of life, a book which I mentioned in *Liberty Bell*, September 1986, pp. 14-16.) Mr. Cowley frankly and prudently reprehends the duplicity of the 'creation science' hoax as both dishonest and imprudent. 'The world is totally aware of our transparent efforts to disguise our creation curriculum in the 'two-model approach,' while we reassure them that we are willing to teach evolution too in a 'balanced approach.' We bring no credit to ourselves, nor honor to our Lord, through such tactics.' So there are honest Christians! And we must respect them for their integrity and their candor in telling us precisely what they intend.

Mr. Cowley's distress over scientific studies is echoed by an anonymous colleague, who is "deeply saddened that professors like Victor Stenger are roaming freely in our universities." The wicked Professor of Physics has published an article in *Free Inquiry*, Summer 1987, in which he states what is well known to every educated man who is interested in truth and not afraid to investigate and think: "there is not one shred of evidence for a creation," with the conclusion that "there was no Creator because there was no creation."³

It is quite easy to foresee what will happen if the witch-doctors mobilize the voting boobs and gain control. Now that practically everything (including the shamans' churches) is tax-supported in one way or another, professors who doubt that old Yahweh stopped the sun so that his pet bandits could get in a little more genocide can be fired before they are sent to work camps; libraries that contain books that contradict the Jews' hokum can be abolished and the offending books burned, so that no youthful mind will be contaminated with rationality; and all airplanes should be destroyed lest they disturb old Yahweh while he is snoozing on a comfortable cloud (as is his habit, according to the 'inerrant' Jew-Book) – and if old Yahweh gets riled up, he might lose his temper again and smash up the universe before Jesus has a chance to inflict on mankind the sadistic horrors over which Christians gloat as they read their favorite Apocalypse.

It is not likely that the Christians' political ambitions will be realized, for the Jews will have attained their goal long before the reforms outlined in the preceding paragraph are fully carried out, but it is well to know that Christians have not changed at heart since the Wars of Religion devastated Europe.

³ It is unfortunate that Professor Stenger, in his article in *Free Inquiry*, seems to regard this conclusion as a modern discovery; he should have remarked that when the Aryan mind in Greece first emancipated itself from superstition, it reached the common-sense conclusion that the universe had existed from all time and therefore could not have been 'created.' There is even a glimmering of this fact in the Sumerian myth and the Jews' adaptation of it: at the beginning of Genesis it is assumed that matter always existed but was 'formless' (i.e., Chaos; the Hebrew term appears in the French word, *tohu-bohu*), and that what the gods (*elohim*) did when they 'created Heaven and Earth' was to organize the pre-existing matter. In *Gen.*, 1.2, we are told that the creation began when the gods' agent, RWH (probably imagined as a great bird, the prototype of the roc (*rukub*) of the *Arabian Nights*), flew over the already existing and therefore uncreated waters in the abyss.

The Jews have long kept their herds of *goyim* milling about between Communism and Capitalism, relying on the stupidity of the dumb brutes, who do not see that both are just superficially different devices for abolishing private property and the civilization that depends on it, so that the Jews will have unquestioned possession of the whole World, including its livestock. In the same way, they are now sending Christians into a tizzy by making them imagine a fundamental opposition between the purportedly “atheistic” Christianity of the Marxian Reformation and “fundamentalist” Protestantism, which has been stripped of what once made it not utterly intolerable.

In these circumstances, the shoddy scribbling, cheap tricks and greasy hypocrisy of the “creationists” are more than ludicrous antics. They have become a dire menace. And you will notice a neat reversal of roles in the recent decisions of the Revolutionary Tribunal in Washington; now the danger often comes, not from the “Liberals”, but from the “Conservatives” appointed by the Jews’ President, old Ronnie.

One hears Rehnquist lauded because he has *said* some nice things that soothe the ears of tax-paying boobs who imagine that their servitude can ever be eased in a Jew-governed ochlocracy, and have forgotten that even nicer things were said by the foul monster called Franklin Roosevelt when he was lying to the Americans whom he tricked into voting for him. Whether Rehnquist means any part of his verbal paregoric, I do not profess to know, but I estimate his character by what he does. He, with his “conservative” pal, wrote the infamous dissenting opinion in favor of the ‘creation scientists’ confidence game. He is also the author of an opinion (in which three of the “Liberals” joined) that would have sustained the corrupt legislature of Kentucky in directing that all public schoolrooms be posted with advertisements of Yahweh’s bluff, the so-called ‘Ten Commandments,’ which begin with threats against persons who worship gods that are in competition with Yahweh.⁴ And Rehnquist was such a hypocritical twister that he pretended that such an advertisement was not intended to get customers for a religion and its howling dervishes!⁵

The danger from thoughtless Christians today is such that we must welcome with more than critical satisfaction the new book by Dr. Richard Dawkins, an eminent zoologist and Fellow of New College, Oxford, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York, Norton, 1987). The work should be conclusive, even for Christians who can read – but remember that while most Christians know

⁴ That’s what the Jews claimed the command meant in the first century B.C., after they had decided to become monotheistic in imitation of GræcoRoman Stoicism. It is likely that the older meaning was preserved in the Vulgate: “you shall not worship foreign gods in my presence.” That fits the Judaism of the fifth century B.C. The command was, of course, intended only for Jews, and Jews today must find it difficult not to guffaw when they see the Jesus-jerks thinking it applied to themselves after the deal they suppose the wily old Jew in the clouds made with them by tearing up his old bargain with his Chosen Ones.

⁵ For a good essay on Rehnquist and the Kentucky legislature’s attempt to cadge votes from the yokels, see the article by Professor Frank R. Zindler in the *American Atheist*, June 1987, pp. 37-41 I learn from it that the legislature provided that the advertisements contain the lie that the ‘Ten Commandments’ were adopted ‘as the fundamental legal code of Western Civilization and the Common Law of the United States.’ I do not know whether it would have paid the bottlers of flavored water to hire the legislature of Kentucky to add to the advertisement, “And Yahweh says, drink Coca-Cola.” That could have been explained as the fundamental social code of the United States.

the alphabet and quite a few English words, many of them seem quite incapable of reading and understanding anything that does not reek with their favorite hallucinogen.

Dr. Dawkins proves logically, in admirably lucid language that the evidence of the biological record categorically excludes all notions of teleology in the operations of nature, which are determined by natural laws that cannot conceivably have a purpose, such as only thinking organisms can form in their own minds. One very important point is his elucidation of what we call blind chance. It is chance, certainly, that the peculiar conditions necessary for the chemical production of life occurred on one of the lesser planets of our sun, but it is also not fortuitous, since the chance was produced by the uniform operation of physical laws, which, at this point in space, resulted in the formation of the sun and the widely differing satellites that revolve about it, one of which was so constituted and located that the bio-genetic chemical reaction could and did occur. The universe is indeed the nexus of cause and effect that the Greeks called *heimarmene*.

This point has crucial importance when one considers biological evolution. Unwary persons are often taken in by the sciolistic claim that mere chance could not have produced so complicated an organ as an eye or so complicated an organism as an anthropoid, to say nothing of so perfect an organism as a rabble-raising, money-grabbing evangelist. The fundamental fact to keep in mind is that an organism's potentiality for further development is limited by the structure it has already attained. I suggest as a very crude and simplified analogy the drawing of cards from a shuffled deck: the first cards that are dealt may be regarded as dealt by chance, but in any further dealing of cards chance is limited by the absence from the deck of the cards already dealt. Or, if you remember Lucretius, call to mind his argument that while the blind concurrence of atoms probably produced many strange forms of life that were eliminated by the survival of only the fittest, there were forms that could not have been produced, e.g., centaurs or hippocamps, because they would have combined incompatible organs.

The evolution of an organism is determined by the adaptability of the form it has already attained and the law of the survival of the fittest, which rigorously and properly eliminates species, that are defeated in the perpetual struggle for life at the expense of other species. Now all the evidence proves that living organisms evolved in precisely this way, often with help from mutations caused by exposure to chemical substances or to radiation, solar or cosmic.

The unvarying and inexorable laws of biological evolution apply uniformly to all living organisms, including the species of mammals that are called human and designated taxonomically as varieties of *Homo sapiens*, although an observer of the present must think that *insipiens* would be a more appropriate adjective. That, of course, is the fact that incites the real promoters of the "creationist" hokum today. We are a part of nature and subject to its laws, and among races, as among all other organisms, the fittest will survive and the unfit will perish. It is a simple fact that today Aryans are no longer fit to survive, and will become as extinct as the

dodo and the moa, unless by some miracle they recover the will to live, which in human affairs is simply the will to conquer.⁶

Our implacable enemies fear, I know not how correctly, that a perception of this fact of nature might stimulate thought in the consciousness of a sufficiently large number of befuddled Aryans to make the race recover its lost will to live. The one real argument behind all the twisted sophistries of the 'creation scientists' is one they are avowing with increasing frequency: 'Evolution leads to racism.' Of course it does!

I note that the Jews' endless yammering today not infrequently attributes to Darwinism the Germans' gassing of six or sixty millions or billions of Yahweh's Masterpieces, as described in their wild and blatantly inconsistent fictions about a 'Holocaust.' Now if they make everyone believe that the big Sheeny up in the clouds is running everything and wants Aryans to follow the commands of the crucified Jew-boy and have bird brains that take no thought for the morrow, the hated race, drugged with hallucinatory superstitions, will go blindly to its final extinction, loving its enemies and executioners.

That is why the only hope for our race – if there is a hope – now depends on our ability to accept the grim but unalterable laws of nature and act upon them – our ability, in other words, to recover from the irrational superstitions foisted on us by an Alien religion. Dr. Dawkins cites, with perfunctory apology, a passage in which Darwin merely noted what was obvious and indubitable in his day, the great biological difference between Aryans and Congoids, and that serves to remind us that, as I have noted often before, Darwin expected the savages to become extinct as civilized peoples took over their territories. That, in turn, will remind us how suddenly – in less than a hundred years – our race went into a coma – how suddenly the terminal symptoms of Christianity appeared, like the symptoms of the tertiary stage of syphilis, and destroyed our race's mentality and vital instincts, making it throw away its virtual dominion over the earth, so that it is now the Aryans who will be eliminated as less stupefied peoples takeover their territories.

The later part of Dr. Dawkins' brilliant book is devoted to exploring and explaining the theoretical controversies among biologists, many of which are idle and somewhat childish quarrels over taxonomy. The vanity of some scientists, plus a polemical tropism that makes some of them indulge in hyperbolic pronouncements which are then magnified by the sensational press, has provided the "creationists" with many quotations which, taken out of context and distorted, they use to lend a sickly semblance of scientific authority to their ignorant or fraudulent bunkum. I do not mean to embarrass Dr. Dawkins in his retreat in Oxford, which seems to have become a polluted and dangerous environment (cf. *Liberty Bell*, August 1986, pp. 9-14), but I am grateful to him for his exemplary clarification of the facts with which Aryans must reckon if they are to have a chance of escaping the extermination to which they have

⁶ The Russians, who are largely Aryan, seem not to have lost the will to survive, even under a Judaeo-Communist regime. Their future is problematical, but they have a chance to remain in the world after we have perished.

doomed themselves – a chance, if there is any, of belatedly reviving their racial immune system and recovering from the Christian virus.

Race and History Distortion

IN THE DECADE before us, the methods of historiography will undergo a very considerable modification.

History depends primarily on written documents, from the clay tablets of ancient Sumeria and the earliest Egyptian hieroglyphs to the archives of modern states. In the absence of documents, the historian can only elicit tentative conclusions from artifacts disinterred by archaeologists or surmise what actual events gave rise to folk-tales and legends, such as the myths about Hercules or the story of Heimdall in the *Rigsthula*.

It is the function of the historian to submit all documents, whether purported originals or copies of lost originals, to the most rigorous critical analysis to determine their authenticity and their veracity. Wherever there is an apparent motive for forgery or mendacity, the document and its contents must be tested by every available criterion and technique, and only rarely are these sufficient to give results that have so high a degree of probability as to be virtually certain.

Inevitably of course, there are a few documents of great historical import about which doubt subsists. The famous letter of the younger Pliny, evidently written in A.D. 112, which is the earliest evidence for the existence of a sect with which modern Christians would admit an affinity, is now accepted as genuine by the majority of scholars, chiefly on the grounds that if it were a forgery concocted by the Christians and inserted in the corpus of Pliny's letters that came down to us in only one manuscript, now lost, it would presuppose in the forger a degree of learning, skill, and care much greater than is found in other Christian compositions. But we cannot be quite certain. The letter was quoted, with some odd variations, by Tertullian in the very *Apologeticum*, written around 200, in which that Father of the Church and shyster lawyer cites one of the most audacious of Christian forgeries, a purported letter from Pontius Pilate to Tiberius: recent studies have disclosed two odd anomalies; and it is not *impossible* that Tertullian or an accomplice had the requisite skill and diligence: so doubt remains.

The famous Kensington Rune Stone, which purportedly attests the presence of Norse explorers in what is now Minnesota in 1362, has long been regarded as a forgery perpetrated by a local resident for the glory of Scandinavia, but a recent linguistic analysis makes it seem unlikely that the supposed forger could have introduced subtle dialectical variations of Old Norse unrecorded in his time; so doubt remains.

These examples suffice to show the underlying assumption in all historical criticism: forgeries or impostures are always the work of an individual or a small group of individuals for profit, piety, or political ends. The most recent Christian gospels are good examples. When Joseph Smith found that swindling farmers with tales of buried treasure entailed legal hazards, he manufactured the *Book of Mormon*, possibly with one assistant author, and enlisted eleven perjurers to attest its authenticity. In 1879 and 1883, the Reverend Mr. William Dennis Mahan produced a whole sheaf of forgeries to prove the historical truth of a religion to which he had a deep emotional attachment, and it seems that only his wife was a party to his pious hoax, although other clergymen soon tried to muscle in on what had become a lucrative imposture by producing supplemental forgeries. Smith founded what became the staunchest, most stable,

and most cohesive church in the United States, exciting the emotional faith of millions who never suspected that the "Newest Testament" was a fraud. Poor Mahan undertook a more difficult task, for which he had neither the education nor the financial resources, but he stimulated the glands of many thousands of yearning Christians, and many enterprising publishers since his time have found it highly profitable to reprint, *ad maiorem gloriam Dei*, what some of them call "the Archko Volume."

Forged Letters

Some political hoaxes are comparable. The forged letters of Winston Churchill, which aroused considerable excitement in Italy in 1954, were plausible in content and deceived many well-educated Italians, for whom English was a foreign language and who had never noted the minute characteristics that distinguish the work of the various brands of typewriters. It is uncertain whether the forgers were interested only in collecting the large sums of money they obtained from Italian conservatives for the precious historical documents, or had been inspired by the Italian Premier, De Gasperi, who used the hoax to prosecute and discredit the conservatives who had earlier obtained possession of possibly genuine letters that he wrote while hiding out in the Vatican in 1940-43.

In the absence of documents, the historians' task is more difficult, and where there is no trustworthy evidence and the doctrine of "*cui bono?*" does not yield conclusive results, we naturally have one of the innumerable mysteries or ambiguities that season the pages of history. The facts concerning the death of the Austrian Crown Prince at Mayerling were so successfully covered up that, while we may have strong suspicions, we do not know whether or not Rudolph murdered his mistress and committed suicide. We shall probably never know why the Great

Fire of London in September 1666 "happened" to begin on the eve of the very day for which it had been scheduled by a conspiracy, directed by unidentified persons residing in Holland, some of whose agents were arrested, confessed, and were executed in the preceding April. Nor shall we know why so remarkable a "coincidence" excited no official investigation after the event.

Evidence Destroyed Thoroughly

When conspiracies have governmental powers, they can usually cover up their guilt at the time and they often destroy evidence so thoroughly that later generations are left with a puzzle they can solve only partially or tentatively. We now know only that the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was arranged by a conspiracy for the dual purpose of eliminating a political figure who was no longer useful and of exciting fresh animosity against the Southerners who had been conquered, and whose country had been destroyed, in the unconscionable war of aggression of which he had been the ostensible leader; but, aside from a few hirelings, the only person whom we can positively identify as a member of the conspiracy is Stanton, who was the Secretary of War in Lincoln's cabinet, arranged many of the practical details, and was able, after the event, to silence key witnesses, although we can only guess what it was they knew that made it necessary to have them judicially murdered. And Stanton seems to have been only a local manager for principals whose identity we can only surmise.

The second-class battleship *Maine*, significantly the least useful ship in the comparatively small American navy, was sent to Havana to overawe the legitimate government of Cuba, and was there destroyed, with great loss of life, by an internal explosion. The American government, however, was able to cover up that fact and to claim that a Spanish mine or torpedo was responsible, thus preparing the excitable American populace for the desired war of aggression against Spain. So far as I know, no one has thus far found evidence to fix the responsibility for what is likely to have been more than a happy "accident" at just the right time.

It frequently happens, of course, that all the evidence is not thoroughly destroyed. The work of Mr. Colin Simpson, published in 1972, amply documents the facts concerning the sinking of the British cruiser and munitions ship, *Lusitania*, which had been disguised as a passenger liner to attract a large number of American passengers in the hope that a German submarine would take the "livebait" dangled before it.

It is now clear that the atrocious gambit, which would certainly have offended the sensibilities of the English public in 1915, was contrived by Winston Churchill with only a few accomplices. After the event, there were in Britain a considerable number of persons who knew that the official tale was false and had solid grounds for suspecting the truth, but gentlemen (e.g. Lord Mersey, who retired from the bench after his part in what he termed "a damned dirty business") were silenced by appeals to patriotism and the *raison d'état*, while lesser men were intimidated. In the United States, the great deception was assiduously promoted by the cynical gang that surrounded Woodrow Wilson, a muzzy-headed shyster whom the Jews had trained for the Presidency into which they boosted him by the simple expedient of playing on the vanity and gullibility of Theodore Roosevelt. Their efforts were, of course, abetted by the large corps of journalistic hirelings, who probably disseminated sensational lies with the efficiency and in the spirit with which they would have waited on tables or operated taxicabs.

Many millions of citizens of both Great Britain and the United States were successfully duped, while the facts were known to only comparatively few persons and, in all probability, the ultimate purpose of the operation was known to yet fewer.

Mental Logistics

Experience has shown that the mass-armies of "democratic" states fight with greater zeal when they are animated by hatred and supported by a hate-crazed populace that fancies it is fighting a holy war. Lies have therefore become military equipment, a kind of mental logistics; but it is the essence of such propaganda that its spuriousness is known only to the persons who manufacture it. The model of such operations is the famous lie-factory managed by Lord Bryce during the First World War, in which a corps of expert technicians forged photographs, while expert liars, including Arnold Toynbee, concocted stories of "atrocities" to inspire the emotionally overwrought British with a fanatic's hatred of the incredibly bestial Germans and with a noble Christian ardor to kill them.

Lord Bryce's superiors in the Government undoubtedly knew what his merry knaves were doing, and a small number of educated and judicious men must at least have had suspicions which they concealed from fear or unwillingness to impair the "war effort", but the number of

persons who knew or suspected the truth was very small in comparison with the vast majority that was successfully deceived during the war. And after the war, the secret could no longer be kept.

It is a truism, of course, that in "democratic" states the populace must be encouraged to imagine that it makes important decisions by voting, and must therefore be controlled by suitable propaganda, which implants ideas to which the voters respond automatically as trained animals respond to words of command in a circus, thus leaving to the masses only a factitious choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee on the basis of their preference for a certain kind of oratory, a hair-style, or a particular facial expression.

The production of such propaganda requires a very high degree of technical skill, as may be learned from the most complete treatise on the subject, Jacques Ellul's *Les Propagandes* (Paris, 1962), which is also available in an excellent English translation. The conditioning of the populace must be directed by a small corps of expert technicians in the employ of an oligarchy, with only a limited number of assistants who are fully aware of their task. When we consider the British and Americans (as distinct from resident aliens), we may be certain that most of the teachers who inject illusions into the minds of the young, many of the journalists who manufacture tripe for the press and radio, and even quite a few of the "social scientists" who concoct sophistries for the half-educated, are not conscious of what they are doing, being themselves deceived. And the individuals who suspect that they are deluding their victims probably soothe their consciences with assurances that they are engaged in noble work for "democracy" and their salaries.

Thus, although it is true that the manufacture of propaganda, like the manufacture of shoes or stoves, requires today a larger number of technicians and other employees than were needed even a few decades ago, the number concerned in its production is relatively small and the employers even fewer, so that historians still think in terms of a small group engaged in conscious and calculated deception of a great majority.

To take a specific example, *adhuc sub iudice*, a photograph with some collateral evidence has recently been published to show that the holy man who has been raising Hell in Persia is not the Khomeini who appeared in France as a refugee some years ago. We automatically assume that if the evidence is spurious, it was fabricated by a few men, no more, perhaps, than half a dozen. If it is genuine, then the impersonation was arranged by the secret service of some major nation or international state, requiring the complicity of no more than a dozen men, including the director who gave the orders. We should think it fantastic to suppose that there are as many as four hundred persons, now in Europe and able to tell the truth, who are party to the hoax, whichever it is.

Historians have never thought of calculated deception as the work of any large number of persons. It is true, of course, that some minority groups, religious or conspiratorial, have tried to disguise their beliefs. The Mandaean are reputed to have lied about their faith to strangers, but if their religion is fairly represented by the scriptures that have been recently obtained and published (e.g., their Canonical Prayer Book, edited and translated by Professor E. S. Drower in

1939), one wonders why they took the trouble. In past centuries, Persian Shi'ites, when they made a pilgrimage to Mecca, understandably practised *takiyah*, concealing their heresy from the more orthodox Moslems among whom they had to travel at the risk of their lives.

In the United States, the American Republican Party, which limited its membership to American-born white men, excluding Jews and other unassimilable aliens, earned the sobriquet by which it is now commonly known by urging its members to avoid futile debate with their adversaries by saying, "I Know Nothing about it." But their aim was not to keep secret purposes which, indeed, were so well known that, despite the furious opposition of professional politicians, they might well have achieved control of the Federal government, had they not been disrupted and dispersed by agitation about slavery in the South. One could cite other instances of evasion to avoid inconvenience or harassment, but such expedients differ totally from the perpetuation of hoaxes and do not impugn the historians' premise that forgeries and impostures are secretly contrived by a few individuals.

Historians must now drastically revise that premise. No matter how timorous they may be, they cannot, if honest, close their eyes to proof that massive deceptions can be carried out by thousands, even millions, of individuals who act unanimously with a common purpose.

40 Million Too Preposterous

The great Jewish hoax about millions of God's Chosen People whom the Germans supposedly exterminated seems to have been devised late in 1942, when it was claimed that in the autumn of that year the Germans had murdered two millions of the Holy Race in various ways. By 1943, the number had been increased to six million, and to keep up the progression, it was later increased to 40,000,000, which was seen to be so preposterous that it was reduced to 12,000,000, and at the end of the Crusade to Save the Soviet, the figure of six million was taken as the largest that could be imposed on the gullible *goyim*.

The obvious original motive, common to all war propaganda, was to pep up the cattle that were being stampeded against Germany, but there may have been a further purpose in a hope that after the war it would be possible to carry out the Jewish plan, formulated and published by Theodore Kaufman in 1941, to exterminate the entire population of Germany as an object lesson to lower races that might want to have a country of their own, not under the management of God's People.

Since that proved not to be feasible, the hoax was used as a pretext for the obscene murders perpetrated at Nuremberg by the American, Soviet, British, and French victors, for their repudiation of the conventions, called international law, that had been observed by all civilised nations, and for the innumerable and ghastly atrocities by which all the victors, guided by their Jewish supervisors, equally and forever forfeited their claim to be morally superior to Atilla's Huns or Hulagu's

Mongols. And the hoax is still being used to loot Germany and, indirectly, all the nations of the West to subsidise the Jewish seizure of Palestine and adjacent lands.

It is no longer possible to think of a deception of many by a few. The utter falsity of this hoax, which was made the more preposterous when the physically impossible gas chambers were invented to dress it up, was necessarily known to hundreds of thousands of Jews who remained on German territory during the insane war, many of whom - probably 250,000 - the Germans naturally interned as domestic enemies, although not with the thoroughness with which the Americans put resident Japanese in concentration camps during 1942-45. The Jews who remained in Germany, both those who were foolishly trusted and held governmental positions and those who were confined to the various camps, necessarily knew that there were no "gas chambers" and there was no "extermination" (although, of course, many individuals died from disease, old age, and Anglo-American bombing raids on the various camps, and, no doubt, some were slain by individual Germans when they foresaw the defeat and ruin of their country by the maddened hordes that the international race had mobilised against them - and by the Polish and Russian populations of occupied territories when the German armies failed to control their long-standing resentment of their parasites).

Furthermore, since the race has always been truly international, many hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Jews throughout the world and especially in the United States must have known or suspected the truth when their supposedly exterminated relatives flocked into the country or corresponded with them. In addition, there must have been a considerable number of Jews who, even if without sources of direct information, were intelligent enough to see that the hoax was inherently incredible, psychologically improbable and physically impossible.

But nevertheless, so far as I know, only one Jew, Josef Ginsburg, who resided in German or Rumanian territory throughout the war, has borne witness that there was no German policy to "exterminate" his race; and although he published his books under the pseudonym of J. G. Burg, he only accidentally escaped death at the hands of Jewish terrorists in Munich.

The great Jewish hoax, which is currently imposed by the Jewish Terror on the population of Western nations, must be distinguished from the tall tales now told in Soviet territory, where the yowling about fictitious Jewish victims was long ago replaced by an official claim that the Germans deliberately exterminated six million of high-minded Slavs. How much of this propaganda, much of which is so phrased that it could include casualties in battle, is believed by intelligent Russians, it is impossible to say, and no one will wonder at the lack of public protest from persons who know better but live in Soviet territory, under a supervision more strict than any that has thus far been imposed on any Western nation, although the Jews are naturally trying to approximate it for purposes of their own and have attained a very considerable success in Western Germany, where the corrupt government in Bonn has virtually made it illegal to disbelieve any Jewish imposture, and many books that the Jewish censorship has not approved for *goyim* can be circulated only clandestinely.

Although the hoax about the "six million" has always been inherently unbelievable in all of the various revisions that have been made from time to time, and although it has been definitively exposed and demolished by Professor Arthur A. Butz in his *Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Historical Review Press, 1976), the entire race, numbering at least thirty millions

throughout the world, is frantically insisting, with apparent unanimity, that the lower races must believe whatever they are told by God's Master Race, and what is most significant, Jewish professors ensconced in Western universities and necessarily knowing something of the methods of Western scholarship, automatically shrieked and spat at Professor Butz, although they had never seen his book and did not even know its correct title. One cannot avoid the conclusion that however well they had learned or simulated the methods of scholarship, all questions of fact were to be rigorously subordinated to the interests of their race.

Anne Frank's Diary

A second example is the astoundingly crude forgery called "Anne Frank's Diary", concocted so negligently and with such contempt for Aryan minds that its many internal contradictions proclaim its falsity. It can have imposed on no reader who had even a modicum of critical judgement and a memory sufficiently good to retain what he read on one page when he read a passage a few pages later. The blatant contradictions in the text of this fraud have now been listed by Swedish writer, Ditlieb Felderer, in *Anne Frank's Diary: a Hoax* (Institute for Historical Review, Torrance, California, 1980), but the mystery is why such a booklet was ever needed.

Many persons, it is true, read religious texts in an emotional trance that paralyses their reason, and one can only assume that sentimental persons who have been so prepared by preliminary propaganda that they blubber as they read the first page of the "Diary" can go on reading in a similar stupor. No critical reader can ever have been deceived, whatever his race. But here again, thirty to sixty million Jews, with apparent unanimity, are determined that the *goyim* shall believe, or profess to believe, that preposterous canard, if they are to escape punishment for being rational. And one hears that the courts in Western Germany have held that it is a criminal offence to express doubts about what no intelligent man can believe. One cannot predict when the same courts will hold that it is an "insult" to the "Jewish nation" to deny that the earth is flat, as was specifically stated by the God who covenanted to deliver the whole earth to His People.

Even more significant is the Jews' progressive abandonment of their usual measures for herding the *goyim*: bribery, open or surreptitious financial pressures, and the manipulation of venal politicians. Mobs of Jewish hoodlums now openly assault French professors who dare to doubt the incredible, wield iron clubs to crack the skulls of a few French writers who have met privately to discuss the forbidden topic, and openly boast they have murdered with a time bomb a French professor who dared to stand for election to the Chambre des Députés. And there is comparable violence by Jewish thugs, with or without an admixture of zombies from the lower races, in West Germany, England, and the United States, while thirty to sixty million Jews, without significant exceptions, applaud the good work and protect the criminals through their control of virtually all the means of communication and their control or intimidation of police forces and courts.

The drastic import of these facts for historiography is obvious. An entire race (or sub-race, if you prefer that classification) can show effective solidarity in the perpetration of outrageous hoaxes, while many thousands or even millions who cannot but know the truth, knowingly

participate in the fraud, whether from fear of reprisals by their fellows, hatred of their victims, or a confidence in their biological superiority, such as we show when we imprison or kill wild animals and make cows, horses, sheep, and dogs our domestic servants or our food. The implication for historians in their consideration of *all* information, ancient or modern, that has come to us from or through Jewish sources is emphatically clear and imposes an inescapable obligation. And it remains to be ascertained whether there may be, or have been, comparable phenomena in seemingly unanimous asseverations by other races.

The Spiritual Jew

excerpted from The Yellow Peril, by Professor Revilo P. Oliver

...It may be that we err when we think of the Jewish race as only materialists, predatory for profit. We think of cut-throat methods and dirty tricks to take over the businesses of *goyim* and drive them from the professions, of political corruption and lucrative incitement of depravity. We think of the habitual device used in its simplest form by the parasites who swarmed into the South in the wake of the invading armies in 1865. It was neatly described by Mark Twain. As soon as the ruined plantations were made productive again, a store was promptly established by "a thrifty Israelite, who encourages the thoughtless negro and his wife to buy all sorts of things they could do without--but on credit, at big prices, month after month, credit based on the negro's share of the growing crop; and at the end of the season, the negro's share belongs to the Israelite, and the negro is in debt besides." It is always the same: in Rumania, in Hungary, in Poland, in every country infested by the international race. Of course, the simple method that suffices for Congoids and simple-minded peasants has to be made more elaborate and sophisticated when applied to prosperous Aryans, including millionaires, but the principle remains the same. Where there is blood to be sucked from the natives, the leeches are always fat.⁷

We should not think of such stupidity as a peculiarity of the Irish. In his *Racial Contours* (Douglas, Isle of Man, 1965), H.B. Isherwood, on the basis of his own observations and the latest anthropological data then available, stated that the highest percentage of Nordics was to be found in Sweden, where the Nordic characteristics were more common than in Norway. In my review of Donald Day's book in the January issue of *Liberty Bell*, I commented on his observation of the Swedes. A reader tells me that he recently attended an academic ceremony at the University of Uppsala: he says the University was swarming with Jews and that the Swedes could not tell the difference between a Jew and a Swede--not because they cowered before the Jewish Terror, which would be understandable, but because they were too stupid to perceive a difference between persons who spoke Swedish. He said that he at last understood that the common phrase, "dumb Swede," did not refer to a person stricken with aphasia or a disease of the vocal chords. The Swedish government has arrested Dietrich Felderer for disrespect to God's Race and has placed him at the mercy of Jewish "psychiatrists." Felderer's crime was to write a book in which he analysed the hoax called *Anne Frank's Diary*, a piece of fiction so carelessly put together that any person who can read it while awake and fail to recognize it as clumsy fiction is so deficient in common sense that he must be considered intellectually subnormal. It would be bad enough if the Swedish authorities who are persecuting Felderer were doing so in

⁷ The obtuseness of White men would be incredible, if it were not attested by innumerable examples. The Irish, for example, still venerate the memory of the "great Irish patriot," Robert Briscoe, and his "heroic part in the Irish revolt [against Britain]," his heroism having consisted of inciting murders and planning riots from a place of safety and of smuggling into Ireland arms and bombs that the Irish purchased at high prices from Jewish dealers. They venerate that hero because their newspapers tell them to, and they do so quite oblivious of the fact that "Briscoe" did not have in his veins a drop of Irish blood, being the offspring of Jews who crawled into the island from Lithuania, either before or after his birth. In March 1957, he strutted through Boston at the head of a procession of Irish, suitably adorned while the band played "Wearing of the Green" and he waved his cane at the cheering crowds of "those dumb Micks," as he called them when speaking later to a German-American, although the Jew seems to have concealed his contempt for his dupes when he was with them.

expectation of being rewarded with a few dollars by the Jews, but one cannot exclude the horrible thought that some of them may actually believe the silly story told in the hoax. If they do, they probably believe Grimm's Fairy Tales to be historical records.

The publication of Professor Butz's analysis of the "holocaust" swindle, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, naturally has caused among the Jews some dissent as to the policy the race should pursue, and several rabbis, in their own publications and even in their columns in papers for the *goyim*, such as the *Chicago Sun-Times*, issued veiled warnings that too much agitation about their Holohoax might give Americans ideas they would put into practice. The ruling element in Jewry decided to use their newspapers and boob-tubes to pump a steady stream of sludge in the faces of the dumb brutes; but some intelligent rabbis continued to have misgivings. The *Stratford (Connecticut) Express*, 23 September, quoted the opinions of two rabbis concerning the slop currently sprayed from the boob-tubes; one said that the film might make people "wonder why Hitler did not complete the job, and it could encourage Fascism to rear its ugly head again"; the other said that the film was "far too contrived...and could encourage Fascism again." Even the device of ramming the pus into the minds of school children seems to be becoming counter-productive, and one hears that some Jews are coming to feel that they are only advertising their dominion over their American plantation and its livestock. Such dissidents may have been the object of a warning in *Jewish Week*, 29 April: "The Holocaust is our strength. We have been shielded by it for a generation." The blatant hoax, however, may prove to be their great and perhaps fatal weakness.)

That picture of the invading hordes is accurate so far as it goes, but it may not be complete. A race is more than an aggregation of individuals, and it is as much a spiritual as a physical entity. And there are historical incidents in which the spiritual force of Judaism has unmistakably overcome the selfish interests of individuals. A famous example is an event in A.D. 117, which was summarized in Ralph Perier's little booklet, *The Jews Love Christianity*:

"In the capital city [Cyrene] of that prosperous province [Cyrenaica] of the Roman Empire, the Jews, naturally, had planted a huge ghetto and they undoubtedly controlled a large part of the trade on which the province's prosperity depended. Many Jews must have been among the wealthiest inhabitants. But, nevertheless, the race's innate nihilism was excited by a christ, who announced the glad tidings that Yahweh had said that the time had come to put the *goyim* in their place. Filled with a zeal for righteousness, the Jewish swarm caught the stupidly complacent Greeks and Romans off their guard and slaughtered more than 200,000 men and women in various ingenious ways....God's People then destroyed all the property in the city *including their own!*, apparently by burning the city and then levelling to the ground such walls as remained standing. They then rushed out into the countryside to destroy the villages and uproot the crops."

I italicized the significant phrase. We do not know whether the wealthy Jews whose riches were thus annihilated were overmastered by the mob or had themselves caught the enthusiasm for ripping the guts out of people whose civilization and culture the race has always hated, but what is more significant is that *every* one of the Jewish rabble, even the very poorest, must have

had to abandon and sacrifice his possessions, however few they may have been, when he and his fellows were inflamed by a spiritual ardor.

A race's innate character is most clearly shown in its favorite myths. No reader of the "Old Testament" can have failed to notice that while there are many tales of highly profitable theft, subversion, and looting by God's Chosen Bandits, the real *Leitmotiv* of the whole collection is destruction, universal massacres and total destruction. There is the well-known passage (Exod. 23.27) in which Yahweh promises each and every Jew that he "will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come."⁸ And the story narrates, over and over again, with wearisome iteration, the triumphs of the blood-thirsty and nihilistic marauders. Yahweh's special pet, Moses, boasts, "And we took all the cities [of Bashan]...threescore cities...and we utterly destroyed them...utterly destroying the men, women, and children of every city." And although Moses didn't get to enjoy much more carnage, the savage swarm moved on to Jericho, "And they utterly destroyed all that was in that city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox and sheep and ass, with the edge of the sword....And they burnt the city with fire, and all that was therein." "And Joshua⁹...utterly destroyed all the inhabitants of Ai...And Joshua burnt Ai, and made it a heap for ever, even a desolation unto this day." And so the inspiring tale goes on and on and on. "So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vales, and of the springs, and all their kings: he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed." A righteous lust to kill all the men, all the women, all the children, all the animals, everything that breathed, and to destroy cities and make of them mounds of desolation in a desert, was stronger even than the greed of the godly brigands whose piety is celebrated in their exemplary tales.

⁸ The words that I have quoted from the King James Version are attenuated in later translations on the basis of quibbles about the Hebrew text that are not worth mentioning. Very significant, however, is the meaning of the Hebrew text that was current in the first century B.C. and was translated into Greek in the Septuagint. In it are the crucial words that Yahweh promises "I will befuddle the minds of all the gentiles [=goyim]." This text agrees with the rest of the chapter, in which Yahweh explains that the hated races are not to be exterminated all at once, but gradually and "little by little." That, in turn, fully agrees with the explanation given by Philo Judaeus, the Jew's great apologist of the First Century A.D. Admitting that the tales about the conquest of Canaan were intrinsically unbelievable, he gave a rational explanation of them (*Hypoth.* 6.6-7 = 356d-357a). When the wandering tribe of Jews reached Canaan, intending to slaughter the natives and take their country from them, the Jews were necessarily incapable of armed aggression against a strong nation, but the Canaanites were so befuddled that they believed their implacable enemies to be a godly and peaceful folk and accordingly invited the Jews into their country and permitted them to set up their synagogues and colonies. That proves that the Jews are God's People, because God must have made the Canaanites so stupid as to let the Jews immigrate. Of course, when the Jews had securely lodged themselves in the country they intended to steal, they destroyed the gullible *goyim* by methods, doubtless including their habitual technique of subversion and inciting civil discord and war, that Philo thought it would be tactless to describe. We may be virtually certain, therefore, that the Septuagint preserves the meaning of the original text, although later tales in the collection lovingly describe a military invasion of Canaan and the delights of slaughtering its inhabitants. One Jewish hoax that long imposed on our people was the claim that they sedulously preserved the texts of their holy books without alteration; that was, of course, definitely exposed by the few Dead Sea Scrolls that have been published, and is probably one reason why the Jews, with, of course, the complicity of the Christians, have made certain that the great bulk of those scrolls will never be read by honest *goyim*. (The story now is that a mysterious infection has attacked the organic fibers of the scrolls and is turning them into gelatin, so they are now said to be locked up in lightless vaults and one of the "custodians" has boasted that no one will ever again see them.

⁹ The King James Version (and, so far as I have noticed, all others in English) is in error here. The name of the supposed leader of the Jewish invasion and despoliation of Canaan should be spelled 'Jesus' since that is the spelling of the same name when it refers to the protagonist of the "New Testament." The name is the Hebrew YSW, and since vowels were not written in Hebrew, it was easy to deceive persons who did not know Hebrew or the language from which that dialect was derived by supplying different vowels in the two contexts. In the last centuries B.C. and early centuries A.D. the name was pronounced as *Yeshua* or *Yeshwa*, which, as filtered through Greek and Latin, gives the English 'Jesus.' Of this, there can be no possible doubt: in the Septuagint the character whom ignorant Christians call "Joshua" in the Christian's Bible is entitled "Jesus." The fact that there was only the one name is admitted by Christian theologians, but they maintain the false distinction for business reasons

Their "prophets" attain a memorable eloquence when they are inspired by visions of world-wide death and desolation. "The indignation of the Lord is upon all nations;...he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain shall be cast out, and their stink shall come out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted [!] with their blood. And all the host of heaven [i.e., the constellations] shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll."--"Their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness [of decaying flesh]....And the streams thereof shall be turned to pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night or day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever."--"I will break in pieces the horse and his rider...I will break in pieces the chariot and its rider...I will break in pieces man and woman...I will break in pieces old and young...I will break in pieces the young man and the maid...I will break in pieces the shepherd and his flock...I will break in pieces the husbandman and his yoke of oxen...I will break in pieces the captains and rulers...And the land shall tremble and sorrow: for every purpose of the Lord shall be performed...to make the land of Babylon a desolation without an inhabitant."--"I [Yahweh] have cut off the nations: their towers are desolate; I have made their streets waste, that none passeth by; their cities are destroyed, so that there is no man, that there is no inhabitant...My determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be destroyed with the fire of my jealousy."

The same spiritual *Leitmotiv* of Judaism appears vividly in the apocalypse that was selected for inclusion in the "New Testament." It would take too long to enumerate the ingenious ways in which Jesus afflicts, tortures, and kills all the inhabitants of the earth, and every reader of that mad phantasmagoria will remember that Jesus, in a paroxysm of nihilistic fury, destroys the mountains and the seas, destroys the whole earth, destroys the sun and the moon, destroys all the stars--destroys the whole universe, destroys everything, destroys and destroys.

No other mythology so reeks of an insane lust to torture, to kill, to destroy, to create only desolation and nothingness. And this spiritual force has characterized the activities of the Jews throughout history: they can only destroy. And the few Jews to whom we should be profoundly grateful, notably Marcus Eli Ravage, Oscar Levy, and Maurice Samuel, have been so candid as to tell us the truth explicitly: "We are intruders, we are subverters."--"We Jews...today are nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners."--"We Jews, we the destroyers, will remain destroyers forever."¹⁰

This is a cardinal fact that we must take into account in our estimates of the present. It is obvious that the Jews derive great profits from the many forms of subversion--from pornography and the incitement to degeneracy, from class warfare, from wars between nations of our race, from the inflation of counterfeit currencies and the impoverishment of our people, and from many similar activities.¹¹ But if we consider such things from the standpoint of the race, not

¹⁰ The passages from which I have taken these sentences are more fully quoted, with bibliographic references, by Colonel Farrell in his article in the March 1983 issue of *Liberty Bell*, p.31.)

¹¹ This includes, of course, the instigation of destructive lusts in the natives. Malcolm Muggeridge, writing in *Time*, 3 December 1979, proposed an explanation of the intensive campaign in our schools and newspapers to spread the race-destroying plague of homosexuality. His

from the standpoint of the individual Jew who battens on us, is it not likely that the material profit counts for much less than the spiritual satisfaction? And if we consider some of the Jew's work, I cannot see how it could conceivably yield a net profit. What monetary gain can they have obtained, or intended to obtain, by spending vast sums to incite the niggers to rape, murder, and arson? What profit from destroying civilization in Rhodesia and making that land again a land of savages? What can the Jews in South Africa gain in material terms from their present intensive effort to destroy the white population and make of that country another Rhodesia? Is it not obvious that they could squeeze much more money out of the White population by peaceful parasitism and without inciting the racial hatreds that disrupt the economy and could conceivably bring retribution upon themselves? The only explanation, it seems to me, is that with their race as a whole spiritual considerations are paramount, paramount over profit and even over self-preservation. One can foresee the logical end in a future that may not be too distant: one can see the last Jews dying with exultation on the surface of a planet from which they have exterminated all other human beings, all animal, all vegetation, all life--a planet of which they have made "a desolation of desolations."

explanation merits consideration. He believes that John Maynard Keynes, for example, incensed by the loss of the ministrations of a favorite pervert, took vengeance on society "by inventing an economic theory which, after a period of spurious prosperity, must infallibly bankrupt the countries which adopt it." The article is accompanied by a photograph which reminds us that Keynes can have been only partly an Englishman; I do not know whether or not the non-Aryan race that entered into his composition was Jewish, but it is well known that intelligent mongrels usually feel a bitter rancor against the society that made them possible. Muggeridge by implication also accuses E.M. Forster and Lytton Strachey of the same social incendiarism, but, so far as I know, they and the other noted homosexuals whom he mentions were of uncontaminated English descent.

CHRISTIANITY

and the

SURVIVAL

of the

WEST



Revalo P. Oliver

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SURVIVAL OF THE WEST

By
Revalo P. Oliver

STERLING ENTERPRISES STERLING, VIRGINIA 1973

©Revalo P. Oliver 1973

STERLING ENTERPRISES STERLING, VIRGINIA 1973

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 73- 77357 Printed in the United States of America

COVER

A Christian memorial at Middleton, Yorkshire, showing the figure of a Viking warrior surrounded by his weapons and shield, as if representing the layout of his grave chamber in accordance with pagan tradition.

EBOOK BY:

)))JEREMY WHITLOCK(((

ABOUT THIS BOOK

In his *Conspiracy or Degeneracy?* in 1966 Dr. Oliver asked the crucial question, “Have we, the Men of the West, lost the will to live?” To that question there has been no definitive answer.

The present book is an attempt to clarify our religious and cultural tradition. It is a profound and revealing analysis. Rest assured, *you will not find in these pages what you have read elsewhere.*

It is the publisher’s sincere belief that this book, widely read, could accomplish miracles. The question is whether or not we can set aside our preconceived notions long enough to understand its message.

And what is that message? It is that we must recognize things *as they are*, and base our efforts on present realities, not dreams and wishes. Make no mistake: unless we deal with facts *as facts*, we, the heirs of Christendom, will doom ourselves to oblivion.

The Publisher



Dr. Revilo Pendleton Oliver

Dr. Revilo Pendleton Oliver, Professor of the Classics at the University of Illinois, is a scholar of international distinction who has written in four languages scholarly articles published in twelve learned periodicals of the United States and Europe. His first book, a critical and copiously annotated translation from the Sanskrit, was published in 1938.

During World War II, Dr. Oliver was Director of Research in a highly secret agency of the War Department, and was cited for outstanding service to his country.

As early as 1934, in articles in *Nation's Business*, he accurately forecast the economic servitude that was gradually imposed on the American people during the next decade by the masters of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He is one of the very few college professors who have dared consistently and vigorously to oppose and denounce the progressive subversion of American institutions and defacement of Western civilization.

Since 1954, he unceasingly sought to promote and obtain an effective cooperation between all genuinely American patriotic groups, urging that doctrinaire differences be subordinated to *essential* purposes. His article, "Conservatism and Reality," in *Modern Age* (Fall 1961) represents the counsel that he consistently gave until he recognized in 1964 that irreversible events had made the proposed tactic obsolete and had finally made many of the hopes of "conservatives" unattainable.

He participated in the founding of the John Birch Society and in planning for it a strategy that was never put into practice. He was a member of the National Council of the Birch Society until July, 1966, when he severed his connections with all of the various enterprises promoted by Robert Welch, including *American Opinion*, to which he had contributed two short books, numerous articles, and many searching book reviews, believing that he could thus best serve the American interest.

His booklet, *Conspiracy or Degeneracy?*, containing the text of a famous speech given in Boston on 2 July, 1966, and copious documentary and elucidatory notes, was published by Power Products, Nedrow, New York, in 1967, and received the Award of Merit of the American Academy of Public Affairs.

After his public announcement that he could "no longer in conscience remain a member" of the Birch Council or lend his efforts and name to any of the activities of Robert Welch, Professor Oliver refused to contribute to "conservative" periodicals published in the United States, believing that the public was not yet ready to face unpleasant realities or to surrender hopes and dreams that had become unattainable within the predictable future.

When the Birch Society was founded as a patriotic organization in 1958, Professor Oliver urged the formation of an affiliate that would appeal directly and in realistic terms to young Americans in the schools and colleges, and help them free their minds from the demoralizing propaganda to which they were constantly and forcibly exposed.

Believing that the riots which our enemies were obviously planning to hold in colleges during the autumn and winter of 1969 would offer a unique opportunity to recruit decent young men and women, he agreed at the beginning of that year to sponsor the National Youth Alliance, for which he wrote an article, "After Fifty Years," published in the *American Mercury*, Fall, 1969, after having been widely distributed in advance offprints. The organization was aborted by the professional promoter who had agreed to finance its formative stages, and was, as Professor Oliver apprehended in his article, "frustrated at its very inception," and so came to an end. A great opportunity was thus irretrievably lost.

Professor Oliver has no connection with the National Youth Alliance that is the legitimate successor organization and is directed by Dr. William L. Pierce, for whose abilities he has a high regard.

As the author observes in his "Postscript" to the present volume, this is his first publication of general interest on behalf of our agonizing nation and civilization since 1969.

The Publisher

A return will set in of the re-active pressure of nature upon mankind. Mankind will again be restive under it. ... But woe to that people which has not men that will stand up and fight without flinching. Those countries where the moral decay shall have gone deepest, where the proved stock shall have died out and given way to poor stock, where the greatest effeminisation of men shall have taken place (for the masculinisation of women will be no compensation), where the strong and the wise and the shrewd shall gain no more of wealth, power, and influence than the weak, silly, and incompetent, all being equal, - those will go to the wall. And when this fate shall have overtaken most of our western white men's countries, our cycle of civilization will be completed.

—Correa Moylan Walsh (1917)

Glücklich wird niemand sein, der heute irgendwo in der Welt lebt.

—Oswald Spengler (1918)

Jamais comme aujourd'hui les peuples n'ont eu la sensation d'être menés par les événements. Jamais ils n'ont été plus impuissants, plus *volontairement* impuissants devant eux. ... Et c'est bien ce qui me parait le plus tragique dans l'aspect du monde de 1932: on n'y voit qu'une civilisation qui tombe et la nuit qui approche.

—Pierre Loewel (1932)

The mission of this generation is the most difficult that has ever faced a Western generation. It must break the terror by which it is held in silence, it must look ahead, it must believe when there is apparently no hope, it must obey even if it means death, it must fight to the end rather than submit. ... The men of this generation must fight for the continued existence of the West.

—Francis Parker Yockey (1948)

The Religion of the West

YOU, WHO ARE now reading these lines, and I are strangers. I have no means of knowing whether you are a Christian or an atheist. That, however, will not matter, so long as we talk about facts and not wishes.

The observed and verifiable facts of the world about us are not affected by religious faith or the lack of faith. Christians and atheists must find themselves in perfect agreement when they affirm that lead is more malleable than steel, that the earth is an oblate spheroid rotating on its axis, that whales are mammals, that Germany was defeated and devastated by the many nations allied against her in 1945, and that the Chinese are Mongolians. About such matters there can be no dispute among Western men, who instinctively accept the reality of the world about us and *cannot* believe, as do many Orientals, that it is merely an illusion in the mind of a dreamer.

If we would salvage and restore our civilization—the Occidental culture that is peculiarly our own and that now seems to be disintegrating and rotting before our very eyes—we must do so as Western men, by observing reality objectively and by reasoning from it dispassionately. And when we try to compute what resources remain to us, we need first of all to determine the actual strength of the Christian tradition at the present time.

It is a fact, which Christians will regard with satisfaction and some atheists may deplore, that Western civilization, for about half of its recorded history, has been a Christian civilization in the sense that the great majority of the people belonging to it (though never, at any time, *all* of them) believed implicitly in the truth of the Christian revelation. That religious unanimity was for a long time so nearly complete that, after the fall of the Roman Empire and the evanescence of hopes for its restoration, we of the West regarded our religion as the bond that united us and distinguished us from the rest of the human species. During the Middle Ages, our ancestors occupied the greater part of Europe, and, until they discovered the American continents, they lived only in Europe, but despite that geographical unity, they did not generally refer to themselves as the Europeans. For all practical purposes, furthermore, our ancestors belonged to the same division of the white race: they, like the true Greeks and the true Romans before them, were all members of the great race that we now call Indo-European or Aryan, but they had in their languages no word to designate their blood relationship and biological unity. Thus, when they referred to the unity of which they were always conscious as something transcending the constantly shifting territorial and political divisions of Europe, they called themselves Christendom. And for many centuries that word was adequate and misled no one.

For many centuries the West was Christendom and its civilization was indubitably Christian: that, whether you like it or not, is an historical fact. There is a complementary historical fact that was less obvious at the time and that even thoughtful men overlooked or tried to ignore until the events of the past two decades made it indubitable: Christianity is a religion of the West, and, for all practical purposes, *only* of the West. It is not, as its polemical adversaries so

often charge, a Semitic cult, for it has never commanded the adhesion of any considerable number of Semites, and it is not, as Christians once generally believed, a universal religion, for experience has now proved that it cannot be successfully exported to populations that are not Indo-European.

Experience has also proved that it does not do the slightest good to deny ascertained facts. The men of Classical antiquity knew, of course, that the earth is spherical, and Eratosthenes in the third century B.C. calculated its circumference as 24,663 miles. But the early Fathers of the Church, living in the age of growing ignorance that shrouded the last century of the Roman Empire, decided, on the basis of some statements in the Old Testament, that the earth ought to be flat or, at least, no more curved than a shield. Lactantius was the most eloquent and probably, therefore, the most influential of the many who assiduously demanded that the earth be flat and so imposed on their contemporaries the conviction that it was. In the Middle Ages, to be sure, there were some learned men, such as Buridan, who knew that the globe is a globe, but they, like learned men today, who all know very well that talk about the equality of races is utter nonsense, usually refrained from publicly denouncing fashionable delusions. It was not until the Fifteenth Century that the truth became again inescapable, but when it did, the Christians, being men of the West, who do not deny the lessons of experience, surrendered the comfortable error in which they had once generally believed; and since that time, no rational Christian has doubted that the earth is spherical.

Today, as in the Fifteenth Century, Western men have had to discard a congenial assumption to bring their conception of the world into conformity with observed reality. So long as we of the West held unquestioned dominion over the whole earth, we permitted ourselves to assume that our civilization in general, and our religion in particular, could be exported and made universal. We did not sufficiently observe that talent for mimicry is common to all human beings and indeed to all anthropoids; that all human beings stand in awe of those who have power over them; and that a genius for dissimulation and hypocrisy is hereditary in the most intelligent Orientals. Even with these oversights, the evidence against our assumption was fairly clear, but in the pride of our power we felt that we could indulge an assumption that was so congenial to the romantic generosity that is a peculiarity of our race. But the events of half a century, and especially of the past two decades, have shown us, beyond peradventure of doubt, the shape of the world in which we live. We now know what our prolonged missionary effort, cultural as well as religious, accomplished—and how its visible effects were produced.

When Cortes and his small but valiant band of iron men conquered the teeming empire of the Aztecs, he was immediately followed by a train of earnest missionaries, chiefly Franciscans, who began to preach the Gospel to the natives and soon sent home, with naive enthusiasm, glowing accounts of the conversions they had effected. Their pious sincerity and innocent joy still lives in the pages of Father Sahagun, Father Torquemada, and many others. For their sake I am glad that the poor Franciscans never suspected how small a part they played in the religious conversions that gave them such happiness. Far, far more persuasive than their sermons and their book had been the Spanish cannon that breached and shattered the Aztec defenses, and

the ruthless Spanish soldiers who slew the Aztec priests at their own altars and toppled the Aztec idols from the sacrificial pyramids. The Aztecs, Tapanecs, and other natives accepted Christianity, not because their hearts were touched by alien and incomprehensible doctrines of love and mercy, but because it was the religion of the white men whose bronze cannon and mail-clad warriors were invincible.

That was early in the Sixteenth Century and even then, there were not wanting indications that should have given pause to a critical mind, but we of the West went on repeating that fond mistake for four centuries, as the missionaries whom we sent to all parts of the world wrote home glowing reports of the number of "hearts" they had "won for Christ." It was only after our enemies' campaign of "anti-colonialism" really got under way that most of us realized that what had won all those hearts was primarily the discipline of British regiments and the manifest power of the white man.

We now know what happened. On many a shore of Africa, for example, missionaries eager to "win souls for Christ" ventured to land alone, and the aborigines, after mutilating and torturing them for a good communal laugh, ate them, cooked or raw according to the custom of the local cuisine. Usually, a few weeks or a few months later, a British cruiser hove to off shore and lobbed half a dozen 4.5 shells into the native village, and, if not pressed for time, landed half a company of marines to beat the bushes and drag out a dozen or so savages to hang on convenient trees. Consequently the tribe, if not very obtuse, took the hint and respected the next bevy of missionaries as somehow representing the god of thunder and lightning. And if the men of God distributed enough free rice and medical care with their sermons, they were able to make "converts," as the natives learned to utter the words that Christians like to hear.

That is, in essence, the whole history of "winning souls" among the savages. There were, of course, many local variations. If the first missionaries were preceded by troops or white settlers, the blacks had already been convinced of the virtues of Christian rifles and had learned that white men should not be regarded as esculent comestibles. It often happened, however, that the natives, even after many years of preaching and conversion, rejected the white man's odd rites very emphatically, and a fresh supply of missionaries was needed. In 1905, for example, the Maji-Maji conspiracy in Tanganyika murdered all the missionaries and almost all the white men and women in the entire territory, and it required a German regiment and several companies of marines to restore the teaching of the Gospel. That was done by giving some forty or fifty thousand demonstrations that a Mauser bullet could penetrate even a black hide that had been most carefully anointed with the grease of a boiled baby.

The Christian missionaries did teach a ritual and often inculcated a superstition that had some superficial resemblance to their religion, but as for teaching the spiritual substance of Christianity, they might as well have followed the example of St. Francis and preached sermons to the birds. That is why the many, many thousands of devoted Christians who expended their whole lives to "save souls" built only an edifice of cardboard and tinsel that is now gone in the wind.

What the vanishing of that flimsy façade has made obvious was predictable from the first. The religion of the West has *never* been comprehensible to the rudimentary minds of Congoids, Capoids, and Australoids, races so primitive that they were congenitally incapable of inventing a wheel and even of using one without supervision—races that could not develop for themselves even the first and simplest preliminaries of a civilization. When the missionaries invented systems of writing the crude languages of the primitives, they had also to invent words to express such concepts as 'God,' 'soul,' 'justice,' 'morality,' and 'religion'—invent them by either creating new words or by perverting to such meanings sounds that in the native jargons conveyed impressions that were faintly and remotely analogous. That fact alone should have made us think. It was clear, furthermore, that the "converts," even those who had been most thoroughly imbued with an awe of the god of repeating rifles and locomotives, would conform to the white man's morality only under coercion, and that whenever they escaped from the white man's supervision they spontaneously reverted not only to their own *mores* but also to whatever form of voodoo they had practiced before. Even if earlier experience had not been conclusive, what happened in Haiti at the very beginning of the Nineteenth Century should have removed the last lingering doubt. But the missionaries did not learn, and the "Ladies' Missionary Society" went on contributing their mites, plying their needles, and glowing with tender emotion for the sweet little savages depicted by their romantic imaginations.

Although it is true that in some places in the former colonial possessions missionaries are still tolerated, if they are obsequious to the natives and pay very well, we have at last learned that the Gospel follows the British regiments in the white man's ignominious and insane retreat from the world that was his.

The Orient

WE INDO-EUROPEANS have been Christian for about half of our recorded history, and our whole culture was so intimately connected with our religion that we called our world Christendom. Today, however, our religion and hence our understanding of ourselves and the world about us have been drastically affected by three distinct developments that have no necessary relation to one another and that we should be careful not to confuse, viz.:

(1) The catastrophic decline of religious faith and belief among our own people during the past century and a half or two centuries. That is a phenomenon which, although perhaps slightly accelerated by alien influences, arose within our culture and was simply a revival of the tendency of our Western philosophy before the appearance of Christianity. It is therefore a separate topic that we must postpone for later consideration.

(2) The now obvious failure of our efforts to communicate Christianity to the primitive races, which we discussed briefly in our opening chapter.

(3) The futility of all our efforts to export our Occidental religion to the old and civilized nations of the Orient. This is really the most striking phenomenon of all.

Among the biologically and mentally primitive Congoids, Capoids, and Australoids, Christian missionaries attained for a while some specious semblance of success. One can only marvel, however, at the illusions that Christendom obstinately entertained, century after century, despite its constant and virtually total failure to win converts among the highly intelligent and subtle Orientals, both white and yellow, who had elaborate cultures of their own.

Since we are, on the whole, a rational race, there was *some* basis for those illusions. The sacred books of Christianity did not originate in the West. The Old Testament deals almost entirely with the activities of Israelites and Jews. The events of the New Testament, to be sure, took place in a Roman province in Asia Minor, and largely in Galilee, a small territory inhabited by a conglomerate population that the Jews despised as inferiors, but the first apostles, whatever their race, were certainly not Europeans, and Paul was admittedly a Jew. It was known, furthermore, that in the early centuries there had been some small Judæo-Christian sects,¹ and that it was not until later that the new religion attracted votaries that could be identified as authentically Greek, Roman, and Celtic. Although Europeans knew the Christian scriptures only in Greek and Latin, and during the Middle Ages only in Latin, the Asiatic origins created a supposition that Christianity, the religion of Europe, was not European, even when everyone knew that it had no adherents outside Europe except in the territories of the Byzantine Empire, and that Byzantine Christianity was so adulterated with Levantine elements that it was

¹ The Ebionites and the Cerinthians were the most important of these sects, but there were others, most of which are catalogued in the seven-volume edition of Adolf von Harnack's *History of Dogma*. I need scarcely add that the term "Judæo-Christian" is correctly used *only* with reference to these sects and their antecedents.

unacceptable to the West.²

We cannot here analyze the effects of that supposition on Mediaeval Christendom. A concise and incisive treatment of that subject may be found in Lawrence R. Brown's brilliant work, *The Might of the West* (New York, 1963). It will here suffice to note that even during the high-tide of Christian faith marked by the Crusades, that supposition prevented our ancestors from drawing the correct deductions from their manifest and perpetual failure to extend Western Christianity beyond the borders of the West.

Ever since it was founded, the Christian Church has labored incessantly to convert Jews, using every method from flattering exhortations and cash rewards to legislative pressure and armed coercion, and it has failed utterly. That failure, furthermore, was conspicuous in every city and almost every town of Christendom, year after year and century after century. It was known even to the most ignorant and isolated peasant.

In Christendom, as elsewhere, the international race planted its colonies wherever there was money to be got from the natives, and it always followed the standard procedure that it used, for example, in Alexandria in the fourth century B.C. The colonists filtered in in small groups until their numbers were sufficient to take over a part of the city for themselves to establish their own ghettos, from which the natives of the country were informally, but effectively, excluded. But the main body of colonists, ostentatiously exclusive, was usually or always accompanied by a number, smaller or greater as the occasion demanded, of *Marranos*, i.e., Jews who feigned conversion to the religion and culture of the nation in which they had come to reside. As they had professed Greek philosophy in Alexandria, so in Mediaeval Europe they professed Christianity. They, so to speak, covered the flanks of their less versatile congeners.

Here and there in Europe, Christians sometimes tried to dislodge and expel the Jewish colonies, but they never succeeded. By violence or threats of violence some cities and territories were able to drive Jews from their ghettos for a few years, but invariably, except in Spain and Portugal, the ostentatiously alien Jews returned sooner or later and industriously restored their ghettos. The Marranos, sheltered by their professed "conversion," eluded all efforts to control them, and in Spain and Portugal, at least, they not only entered the highest offices of the state but, despite the frantic efforts of the Inquisition, they filled even the Church with nuns, priests, bishops, and archbishops who solemnly celebrated in public the rites of a religion they despised

² The differences between Western and Oriental Christianity were so profound and fundamental that repeated attempts made before 1453 to affect a union of the two churches were utter failures despite the Byzantines' desperate need for military aid from the West, despite the West's idealistic notion that its religion was "universal," and despite a generous amount of hypocrisy on both sides. After the capture of Constantinople by Mohammed II, most of the surviving Byzantines devoutly thanked their god that they had fallen under the rule of Moslems (with whom they had much in common) instead of European Christians, who would have tried to impose on them an alien religion. It is significant that the abyss between the two religions that called themselves Christian was too wide to be bridged, even though the conglomerate and partly Levantine population of the Byzantine Empire had inherited the culture and learning of the ancient (and extinct) Greeks.

and, when they met in their secret conclaves, laughed at the stupidity of the gullible *goyim*.

The amazing versatility and subtlety of the Marranos, especially in “most Christian” Spain and Portugal, has been described by many distinguished Jewish scholars. *A History of the Marranos*, by Professor Cecil Roth of Oxford, is a concise survey; the recent work by Haim Beinart, *Anusim be-Din ha-Inqwizisiah* (Tel Aviv, 1965), unfortunately not available in English, is a highly detailed study of a single community at one point in its history.

Was a Jew ever converted to Christianity? The learned and candid Rabbi Solomon Schindler,³ addressing a Christian audience in Boston, was certain that *no* Jew could “submit conscientiously” to so inferior a creed. “There never was a Jew,” he said, “converted to Christianity who conscientiously believed in the doctrines of his adopted religion. They were all hypocrites, who changed their creed for earthly considerations merely.” And the acute, sagacious, and earnest Maurice Samuel,⁴ after diligent and conscientious study, concluded that “Obviously you do not make a gentile of a Jew by baptizing him any more than you would make an Aryan of a negro by painting him with ocher.” Such sweeping generalizations may be too absolute, and there seem to be some certain instances of Jews who sincerely defected to Christianity, but they are few. On the whole, the failure of Christians to allure or compel Jews has been total and spectacular.

Christians often explain that failure by attributing to the Jews some peculiar perversity or malevolence, the result of either a divine curse or of conscious collaboration with Satan. But in the interests of both fairness and objectivity, we should consider respectfully and dispassionately the testimony of the erudite and discerning Jews who have earnestly studied and pondered the many and profound differences between their people and ours, and who assure us, as courteously as they can, that to *their* minds *our* religion and most of the standards of *our* culture appear ludicrous or repulsive and sometimes utterly incomprehensible. How can we expect or require a man to believe what is to *his* mind mere nonsense? Would not that be as absurd as to expect the Jews who reside in our country to consult our interests rather than their own?

So long as Christendom knew only the Jewish colonies in its territory and the Semitic and Hamitic Moslems on its southern borders, some theory of an obduracy or perversity peculiar to Jews and Moslems could perhaps be maintained, but surely Christians should have perceived, as their geographical horizons expanded, that their religion had no appeal for *any* Oriental people.

The name of Christ, to be sure, is used by certain Monophysite cults in the Near East and Malabar and by other sects in Egypt and Abyssinia, of which vague rumors reached Mediaeval Europe and inspired the romantic legends of Prester John. But actual contact with those sects in the Sixteenth Century brought disillusion; the reading of their sacred books in Syriac, Coptic, and Geez showed how vastly those conceptions of religion differed from the European; and

³ Solomon Schindler, *Messianic Expectations and Modern Judaism*, with an introduction by [the Reverend] Minot J. Savage. Boston, Cassino, 1886.

⁴ Maurice Samuel, *You Gentiles*. New York, Harcourt-Brace, 1924.

missionaries were dispatched to convert those “Christians” to Western Christianity—efforts that always ended in failure and sometimes in bloody failure.

With the exception of such isolated and minor cults as the Mandæans and the Yezidis, the Semitic peoples of Asia have found *their* aspirations and *their* religiosity fully satisfied by Islam, and all the exhortations of our missionaries for a millennium induced only a handful of Moslems to profess Christianity. In India, where the blood of the Aryan conquerors was blotted up long ago, a few outcasts and famished drudges became “rice Christians,” and some educated babus said they were converts so long as “conversion” seemed likely to expedite their advancement in the bureaucracy of British India; and the Hindus sent us in return hundreds of sloe-eyed swamis to convert us and care for our souls—especially the souls of wealthy dowagers. In China and Japan, the seeds of the Gospel, though sown over and over again by generations of earnest and often martyred missionaries, produced no better harvest.

In sum, experience has shown us that the Jews, though unique as an international race, do not differ from other Orientals in their resistance to the “glad tidings” (*eu-angelium*) of Christianity. In Asia, as in Africa, though for far different reasons, Christianity is evaporating as rapidly as dew in the morning sun, and there is every reason to believe that, with a few possible exceptions, the remaining Asiatic “Christians,” including native clergymen and bishops, are simply Arab, Hindu, Chinese, or Japanese Marranos and profess a Western religion for business or diplomatic reasons.

We have an unbroken record of failure in all our efforts to export Christianity to other peoples. That failure has nothing to do with the decline of faith among our own people in very recent times as a result of a skepticism based on *our* science and technology. Uniformly since the foundation of the Western Church, Christianity failed to attract and convince other races, and in the great Age of Faith in Europe that failure was as complete as it is today. Christendom should have understood the reasons for that inevitable failure long ago.

For centuries our clergymen had the strange custom of looking through all the other religions and cults of the whole world to find superficial similarities that they would then adduce as somehow corroborating our religion. They clutched eagerly at every ghost story in the world and used it to “prove” that a belief in immortality was “universal.” What all the other doctrines and myths really proved was that *our* belief in immortality was something peculiar to ourselves and probably incomprehensible to other races.

We Aryans have a deep and innate longing to endure forever. But the immortality of which the atheist despairs and for which the Christian hopes is a *personal* immortality—the survival of the individual consciousness, complete with all its memories of life on earth. For each of us, immortality is the prolongation of *his* consciousness after the death of his body. Although we, if not spiritually sick, desire the survival of our race and culture, that is not what *we* mean by immortality; even if we felt assured that our people would eventually own the whole earth and all the other peoples in it, that would seem *to us* to have nothing to do with the question whether or not you and I as individuals will live after death. Again, we can believe that at death a man

will be either annihilated or become a single disembodied consciousness: we cannot believe that he will become five or six different and widely scattered pieces of a ghost. Again, if some psychic spark of ourselves should survive death but be unconscious, having no knowledge or memory of what we were in life, to *us* that fate would be annihilation, not immortality. Again, if I am to live after death, so must my wife: no number of houris⁵ could reconcile me to a Paradise attained by many millions of men but only four women and one dog. Furthermore, we can imagine reincarnation, but only reincarnation as ourselves. If my wife has been Napoleon and Richard the Lion-Hearted, she is nothing that I have ever known or loved. And if I was ever Aspasia and Nell Gwyn, then I do not exist even now: I am just an illusion.

The kinds of "immortality" posited by the other major religions are unacceptable to us: meaningless, absurd, or repulsive to our racial instincts. But obviously such notions of a future life are not only satisfactory to other peoples but represent what *they* instinctively desire. To the great majority of the world's inhabitants our conception of immortality is meaningless, absurd, or repulsive. That is simply a fact that we cannot change.

Christianity embodied all the moral instincts of our race, such as our concepts of personal honor, of personal self-respect and integrity, of fair play, of pity for the unfortunate, of loyalty—all of which seem preposterous to other races, at least in the form and application that we give to them. They simply lack our instincts. We think that it makes a great difference whether we kill a man in a fair fight or by treacherously stabbing him in the back or by putting poison in the cup that he accepts from our friendly hand; to at least one other race, we are simply childish and irrational: if you are to kill a man, kill him in the safest and most convenient way. Again, we, whether Christians or atheists, have an instinct for truth, so that if we lie, we have physical reactions that can be detected by a sphygmomanometer (often called a polygraph or "lie detector"). When officers of American military intelligence tried to use that device in the interrogation of prisoners during the Korean War, they discovered that Koreans and Chinese have no reaction that the instrument can detect, no matter how outrageous the lies they tell. We and they are differently constituted.

We can no longer be so obtuse as to ignore the vast differences in mentality and instinct that separate us from all other races—not merely from savages, but from highly civilized races. The differences are innate, and to attempt to change their way of thinking with argument, generosity, or holy water is as absurd as attempting to change the color of their skins. That is a fact that we must accept. However one may relate that fact to Christian doctrine, if we, a small minority among the teeming and terribly fecund populations of the globe, call all other peoples perverse or wicked, we merely confuse ourselves. If we are to think objectively and rationally, we must do so in the terms used by Maurice Samuel, who, after his discerning and admirably candid study of the "unbridgeable gulf" that separates Indo-Europeans from Jews, had to conclude that "This difference in behavior and reaction springs from something more earnest and significant than a difference of beliefs: it springs from a difference in our biologic

⁵ Houris are women who will accompany faithful Muslim believers in Paradise.

equipment.”

We cannot reasonably expect beings differently constituted to have our instincts or to believe as we do, any more than we can expect dogs to climb trees or cats to bark at intruders. And let us beware of the word “superiority.” If it means that we are superior in terms of our own values, it is a mere tautology; if it has an objective and practical meaning, it poses a question that can be answered only when the future has proved which peoples will survive and which will go under in the proximate struggle for possession of an overcrowded globe.

This is not a matter of doctrine or wishes, and it does not depend on our faith or lack of faith. Whatever may be the meaning of certain passages in the Old Testament, the earth is not flat. Whatever may be the meaning of certain passages in the New Testament, Christianity was not for “all the world.” The earth is spherical. Christianity is an Indo-European religion.

Christianity Today

IF YOU DESIRE TO PRESERVE our country and our civilization, you must face two fundamental facts.

The first of these is that 90% of all the active support of pro-American efforts has come from Christians.

Of that, there can be no doubt. Almost without exception, all of the thousands of "conservative" and "anti-Communist" organizations that have come and gone during the past fifty years have been specifically Christian, proposing to defend Christianity and the Constitution simultaneously. Many of the most active organizations today are evangelical and try to revive Christian faith by holding meetings in which the Gospel and patriotism are inseparably blended. Some organizations specifically established to resist or promote certain legislation do not explicitly raise religious issues, but they take Christianity for granted. The only patriotic organizations that are explicitly non-Christian are a small periodical, *The Truth Seeker*, which, having spoken disrespectfully of Jews, is now being forced to the wall, and one small "activist" group in California.

It is true that a very successful promotion was founded by a master-salesman who began by admitting, with a show of candor, that he rejected belief in a personal god as childish and preferred a vague pantheism that recognized an "upward reach" in "all mankind" that was similar to the upward reach of growing plants. But after testing the market, he began to claim that he was purveying a doctrine that was a kind of pep pill good for all religions and guaranteed to make the purchaser a better Christian, better Pharisee, or better Moslem, as the case might be. (There are no Buddhists, Parsees, Yezidis, Jains, Saivites, or Tantrists with large bank rolls in the United States at the present time, nor are they represented by oil-rich governments abroad.) The only point that need concern us now is that the promoter accurately gauged his market. Of all the members who passed through his organization in its heyday, at least 80% were Christians- probably 90% of those who really worked and gave money to the limit of their resources.

You have only to attend *any* "anti-Communist" meeting, including both the most sincere efforts and the most fraudulent promotions, and talk to the persons who attend and contribute to convince yourself that almost all of them are Christians, and by that I mean persons who really *believe* in Christ, as distinct, of course, from the many persons who attend Sunday-morning clubs because they think it good for business, politically expedient, or socially amusing. Whether you like it or not, you must accept the fact that 90% of the active support for patriotic and pseudo-patriotic efforts comes from men and women who have a sincere faith in Christ.

During more than two decades, the active Defense of the West has rested almost entirely on the shoulders of Christians in all Occidental nations. And that has been true on all levels. I know that comparisons are invidious, but to make my point I will say that if I had to pick one

periodical on our side as having the highest literary finish and intellectual content, I should have to name *Découvertes*, the monthly publication of a highly cultivated group of staunchly Christian Frenchmen now in Lisbon.

That is not astonishing. For almost fifteen centuries, Occidental civilization was Christendom, and, as is shown by the data that we have already examined, Christianity as we know it is, and always has been, an Indo-European religion, incomprehensible to the rudimentary minds of the primitive races and unacceptable to the subtle minds of the Orientals who have civilizations of their own. If that seems to you negative proof, consider the conversion of the Norse peoples during the early Middle Ages. They were not subject to a Christian government that could coerce them and they needed no Christian support against anyone; the Christians whom they plundered on occasion were certainly not militarily superior, nor were the institutions and culture of the Dark Ages anything that Vikings and Varangians might have envied and wished to imitate. Their only reason for abandoning the bleakly pessimistic religion of Thor and Odin must have been that Christianity was more congenial to their minds.⁶ Such *spontaneous* conversions are rare phenomena in the history of the world's religions; the closest parallel is the adoption of decadent Buddhism by the Chinese who found it congenial to their mentality.⁷

There is a second fact that you must also face. The Western world is no longer Christendom. The religion that once united us has become the faith of a minority.

That is obvious from what has been happening here and in every country of Europe except Spain and Portugal. The real question is how small a minority are Christians in the United States.

In 1942, after a very careful study of the situation in England, Professor A.N. Whitehead concluded that "in the whole country far less than one-fifth of the population are *in any sense* Christians today." There is very little difference in this respect between England and the United States. And today?

Let us transcend all the doctrinal differences, important as they are, that divide the Christian

⁶ One factor often overlooked was Christianity's appeal to the historical sense of our race. Norse theology was a collection of inconsistent tales, admittedly mythical since the skalds could revise or elaborate them at will, about the adventures of various gods in Niflheim, Jotunheim, Asgard and other realms outside the known world and inaccessible to men, at dates no more specific than "once upon a time." Christianity offered a circumstantial and realistic narrative of events that had taken place in remote but specific and well-known towns and geographical areas at precisely stated times during the reigns of known Roman Emperors; the historicity of the narrative was further guaranteed by the generally consistent and apparently independent statements of four eyewitnesses, whose veracity was further guaranteed by the official reports of Roman governors who had themselves participated in the climactic scene (i.e., the *Acta Pilati*, *Epistula Lentuli*, and other forgeries that were accepted as genuine during the Dark Ages). It may be relevant that *the Epistula Lentuli* certifies Christ as unmistakably Nordic: tall, fair-skinned, with blonde hair and blue eyes.

⁷ Note, however, the very important difference that although the Chinese adaptation of the Buddhist religion eventually made a large number of converts, it never supplanted Taoism and other native cults, to say nothing of the widely-held doctrine of Confucius (which virtually ignores the supernatural) and the more restricted philosophy of the Fa Chia (which regards all religions as myths useful for governmental purposes). It would *never* have been proper to speak of China as a Buddhist country.

churches. The absolute minimum requirement of a Christian is faith that Christ was literally the Son of God. Of course, persons who do not have that faith may have the impudence to call themselves Christians, just as they may call themselves elves, Martians, or pterodactyls, but if they do, they are obviously intending some hoax or fraud.

How many adult Americans today really believe that Christ was God Incarnate? I have consulted discerning Christians of indubitable piety and zeal who have had exceptional opportunities to observe in all parts of the country. The lowest estimate was 9%. The figure that was best supported was approximately 12%.

Of the 12% of adult Americans who truly believe in Christ, not all, by any means, are active in efforts to defend our nation and civilization. Of true believers, some also believe that the End of the World is at hand; others believe that the destruction of the Western world has been ordained as condign punishment for its sins, and that it would be impious to resist the manifest Will of God; and others quite logically regard the events of the brief life on earth as merely preparation for the salvation of their souls. I should be astonished if more than half of the remaining Christians are actively committed to the preservation of our country. And yet this 6% has provided almost all of the support for anti-Communist causes. That is something to think about.

We must specifically notice that the minority that still believes that Christ was really the Son of God does not include the majority of the persons who now talk from the pulpits of Sunday-morning clubs, including the propaganda chain operated by the National Council of Churches. The majority of professional clergymen were trained in theological seminaries in which they were taught that the Christian Bible is an agglomeration of forgeries perpetrated by persons too ignorant to write coherently and patched together by persons too stupid to make a consistent story out of it. They were further taught that Christ, *if* he existed and was not merely a myth created by awkward revision of the Essene story about the Teacher Yeshu, was a crack-pot agitator to whom were attributed, long after his death, some nice remarks about ethics and "social justice."⁸

Believing this but lacking the courage to seek honest employment, the poor wretches are ordained and find themselves in a business in which their income depends on their ability to keep congregations awake or, at least, in a donating mood each Sunday, while they must curry

⁸ Christians who have the courage to contemplate the present status and the now inevitable future of all the large organized denominations *must* read a recent book by a highly reputed "Biblical scholar" whose works have long been respected as authoritative in ecclesiastical seminaries: Dr. Hugh J. Schonfield's *The Passover Plot* (1965). Although his reconstruction of the way in which a crack-brained Jewish agitator named Jesus tried to stage a fake miracle is admittedly conjectural, his interpretation of the character and motives of that man (assuming that he ever existed) is now accepted in all of its essentials by virtually all educated clergymen, although, understandably, they may prefer to envelop it in clouds of misty verbiage when they harangue the persons who fill the collection-plates each Sunday. *That* Jesus, although an ignorant blunderer, is thought admirable because he was an early Bolshevik who tried to incite a revolution to destroy our race's Classical civilization and realize the old Jewish dream of One World ruled, of course, by God's Own People.

the favor of both their atheistic superiors and of the Lords of the Press and Radio. It is no wonder that they preach the "social gospel." Some of them, no doubt, really believe it, for it is a fact that the loss of religious faith merely leaves many minds morbidly susceptible to the contagion of the most grotesque superstitions. Some see no reason why they shouldn't peddle the brand of buncombe that pays the best. Some doubtless thirst for revolution and chaos to avenge themselves on the society that makes them exert themselves in pulpits, and, like the Vicar in Daphne du Maurier's memorable novel, *Jamaica Inn*, picture themselves as clever wolves preaching to congregations of uncomprehending mutton-heads. That is the real explanation of what has happened to most of our churches, and there is no need to imagine some fantastically large and cunning conspiracy of Illuminati or other Supermen to account for the behavior of clergymen who do not believe in Christianity.

The catastrophic decline of Christian faith is the most important, the crucial event of our recent history. Even the dullest members of Sunday-morning clubs know that it has happened, but they will try to deny it by informing you that the Seventh Baptistical Church has just moved to a wonderful new edifice that cost half a million dollars and is architecturally indistinguishable from a night club, and that St. Olaf's Presbutheran Church has just added a hundred-thousand-dollar gymnasium to its sacred facilities. Believing Christians, on the other hand, know what has happened and deplore it. When they try to account for the catastrophe, however, they, if they recognize a natural cause at all, most commonly blame the Jews. That, I think, is unfair and, what is much worse, incorrect and therefore dangerous.

The most comprehensive and scholarly survey of Jewish pressures on, and infiltration of, Christianity from the earliest times is the work of one of the most learned ecclesiastical historians of our day and is now available in a passable English translation: *The Plot Against the Church* by Maurice Pinay. The virtual capture of the Catholic Church in recent years, which has been celebrated in articles in *Look* and other periodicals, is ably described by Vicomte Leon de Poncins in his *Judaism and the Vatican*. No Protestant scholar, so far as I know, has made a comparable study of Protestant denominations. It would be difficult to take exception to the reporting of historical facts in the two books that I have cited, and let us not question the authors' conclusions. Do they adequately explain the decline of Christianity?

I have no wish to defend the Jews, and I shall not ask whether it is entirely reasonable to blame them for forwarding their own interests by their own methods wherever they have planted colonies among populations whom they regard as inferior, much as our ancestors regarded the aborigines of North America. Let the Jews be as wicked and diabolical as you wish, but let us consider the religious question objectively, lest error delude us with fallacious hopes.

If we, from our vantage point in the present, look back over the history of our religion dispassionately, we can discern, at a distance of a thousand years and more, the origins of our plight today. I do not refer to sectarianism and heresies: they are simply normal in all evangelical religions. In Islam, for example, the multiplicity of sects is proverbial, and by the time that Buddhism became a religion in the second century B.C., there were already eighteen major sects, each claiming, of course, to be the sole repository of the true doctrine. Christianity is

exceptional only for its relative stability. Over a period of twelve centuries, from 325 A.D., when its doctrine had taken form in all essentials, to the Protestant Reformation in the Sixteenth Century, the religion of the West was an effective unity, not seriously disturbed by such sporadic heresies as the Albigensians, and Waldenses, the Patarini, and the Hussites.⁹

Christianity is, as we have said, an Indo-European religion and it was therefore accepted and understood in terms of the mentality and thought-processes peculiar to our race. Our minds, unlike those of other races, demand that all the elements of a doctrine be logically consistent with one another and in conformity with observed reality. The intellectual efforts of the early Fathers of the Church, who labored to establish texts and resolve contradictions, have some analogies in other religions, but the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages is unique. This great philosophical effort to understand the world about us has nothing to do with heresies or even skepticism; it was, as one of the Scholastics defined it, *fides quærens intellectum*, it was carried on by churchmen, and, as we too often forget, accompanied by mathematical investigations and empirical observation of nature. There are many histories of Scholasticism, and a good outline may be found in the second volume of Ueberweg's standard *History of Philosophy*. There are some very stimulating observations on late Scholasticism in the first volume of Egon Friedell's *Cultural History of the Modern Age*. The histories of science by Sarton and by Thorndike cover the Mediaeval period fairly well. The reader, however, will find the essentials most clearly presented in the brilliant work of Lawrence R. Brown, *The Might of the West*, which not only brings together facts that are artificially separated in other works, but identifies in its Mediaeval origins the great tension of modern thought. Christianity brought with it from Asia Minor alien elements that were generally ignored but remained latent in its sacred books and dogmas, incompatible at the limit with Western man's innate need to know and master the physical world, and further complicated by historical accidents. That is what gave us, as Mr. Brown observes, "a society whose inward convictions have been at hopeless variance with the outward professions that the events of history have forced it to make." We need only add that the conflict became even more acute with the Renaissance and became one of the hidden causes of the Reformation and Europe's first Civil War.

From the Renaissance to the present, we of the West have had to observe an ever-increasing discrepancy between the tenets of our religion and the observed phenomena of the world in which we live, and during the past century the discrepancies became catastrophic.

One can enumerate sixteen intellectual factors that have contributed to the decline of Christianity, but the four most important, all of which took effect during the past hundred years,

⁹ We are not here concerned with the theological convulsions of the Byzantine ("Orthodox") Church, which, as we observed earlier, was a radically different kind of religion, imbued with Levantine elements rejected by the West, and thereby appealing to a racially different people. A discussion of the origin, incidence, and relative importance of Jewish and other Levantine elements in the early Christian doctrines, the progressive supersession of such elements in the West, and their recrudescence in some heresies would necessarily be long, involved, and somewhat abstruse. We cannot touch upon that topic here, where our concern is with Christianity as it was generally understood and accepted by our race. Debates about whether our distant ancestors understood it correctly or should have accepted what they did would be, for our present purposes, irrelevant and otiose.

are:

- (1) The recovery by archaeological excavation of much of the history of the Near East.
- (2) Perception of the great physiological and anatomical similarity of human beings to extinct sub-human species and to existing anthropoids, the whole forming a neat evolutionary sequence.
- (3) Determinations that the earth is at least a billion years older than the Creation posited by Christian doctrine.
- (4) Most important of all, perhaps, perception of the size of the universe. It is one thing to call it infinite; it is another to know that there are galaxies so remote that Light from them, travelling at more than eleven million miles a minute, has taken eight billion years to reach us.

Christian theologians, to be sure, have offered innumerable explanations of these discrepancies. Some are forthright efforts to meet the issues squarely, of which the best that I have seen is *The Genesis Flood*, by Professor John C. Whitcomb, Jr., of Grace Theological Seminary, and Professor Henry M. Morris, of the Virginia Polytechnical Institute. Some are bizarre efforts to conjure a god from the Planck constant or squeeze him out of the (hypothetical) Lorentz contractions. And some reach the level of the books that Teilhard de Chardin must have written with tongue in cheek. But we are not here concerned with the validity of any of these Christian explanations. The important fact is that they convince no one except Christians. Perhaps they should, but they do not.

That is the *principal* cause of the recession of Christian faith, and you cannot blame the Jews for it. It is most unlikely that the Jews planted every inscribed tablet found by excavators in Asia Minor, and it is quite certain that they did not create quasars or even the great galaxy in Virgo. The blame, if any, must fall entirely on our race—on the philosophical mentality and Faustian will that distinguish us from all other races and that alone made possible the abstruse and complex determinations of fact that undermined our faith. The four intellectual factors that I listed above and eleven of the twelve that I did not have space to enumerate all depend on data that *no* other race had either the capacity or the wish to ascertain—data, furthermore, that all other races either cannot comprehend or regard as insignificant and irrelevant to their racial mentality.

To repudiate the science of the West is simply to blow out our brains figuratively, as our fetish-men, witch-doctors, and other “Liberal intellectuals” would have us do. And if we of the West do it figuratively, we may as well all do it literally, too, and so escape the ultimate misery and degradation in store for us.

I began this cursory discussion by saying that it did not matter whether we were Christians or atheists so long as we faced facts and reasoned objectively about them. As rational men, all that we can do is measure the consequences of the disastrous decline of faith—for it is a disaster even greater than most Christians suppose—and ascertain by what means (if any) we can hope to survive it.

The Predictable Future

CHRISTENDOM IS NO LONGER Christendom. The faith that Christ was literally the Son of God, which dominated the Western world for fifteen centuries, and effectively united all the men of our race for ten, has become the faith of a minority.

It is vain to wish that this calamity had not happened, and nugatory to try to blame our enemies for it, however cunning and malevolent they may be. For it is our destiny—the destiny that is biologically innate in our race and the only source of our greatness and of the power that enabled us thus far to survive in a world in which we are a small and universally hated minority—to think philosophically about the external and physical world, and to seek objective truth, at whatever cost to our vanity or comfort. As Lawrence R. Brown says, in the book that I quoted before, “Whatever has been easier to believe than to discover has never been what created the unique greatness of our society. Not the comforting satisfaction of inward belief, but the potential humiliation of outward fact has been the last standard of truth in the West.” And that has been the *principal* cause of the waning of what was once our common faith.

We cannot expect, therefore, within the foreseeable future any increase in the number of believing Christians, who now number about 12% of adult Americans; on the contrary, a gradual decrease is possible and in some circumstances likely, since the majority of them are now in or past middle age.¹⁰

We have no reason to anticipate a drastic and revolutionary change in the scientific evidence—a discovery, for example, that the earth ceased to rotate on its axis for a day or two when the Isrælités invaded Canaan, or that stars outside the solar system are optical illusions. Rightly or wrongly, a great many men of intellectual integrity can now discern no evidence of the existence in the universe of a *conscious* power superior to man, and, precisely because they are men of intellectual integrity, they are not going to change their deductions in the absence

¹⁰ I need not remark that no one should take seriously the little bands of hysterical adolescents who occasionally try to attract attention by emerging from the communal squalor of their *kibbuzim* and yelling “Jesus!” instead of “Peace in Vietnam!” Although some enterprising operators in the evangelical business advertise such outbreaks as harbingers of a “revival of faith,” it is quite clear that the young derelicts, insofar as they are not indulging in mere exhibitionism, are actuated by the hallucinations that normally occur in minds that have been rotted by the drugs now commonly used by children in the public schools, chiefly marijuana, mescaline, lysergic acid diethylamide, and heroin. The febrile excitement of derelicts “hooked on Jesus” is merely a variation of their feeble-minded enthusiasm for every kind of occult posturing and mystery-mongering, including witchcraft, black magic, Satanism, astrology, oneiromancy, necromancy, and innumerable adaptations of various Oriental cults. More disturbing are the reports of colonies of youngsters who, reportedly without the help of hallucinatory drugs, exchange thoughts with a superior race on Jupiter, chat with visiting spooks, or have at the top of their skull a psychic opening through which the Holy Ghost whispers instructions. Like the “hippies,” these unfortunates are commonly graduates of the cut-rate diploma-factories that are still called “universities.” That is a fact that will be terribly significant to those who are not afraid to think about it.

of radically *new* evidence that is intellectually cogent to them. And precisely because they are men of our race, who reason from dispassionately ascertained data, they are not going to be swayed by the emotions of orating evangelists, and they will be simply disgusted by attempts to equate "atheism" and "Communism."

No one doubts but that the power of man—which, for all practical purposes, means the power of our race—is small indeed. We and our planet and our whole solar system are infinitesimal motes in a galaxy that is itself an insignificant part of the known universe. No one doubts, furthermore, but that for many phenomena we have no satisfactory explanation. But knowledge cannot be derived from what is not known, and to deify known natural forces is to resort to a mocking evasion, not unlike that of Epicurus. In the 1930's, Leopold Ziegler thought that the Second Law of Thermodynamics was a quite satisfactory "god" and others have applied that term to biological evolution toward more complex organic forms, to the fact of human consciousness, to instincts found in one or more races that seem analogous to a growing plant's heliotropic striving for sunlight, to the theories of indeterminacy or of parity in sub-atomic physics, and a wide variety of other phenomena. But no alert Christian will be deceived. His God is a *conscious* being, a *personal* God, a God who is aware of, and has concern for, the *individual*; He is a God to whom one can pray.

Men prayed to the Sun when they believed that that incandescent globe was a conscious being who could hear them; but nobody ever prayed to the Great Mystery that $dS = dQ/T + dH/T$. Christians rightly regard the difference between an atheist and a "pantheist" today as the difference between six apples and half-a-dozen. They can derive no comfort from the prudential evasions of some writers.

Christians are demonstrably right when they insist that if we and the other nations of the West were still Christian nations, we should not find ourselves in our present plight. We should have other difficulties, of course; we should, no doubt, continue to quarrel among ourselves, and we should have to face, as now, the open hostility or covert hatred of the rest of the world. But if we Occidentals were still Christian nations, we should have no need to worry about International Bankers, Illuminati, Bolsheviks, Jews, "Liberals," or any other *internal* menace that you may choose to name or imagine. Recognition of that fact, however, will not produce a religious revival. It is a peculiarity of our Indo-European mind that for us truth is not demonstrated by either comfort or self-interest. We *cannot* believe a proposition to be objectively true just because we wish that it were or because our personal safety depends upon it. No exposition of present danger, therefore, can create faith.

Is there *any* hope of a significant increase in the minority that now believes that Christ was the Son of God?

Some Christians anticipate that the trend will be reversed by divine intervention, but there is little agreement about the nature of the expected miracle. Some expect the Second Coming of Christ, which will provide visible evidence of the truth of Christian doctrine and thus start a wave of conversions, while others count on God's application of a psychological force that will

change men's minds and force them to believe what now seems unreasonable. Others as positively expect a virtually total loss of faith with miraculous suddenness. Not infrequently one encounters a Christian, usually a lady, who is quite certain that on a day in the very near future she and 499 other persons will soar aloft into the atmosphere, apparently to a level above the cumulus and below the cirrus cloud-formations, and there float in ecstasy while the rest of the earth's population is condignly destroyed in a succession of catastrophes. But the majority of Christians, I am sure, do not count on impending miracles.

One common ground for hope is, at best, uncertain. We Americans, thanks to our folly, will soon undergo a considerable amount of physical suffering: domestic violence, economic collapse, probably some starvation, quite possibly conquest by foreign invaders and resident revolutionists. It is true that, as history shows, such afflictions usually induce a revival of religion, and many Christians expect such an effect here. That is not likely in the future that we can foresee. For one thing, the historical effect requires an unremitting and prolonged suffering—thirty years or more. The Crusade to Save the Soviet in 1939–45 inflicted great suffering on many nations of Europe, especially Germany and Poland, but produced no significant religious revival. Secondly, if there should be such an effect, it probably would not benefit Christianity. The Protestant Churches as a whole have long been disgraced by the pinks and punks of the National Council. The Catholic Church is now committing suicide by repudiating its own doctrines and burlesquing its traditions. In the eyes of non-believers now, the religion has been compromised by the antics of the greater part of the professional clergy, and despite the admirable loyalty of "traditionalist" and "fundamentalist" minorities, it is likely that the coming disasters will—unjustly, but understandably—make Christianity seem a religion that failed. Thus any revival of religiosity will benefit cults that will have the attraction of novelty and a new "revelation," possibly including some doctrine of metempsychosis.

We are left, therefore, with the present situation and very little hope that it will or can be soon altered. So we had better reckon with it, whatever our personal desires or convictions.

The visible consequences of the withering of our religion are enormous, overshadowing, frightening. Christianity was much more than a religion comparable to the religion of Osiris in early Egypt, the worship of the Olympian gods, the Orphic mysteries, or Mithraism. Unlike those cults in their time and place, Christianity for a large part of our history was the whole formal basis of our entire culture, the absolute from which were deduced our moral codes, our laws, and our political systems; it largely informed our art, inspired our literature, animated our music, and sustained our men of science. The void that has been left is so great that few can peer into the dark abyss without vertigo.

There is, however, no rational escape from a question to which there can be *only* two answers. Was Christ the Son of God?

Christians answer Yes. And on that faith, they found their lives.

The majority of adults today, including most of the persons who are doing business in the pulpits, answer No. The negative answer cannot be covered with verbiage about "great

Teacher," "social vision," "moral earnestness," and the like. There is no escape from logic.

If Christ was not the Son of God and an Incarnate God, then he was, on the record, a lunatic with delusions that he was. And a lunatic's views on morality and justice are simply worthless. From this simple alternative our "modernist" clergy try to escape by claiming that all the passages in which Christ speaks of his own divinity, or miraculous proof of it is given, are forgeries concocted by clumsy interpolators, but if that is true, there is no passage that is exempt from the suspicion of forgery, and we have to conclude, as did Father Loisy in his famous work on *Le mystère chrétien* (1930), that there is *no* authentic record of what Jesus said—and, indeed, no certainty that He is not, like the words attributed to him, merely an invention of the clumsy "interpolators." At the very best, if Christ was not literally the Son of God, his opinions are of infinitely less value than the opinions of learned, earnest, and thoughtful men, such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Marcus Aurelius in antiquity, and in modern times, David Hume, Schopenhauer, and Renan. From that clear alternative there is no escape except in the kind of patter and chatter that stage magicians use to distract the attention of the audience from a trick of prestidigitation.

If Christ was not literally the Son of God, the *entire* morality on which our civilization was *consciously* based for so long seems to collapse, to vanish as an illusion, to be as unfounded as the old notion that the earth was flat. And this apparent dissolution includes all of the ancient Indo-European morality that guided our peoples in the many centuries that preceded our adoption of Christianity.¹¹ That is obviously what is happening—has happened today, when we witness everywhere tacit and explicit repudiation of *all* morality—not only Christian teaching, but the antecedent and basic morality without which civilization is flatly impossible. And, what is even more disheartening, there seems to be no basis left for *any* morality.

For a long time, men, except a few romantic and evangelical atheists, have agreed that a viable morality must be based on a religious faith. Hesiod, whom some scholars place in the ninth century B.C., warned the judges of his day that Zeus had 30,000 invisible and immortal observers who go through the whole earth and report the evil deeds of men. A discerning

¹¹ Christianity, of course, introduced very little that was novel in the practical ethics governing human conduct in society, most of which were not only traditional in our race but were common to most civilized societies, including the oldest of which we have adequate knowledge. (Clergymen who impudently talk of "Judaean-Christian ethics" try to give the impression that the prohibition of theft, adultery, etc. in the Ten Commandments was some kind of dazzling and miraculous invention, but if they were honest they would speak of "Sumerian-Christian ethics" in that connection.) About the only element that can fairly be called a Christian innovation was the great emphasis on forgiveness as a duty rather than an act of unnecessary generosity. (Its doctrine of rewards and punishments after death tended to enforce observance of the whole moral code, but that is another matter.) The historical antecedents, however, will not help us now, for our religion was so long regarded as the one and *only* basis for morality and the *unique* source of all right conduct that the earlier traditions have vanished except insofar as we still instinctively regard certain actions as dishonorable. Even those feelings, however, may be consciously repressed as "relics of superstition" by persons who have reacted strongly against the religion and are proud of having "emancipated" themselves from it.

correspondent, whose letter reached me yesterday, remarks that "unfortunately, most people need to feel that they are watched by a superhuman power."

For Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero, civilized society must be based on a generally accepted and uniform religious faith. And, with few exceptions, the thoughtful non-Christians of our world have held the same opinion. Renan, for example, took leave of Christianity with elegiac sadness and deep apprehension: "What is ominous is that we cannot foresee for the future any means of giving men a code of conduct that they will generally accept ... I frankly admit that I cannot imagine how it will be possible to restore, without the ancient illusions, the foundations of a noble and serene life."

On a quite different level, the pragmatic and cynical Augustus believed religion the indispensable basis of political stability, and many rulers and statesmen, before him and after him, had the same conviction. And some of the world's most acute minds have drawn the conclusions that Machiavelli, perhaps, stated most bluntly:

Principalities and republics that would save themselves from decadence must above all other things keep uncorrupted the ceremonies of their religion, and hold it always in veneration; for there can be no greater symptom of the ruin of a state than to see divine rites held in contempt. [...] They should therefore use every opportunity to foster and augment their religion, even though they perceive it to be false; and the more prudent they are and the more they know about natural phenomena, the greater their obligation to do this.

It is now too late to heed Machiavelli's warning. The disaster that he apprehended has come upon us.

It is vain to dream of a religion to replace Christianity. Comte's notion of a "Religion of Humanity," whereby congregations would throng temples to venerate Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, and Werner von Braun as "benefactors," was one of the ideas that occurred to him when he was out of a straight-jacket, but it should have suggested to his friends and keepers the need to hustle him into one. True, there have been serious proposals by eminently sane men, who, however, seem to forget that a religion must be based on faith, not speculation or psychological peculiarities. Captain Ludovici is a highly intelligent and earnest man, and when

he wrote his *Religion for Infidels* (1961), he must have known that his “rational religion” could appeal only to a few, and had no chance whatsoever of meeting our society’s need for a unifying faith.

If the faith of Christendom was an error, alien gods can command no true piety-not even in the little circles where they may enjoy a passing vogue. The Oriental cults that make wealthy dowagers beam and write cheques are not for men. Christianity is irreplaceable.

The Consequences

NO MORE THAN 12% of adult Americans believe that Christ was the Son of God. No more than half of this minority has thus far provided from 80% to 90% of all the support given to “conservative” and “anti-Communist” efforts. So there is another fundamental fact that you must face, if you desire to preserve our country and our civilization.

If most of the men included in that 6% were physically robust and vigorous, disciplined and well trained in the techniques of guerrilla warfare, equipped with the necessary weapons (including, in addition to automatic rifles, machine guns, and land mines, such devices as infra-red projectors), and willing to fight ruthlessly under a unified command, they could recapture the United States.

If the 6%, though not capable of military action, formed a group that would not only contribute money and work to the very limit of their powers and vote as a solid bloc, but would also, at the command of their leaders, endorse and propagate the propaganda line that those leaders judged most expedient at any given time, even though that line was patently mendacious and contrary to all that they as individuals believed, and would furthermore, at command, work politically for candidates whose political patten suggested the very opposite of what they as individuals want, it might be possible for them, by persistent effort over many years, to recapture the country with conspiratorial tactics.

Obviously, however, the active Christian minority is incapable of either of the only two kinds of action that could bring success. It is, furthermore, incapable of even sentimental agreement, for it is fragmented by real and important doctrinal differences, and any accord that may be established among Christians can always be quickly disrupted by even the crudest incitation of sectarian emotions. Even now, one of the most influential of the Christian “anti-Communist” preachers varies his message from time to time with clear intimations that the Pope is the Antichrist. The remaining Christians in the Catholic Church, having faith in its traditions, are more sensitive than ever to Protestantism now that they see their church resorting to cheap parodies of Protestant services as part of its effort to commit suicide. “Fundamentalist” Protestants frequently quarrel over the question whether or not certain tribes of Isrælites migrated to northern Europe or the British Isles after they were supposedly captured by the Babylonians. And one evangelist with a very well-known name and small following is currently urging that all the Jews residing in the United States be killed “county by county” without delay, and most vehemently denounces all who have so little faith in Scripture that they have doubts about the feasibility of carrying out the proposed purification successfully this year.

Seeking the most inclusive definition, we defined Christians as persons who have an abiding faith that Christ was in fact the Son of God. But each Christian necessarily believes more than that, and the diversity of faith in other tenets reduces the Christian minority to a multiplicity of groups that are incapable of sustained unity of purpose and could not act effectively, even if

they had the means of action. Crusades were possible in ages in which Faith in Christ could bring together large and well-equipped armies of veteran warriors ready to smite and slay the paynim and to vindicate their faith with the sword, but today a suggestion that Christians could launch a Crusade is simply ludicrous.

If Christians and other Americans really want to survive as Americans rather than as brutalized and stultified fellahin, the despised slaves of an alien and international super-state, they had better think seriously about the 88% of non-Christians of their race in the United States. We are here concerned only with Christians who are willing to make that effort, and we are well aware that many will find it much more entertaining to continue orating to one another, pounding their typewriters, quoting Scripture and wrangling about what it means, and contributing their money to every clever promoter who promises to produce with talk precisely the kind of miracle that would make them happy.

So what of the 88%?

The most logical alternative to Christianity is obviously atheism, by which we mean the belief that, in all probability, there does not exist in the universe a personal god to whom one can address prayers and who has conscious purposes. If the faith that was well-nigh universal among members of our race for so many centuries was a fiction and delusion, then it is *a priori* highly improbable that Apollo, Odin, Vishnu, Dionysus, or any other Savior God is less of a myth and fantasy than the Christian God. If the faith that inspired our race for so large a part of its recorded history was merely a figment of overwrought imaginations, it is highly probable that faith in any substitute for Christianity is likewise a product of the same overheated fancy. He who finds Christianity unbelievable should at least equally suspect all other revelations, and conclude that, so far as we can ascertain, there is no god, no conscious power in the universe superior to man. That is only reasonable.

It is odd, therefore, that we hear so little of atheism today. There is, to be sure, a small number of evangelical atheists, who devote themselves to spreading the glad tidings that there is no god. They are best represented by the little periodical, *The Truth Seeker*, that does not enjoy enough support to continue publication in conventionally set type and has had to resort to photo-offset reproduction from copy prepared on a quite ordinary typewriter. It would be a gross exaggeration to estimate the avowed and active atheists at one-half of one percent of our adult population. And one suspects that their number is steadily dwindling.

It is true, nevertheless, that doubt and denial of religion is a long-standing and ancient tendency in our race, and is very closely connected with our peculiar capacity to think objectively about the world in which we live and our experience of it.¹ I shall not argue that atheism is distinctively Indo-European like Christianity, for I doubt that such an argument could be maintained, nor shall I advance the more defensible claim that the atheism of Occidental

¹ It may be pertinent to recall that during the Viking Age many men, including even some kings, confessed that they were atheists (*goðlauss*) and openly derided the Norse theology; many more, no doubt, were content to keep their opinions to themselves.

minds differs generically from the manifestations of irreligion in other races, for that would entail a long excursus on China, with particular consideration of the doctrines of Confucius, Mencius, Hsun Tzu, and, most important of all, the Fa Chia;² a second excursus on the *falasifa* who flourished briefly in the world of Islam and included true Semites from southern Arabia; and, at least, a third excursus on the atheism that is so wide-spread among the Jews today. I shall merely remind you of two items in the history of India, and suggest that you reflect on their significance.

If you search the annals of mankind for a parallel to the strict materialism and concomitant atheism that is the premise of a very large part of the dominant thought of our time and simply taken for granted by many of our best minds, you will find the closest parallel in the philosophy called Lokāyata, of which traces remain in the next-to-the-oldest parts of the *Mahābhārata*, in the *Arthaśāstra*, and in a few other ancient works in Sanskrit. It is quite clear that this virtually scientific materialism flourished while the Aryan conquerors of India were in the plenitude of their power, and vanished as completely as though it had never been when the natives of that sub-continent succeeded, by such devices as miscegenation, military imitation, and exploitation of rivalries, in breaking the Aryan power and racial consciousness.

Late in the sixth century B.C. a young Aryan prince named Siddhārtha, doubtless influenced by the Lokāyata prevalent in intellectual circles, evolved an atheistic pessimism that differed from a strict materialism only in the assumption that an individual's will-to-live (as distinct from his mind and personality) could survive his death. This palingenesis of the will (which must be sharply distinguished from the reincarnation of a soul) strikingly resembled the basis of the modern philosophy of Schopenhauer, and Siddhārtha, yielding to our racial instinct to deduce and formulate universal laws, presented it as true for all men. His doctrine therefore appealed to sentimental Aryans who were concerned for "all mankind" and had an itch to "do good" to the lower races by pretending that those races were their equals. They accordingly preached the philosophy of Siddhārtha and gradually transformed that bleak pessimism into a religion complete with gods, saviors, and innumerable angels and demons, and they called Siddhārtha "the Enlightener of Mankind" (*Buddha*). As an odd mixture of philosophy and religion, Buddhism became the Established Religion of India, consummated the mongrelization of the Aryans and their submergence in the prolific native races, and then, its work of subversion accomplished, it disappeared from India and survived only as a grossly superstitious religion in Tibet, China, Japan, and adjacent Mongolian territories, and, with many doctrinal differences, in Ceylon and

² I remark in passing that although the Fa Chia, which I mentioned in an earlier note, was a political philosophy confined to an intellectual elite in positions of power, it effectively dominated the practice of Chinese governments from the third century B.C. to the present, except for comparatively brief intermissions. It appears to be totally unknown to the journalists, both "Liberal" and "anti-Communist," who manufacture books about the present regimes in Formosa and on the mainland, ignoring the racial determinants of the Mongolian mind and pretending that the Chinese have a yen for "democracy" and the other abstractions that are effective bait for voters in this country. The best thing to do with such books is to drop them in the wastebasket unopened; that saves time and eyestrain.

Southeast Asia, where it appears to have become as decadent as Christianity among us.³

If we consult the direct tradition of our civilization, we find from the earliest recorded times to the present eminent men who reject the popular religion of their day and the god or gods of that religion, believing that the world is uncreated and eternal and holding, in keeping with the mentality of our race, that the world operated by natural law, that is to say, the uniform and automatic processes of a nature that is independent of supernatural intervention. What is rare is not thinking that dispenses with gods, but proselytizing atheism. That rarity cannot be entirely explained by fear of persecution, and it must be attributed in part to a reluctance to destroy the religion of the people.

In the seventh century B.C., Thales, who was regarded as the founder of both astronomy and natural philosophy, and is believed to have been the first who could predict eclipses of the sun by mathematical calculation, appears to have identified the gods with what we should call kinetic energy, gravitation, magnetic force, and, perhaps, chemical properties. Such a definition cannot have been either instructive or encouraging to persons intent on praying for mercy or favor from Zeus or one of his divine associates or subordinates, but Thales was not technically an atheist, and he disturbed established beliefs less than did Xenophanes, whose rigorous monotheism required him to ridicule all anthropomorphic gods. Democritus, one of the greatest minds of antiquity, explained all phenomena in terms of atoms governed by uniform natural forces, and he left nothing for gods to do, although he cheerfully conceded, for the benefit of those who felt strongly about the matter, that the same natural forces that produced man could have produced superior races, more perfectly formed of a more tenuous matter and so possibly exempt from some of our ills and limitations. Epicurus argued, perhaps sincerely, on the basis of epistemological considerations, that gods probably existed, but must dwell outside our world and must, by their very nature, have no interest in or concern for human beings. It is obviously folly to try to attract the attention of such superior beings, and it is preposterous to think that a god would have cared who won the Trojan War, or that a son of God (*Dios nysos*, i.e. Dionysus) could have suffered, been slain, and have arisen from the dead to save mankind, but Epicurus was not technically an atheist. Euhemerus blandly devised evidence and argument to show that Zeus had been a King of Crete and that the notion of worshipping gods was merely a development of men's natural tendency to venerate the memory of great men after they are dead. Many an ancient writer explained religion in the terms most generally accepted by modern anthropologists: *primus in orbe deos fecit timor*. Primitive men personified and tried to placate forces of nature that they did not understand. Intelligent readers could draw their own deductions, but ancient writers refrained from preaching atheism as such, and addressed

³ When Arnold J. Toynbee visited Burma he was impressed by the "spiritual light" that is particularly radiant in Buddhist friars who assemble in mobs and, when the spirit moves them, start killing people with the clubs, revolvers, and hand-grenades they carry under their sacred yellow robes. This social gospel, however, is a very recent innovation. On the other hand, much that is old survives, as was evident a few years ago when our propaganda machine for political purposes exhibited on television the spectacle of some Buddhists who incinerated themselves. The yokels who gawked at the exhibition did not know that it was merely the observance of an ancient custom, much older than Christianity and even older than Buddhism itself.

themselves only to very limited and select audiences.

There may have been an intermission of such skepticism during the Roman Decadence and the darkest part of the Dark Ages, but by the Thirteenth Century men knew of the famous book *De tribus impostoribus* that is now lost. (The extant work is a forgery produced in the Eighteenth Century.) The three impostors, of course, were Moses, Christ, and Mahomet, charlatans who imposed on the credulity of their ignorant contemporaries, but so far as we can tell, the author of that doctrine did not specifically deny the existence of a god. From the Thirteenth Century to the present, the chain of such thinking is unbroken, and it is easily recognized under the various forms that it successively assumed. During the Renaissance, for example, a favorite precaution was the doctrine of "two truths," which enabled a philosopher, such as the most illustrious of the Paduans, Petrus Pomponatius, to affirm that by faith he believed to be true precisely those propositions (e.g., the immortality of the soul) that he had just demonstrated to be false in the light of reason and observation. After the Reformation, the modern method appears. For example, Sir Walter Raleigh's friend, Thomas Hariot, now chiefly remembered for his work on the mathematics of navigation and cartography, simply ignored Christianity (except that he thought it good for the American Indians); his contemporaries suspected him of atheism, but they couldn't prove it. Today, you may pick up any serious treatise on astronomy, geology, biology, or almost any science, and you will find that the author simply ignores religion as irrelevant and does not even take the trouble to mention as curious myths the Christian beliefs that are tacitly refuted by his findings. Authors today have nothing to fear from the rage of Christian divines, but they are content to let intelligent readers draw their own conclusions. A formal profession of atheism would be in bad taste, and, what is more, many of the authors really do not want to destroy what religion is left to our people.

Our whole tradition, therefore, deprecates gratuitous and unnecessary offense to religious beliefs, and one of the strongest reasons for that restraint is, and long has been, a conviction that a belief in gods who punish moral transgressions is the most efficacious, and possibly the unique and indispensable, means of maintaining in a large population the morality without which a civilized society would become impossible. Machiavelli did not originate the doctrine that he expressed with brutal frankness in the passage from his *Discorsi* that we quoted above. The idea is ancient; it appears in Herodotus, the "Father of History," and was probably old in his time. It is not even confined to Aryans. Although he was doubtless influenced by Greek thought, the great Arabian poet, Abū al-'Alā al-Ma'arrī, gave the idea an epigrammatic expression in verses that may be translated thus:

The Moslem stumble; Christians are astray;

The Jews are mad, and Magians grope their way.

We mortals are composed of two great schools— Enlightened knaves or else religious fools. "Enlightened knaves" will flout and circumvent the ethics imposed by religious sanctions, and no society can support more than a small proportion of them. Such, at least, has been the conclusion of careful observers of human society.

An infidel, to be sure, is not necessarily a scoundrel, but even if we claim that a system of ethics can be so logically deduced from objectively ascertained data that it will be cogent to every rational reader, we cannot reasonably expect that the demonstration will sway any very large part of the population. How many persons, for example, would be willing to read the *Nicomachean Ethics* or the *officiis*, or would understand them, if they did read them? Even if we could construct an intellectually irrefragable code of morality, we should still find religion indispensable, as Aristotle said, "in order to persuade the majority." Or as James Burnham, who is certainly one of the best minds in conservative circles today, expresses it: "The political life of the masses and the cohesion of society demand the acceptance of myths. A scientific attitude toward society does not permit belief in the truth of the myths. But the leaders must profess, indeed foster, belief in the myths, or the fabric of society will crack."

That conclusion always has been widely accepted by men who, naturally, refrain from proclaiming it in public. I knew a gentleman who, although not wealthy in the usual sense of that word, contributed some five thousand dollars a year to his local church. "Of course, I don't believe in immortality and the rest of that bunk," he told me, "but belief in a hereafter is the only thing that will keep most people straight, so I do what I can." That opinion was based, not on reading, but on his own observation of men. Essentially the same opinion is held by some clergymen. I have conversed with one, who is certainly not one of the "social gospel" shysters. He is a very well educated and thoughtful man, who believes religion necessary for social stability, although he regrets that a series of historical accidents made so confused and vulnerable a cult as Christianity the religion of the West instead of the form of Buddhism found in the *Milinda-pañha* (c. 125 B.C.), which, incidentally, he has read in the original Pali. That, of course, is not what he tells his congregation, but he holds that since a belief in the supernatural must be fostered for the comfort of the majority, it is best for society that the doctrine be dispensed by men who can take an honest and coldly rational view of their task and will not be carried away by fanaticism or exhibitionism. That view is not unique, and we should remember, for example, that in this century the staunchest and most eloquent defender of the Christian faith in France was the genial Charles Maurras, who, perhaps indiscreetly, confessed that he personally was an atheist.

One of the most striking proofs of the extent of irreligious support of religion as a social utility is the current rash of books and articles that urge Christians to unite with all other religions in "combating skepticism," because the important thing is to have "a faith," chosen from the contemporary flowerbed that provides nosegays to match any complexion or ensemble. That, of course, is the equivalent of saying that it does not matter what you believe, provided that you believe it hard enough. Just as the antithesis of love is not indifference but hate, so the opposite of a true religion is not skepticism but a false religion. So far as there is any honesty in this campaign to "save religion"—so far as it is not a swindle—it must be based on the premise that the beliefs of all Christians, Pharisees, Kabbalists, Theosophists, Moslems, Buddhists, etc., are equally false, but should be encouraged because such superstitions may serve to restrain men's natural propensity to crime. Obviously, the "interfaith" cuddling that is so much in the vogue among professional clergymen these days is possible only for those who have no faith in

their own religion, and we can only hope that some of them are thinking in terms of social utility rather than promoting a racket or a conspiracy.

The incidence of disbelief in a personal god—atheism, although many atheists escape social disapproval by using such euphemisms as agnosticism and pantheism—cannot, therefore, be estimated, even roughly. It is not limited to strict materialism. The structure of the human consciousness is at present so little understood, and so many psychological phenomena (e.g., hypnotism, the effects of hallucinogenic drugs, possible instances of telepathy, certain instincts of civilized men, many of the mental peculiarities of our race) remain unexplained that a belief that we have an immaterial and spiritual component is widely held, often associated with hypotheses concerning a fourth (or, if time is the fourth, a fifth) dimension. This spiritual element, though yet mysterious in the way that the observed effects of radioactivity were mysterious before radium was isolated and identified, is regarded as subject to natural laws yet unascertained, and therefore as involving no presumption that a deity is responsible for those phenomena. Some of our contemporaries, indeed, consider probable a doctrine similar to that of the “godless” Yogins of India (*Nirīśvara Sāṃkhya*) and posit cycles of reincarnation governed by moral laws that are as automatic and impersonal as gravitation. And Captain Ludovici, in his well-known *Religion for Infidels*, believes in the efficacy of prayer even in the absence of a god or other conscious force to hear it.

For many earnest Americans, religion has become a private matter, a system of ethical conduct reposing on metaphysical premises, hopes, or conjectures that they are unwilling to discuss and might have difficulty in defining precisely even to themselves. All that is certain is that there must be the greatest variety in their conceptions of the præterhuman. It is impossible, therefore, to estimate the persistence in our time of the Stoic conception of a deity that is the Soul of the Universe, which reappeared in the Deism of the late Eighteenth Century, which was professed by some of the founders of the American Republic—just as it is difficult to be certain to what extent that Deism was more than a way of rejecting Christianity without incurring the stigma of atheism. Many of its pronouncements, indeed, such as Voltaire’s famous dictum, *si Dieu n’existait pas, il faudrait l’inventer* (particularly when read in context), suggest much more concern for the stability of society than faith in the unnamed god.

One suspects that a numerical majority of our population has simply lost interest in religion as such and does not think about it at all, except as a kind of social convention, regarding the existence or non-existence of a god as something that probably cannot be determined, so that thought about it is impractical and profitless—a waste of time that can be used more advantageously in thinking about how to get a raise in salary, and more pleasurably in watching a baseball game or a prize fight. The conventions must, of course, be observed; indeed, some corporations when they send an “executive” into a new territory, perhaps as

District Sales Manager for Charnel House cosmetics or Bloaters' beer, stipulate that he must promptly join a country club, a church, and a local business men's association. I am told that at least one corporate monstrosity has thoughtfully compiled a catalogue of the churches that are best for business in each section of the country, so that its "executives" and their wives (who must be "college graduates without intellectual interests and active in community work") won't have to worry about a choice. "Fundamentalist" churches, I hear, are *streng verboden*: being suspected of taking Christianity seriously would be, like atheism, bad for sales. And that, I fear, is symptomatic of what religion has become for a large section of our people: not a matter of belief or disbelief, not a subject that excites either emotion or thought, but just a social gesture, to be made perfunctorily and with indifference.

All this, I know, is acutely painful for Christians, but it will do them no good to weep or to curse infidels or to hire an evangelist to tell them that they must "fight atheism" by booking him for a return engagement. The facts are but little less distressing to non-Christians who want to preserve what is left of our culture and our race, and who desperately wish that there were some way to restore the faith that was our bond of unity when the West was Christendom. But we were born into the Twentieth Century, not the Eleventh or the Thirteenth, and, unless we prefer to retreat into a dreamworld or passively await our doom, it is with the realities of the present that we must cope, if we can.

Succedaneous Religion

THE LOSS OF CHRISTIAN FAITH as the west's bond of union was a disaster; the spiritual vacuum thus created was a catastrophe.

Since the later part of the Eighteenth Century, we have had among us bands of evangelical atheists, numerically small but at times very influential, who, either openly or under the euphemistic appellation of "anti-clericals," worked to destroy Christianity. Although they were used by political conspiracies with which they sometimes knowingly collaborated, and although they were certainly encouraged and often subsidized by the Jews, who always profit from the misfortunes of the peoples among whom they have planted their colonies, most of the polemicists against our religion were quite sincere and many were men of good moral character. Let us, for our own instruction, disregard here the scabrous plotters who appear so often darkly in the background, and let us disregard also the often funeste consequences of the anti-religious agitation. Let us reduce to the simplest terms the principles of every society for the promotion of atheism, whatever it was formally or informally called.

There are just three basic propositions. Let us examine them, remembering that we are trying to reason about a desperate situation in which we find ourselves, whatever our beliefs. If we feel a need to indulge orgiastic emotions, let us do that elsewhere and after we have concluded our serious business.

1) Christianity is false. This conclusion is drawn from:

- a) a critical examination of the Christian Scriptures to discern the innumerable internal inconsistencies and contradictions, and to weigh the innumerable and equally contradictory attempts of theologians to explain them away;
- b) comparison of Scriptural accounts, so far as possible, with historical records;
- c) examination of Scriptural statements in the light of known natural laws; and
- d) consideration of the discrepancies between Biblical statements about the world and the observed nature of that world. Obviously, we cannot here consider the data and arguments adduced by the atheists under each of those four headings, but the important point is that, with no exceptions worth mentioning, this first step is *intellectually sound*. Each writer reports the facts correctly (except insofar as they were supplemented by later discoveries) and reasons from them with strict logic to rigorously drawn conclusions. Christians, to be sure, surmount those conclusions by various acts of faith, and their faith is entitled to every respect, but although it is asking much of them—as it is asking much of any man to ask him to be objective and just to his opponent—I hope that they will be able to admire the *intellectual* processes by which the conclusions were

obtained. They cannot deny the facts without lying; to throw themselves on the floor, kick with their heels, and scream "blasphemy!" is unworthy of adults.

2) Religion is therefore an imposture on the ignorant perpetrated by priests for their own profit. This conclusion is drawn from:

- a) the long, long history of fraudulent simulation of supernatural phenomena, from the witch-doctors among the Congoids, who excite the awe of their tribesmen with some of our simpler parlor-tricks, to the elaborate machinery and drugs used in ancient Egypt, Asia Minor, and even Greece to show the ways of god to the suckers;
- b) the manufacture of relics and the forgery of decretals and donations in Christianity;
- c) the power-politics of the established clergy in many historical periods; and
- d) the corruption and scandalous profligacy or dishonesty of many churchmen of exalted rank, including some Popes.

Here, however, we have gone a little fast, haven't we? There is no conduct attributed to the clergy, even to its worst members, that is not at least matched by conduct that is common enough among laymen, including rulers and members of a nobility or aristocracy, and while believers may be distressed that their religion does not transform men, how can atheists think it very significant that ecclesiastics are human beings? And have we not *excluded* some data here? Does not the record show a very large number of well-educated and highly intelligent men, both churchmen and laymen, who, if not insane, *must* have held the faith they professed? And can we suppose that religion answers no natural need or desire in men? That it serves no purpose in civilized society? That it would never have existed, if the equivalent of our stage magicians and our confidence men had not imposed on the credulity of our ancestors?

3) Let us, therefore, destroy religion, that monstrous engine of deception and exploitation—*écrasez l'infâme!*—and men, governing their conduct by clear-sighted reason alone, will enjoy the infinite progress that Science makes possible.

This conclusion is based on—what? History provides no example of a people that governed itself by cold reason, and, for that matter, not many examples of leaders and governors who behaved reasonably even in terms of their own personal advantage or the advantage of their family or other small group. It provides no example of a civilized people without a prevalent religion¹ If, in our society, religion is a fraud, it is only one of the hundreds of frauds currently

¹ I speak, of course, of nations as a whole. It is true that small and essentially aristocratic groups, delimited by birth and education, such as Victorian gentlemen, found in a code of personal honor an adequate substitute for religion, and there have been times when incredulity was normal among an upper and politically dominant group, but it may be significant that the incredulity was most open and notorious in the periods that immediately preceded a great national catastrophe. Even during those periods, however, the mass of common people remained religious. In Eighteenth-Century France, 95% of the population practiced Christianity until the Revolution. In the late Roman Republic, before the great Civil Wars, the Capitoline gods suffered some neglect, but the religiosity of the populace was increasing as shown by the importation and spread of various Oriental cults, and the local deities of the

practiced by playing on ignorance and emotions, usually with appeal to such constant human incentives as greed and malice. So what is the basis of the atheists' third proposition? Faith. Faith in a statement that is completely unsupported by objective thought—unsupported by data or by logical deductions, and even contrary to the indications of *all* the relevant evidence that can be found.² It is a faith that can be based on no revelation other than the effervescence of an overheated imagination, and that can have been accepted for no reason other than that it promises a miracle that seems delightful.

What has happened to the evangelical atheists without their being aware of it is clear. When they expelled their faith in Christianity, they created within themselves a vacuum that was quickly filled by another faith. And the fervor with which they hold that faith is of religious intensity. They preach the joyful tidings that there is no God with as much ardor and sincerity as ever a Christian preached his gospel. They sacrificed themselves, and some even underwent martyrdom, for their faith. If we wanted to indulge in paradox, we could describe them as the zealots of an anti-religious religion, but it is more accurate to say that their faith in a religion, which was rational in that it expected miracles only from the supernatural power of its invisible deity, was replaced by a superstition that expects miracles from natural causes that have never produced such effects—a superstition that is totally irrational.

Societies for the promotion of atheism as such are relatively innocuous and merely exhibit on a small scale a psychological phenomenon that has catastrophic effects when it occurs on a large scale, much as sand spouts and dust devils are miniature tornadoes. When religious faith is replaced by materialistic superstition on a large scale, the consequences are enormous devastation.

The great wave of anti-Christian evangelism swept over Europe about the middle of the Eighteenth Century, and its natural results were most conspicuous in France, where decades of strenuous social reform imposed by a centralized government under a king whose mediocre mind had been thoroughly addled by "Liberal" notions, naturally triggered the outbreak of insanity and savagery known as the French Revolution. Since the shamans and fetish-men of the new superstition control our schools and universities today, the history of that event is little known to the average American, who is likely to have derived his impressions, at best, from

countryside seem to have enjoyed about as much veneration as ever. We shall come to the situation in the United States today below.

² For example, Robert G. Ingersoll was a very intelligent and well-read man, but readers of his famous orations and of his collected letters (which will guarantee the candor of the speeches) can only marvel at the facility with which his evangelical eloquence disregards the French Revolution, which should have provided him with an unforgettable lesson of what Gibbon termed "the danger of exposing an old superstition to the contempt of the blind and fanatic multitude." Ingersoll must have read, in one of the three historians whom he most highly esteemed, the passage from which I have quoted, and he must have read many reports, written by non-Christians and so acceptable to him, of the orgy of sadism, savagery, and homicidal mania in France, but the lesson was evidently lost on him, perhaps because he had faith in institutions that have now disappeared in all but name from the United States—and yet he had himself fought in the fratricidal madness commonly called the Civil War, and he had himself witnessed the sadistic reprisals carried out by hate-crazed fanatics on the civilized inhabitants of the conquered and helpless Confederacy!

Carlyle's novel, *The French Revolution*, and, at worst, from the epopts and fakirs of Democracy. Obviously, we cannot here insert an excursus of a thousand pages or so on what happened in France at that time, nor need we. The efforts at social uplift through economic and political reforms during the reign of Louis XVI are well summarized by Alexis de Tocqueville in *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*.³ The best short account in English of the underlying forces of the disaster is the late Nesta Webster's *The French Revolution*, supplemented by the two volumes of her biography of Marie Antoinette and Louis XVI and by the pertinent chapters of her *World Revolution*.⁴

We need not here concern ourselves with the sinister and mephitic conspiracies that clandestinely incited and contrived so much of the disaster, for our interest is not in the manipulators but in the men of our race who were manipulated. Our problem is not what was done to them, but why they let it be done. Adam Weishaupt, the founder and titular head of the homicidal conspiracy of the Illuminati,⁵ was undoubtedly a cunning creature, who was able to enlist some of the kings and princes of Europe in a conspiracy to abolish monarchy, to enlist Christian clergymen in a conspiracy to destroy Christianity, and to enlist tender-hearted sentimentalists in a conspiracy to murder thousands of cultivated men and women, but however subtle his methods of deceit, his success argues some fundamental weakness, mental or moral,

³ The reader should remember that de Tocqueville wrote at a time (1856) when the recrudescence of religion that followed the French Revolution permitted him the illusion that Christianity had been "definitely reestablished" and that the climate of his time was "highly favorable to Christianity."

⁴ Mrs. Webster wrote as a Christian and so, although she was a woman of great learning and penetrating mind, her interpretations of the facts that she correctly reports are colored by (a) failure sufficiently to allow for the fact that while the publication of the great French *Encyclopédie* was undoubtedly subversive of both church and state, it was nevertheless an accurate report of the science, technology, and historical knowledge of the time, so that if we deplore the publication of encyclopaedias, we must logically demand that accumulated knowledge be made accessible only to a restricted and small elite; and (b) the Christian conception of a universal conflict between God and Satan, whence it follows that whatever is anti-Christian is morally evil and wicked. Many of the early colonists in North America, especially the English, accordingly thought that the Indians must have been incited by the Devil not to surrender their hunting grounds to the Christians, and today many think that the Jews are Satanic and wicked because they act in conformity with the interests, instincts, and beliefs of their race. Non-Christian readers should make allowance for this tendency without illogically rejecting Mrs. Webster's report of the facts.

⁵ We must, of course, be careful to avoid exalting Weishaupt to the rank of Satan by making him and his scabrous crew responsible for the whole of the catastrophe to which they (and many others) undoubtedly contributed. In my *Conspiracy or Degeneracy?*, note 19, I commented sufficiently on the notion, popular in some circles, that the Illuminati were and now are an incredibly powerful gang of mysterious Master Minds who have conspired and labored for hundreds or thousands of years, and have caused all the woes of the world for some purpose of their own. The underlying premise, sometimes explicit but often left latent these days, is that the terrible but unidentified Illuminati are engaged in a Conspiracy Against Christianity, presumably with the active cooperation of the Devil. If those diabolic conspirators had not done their dirty work, there would now be no nasty skeptics and awful atheists, and everyone in the whole world—well, everyone in the United States, at least, would believe every word in the Bible and conduct himself accordingly. Now, as I have indicated above, if you accept that idea, you must accept its necessary corollary, that most of the physical world about us is an illusion that we mistake for reality—an illusion somehow contrived by the Illuminati or their immortal Superintendent. And if you believe that, the best thing to do is to retire, as did the well-known group of Byzantine monks, and contemplate your navel (assuming that it is not also an illusion).

in his victims.

No historical period is more instructive than the half-century in France during which the yet numerous members of the hereditary aristocracy and the more numerous *nouveaux-riches* with their purchased titles worked so assiduously to produce the cataclysm in which they perished. They spoke proudly of their time as the Enlightenment, the *Siècle des Lumières*, the Age of Reason. Most of them saw the light at last when they faced a new humanitarian machine for amputating their heads; and many did not live until 10 November 1793, when they could have seen Reason finally enthroned and incarnate in the person of a nude whore seated on the high altar of Notre Dame. The results proved that, taken as a whole, the French aristocracy, which included much of the best (and some of the worst) blood in the nation, was the most spectacular collection of boobs seen anywhere before Twentieth-Century America.

The Eighteenth Century saw great and solid achievement in all the basic sciences, in industrial technology, and in historical scholarship. It is indubitable that almost all of those brilliant achievements in science and scholarship directly or indirectly impugned the tenets of Christianity. Although comparatively few men had a thorough understanding of those discoveries, a superficial knowledge of their implications was communicated, usually by witty popularizers, to the entire educated class. That sufficed to destroy their religious faith, which was accordingly replaced by the weird superstitions of the self-styled *philosophes*. That gabbling crew could no longer believe in God, but they could believe in World Peace, which was to be magically produced by either the Abbé de Saint-Pierre's project for a "United Nations" or by tobacco, which, if smoked by everyone, would infallibly soothe men's nerves that they would no longer lose their tempers and want to fight. They could not believe in Christ, but they could believe that an oleaginous Jew who impudently called himself the Comte de Saint-Germain had witnessed the Crucifixion and had remained in good health ever since by abstaining from all food and extracting his nourishment directly from the air—and they thought it the most natural thing in the world that such a long-lived genius should be installed in the royal palace as a personal adviser to the king. They could not believe in the immortality of the soul, but they could believe that a sleazy Jew named Balsamo, alias Mr. Bacthymore, alias Comte Pellegrini, alias Comte de Cagliostro, etc., could conjure up the dead, foresee each person's future, make diamonds grow bigger, and distill an elixir that would rejuvenate old men and convert young men into infants.⁶

If there is any one individual who can be regarded as a perfect representative and, as it were, archetypal symbol of the Enlightenment, it is the famous Marquise d'Urfé. She was a high-born, wealthy, and intelligent woman who evidently had a serious interest in chemistry and is credited with the invention of a self-regulating laboratory furnace for use in her experiments.

⁶ In this connection, we should perhaps mention the Cardinal de Rohan, a model ecclesiastic who was so intellectual that he discovered how profitable it was to collaborate with the Cerf-Beers and other Jewish banking houses. He knew, of course, that Christianity was a "silly superstition," but after he saw the "Comte de Cagliostro" manufacture a potful of gold out of dross, he logically concluded that the conjurer was Divine and perhaps an incarnation of God, and must therefore have the power to help the Cardinal seduce Marie Antoinette and cuckold the King.

She also believed that it would be much nicer to be a young man than an old woman, and accordingly she took steps to have herself transformed. She took one important step on the advice of Querilinthos, a Genius then residing in the Milky Way, and at the exactly calculated astrological moment she, after a solemn prayer to Selenis, the Spirit of the Moon, cast into the Mediterranean a casket which she had filled with fifty pounds of gold, silver, mercury, and other metals, and diamonds, rubies, emeralds, sapphires, chrysolites, topazes, and opals. (Casanova, of course, had thoughtfully substituted fifty pounds of lead before the lady cast into the waves her offering to the Seven Planets.) This devotion so moved Selenis that she sent from the Moon an immortal Undine (one of Casanova's mistresses in green tights) to give the Marquise a ceremonial bath. The Marquise d'Urfé, I need not say, was a true intellectual, who had emancipated herself from vulgar prejudices.

It is not astonishing that a society of such intellectuals took seriously a crack-brained vagabond who was given to sniveling ecstatically as he meditated on the Virtue that filled his Pure Heart, and to denouncing the corruption of the Christian Churches that maintained the orphan asylums at which his bastards were surreptitiously abandoned. Rousseau, unfortunately for us, had the ability to write an emotional prose that gave spice to his balderdash, and he seems on occasion to have been capable of a forced lucidity (as in his *Considerations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*), but he himself summed up his whole career when, in a moment of candor, he told Boswell, "I live in a world of fantasies, and I cannot tolerate the world as it is."⁷

We should not damn Rousseau for his influence. The real gravamen of guilt falls on the educated, skeptical, intellectual society that did not laugh at his fantasies about the innate Virtue of hearts uncorrupted by civilization, the Noble Savage, the Equality of all human beings, who can become unequal only through the wickedness of civilized society, the sinfulness of owning property of any kind, and the rest of the tommyrot that you will find in the thousands of printed pages of Rousseau's whining and ranting. You can read all of it—if you grit your teeth and resolve to go through with it—and you really should, for otherwise you will not believe that books so widely read and rhapsodically admired can be so supremely silly and so excruciatingly tedious.

What Rousseau's fantasies produced is an amazing superstition. It is not exactly an atheism, for a vague god was needed to create perfectly noble savages to be corrupted by civilization, and to inspire perfectly pure hearts, like Rousseau's, that overflow with Virtue and drip tears wherever they go; but for all practical purposes, Rousseau's creed substituted "democracy" for God, and put civilized society in place of the Devil. It replaced faith in the unseen and empirically unverifiable with faith in the visibly and demonstrably false.

We cannot afford to smile at poor Mme. d'Urfé. Her instructions came from Querilinthos, but that great Spirit had been conveyed to the Milky Way by seven salamanders, so naturally she could not expect him to come in person for her to see. You may think that if the noble lady had

⁷ Not by any means his only confession; cf. his letter to Malesherbes, 4 January 1762: "Je trouve mieux mon compte avec les êtres chimériques que je rassemble autour de moi, qu'avec ceux que je vois dans le monde." One could collect at least a dozen more or less candid admissions that he could not bear to think about the real world.

been really shrewd at the time that the immortal and voiceless Undine was giving her a lustral scrub, she would have jabbed that Moon-maid with a pin, but, after all, a woman who has just thrown a fortune in gold and jewels into the sea is apt to be a little excited, and something must be allowed for the impatience of an old woman eager to become a young man. No such apology can be made for the mighty minds that were stunned by Rousseau's drivel. They could have tested the proposition about natural Equality by just walking down the street with their eyes open, looking inside the nearest prison, or paying a little attention to the conduct of any one of the score of really noteworthy degenerates of very high rank.⁸

They must have met every day military men and others who had observed savages in their native habitat and could comment on the innate nobility of the dear creatures. And some conversation with a few footpads and cutpurses would have elucidated the problem whether or not Society was responsible for their having been born without a conscience, wings, and other desirable appurtenances. In fact, no rational person could have escaped a daily demonstration that Rousseau's babble was utter nonsense—except, perhaps, by confining himself in a windowless and soundproof room. But the *philosophes* were able to attain in their own capacious minds a far more total isolation from reality.

How was this possible? There are two obvious factors.

Of the first of these, let us take one of the innumerable examples that have no political or religious implications.

Many of the novels of Dickens were published serially in periodicals, and naturally each installment was published in

England before it appeared in the United States. In 1840, ships arriving from Britain found awaiting them on the dock little knots of well-dressed men and women who, as soon as the vessel came within hailing distance, inquired with tearful anxiety, "Is Little Nell dead?" Now those who asked that question with bated breath were literate and presumably educated persons of what is called the leisure class. They were neither drunk nor insane, so they must have known that Little Nell was a purely fictitious product of Dickens' imagination and that she appeared in a tale set quite some time before the present. If they had any acquaintance with

⁸ Including, by the way, the great Apostle of Democracy to whom we owe both the word *Sadism* and the nonsensical dictum that 'All men are created equal' ("La Nature nous a fait naître tous égaux"). This favorite dictum of the Marquis de Sade is elaborated early in the first volume of his *Justine*, where he expounds the doctrine, now tacitly or explicitly espoused by our "Liberals," that the most revolting crimes are always justified as a form of social protest and receive the special approbation of Providence, since it is only through every form of criminal action that we can restore the blessed state of perfect equality intended by our Creator ("l'état où elle [la Providence] nous a créés est l'Égalité"). De Sade was twice condemned to death for revolting crimes of which it had been possible to convict him in the courts, but under the decadent government of Louis XVI, as in the United States today, political influences were always available to save the utterly depraved from execution, and De Sade was held in a comfortable prison until he was released by the French Revolution. He became one of the most fervent orators for Social Justice and Brotherhood, and continued to exercise his phenomenal ingenuity in torturing and mutilating the men and women whom he kidnapped for his private amusement, throughout the Revolution. The degenerate creature was clapped into an insane asylum as soon as Napoleon came to power.

human life, they must further have known that the fictitious Little Nell was a paragon that resembled no child ever born of woman. A minimal amount of reflection would have assured them that Dickens was contriving with conscious art a tear-jerking story of which the peripeties and denouement would be determined by his judgement of what would most excite the sentimentality of his readers within the limits of length that he thought most advantageous for his magazine.

The inquirers were not idiots; they knew all that. But the imaginations that Dickens had stimulated were so vivid and powerful, and were reinforced by sentiments of generosity and pity so strong, that the rational mind was, so to speak, put on a chain, like an inconvenient watchdog, and a part of the consciousness luxuriated in the illusion that Little Nell was a real being and in anxiety over her fate.

The hypostatization of Little Nell was merely an extension or, rather, perversion of a psychological process common to our race and that we all experience whenever we read a work of imaginative literature, in prose or verse. When we take up a work of poetry or prose fiction, we begin with what literary critics commonly call the poetic suspension of doubt. We resolve that during our reading we will believe that whatever the author tells us actually happened, and that we will vicariously be present when it happens and will experience the emotions that we would experience if we were physically present. That is the literary experience of great literature—and, indeed, our experience when we read any fiction that is sufficiently well written to keep us from throwing the book in the fireplace. When we read tales of the marvelous and præternatural, we make a temporary act of faith and accept the world that the author has created. Only the poor in spirit will refuse to believe in hippogriffs when they read the *Orlando furioso* or doubt Prospero's power when they read *The Tempest*. We make what is essentially the same act of faith when we read fiction written in more realistic terms. It is a faith of strictly limited duration, and, unless our minds have slipped a cog or two, when we put down Hardy's greatest novel we no more suppose that we have read the biography of a man named Jude the Obscure than we expect to find hippogriffs mingling with the traffic on the street outside after we have read Ariosto.

Literature provides us with emotional and spiritual experience of which we have a racial need, for we Indo-Europeans inherit genetically vivid imaginations that are apt to get out of control if we try to repress or ignore them instead of exercising them rationally and thus satisfying our inner yearning for worlds brighter, more beautiful, and more dramatic than the one in which we live. Our first great literature was the poems of Homer, both the *Iliad*, with its eternal figuration of the unalterably tragic fate that only we men of the West are strong enough to meet knowingly, and the *Odyssey*, with its magic casements opening on the foam of perilous seas. And that literature we shall need so long as we endure as a race. The power of our imagination, while not, perhaps, unique, as is the capacity for philosophic reasoning that enables us to know and partly master the physical world, is a part of our racial being, and we can deny it only at our own peril.

The danger comes, of course, when imagined scenes are so vivid that we ignorantly mistake

them for reality. That is what makes "historical" and "thesis" novels as dangerous as nitroglycerine and to be handled with the same caution. Many a person who has not read in the historical sources has been left with the impression that Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities* describes the French Revolution. Many readers of Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans* have thought that they had learned something about Indian tribes that had actually lived in North America. And, incredible as it seems, the sentimental drivel exuded by the infected imagination of Harriet Beecher Stowe so inflamed weak minds that it became one of the causes of national insanity and a fratricidal war that permanently impoverished our nation and may yet prove to have been suicidal.

On a vulgar and prosaic level, we see constantly cases of imaginative intoxication that match anything produced by alcohol. The good ladies of the local church's sewing circle read the prose of some missionary or journalist, and lo! each sees in her imagination sweet little black boys and girls just like her Johnny and her Mary, only a little nicer, and her heart yearns to equip them with trousers and dresses and a copy of the New Testament, and to supply them with ice-cream cones. And so she plies her needle for their sake and puts her mite in the collection box, blissfully unaware that the darling objects of her concern are no more real than Lewis Carroll's Sylvie and Bruno. It is also a commonplace phenomenon that whenever some particularly vicious young brute has rearranged his wife's anatomy with an axe, a certain number of females will generate pictures of a dear misunderstood boy and write him offers of marriage, and a much larger number of females, seeing the same vision but less impulsive in their behavior, will hope that, at the very worst, the parole board will turn the lad loose in a year or two so that he can resume his amateur surgery. The phenomenon is not by any means confined to the more lachrymose sex, and we see instances of it every day. We enact laws to discourage people who see pink elephants on the wall from driving automobiles, but we do nothing about the far graver problem of preventing people who see World Peace around the corner from voting.

Our hyperactive imaginations usually act in concert with the generous impulses that are peculiar to our race – so peculiar that no other race can understand them except as a kind of fatuity from which they, thank God! are exempt. Long before we began to indulge in international idiocy on a governmental scale, it was virtually routine for Americans to hear that the Chinese in some province were starving, and within a few weeks numerous individuals, many of them comparatively poor, made private contributions, and food was bought and shipped to the starving (if the collections were honestly made). Now I do not deprecate that exercise of charity, which is a virtue that we instinctively admire, but we should understand that although the Chinese gladly ate the food and politely said "thank you," they privately concluded that we must be weak in the head. They would never have done anything of that sort, not even for men of their own race in a neighboring province. The White Devils, they decided, must have maggots in their minds. Sympathetic generosity, however, is a virtue or vice of our race, and we shall have to live with it.

What happened in the Eighteenth Century was that Rousseau's fantasies so excited imaginations and generous impulses that the reasoning mind lost control. The nobility's

collective heart bled for Little Nell.

There is, however, a second factor more important for our purposes here. You will find a clear illustration in our recent history, during the presidency of Woodrow Wilson, who appears to have been a not uncommon combination of mental auto-intoxication with corrupt ambition, and who was appointed President after the resident General Manager, Barney Baruch, and his crew had (as one of them boasted to Colonel Dall) led him around “like a poodle on a string,” taught him to sit up and bark for bonbons, and made sure that he was well trained. As we all know, Baruch eventually decided that it would be good for the Jewish people to prolong the war in Europe, so that more Indo-Europeans would be killed and more of their countries devastated, and that the time had come to repay Germany and Austria for their generosity toward the Jews, who had been given in those countries more of economic, social, and political dominance than in any other European nation. It followed therefore that the thing to do was to stampede an American herd into European territory.

Our concern here is with the herd: what set it in motion? We all know how credulous individuals, many of whom had visited Germany and knew better, were impelled to imagine pictures of the evil War Lord, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and the terrible Huns—pictures that were as vivid and convincing as the vision of the monster Grendel that we see every time we read *Beowulf*. And, of course, there was much rant about supposed violations of a code of chivalry that no one even remembered a few years later. A college professor with some reputation as an historian was hired, doubtless for a small fee, to prove that wars are caused by monarchies, although he somehow forgot to mention the terribly bloody war that had taken place on our soil some fifty years before and which had obviously been caused by the dynastic ambitions of King Lincoln and King Davis. And, naturally, the press was filled with many other ravings. So pretty soon the Americans found themselves engaged in a “war to end wars” and a “war to make the world safe for democracy.” It would probably have been a little more expensive—good propaganda costs money—to make them fight a “war to end selfishness” and a “war to make the world safe for goblins,” but it doubtless could have been done. Green snakes are not much harder to see on the wall than pink elephants.

We must not tarry to discuss either the methods of the conspirators who so easily manipulated the American people or the folly of those who were manipulated. Let us consider our enthusiastic rush on Europe as an historical movement.

If, taking the larger view, you ask yourself what that movement most resembled, you will see the answer at once. It was a crusade—or, to be more exact, an obscene parody of a crusade. It was a mass movement inspired by a fervor of religious intensity.

The Crusades, which mark the high tide of Christianity, were (given our faith) entirely rational undertakings.⁹ It was obviously desirable that Christendom own the territory that was a Holy Land, where its God had appeared on earth and whither many pilgrims journeyed for the

⁹ Except, of course, the so-called Children’s Crusade, which is significant only as evidence that even at that early date some members of our race had a pathological propensity to have hallucinatory imaginations.

welfare of their souls. The Crusades were, furthermore, the first real effort of European unity since the fall of the Roman Empire, and they were also a *realistic* missionary effort. It was impossible to convert Orientals to Christianity, but it was possible to make Orientals submit to Christian rulers. The Crusaders established the Kingdoms of Cyprus and Jerusalem and the Principalities of Edessa, Tripoli, and Antioch—and eventually they found it necessary to capture Constantinople. But they could not take Bagdad and their high emprise ultimately failed for reasons which need not concern us here. The Crusades were, as we have said, the high tide of Christianity.

Wilson's fake crusade against Europe evoked from the American people the energies and spirit that the real Crusades had aroused in Europe, and while we must deplore their delusions, we must admire the unanimity and devotion with which the Americans attacked and fought the Europeans.¹⁰ The crusade was irrational, however, because it was prompted, not by religion, but by the debased and debasing superstitions represented by Rousseau.

From about the middle of the Eighteenth Century to the present we have witnessed the spread and propagation throughout the West of a superstition that is as un-Christian as it is irrational, as obviously contrary to the Scriptures and tradition of Christianity as it is a blanket denial of the reality that all men see and experience every day—a superstition by which faith in an unseen God is replaced by hallucinations about the world in which we live. After that grotesque superstition inspired the most civilized and intelligent part of France to commit suicide, and loosed the frenzied orgy of depravity, crime, and murder called the French Revolution, its influence was contracted by a resurgence of both Christian faith and human reason, but recovering its malefic power over the imagination and sentimentality of our people, it grew again and as a succedaneous religion it gradually supplanted Christianity in the consciousness of both unintelligent non-Christians and infidel Christians, paralyzing both reason and faith.

This grotesque caricature of religion is now the dominant cult in the United States: its marabouts yell from almost all the pulpits; its fetish-men brandish their obscene idols before all the children in the schools; its witch-doctors prance triumphantly through all the colleges and universities. And virtually everyone stands in fearful awe of the fanatical practitioners of mumbo-jumbo. Both the God of Christendom and the reasoning mind of our race have been virtually obliterated by the peculiar system of voodoo called "Liberalism."

It is obvious that this mass delusion is leading, and can lead, to but one end. James Burnham named it correctly in his generally excellent book, *Suicide of the West*.

It can be argued—and argued very plausibly—that a race that could long accept the "Liberal" voodoo-cult as a substitute for both its religion and its powers of observation and reason—a race capable of such mindless orgies as a "war to end wars"—a race that has for decades worked to

¹⁰ Of course, we did not actually fight Great Britain, France, and Russia, our ostensible allies; they were defeated in other ways.

commit suicide—is a race that has become too imbecile to be biologically viable. It is entirely possible that our unique capacity for science and technology will, after all, be no more effective in the struggle for life than was the vast bulk and musculature of the dinosaurs. It may be that any attempt to reason with a people seemingly in the grip of suicidal mania is itself the greatest folly, and that the vainest of all illusions is the hope that anything can save men who evidently no longer want to live.

If we permit ourselves as Christians any hope this side of Heaven, and if we permit ourselves as atheists any hope at all, we must base that expectation on the hypothesis that the collapse of Christendom, the loss of faith in the religion of the West, was a traumatic shock to our racial psyche that stunned but did not kill. If that is so, then there is hope not only that we may revive from the shock and survive, but also that the unique powers of our unique race may again be exerted to give us a future that will be brilliant, glorious, and triumphant beyond all imagining. If that is so. . . .

The question is one that only the future can answer. But a significant indication will be given by the attitude and action of the Christian minority that has thus far been the only defender of our race, the only champion of our embezzled heritage. Will they be willing to face, as did their ancestors in the great Crusade, the fact that wars are won only by mobilizing and directing superior *force* against the enemy; that pious sermons, Scriptural citations, and benevolent intentions never turned a single spear or blunted a single blade; and that if Christians had put their trust in miracles, they would long since have disappeared from the face of the earth? Christendom survived at Chalons, and at Tours, and at Vienna, and in many another crisis, not by book, bell, and candle, but by grace of the shining sword in a mailed fist directed by a dauntless heart.

Postscript

The foregoing pages were written in March and April, 1969, as a sequel to my article, "After Fifty Years," and were to be published first as a series of articles and then as a booklet on behalf of the newly formed National Youth Alliance. The first chapter appeared in the Summer (1969) issue of the *American Mercury*, but the rest of the work was withdrawn as soon as I had reason to apprehend that the Youth Alliance, contrary to the assurances given its sponsors (Professor Austin J. App, Mr. Richard Cotten, Admiral John G. Crommelin, General Pedro del Valle, the Reverend Mr. Ferrell Griswold, and myself), would be turned into one of the sucker-list operations that now constitute the principal business of the American "right-wing."¹¹

I was unwilling to have the booklet published under other auspices because conversations with some very influential Christians showed me the futility of trying to talk sense to them. Their plan for salvaging the nation consisted of cursing the Jews and repudiating reason by reciting the mantram, "A little child shall lead them." They could not remember that precisely that phrase had been the inspiration of the Children's Crusade, which succeeded only in filling the slave-markets of the Near East with a choice breed of biped cattle.

I also observed that, on the whole, American "conservatives" and "anti-Communists" seem to be either unwilling or unable to learn anything from the total and unmitigated failure of all their efforts for the past fifty years. They have dwindled to a little band of aged and aging men and women who now can talk only to themselves, repeating ever more shrilly their futile anachronisms, closing their eyes more tightly to avoid seeing the world of today, and retreating ever farther into a realm of fantasy filled with good fairies and wicked witches who can be summoned or exorcised with magic words. And they have, inadvertently and unwittingly, made patriotic organizations almost a monopoly of confidence men who cynically sell them fallacious hopes and comforting fictions.

Many well-meaning, estimable, and voluntarily blind Americans seem to derive satisfaction from writing cheques whenever a sucker-list operator has his computer write them an "urgent" letter promising the impossible; from imagining that they can hire a lobbyist so glib that he can talk 370 congressmen into committing political suicide; from going to cozy little chapter-meetings to hear the latest version of Little Red Riding-Hood and the Bad Old Wolf, composed by an expert with just the right sequence of phrases to excite their imaginations, flatter their egos, soothe their nerves, and stimulate their hands as they reach once again for the well-worn billfolds. No one would question their right to purchase consoling illusions, any more than he would question their right to put their money on the horses at Saratoga or to make the rounds of the clip-joints on Montmartre, but their very eagerness for such distractions seemed evidence

¹¹ My apprehensions were soon verified and the original Alliance came to an end. What I have said above implies no criticism of the *legitimate* successor organization, the National Youth Alliance headed by Dr. William Pierce, which has my best wishes, although I have no connection with it.

of an invincible determination never to find out that the United States passed the point of no return in 1964.

As Professor Andrew Hacker cheerfully assures us in *The End of the American Era* (1970), the United States has ceased to be a nation: "What was once a nation has become simply an agglomeration of self-concerned individuals." Despite the assumptions made by jabbering politicians and journalists, the United States has become a territory filled with bewildered individuals who have in common only a geographical area inhabited by incompatible races. Our "history as a nation has reached its end" because "the American people have never developed a feeling for history." We have been so crazed by the debasing superstitions of "democracy" and "humanitarianism," our minds have been so thoroughly sabotaged by the witch-doctors in the public schools, and our society has been so rotted by feckless sentimentality that we have reached "a juncture at which it becomes pointless to call for rehabilitation or renewal." Professor Hacker optimistically thinks it likely that our amorphous horde can continue to exist for some time in ever increasing discomfort, disorder, degradation, and danger- provided no healthy nation desires our territory and sees the advantages of using its present population to fertilize the depleted soil.

Although our people will not believe it so long as the routine of their personal lives is not suddenly and violently disturbed, we have ceased to be a nation because Americans no longer have the will to be one. That is the conclusion reached by Professor Hacker, a diligent observer who cannot be suspected of having the slightest taint of "conservatism" (to say nothing of horrid "racism"!), and whose sympathies, evidently, lie with the very forces that he identifies as the cause of our national decease.

The last years of the late Whittaker Chambers were overshadowed by a bleak pessimism of which some adumbrations appear in the pages of his *Witness* and the posthumous book, *Cold Friday* (1964). He was convinced that the American people are actuated by a subconscious, but ineradicable and irresistible, death-wish—a subliminal longing for extinction that makes them turn in fury on anyone who tries to make possible their survival. Before his death in 1962 so drastic a conclusion, extending the effects of morbid psychological states and degenerative diseases to an entire population or even an entire race, seemed highly improbable and could be dismissed as a reflection of the bitterness of his own experience. But another decade has produced no evidence that Chambers was not right. We usually tell ourselves that our domestic enemies have stealthily captured all of our means of information and communication, and now administer through the schools, the newspapers, and the boob-tubes a corrosive brainwashing that accounts for the ovine apathy of our people as they are herded toward national suicide, but it seems a little odd that our people should have been so obtuse as to permit that capture, and we cannot categorically deny that what we optimistically attribute to systematic brainwashing may have a deeper and hidden cause.

Our race is a biological species and it would be the wildest megalomania to pretend that we are exempt from any of the laws of nature, including those that we cannot yet precisely define. Innumerable other species, less loquacious than ours, have become extinct because they did

not have the intelligence to cope with relatively slight changes in their environment. The dinosaurs, the pterodactyls, the mammoths, the Neanderthals, and the moas cannot have had the capacity for ratiocination on which we pride ourselves, but it is not impossible that when their environment no longer matched the conditions in which the species had become dominant, the resulting frustration of some inherited instinct produced in the individuals of the doomed species behavior that resembled a subconscious awareness that they were biologically obsolete. In some species that are now becoming extinct, notably the mountain gorilla, we can observe a depletion of the vital energies and a resulting apathy that can be described as loss of the will to live.

A gorilla cannot reason. As he shambles toward a new growth of esculent young bamboo, his dim consciousness doubtless is filled by satisfaction with himself and feels no concern for the future; when he slinks away from some challenge that would have roused his ancestors to combat, he does not need to cover his cowardice with a pretense that he has become morally superior and a peace-lover. He cannot know that his contented apathy manifests a genetic deterioration that dooms his species to proximate extinction.

Our race is a biological species, and our peculiar intelligence, like the gorilla's mighty shoulders, once gave us dominance over other species. But what we must now objectively observe in our behavior is not really the gorilla's apathy. It is something much worse: a perverse and idiotic delight in whatever weakens us and strengthens our enemies. This morbid racial masochism is now most conspicuous in the United States and Britain, where we are not only doing everything in our power to subsidize and accelerate the breeding of voracious parasites to impoverish, degrade, and destroy us, but are also applying the most effective biological techniques to breed ourselves into imbecility and eventual extinction.

Six years ago in my *Conspiracy or Degeneracy?*, I asked the one crucial question: Have we, the men of the West, lost the will to live?

Nothing, certainly, has happened since then to suggest a negative answer. To be sure, after some sensationally flagitious outrage to our race, a considerable number of men, invariably the least "educated," mutter angrily among themselves; and in a city of almost two million some fifty men and women may boldly assemble to voice their protest, thus embarrassing the vast majority of Aryans, who hasten to assure the world that their heads are so stuffed with mush that they love their Enemies and hope for nothing better than the privilege of being spat-on and kicked some more. And if the outrage is widely reported, the computers will whirr more loudly as they churn out appeals to patriotic suckers, and the travelling salesmen will drive harder as they rush from chapter-meeting to chapter-meeting to meet a temporarily increased demand for patriotic paregoric to soothe nervous stomachs. Nowhere can one discern the slightest indication that in the great majority of our people the racial instinct of self-preservation has not been lost.

The question remains unanswered, however, for we cannot yet determine whether the instinct has been extinguished or is merely in abeyance while our people are in a kind of

cataleptic trance from which they may be roused by physical suffering and acute privation when the time comes, as it assuredly will in a few years. In the meantime the question remains open, although our fragmentary data point to an affirmative answer-to the loss of the will to live. The laws of biological processes, like the law of gravitation, are constant and unalterable; they cannot be evaded by magic or oratory or whimpering; and it would be supremely silly to expostulate with a people that is not biologically fit to survive.

All these considerations confirmed my decision to withhold these pages from the press.

This booklet is now published at the instance of Mr. Richard Cotten, who refuses to despair of the future, and who has himself set an example of perseverance in the face of great odds.

There are a few encouraging indications. The greatest of these is the publication and increasingly wide distribution of a very important volume, entitled *The Dispossessed Majority* by Wilmot Robertson. This is the first attempt to survey the present plight of the American people coolly and objectively in terms of fact and logic, without mysticism or sentimentality, transcending the self-imposed and self-defeating limitations of the "anti-Communists" who have failed totally and continuously for fifty years. It is addressed to the large number of highly intelligent and scientifically trained men who find it impossible to believe in Christianity, and who should find it impossible to tolerate the preposterous and fetid superstitions of our "Liberal" witch-doctors and fetish-men-superstitions, by the way, that "anti-Communist" buncombe-artists have always been careful not to offend.

The author, who is a man of keen and discerning intellect, and who has devoted ten years of his life to his task, believes that it is yet possible to salvage much from the ruins of our nation. In a man of his intelligence, such optimism is in itself grounds for some hope.

There are some corroborative indications. I am reliably informed that a number of "Liberal intellectuals," who seemed to be devotees of their orgiastic cult, have read Robert Ardrey's new book, *The Social Contract*, and, instead of howling execrations and trying to scalp the author, as is the custom of "Liberals" when confronted with inconvenient facts, they not only understood it but have begun to talk rationally about the structure of human society. That could be the beginning of a true enlightenment.

There are signs that many thoughtful men are becoming skeptical or disillusioned, and question, at least in their own minds, the prevalent superstitions. I cannot believe that so staunch a "Liberal" as Professor Hacker, whose book I mentioned above, is really pleased with the results that he observed and felt obliged to report. Recently Professor William Shockley of Stanford and Professor Arthur Jensen of California dared to suggest openly that the scientific method and the known laws of biology were applicable to Blacks; of course, mobs of Professors of Voodoo and Doctors of Obeah rushed out of their lairs, screaming, spitting, and wildly flourishing their fetishes. The obscene exhibition, however, and the bold claim that it is the function of universities to paralyze the American mind with lies, disquieted many men who, preoccupied with other studies, had not taken time to think about egalitarian idolatry.

This one exposure of "Liberal" charlatanry, obscurantism, and fanaticism may have done more good than all the preaching of "anti-Communist" evangelists for half a century.

There are also some encouraging signs of a disposition in some "conservative" circles to discuss questions normally charged with emotion by dispassionately considering the evidence. In my *Conspiracy or Degeneracy?*, note 45a, I mentioned the existence of data that may indicate that our race is mentally inferior to the Jews, and I intimated that it would be futile to haul in Satan to explain away evidence of crucial importance that needed to be examined with all of our race's capacity for objective thought. It is gratifying, therefore, that the problem has been considered coolly in the light of social structure and biological forces by Mr. Ivor Benson in a short but very valuable article that has been reprinted in this country in *Conservative Viewpoint* (July, 1972) and in the British periodical, *Spearhead* (July, 1972). The reader may also profit from this reminder that the dereliction and "alienation" that is destroying a large part of our genetically sound youth is mainly caused by ignorant or cunning frustration of basic human instincts of which the biological origin was clearly explained in Robert Ardrey's *The Territorial Imperative* (1966) as well as in his latest book. Benson's monthly bulletin, *Behind the News*, is peppered with Scriptural quotations and evidently addressed primarily to a Christian audience. That makes the article particularly encouraging.

These and some other indications that I need not enumerate may warrant some hope, but we must understand that it is hope of surviving the calamities that we in our folly have brought upon ourselves. There can be no hope of escaping them by floating back to 1928 on the magic carpet that the travelling salesmen of pseudo-patriotic businesses promise their customers. What is gone cannot be restored by telling how nice it was; what is dead cannot be resurrected by necromancy, no matter how eloquent the incantation.

It is true that the part of our population that pays taxes still works, receives bogus money that it can still spend, can still amuse itself in its hours of leisure, and, with the exception of individuals who have been robbed, raped, or crippled, can still pretend that everything is nearly normal and will stay that way forever. But no one who gives a moment's thought to the news that cannot be kept out of the daily papers can fail to see the extent of our social disintegration and decay, or to guess how deep the rot goes.

The limits of what can now be accomplished by "political action" were clearly demonstrated a few days ago, when many Americans watched, in addition to football and with almost as much interest, the staged game that was played to make it seem that "the people" were selecting an office boy to run errands in the White House for Commissar Kissinger or whomever our masters may appoint to succeed Kissinger as Chief Executive. The "conservative principles" of the "American businessman" are now exhibited by his joyous expectation that he can make a few bucks out of trading with our enemies in Russia and China at the expense of the taxpaying serfs in the United States. The economic status of our ruined nation is apparent to professional economists, who now speculate only about the date at which the counterfeit dollars printed by the Federal Reserve will be declared worthless and replaced by new counterfeits. And the goals of "education" are made more obvious by the "university" in California that has proudly

established a special "curriculum" for homosexuals.

If you listen perceptively to the young who have not yet been permanently deranged by drugs and depravity, you will see that their febrile emotionalism, their promiscuity, their ostentatious clamor or indifference, their mercurial inconstancy, all mask an underlying and subconscious despair that is terribly significant. And now everyone knows that the peace-lubbers' efforts to sabotage our army and navy and to reduce us to military impotence have been successful, and that even if we had the will, we should not have the capacity to defend this country against the Soviet Union, should its masters order an attack on us.

Our situation is desperate, and we can afford no illusions, no retreat into a land of dreams. Now, more than ever, *optimism is cowardice*.

We are born into this time, and there is no escape from it save in death. If the courage of our ancestors was not entombed with them, if their ability to meet desperate perils with clear-sighted resolution was transmitted to their heirs, if their will to live is not extinct in us, our race and our civilization may yet survive.

If, as I am told, this little booklet can make even the slightest contribution to our survival, its publication is justified.

I have consented to the publication in the hope that it may clarify for some readers the function of Christianity in our history, and also that it may persuade some of the remaining Christians that, however strong and assured their personal faith may be, and however perfect the peace and beatitude they will enjoy in Heaven, they are now living in a world that is governed by impersonal and immutable laws of nature from which there can be no derogation and no appeal, and of which it is childish to complain. If they wish to provide, if possible, a place on this planet for their progeny, their only hope must be based on our science and technology and on our race's capacity for objective thought, which our shamans and howling dervishes have been intensively sabotaging for decades under the guise of "education" and "social science," and which will shortly be attacked by a carefully planned epidemic of occult hocus-pocus and orgiastic irrationality, designed to destroy forever what is left of our sanity.

The behavior of the Christian remnant at this juncture and the extent of its ability to subordinate religious emotions to the grim task of racial survival will be a datum to be considered if you try to guess whether the future holds for us more than a day on which the crucial question will have been definitively answered—when the Americans will have been the only people in history compulsively and yet knowingly to commit suicide, and when all that is left of them will lie forgotten in dishonored tombs.

- 20 November 1972

THE JEWISH STRATEGY

by Revilo P. Oliver

Professor of the Classics, Retired; University of Illinois, Urbana

Autobiographical Note

I was born near Corpus Christi, Texas, on 7th July, 1908.

My first name, an obvious palindrome, has been the burden of the eldest or only son for six generations.

I was sent to a high school in Illinois. After two years of it, including an extraordinarily severe winter that landed me in a hospital for one of the first mastoidectomies performed as more than a daring experiment, I decided that the one insoluble historical problem was why anyone had taken the Midwest away from the Indians, and so I went to California. There I entered what everyone knew was the best high school in the country because the equipment for dramatic productions on the stage cost more than had been spent for such essentials elsewhere. The "educators" there had already made great progress in sabotaging education, so, just to have something to occupy my mind, I began the study of Sanskrit, using Max Muller's handbooks and Monier Williams' grammar. I did feel the need for some tuition, however, and by the most extraordinary good luck I found a Hindu who really knew Sanskrit. He was a missionary who, although he never quite admitted as much to me, had come to the United States to ease the financial burdens of dowagers who had more money than they could spend. He told them that, with proper care and nourishment of their beautiful souls, they would, in their next incarnation, certainly become as lithe as, and certainly even more fetching than, Greta Garbo, so I am sure he gave them their money's worth. At this period in my adolescence, I also amused myself in my spare time by going around to watch the holy men and holier females pitch the woo at the simple-minded, and I learned much from the many performances I attended, from Aimee Semple McPherson's shows for the masses in the theatre called Angelus Temple to Katherine Tingley's select entertainments for high-brow suckers on her then elegant estate near San Diego.

I entered Pomona College in Claremont, California, when I was sixteen.

I married Grace Needham in 1930. Whatever I may have achieved, I owe entirely to the sustaining power through all subsequent years of an unfailing devotion for which I cannot rationally account.

As a result of the preparations, begun in the late autumn of 1929, for the election of Roosevelt in 1932, I spent several years in a small publishing business, learning that I was not destined to become a financial giant.

I began graduate study at the University of Illinois under Professor William Abbott Oldfather, whom many considered the most distinguished Classical Philologist in this country. My first book was a parergon, a critical and annotated translation from the Sanskrit of *The Little Clay Cart*, published in 1938.

I received the degree of *Philosophiae Doctor* in 1940. I may add that, given the great fear of "inbreeding," I am the only person to receive the degree in Classics at the University of Illinois whom the Department determined to retain permanently. I began teaching graduate classes immediately after receiving the degree. For a considerable number of years I also gave graduate courses in the Renaissance, which put me also in the Department of Spanish and Italian, of which my good friend, Professor John Van Horne, was the head.

At the suggestion of a military friend, I agreed, sometime in 1941, to join a secret subsidiary of the War Department, and did so as soon as my academic responsibilities would permit, in 1942, remaining there until the autumn of 1945. By good luck, I found myself in charge of a rapidly expanding department, and soon advanced from Analyst to Director of Research, finding myself responsible for the work of c. 175 persons. Tire work was harrowing, for various reasons, but extremely instructive. I learned, for example, the ultimate secret of Pearl Harbor, which was evidently unknown to Admiral Theobald and which was not disclosed in print until 1981 (in my *America's Decline*, page 7).

I returned to the University in 1945 as an Assistant Professor, became an Associate Professor in 1947, and Professor in 1953. I held a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1946-47, and a Fulbright (Italy), 1953-54. I retired as Emeritus in 1977. (Two days after my retirement, I was amazed to discover from events that then began that the Administration, which has hated me cordially, was also sufficiently afraid of me to defer an attack on the Department's scholarly standing until after my retirement. I don't mean that I had been able to keep it near the distinction it had under Oldfather — I knew that couldn't be done when I resigned in disgust as departmental office boy — and thought it had sadly deteriorated; that was because I had not estimated how much worse things could become.)

Strange as it must now seem, I left the District of Corruption in 1945 with the firm conviction that the unbearable stench of that vast cesspool could not long be confined, and that when the facts of the Crusade to Save the Soviet and other operations became known, as they inevitably must, the indignation of the American people would produce a reaction of such vehemence and violence that it could never be forgotten in history. That confidence was not shaken until 1954. In the following year, my friend, Professor Willmoore Kendall, who had long desiderated a "conservative" antidote to the New

Republic, etc., and had had among his pupils at Yale a bright and wealthy young man, William F. Buckley, Jr., discussed with me plans for the journal, which was eventually called *National Review* and was then intended to be approximately what *Instauration* now is, with, however, the significant difference that *Instauration* was not able to start with the expectation of losing \$2,000 a week for three years. When Kendall told me that he had not been able to find a single university professor who dared to join him in writing for the projected weekly, I accepted the challenge. That is how I began to write on political subjects. That was certainly a grave mistake from the standpoint of my career and the comfort of my wife; whether it was from other standpoints, I have never quite decided. What happened to *National Review* after it began publication, and particularly after Kendall was shouldered out by a gang of "professionals" who assured young Buckley that he was the Messiah, would be a long and depressing story.

In 1958 Robert Welch convinced me of his *bona fides* and induced me to join in founding the John Birch Society. I have never quite been able to make up my mind as to whether he cozened me from the first (which my vanity makes me reluctant to admit) or sold out later.

In 1958 I still believed that there was a significant intellectual difference between the American bourgeoisie and the cattle that one sees peering between the slats of large trucks as they contentedly munch hay on their way to the abattoir.

Since severing my connections with the Birch hoax, I have chosen to write with utter frankness on the dire plight of our race and the civilization we created. The reader has been warned.

Revilo P. Oliver

Dedicated by the publisher to

George P. Dietz

without whom many of Dr. Oliver's works would never have been written.

The Plight of Western Man

IT IS A GRIM AND TERRIBLE FACT that most of the members of our own race have had their minds so deformed by centuries of cunning Jewish propaganda that they have been conditioned, as effectively as well-trained dogs, to snarl and bite when their Jewish masters utter certain key-words, such as "fascist," "racist," and the like, which take the place of the "sic 'em" to which dogs respond. They are, furthermore, so emotionally addicted to narcotic fantasies that many of them are both unwilling and unable to endure the distress of looking at the real world about them and thinking rationally about it. They understandably prefer to close tightly the eyes of their minds and live in the dream-world of pleasurable fairy tales, such as they heard in the childhood to which they subconsciously long to regress. As Kipling neatly characterized them, "If they desire a thing, they declare it is true. If they desire it not, though that were death itself, they cry aloud, 'It has never been!'"

It is a tragic and potentially disastrous fact that any candid and reasonably comprehensive analysis of our present plight not only exposes its author to surreptitious or open reprisals, but also alienates many members of our befuddled and perhaps doomed race, making them snarl and want to bite the man who would make them face an unpleasant reality. Many more are so timorous that even a hint of disrespect for Jews sends them running for cover, like frightened cats, lest the Jews punish them for having listened to impious words.

Many members of our race, to be sure, secretly resent their covert overlords and sometimes venture, when alone with trusted friends, to make jests or give other hints that, deep in their hearts, they do not venerate the Jews. And if we observe our compatriots, we eventually come to know of many, often persons of very considerable wealth, who would gladly read forbidden publications, but do not dare subscribe to them, not even through post office boxes and under assumed names, lest the Jews discover their secret disaffection and punish them for their thoughts. A tiny minority of our people, it is true, most commonly the comparatively poor, who think themselves protected by their obscurity, more or less openly resent the Jewish dominion and, by a nice irony, call themselves "anti-Semitic," thus thoughtlessly using the nonsense word that strident propaganda has implanted in their minds. Some have sufficiently escaped the contemporary thought-control to dare to use the word Aryan, which is the only convenient and approximately accurate designation of our race, although the Jews forbid us to utter it. But even these bold spirits are usually ill-informed and prone to strong emotions, sometimes seething with a frustrated hatred of the international race.

Although they are few in number, the Aryans who feel real hatred disturb the complacency of some Jews, even in this country, where their increasingly open control seems absolute. A rabbi, for example, in his column in the Chicago *Sun-Times*, while not disavowing the great

Jewish hoax about the "six million" who were supposedly exterminated by the Germans (and then crawled into the United States), quite clearly warned his compatriots that their clamors about a "holocaust" might give ideas to the *goyim* and result in the operation of *real* gas-chambers and in a *real* purge, if the Aryans got out of control in the United States. The rabbi is probably an alarmist, but it is true that the ever more blatant arrogance and terrorism of the Jews is arousing hatred in their serfs. It may have been indiscreet of them to erect a monumental "menorah," thirty feet high, in front of the American White House as a symbol of their ownership at the very time that they deny to the cringing Americans (who once had a country of their own) the right to display a Christmas tree on public property. And instead of quietly abandoning the absurd hoax about the "six million," which was devised to pep up the Aryan cattle they stampeded into Europe in 1941, and which has netted them many billions of dollars from the swindled Germans and much more from the rest of the world, they are demanding that the lie be forcibly injected into the mind of every American child. That is certain to increase resentment, as is, for example, their recent attempt to murder a man in Chicago, which, when he was merely grievously injured, they explained by claiming they had mistaken him for a man they intended to murder, it being assumed that since the victim was merely an Aryan dog, that explanation should be sufficient comfort for the other dogs. Open terrorism, whether violent or pseudo-legal, arouses in some Americans an indignant perception of their formerly concealed servitude. I am reliably informed that a young man in the northeastern (and most corrupted) part of the United States recently read Professor Arthur Butz's definitive expose of the "six million" hoax¹ and promptly resigned his membership in one of our minuscule National Socialist organizations on the grounds that Professor Butz had convinced him that Hitler not only did not kill six million Jews, but did not even *try*.

¹ *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Institute for Historical Review, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, California, 92659, U.S.A.

A Realistic Appraisal of the Jews: Their Unparalleled Achievements

Passionate hatred of the Jews is almost certain to be futile, for violent emotions prevent rational thought. Berserkers are excellent shock troops, if they are under competent command, but in all wars, victories are won by generals who lucidly and objectively study the capacities and resources of the enemy and as objectively measure their own.

If our race is ever to be liberated from its present masters, our independence will not be won by tirades against the Jews, wild declamations about their wickedness in serving their own interests instead of ours, idle and tautological boasts of our superiority in terms of our own values, or frantic diatribes about a "synagogue of Satan" and a hope that some supernatural power will kindly do for us what we refuse to do for ourselves. We must begin with a rational understanding of our own situation and of ourselves.

We must, first of all, understand that in the real world the only test of biological superiority is the ability of a species to survive and extend its power, necessarily at the expense of other species. It thus becomes immediately apparent that the international race has very solid grounds for its confidence that it is vastly superior to all other races. Despite the obscurity of their racial origins, it is certain that at one time the Jews must have been a small tribe of barbarians, practicing disgusting sexual mutilations and customs, observing strange taboos, and otherwise resembling mere savages. But that seemingly despicable tribe, by arduous, intelligent, and indefatigable work for more than twenty-five centuries, has, through its own efforts, made itself the major world power today and is not far from its great objective, total ownership of the entire globe. History provides no parallel for that stupendous accomplishment. It must be regarded with respect, even awe.

When we consider this prodigious achievement, this astounding triumph over seemingly insuperable weakness, we must recognize that it was made possible only by that race's cohesion, a biological virtue that I wish our race could emulate, even though the Jews forbid us to do so. The Jews have won through their intense racial consciousness and effective solidarity. It is true that there have been violent dissensions among them when their leaders struggle for power, and that in those civil contentions the various factions have often enlisted *goyim* against each other, but their most violently antagonistic factions have always been united in an underlying hatred of those *goyim*. When, for example, Jesus ben Simon was slugging it out with his brother, Onias, for the high priesthood in Jerusalem, the capital of their ubiquitous race, both tried to make use of the gullible Seleucids, but there can be no doubt that each regarded the stupid *goyim as mere* tools, to be broken and discarded when they had served their purpose. There is still today a certain tension between the avowed Zionists and a minority of Jews who prefer to exploit the subject races tranquilly, and who fear that too blatant assertions of Jewish

superiority may make the *goyim* react, but it is a dispute over means, not ends, and it is noteworthy that the minority is rapidly dwindling as the craven submission of Aryans to even such flagrant outrages as the bombing and strafing of the U. S. S. *Liberty* gives assurance that the beasts of burden can always be harnessed to work for their masters, no matter how much they may be beaten and kicked.

This virtually perfect cohesion, by the way, must in large measure account for the intellectual superiority of which the Jews boast and which, I fear, we must concede when we consider the race *as a whole*, although it is denied by many of our people, who personally only know Jews who, apart from their undoubted cleverness in making money out of the natives, seem stupid, or who ingratiate themselves with the Aryans among whom they have chosen to reside by blandly professing participation in our culture (and I do not mean that all such professions are necessarily hypocritical). But, for all practical purposes, the race is today, as Josephus boasted it was in his time, a unit, and it is somehow very ably directed in its predatory operations against other races. How much of this highly intelligent strategy is instinctive and how much is planned by a supreme command, I shall not try to determine; the available evidence is conflicting and not conclusive.

The racial solidarity of the Jews, furthermore, includes such complete subordination of the individual to the race, whenever the welfare of the race is concerned, that it suggests an hyperbolic comparison with the social organization of certain insects, especially some species of ants and bees, in which the individual is virtually a tentacle of a large organism, and it also reminds one of Roderick Seidenberg's hope, expressed in his *Post-Historic Man* and *Anatomy of the Future* (Chapel Hill, 1950 & 1961), that all human species (except the "administrators," i.e., Jews) can be reduced to mindless automata that operate by reflexes without thought or consciousness, like cockroaches, for example. These comparisons are, of course, extravagant, but may not be entirely irrelevant. A most impressive example of this racial solidarity is the fact that, as was revealed by a Jew who resided in Germany, J. G. Burg (*Schuld und Schicksal*, Munich, 1962, with photographs of corroborating documents), the Zionists, after the election of an independent German government under Hitler, tried to incite pogroms and large-scale massacres of the Jews in Germany for the purpose of facilitating the stampeding of Aryan cattle from Britain and the United States to punish the Germans for trying to have a country of their own. The Germans refused to be incited and the Jewish efforts to procure pogroms were unsuccessful, so it was necessary for them to start the desired war in other ways, and after that war, to devise the "holocaust" hoax. The remarkable thing is that, so far as I know, no Jews anywhere (except Burg) seem at all offended by Weizmann's admission that he thought the "annihilation of the Jews in Germany" a small price to pay for a Jewish seizure of Palestine. This is really remarkable in a race so conscious of its solidarity and superiority. It is true, of course, that the British and Americans know that their great War Criminals, Churchill and Roosevelt,

deliberately contrived the death of many thousands of Englishmen and Americans to please their Jewish masters and get the Crusade Against Western Civilization under way, and show no resentment of such bloody treason, but they are Aryans, who have been so cowed that they seem to accept their status as an inferior and expendable species. But when Jews accept a proposal to massacre large numbers of their own people for the benefit of their race, that *is* significant.

If we are to be rational, the racial solidarity of the Jews forces on us a most humiliating confession of our own inferiority. Our impassioned "anti-Semites" depict the Jews as not only vulgar and barbarous (i.e., with manners that we so consider), but also as treacherous and greedy; but, as a matter of fact, we cannot identify with confidence a single Jew who betrayed his race for profit or any other consideration, while we know that most Aryans will cheerfully betray their race for a few hundred dollars — say, five hundred, to allow for high ideals — or even for a pat on the head and a prospect of future profit. The number of Aryans who have even recognized the common interest of their race, although they know it to be a small and hated minority among the prolific and invidious races who form the bulk of the planet's population, is extremely small. One exception to the rule was Commander Josiah Tattnall of the U.S. Navy, who, in 1859, led the American squadron in China to the assistance of the British gunboats that were trying to force a passage of the Chinese forts at the mouth of the Pei-ho, quoting the once proverbial expression, "Blood is thicker than water." It is significant that, if I have been correctly informed, his statue in the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis has been removed, since he was so wicked as to think that Aryans are fit to live. Americans, it seems, have been so well trained by the Jews that they now accept a status as taxpaying animals that exist so that all the vermin in the world can eat and excrete on them. It is noteworthy that during the "war" in Vietnam, when packs of febrile and neurotic young Americans (incited and led, of course, by Jewish agitators) formed mobs to scream protests, they howled about the suffering of the sweet Mongoloid Vietnamese, but never mentioned the young Americans who had been sent into that racial cesspool to be killed or infected with Oriental diseases for the purpose of further advertising the degradation and impotence of their nation and of providing a pretext for sucking more blood from the imbecile taxpayers. The death of American soldiers was not even considered by the screeching agitators, evidently on the assumption that that was what Americans were for, and, as a matter of fact, an American lieutenant, a commissioned officer in the Army, was later convicted and imprisoned because he had killed some Vietnamese, instead of letting himself be killed by them, as an Aryan should. And when it was thought that the United States had been sufficiently disgraced and made contemptible in the eyes of all its enemies, a "peace" was arranged by one of the Jewish masters; the stupid American taxpayers were further afflicted with "reparations" to compensate their enemies, and several hundred young American

soldiers, prisoners of the enemy, were gladly abandoned to be kept in cages or tortured to death, as might most please their captors.

They were just Aryan curs, after all, and therefore obviously expendable. To such self-imposed debasement our race has come, and it is not, perhaps, remarkable that Aryans employed by the Jews in the press and television gladly cooperate in the offensive against their own nation and race in return for the salary paid them and the approval of their masters.

In sharp and terrible contrast to our race's suicidal mania, the Jews could legitimately boast that no Jew has ever knowingly betrayed his race. It is true that they do not avail themselves of that proof of superiority, but instead wail about betrayals, but that so corresponds to the standard and inveterate Jewish technique of making themselves seem "persecuted" that one is inclined to question every instance of supposed "betrayal" that they adduce.

One hears most often Jewish execration of Pfefferkorn, the Jew who, having had himself sprinkled with the Christians' magic water, became a Dominican and disclosed to the *goyim* some of the contents of the Babylonian Talmud. No one can now ascertain what was in Pfefferkorn's mind, but if we view him historically, it is obvious that he, knowingly or unwittingly, played a very important and possibly crucial role in inciting the great religious schism in Europe in the early Sixteenth Century and thus performed a great service for his compatriots, inciting the *goyim* to butcher one another for centuries and to devastate their own countries, to the great profit, as well as the spiritual satisfaction, of the Jews then residing in Europe.

The Jews speak bitterly of Henry Klein, a Jewish attorney who, during the premature Jewish Terror in the United States in 1944, did not betray his American clients, as a good Jewish lawyer should, but defended them before the Jewish Federal judge who had been appointed by our great War Criminal to destroy them and thus terrorize all American curs who dared not to lick the boots of their masters. The Jews so persecuted Klein that he denounced the Zionists (e.g., in his booklet, *Zionism Rules the World*,¹ which he had printed at his own expense in 1955) before he was hounded to suicide. But, *nota bene*, he denounced the Zionists, *not* his own race, and it is only reasonable to believe that he, however mistakenly, believed that he was protecting his compatriots in the United States, not harming them. It must be remembered that even in 1944, the Americans were not so prostrate and cowed as they now are. In 1939-40, for example, it was possible for an American, Paul Beshers, who had enjoyed a brief season of political prominence a few years before, to assure his Jewish friends, "If you drive us into a war against Germany, it will not be long before Americans are shooting Jews on Michigan Avenue [in Chicago] without a hunting license." Some Jews were (he says) impressed by that prediction in

1 Available from CDL Report, Box 449, Arabi, LA 70032; www.cdlreport.com

1940, and quite a few well-informed Americans, including officers in the armed services' intelligence corps, during the war of 1941-45, expected very drastic reprisals against the Jews after that war. It is against such a background that Klein's supposed "betrayal" of his race must be understood.

The majority of Jews hate Benjamin Freedman, who quoted a few well-known passages in the Talmud and other Jewish writings that the lowly *goyim* should not be permitted to see in his books *Facts Are Facts* and *The Hidden Tyranny*.² Freedman, unlike the many Jews who had themselves sprinkled with holy water and worked themselves up to positions of power in the various Christian churches during the Middle Ages and in the time of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, incurred the venomous hatred of many Jews. When I met him many years ago, he told me — I assume truthfully — that when he and his wife were in an elevator of the very expensive apartment building in New York City in which he then lived, and the very rich Jews who lived in the same building entered the same elevator, they would spit all over his and his wife's clothing to show their disapproval by a typical Jewish gesture. Freedman, however, did not intend to betray his race; on the contrary, he was convinced (it seems, mistakenly) that he was racially a *real* Jew, whereas most Jews were Turko-Mongolians who had disguised themselves as Jews and cunningly come to dominate the Jewish race, which he certainly did not intend to depreciate, much less betray. On the contrary, he imagined that he was, at great self-sacrifice, protecting his own people from the reprisals that might someday fall upon them.

The clearest example of the betrayal of the Jews by a Jew would be the famous "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," if, as is maintained in some accounts of their publication, that document was sold by a Jew to the Russian intelligence services for a fee. The Jews, however, vociferously claim that the "Protocols" are a forgery. This allegation was long accepted, on the grounds that it was extremely unlikely that Jews would rashly put in writing so candid a statement of their purposes, and it was generally believed that the document was forged by a white man who had a phenomenal knowledge of the Jews and an astounding ability to predict what they would do in subsequent decades. Recent exhibitions of Jewish arrogance and contempt for the Aryan mentality suggest, however, a reconsideration of the problem. It may be doubted whether any man of our race could have so perfectly anticipated and described in the last years of the Nineteenth

Century the policies that the Jews put into effect in the Twentieth, down to the present time. But however that may be, we cannot regard the "Protocols" as proof that a Jew betrayed his own race.

² 2 Also available from CDL Report.

Jews often denounce as a “traitor” Benjamin D’Israeli, who, in his *Coningshy* (1844) and many speeches and books down to his *Endymion* (1880), candidly told the British that the only real issue was that of race and further told them that all the governments of Europe were really controlled by Jews, who operated behind the scenes and dictated the policies of the ostensible rulers, whether monarchs or elected officials. Some of our people, including the late Douglas Reed in his posthumous *Controversy of Zion*, think that D’Israeli was trying to warn the British about the power and purposes of “Zionists.” I do not profess to know what was in D’Israeli’s mind — I would not presume to guess that, even if he had been a member of our race, instead of belonging to a race whose mentality is so different from our own that we can only make conjectures about its processes — but I observe that he could have issued the supposed “warnings” with the assurance that the Anglo-Saxons were too stupid to understand them, and that his pronouncements on that subject, like his unconventional behavior and garish clothing, served so to advertise him that he attained political power in Britain, became the first admittedly alien Prime Minister of the British Empire and the first undisguised Jew to enter the House of Lords as the Earl of Beaconsfield. In 1858, Lord Harrington, commenting on the international race’s parasitic plundering of all nations through international finance, control of the press, and revolutionary agitation, pointed out that Jews acquire “citizenship” in a nation only to sabotage it. He was supported by Lord Galloway, who remarked that if Jewish subversion of Great Britain were not checked, the time might come when a corrupt Prime Minister could be bribed to have a title of British nobility conferred on one of the aliens. Ten years later, D’Israeli became the Prime Minister of the British Empire, and in 1876, he became the Earl of Beaconsfield, while Jews throughout the world snickered at another proof that *goyim* never learn.

How great was the corrosion of English character in those years may be estimated from a single datum. One of the foremost British novelists, Louise Ramée (“Ouida”), in her *Strathmore* (1865), casually mentioned in a descriptive passage “the vampires of Israel, who, like their forefather and first usurer, Jacob, know well how to deal with the famished, and sell us our mess of pottage at no smaller price than our birthright.” No one was perturbed by her passing reference to what everyone knew, but less than a century later such a reference by a novelist would have been suicidal audacity. Her publishers would have been at once driven into bankruptcy; her book, however praiseworthy for its literary qualities, would not have been mentioned by any reviewer; she would have been defamed in all the newspapers as a “Nazi”; and all well-trained English nitwits would have shrunk in loathing from the contamination of her presence. The Anglo-Saxons not only cower before the Jewish Terror, but pride themselves on their servitude.

It is not a mere coincidence that *Strathmore* was published three years before a Jew became the Queen’s Prime Minister, thus climaxing a prolonged and patient subversion of the upper

classes by usury, bribes, and the technique of marrying Jewesses with large dowries to the sons of avaricious noblemen or members of the landed gentry.

The Jews complain bitterly of certain members of their tribe who published in the United States in the 1930s indiscreetly candid comments on the innate differences between Jews and our race. The worst offender was probably Samuel Roth, who, having been repeatedly swindled by Jews and told that he must suffer in silence for the sake of racial solidarity, published his *Jews Must Live*³ in 1934, writing in "an agony of spirit" to describe conduct and habits that were, in any case, apparent to any careful observer of what another Jew boastfully called the "nation within" the United States. I do not question Roth's sincerity, but did his comment on "the hideous swamp the Jews have made of Western Civilization" impair the power of the ubiquitous tribe from which he defected? The answer is obvious. Two years before Roth wrote, the German people, on whom the Jews had fed for centuries before D'Israeli specifically noted that, whatever the stupid Germans might imagine, their nation was really governed by Jewish financiers, made a courageous effort to acquire control of their own country and become an independent nation. The result we all know. The Jews, through their control of the press and of numerous hirelings, of whom Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt are merely the most loathsome specimens, stampeded great hordes of crazed Aryans from Britain, France, and the United States into Germany to commit outrages that forever forfeited their claim to be civilized men, thus giving to the world an unforgettable lesson of what happens to Aryan dogs who dare to disobey their divinely-appointed masters. Does anyone wonder that the Jews feel a sovereign contempt for cattle that are so easily herded? And can a rational observer fail to ask whether that contempt is not amply justified, and whether the Suicide of the West is not proof of a biological inferiority in our own race?

The Jewish Strategy at Work: Ancient Alexandria

In the early years of our era, the Jews were then (as now) busy selling religion and revolution to the natives, and that is undoubtedly what the Emperor Claudius meant in 41 A.D. when, in his letter of warning to the Jews in Egypt (preserved in a papyrus now in the British Museum, P. Lond. 1912), he described them as "the fomenters of a universal plague."

Claudius' phrase is the best description of the biologically innate nature of Jews that I have seen. I hope this does not startle you; if it does, I recommend a little objective observation of Jews engaged in collective action.

The publication of these papyri in the British Museum stopped with Volume V, just short of the group of papyri, beginning with #1912, that deal with Jews and Christians in Egypt. These,

³ Available from Catholic Books, Box 350333, Ft Lauderdale FL 33335

however, were edited in a separate volume by H. Idris Bell, London, 1924, which can be found under his name in any good library. Why the official series stopped where it did (and has never been continued), I do not know. One suspects there was a Jew in the woodpile.

P. Lond. 1912 is a long papyrus fragment excellently preserved. It is a private copy of an edict by Claudius that was posted in public places in Alexandria in 41 A.D. and is complete. It is in Greek, not Latin, because in Egypt every literate person (Greeks, Jews, Egyptians, and the comparatively few Romans who were there as governors and military commanders) knew Greek, whereas only the Roman officials knew Latin at all. Bell believes that our Greek text was translated from Claudius's Latin, but I am certain that the text is what Claudius himself dictated to a secretary in Greek. Like every educated Roman of his day, Claudius spoke and wrote Greek fluently, and furthermore he was something of a scholar and wrote his two major historical works (now lost) in Greek. This Greek text contains stylistic peculiarities that are characteristic of Claudius's mentality, but would probably have been smoothed away by a translator.

Claudius, who was born in 10 B.C., was the son of the male child with whom Livia was pregnant at the time that Augustus married her. If that child was legitimate, it was the son of Livia's first husband and the younger brother of the Emperor Tiberius. If the child was illegitimate, as many suspected, Augustus was probably the father, but never acknowledged the paternity. Claudius's mother was the daughter of Mark Antony. Claudius in infancy suffered from poliomyelitis or a similar disease that left him with a partly paralysed foot, some impediment in his speech, and muscles of the face and neck subject to spastic contractions. Regarded as unfit for public life, he devoted himself to historical and antiquarian studies, becoming both erudite and pedantic. He was quite intelligent, but timorous, excitable, and gullible, especially toward persons who showed him some attention and professed friendship during the first fifty-one years of his life, when he was regarded as an awkward and ridiculous political nullity, the butt of his nephew Caligula's wit. Among those who thus acquired his gratitude and confidence were a number of clever Jews of great wealth and influence in Rome. Among these was Marcus Julius Agrippa (note the purely Roman name; a grandson of the Herod who appears in many versions of the Christ story), who, when the barbarian mercenaries rioted after the assassination of Caligula and, while plundering the palace, found old Claudius hiding in a closet and dragged him out to proclaim him emperor, by subtle and crafty machinations and bribery managed to get Claudius installed and recognized as emperor by the Senate. Claudius rewarded him generously, and was always under the influence of the prominent Jews in Rome. That is what makes his pronouncement so significant.

Alexandria was, of course, founded by Alexander the Great as a Greek city in conquered Egypt, and it became under his Greek successors, the Ptolemies, the capital of that country. Its position as the only real harbor in Egypt added to its great prosperity, and naturally Jews came

streaming in from their colonies all over the civilized world. Alexandria became the New York of the ancient world, i.e., the largest Jewish city. The Jews took over two of the five quarters of the city for their ghettos, from which they unofficially but effectively excluded white people, but naturally insisted on pushing their way into all the other quarters of the city and making themselves obnoxious in their normal ways. Jews always betray the countries in which they are feeding on the natives, so naturally, when Augustus attacked Egypt, the Jews naturally betrayed the Greeks, who remained loyal to Cleopatra, the last of the Ptolemies. Augustus punished the Greeks for their loyalty by depriving them of their local self-government, and rewarded the Jews for their treason with many special privileges, including the right to have a kind of Jewish government of their own.

The Jews, now riding high, naturally pushed the Greeks around more than ever, thrusting themselves into the gymnasias and other Greek institutions that were traditionally for Greeks only and inciting riots whenever they were so “persecuted” that the Greeks did not recognize them as a vastly superior race. The result was an endless series of civil disturbances that the Romans were powerless to prevent because no government dared to revoke Augustus’s grant of special privileges to the Jews. In the second year after Claudius became emperor, there was another one of the perennial riots in Alexandria that became virtual civil wars in the city, which was the most populous in the ancient world.

The Greeks of Alexandria despatched an embassy of their leading citizens to Claudius to request restoration of their local government and explain the cause of the riots, and the Jews, of course, sent an embassy of their own to snivel and whine about being “persecuted” by the wicked *goyim*.

The edict of Claudius of which the papyrus is a copy is addressed to the Greeks of Alexandria and announces his decision concerning the requests made by their envoys.

There is (1) a preamble by the Roman prefect who had copies of the edict displayed in public places, (2) a section listing the titles of Claudius and the names of the Greek envoys, (3) permission to hold public celebrations of Claudius’s birthday and to erect statues in his honor, etc., (4) confirmation of the Greeks’ right to have a Greek educational system qualifying them for Alexandrian citizenship, (5) granting requested changes in the appointments to certain temple offices and other minor offices, (6) a promise to take under advisement the Greeks’ request for a restoration of their local government (Claudius never granted that: the Jews would have had fits if so “persecuted”), and, (7) a pronouncement about the recent riots and a warning against repetition of them (which, so far as we know, kept the peace for eleven years). It is this last section which is of interest to us.

Here is the text of the concluding part of the edict. I reproduce it from N. P. Charlesworth's *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero* (Oxford, 1936). The text is here presented with modern capitalization, punctuation, and separation of words; anyone who knows Greek should be able to read it offhand.

ΚΕΥΙΕΘ Ρ. ΟΕΙΥΕΚ

οι,Αυοιυδ

ονκ εχω λέγειν, ότι δε ε'πι των προ έμοϋ Σεβαστών οϋκ ειχετε σαφώς οίδατε. Καινού δή πράγματος νϋν πρώτον καταβαλλόμενου οπερ άδηλον εί συνοίσει τη πόλει και τοίς εμοίς πράγμασι, έγγραψα Αϊμίλιω Ρηκτω διασκεψασθαι και δηλώσαί μοι εϊ τε και συνίσα- τασδαι την αρχήν δει, τόν τε τρόπον, εϊπερ άρα συνάγειν ξεοι, καθ* ον γενησεται τούτο. Της δε προς Ιουδαίους ταραχής και στάσεως, μάλλον δ', εί χρη τό αληθές είπειν, τοϋ πολέμου, πότεροι μεν αίτιοι κατέστησαν, καιίπερ εξ αντικαταστάσεις πολλά των ύμετερων πρέσβειων φιλοτιμηθεντων και μάλιστα Διονυσίου του Θεωνος, όμως ονκ έβονληθην ακριβώς εξελεγξαι, ταμειόμενος εμαυτω κατά των πάλιν άρξαμενων οργήν άμεταμελητον ' απλώς δε προσαγορεύω οτι, άν μη καταπαύσητε την όλεθριον οργήν ταύτην κατ' άλλήλων αύθάδιον, εκβιασθήσομαι δείξαι οϊόν εστιν ηγεμών φιλόανθρωπος εις όργην δικαίαν μεταβελημενος. Αιόπερ ετι και νϋν διαμαρτύρομαι ίνα Άλεξανδρείς μεν πραεως και φιλανθρώπως προσφερωνται Ιουδαίοις τοίς την αυτήν πόλιν εκ πολλών χρόνων οϊκοϋσι και μηδέν των προς θρησκείαν αύτοίς νονομισμενων τοϋ θεοϋ λυμαί- νωνται, αλλά εώσιν αυτούς τοίς εθεσιν χρησθαι οις και επι τοϋ θεοϋ Σεβαστού, άπερ και εγώ διακονσας άμφοτερων εβεβαίωσα· και Ιουδαίοις δε αντικρυς κελεύω μηδέν πλείω ών πρότερον εσχον περιεργάζεσθαι μηδε ώσπερ εν δνσι πόλεσιν κατοικοϋντας δυο πρεσβείας εκπεμπειν τοϋ λοιπού, δ μη πρότερόν ποτέ επράχθη, μηδε επεισπαιειν γυμνασιαρχικοίς η κοσμητικούς άγώσι, καρπου- μενους μεν τά οικεία άπολαύοντας δε εν άλλοτρία πόλει περιουσίας άφθονων αγαθών, μηδε επάγεσθαι η προσίεσθαι από Συρίας ή Αίγυπτου καταπλεοντας Ιουδαίους, εξ οϋ μείζονας νπονοίας άναγκασθήσομαι λαμβάνειν* εϊ δε μη, πάντα τρόπον αυτούς επεξελευ- σομαι καθάπερ κοινήν τινα της οικουμένης νοσον εξεγείροντας. Έάν τούτων άποστάντες άμρότεροι μετά πραότητος και φιλανθρωπίας της προς άλλήλους ζην εθελήσητε, και εγώ πρόνοιαν της πόλεως ποιήσομαι την άνωτάτω καθάπερ εκ προγόνων οικείας ημίν ύπαρχον σι μ. Ιζαρθίλλω τώ εμω εταίρω μαρτυρώ άει πρόνοιαν υμών παρ' εμοι ποιούμενοι, δς και νϋν πάση φιλοτιμμι περί τον αγώνα τον ύπερ υμών κεχρηται, καιί Υιθερίω Κλαυδίω **Άρχιβίω** τώ εμώ εταίρω. Σρρωσθε.

Pap. Lond. 1912, II 14-108.

The original papyrus (with which I compared this text years ago, so I can guarantee the accuracy of this transcription) is in majuscules without separation of words and has other graphic peculiarities which might trouble anyone who has not worked with Greek papyri. The section about the riots, which I am going to translate, begins in the sixth line.

This must have been translated into English at least once, but I do not know where such a translation has been published, so, to save time, I will translate here. Words within parentheses are my explanatory additions. If you want a version to compare with mine, I think it likely that this papyrus may have been included in the two or three volumes of "Select Papyri" in the Loeb series, which I do not have at hand. (If this one is not included in what purports to be a selection of the more interesting papyri, that fact will be significant in itself.) I shall try to make the English reflect a little of Claudius's peculiar style:

As for who were responsible for the outbreak and insurrection, or rather, if we must designate it correctly, for the wars against the Jews, although your envoys and especially Dionysius son of Tlieon distinguished themselves in argument when confronted with their (Jewish) adversaries, I nevertheless decided not to investigate the matter thoroughly, and I entered in the ledgers of my mind a ruthless indignation against whichever people recommences hostilities; I now emphatically give warning that if the two peoples do not desist from their disastrous and contumacious hatred of one another, I shall be compelled to show what a benevolent ruler can be when he is roused to righteous anger. Therefore, I now most solemnly conjure the Alexandrians to behave with forbearance and kindness toward the Jews who have for a long time lived in the same city, and not to obstruct any of their customary rites in the cult of their god, but to permit them to observe the customs they followed in the time of the Divine Augustus, which I now sanction, after hearing both sides of the case. On the other hand, I now order the Jews not to agitate for more privileges than those they have long enjoyed, and not again to have the

unprecedented insolence of sending out their own ambassadors as though they were living in a separate state, and furthermore (I order them) not to force their way into the games and contests held by the gymnasiarchs and *cosmetae* (officers who presided over the physical and intellectual education of Greek youths and held exhibitions that were open only to citizens of Alexandria) while they (the Jews) reap the profits of their own special privileges¹ and, living in a city that is not their own, enjoy all the bountiful advantages of that city; furthermore (I order the Jews) not to import or bring in (i.e., into Alexandria) by ship Jews from Asia Minor or Egypt (from which Alexandria was administratively separated), a procedure which must necessarily excite in me the gravest suspicions. Otherwise (i.e., if the Jews do not obey), I will by all means take vengeance on them as being the fomenters of what is a universal plague throughout the civilized world.

If both peoples, desisting from these practices, are willing to live together with tolerance and kindness toward one another, I, for my part, will show the utmost concern for the prosperity of the city (Alexandria) as being one joined to us in friendship from the time of our ancestors.

I assure you that my friend, (Tiberius Claudius) Barbillus (one of the six Roman citizens among the twelve envoys from Alexandria), has always shown solicitude for your welfare whenever he appeared before me, and he

¹ Alexandrian citizens paid heavy local taxes and additional taxes were levied on residents (including Egyptian natives) who were not citizens, but, as we now learn from a papyrus in Berlin (#8877), one of the privileges of which the Jews boasted was exemption from all such taxes. Naturally, they did not want to become citizens of the city!

now championed your cause with great zeal and distinction, and the same goes for my friend, Tiberius Claudius Archibius (another one of the envoys). Farewell.

The translation could be polished a bit, but it will show the meaning. The sentence in which we are particularly interested, delineated in detail, reads:

But if (they do) not, I shall in every way wreck vengeance upon them inasmuch as (=on the grounds that) they are persons who foment ("incite, propagate) a universal ("ubiquitous, found everywhere) disease ("pestilence, plague) of the *oecumene* (i.e., the settled and inhabited world, as distinct from jungles, steppes, and deserts).

You will have noticed that Jews were behaving normally in Alexandria, not only whining about being "persecuted" because of their Love of God while pushing their way into every place where the despised *goyim* hope to have a little privacy from them, but even illegally importing fellow parasites to prey on the white cattle, just as the Jews are constantly importing thousands of their congeners into the United States, not only across the border from Canada, but by ships that land thousands of the dear creatures at Red Hook on Long Island, whence they are carried by limousine to the New Jerusalem commonly called New York City, in open defiance of the immigration officers, who know about it but dare not intervene.

Survival of the Fittest

The few Aryans who dare to criticize the Jews are wont to wax indignant over the methods by which the aliens acquire control, which, to be sure, are immoral according to our own accepted standards of civil behavior within one of our own societies. But let us be fair and, what is more important, objective.

The survival of the fittest always has been, and always will be, the immutable law of life on this planet. Mammals that do not depend on sheer fecundity to preserve their kind (e.g., rabbits, lemmings) have but two resources in themselves: strength and stealth, the latter compensating for deficiencies in the former. Even the male lion, whom we have taken as the symbol of courage, depends for much of his sustenance on prey that his females take by leaping from ambush. The elephant is a noble animal and a symbol of strength, but he falls prey to the cunning of weaker species, such as tigers and men.

It is a peculiarity of our race — and one that the Jews regard as especially childish and fatuous — that we have an ideal of victory obtained only in a fair fight. Our racial mentality is dominated by the sentiment that finds expression in our cherished picture of Mediaeval knights, equally matched, meeting in the lists or in the storied adventures of King Arthur's Round Table. But even in our romances, the fair fight is an ideal only as between individuals of our own race, who observe our racial standards of personal honor; and in practice our race has accepted modifications of it that seem odd to us today: for example, in the family feuds of Iceland it was considered proper to kill a man by striking from ambush, *provided* that one boasted of the deed and thus averted an imputation of cowardice by indicating to the victim's kinsfolk on whom they should revenge his death.

In war, even between nations of our race, our ideal of a "fair fight" is disregarded as irrelevant, unless we hold that "fairness" includes not only physical courage, but also intelligent forethought and planning, which can be described as cunning. We admire strategy as much as courage. In the proverbial story of the Trojan Horse, we do not reprehend the deception practiced by Sinon, but rather the superstition and credulity of the Trojans, who fell victim to the Greeks' ruse; and while we may feel compassion for certain individual Trojans who suffered for their people's folly, we feel no pity for that people as a whole, unless we attribute their gullibility to a force outside themselves and think that their minds were darkened by the supernatural power of some god or gods. All the great generals of history have achieved their victories, not by the indispensable courage of their men, but by strategy, i.e., their ability to outwit their enemies by a form of deception. We even have an aphorism that affirms that "all is fair in war," and we take it for granted that the physically weaker party must rely on superior cunning, if it is not to succumb. When Europeans first settled in the Western Hemisphere, they

were few in number — so few that even their superiority in armament and discipline over the aborigines did not cancel their numerical weakness — and they did not hesitate to use some Indian tribes to defeat and destroy others, often exciting and always profiting from the internal dissensions of a race whose continent they intended to take from them. Such expedient deception we have always considered justified as a weapon of physical weakness against physical strength.¹

Now the Jews have always been physically (i.e., numerically) a weaker people. Wherever they have lodged themselves, they have been a small minority among the *goyim*. Even in the United States today, where the largest fraction of their race now resides, reasonable estimates of their number do not exceed twenty millions. Estimates must necessarily be uncertain, for when the census was taken ten years ago, the Jews forbade the “American” government to ascertain the number of Jews who openly profess their alien status by publicly practicing their religion. The Jews’ own reports of their numbers in religious terms are, as Mark Twain observed long ago, utterly preposterous, although some persons charitably claim that the figures are obtained by counting only male heads of households and reporting these as a total population, it being the fault of the stupid *goyim* that they assume that the statistics were compiled in the same terms as their own, which include women, children, and dependents in the total. In any event, even an accurate count of the aliens who attend synagogues would be inconclusive, since one would still have to guess the number of Marranos. A large part of the Jewish force in every country consists of Marranos, Jews who, using the chameleonlike ability of their species, effectively disguise themselves. I have often glanced through the lists of births reported by the Jews in their own Detroit *Jewish News*, and I could not but notice that on many days there was no name that betrayed the race of the child. The personal names of the parents and children were all “Christian” names, with some preference for names that are traditionally Scottish, and the family names all suggested British, French, or sometimes Slavic, ancestry. Those instances of the Jews’ masquerading under assumed names, it should be remembered, are all of Jews who, by inserting such announcements in their own newspapers, confess their race. Many Marranos eschew such indiscretion, and some are so adept at disguise that their acquaintances

¹ It is true that the absolute rule is modified by disapproval of treachery, i.e., the violation of an explicit or implied agreement between persons who presumably recognize and accept our standards of honor, but even here the distinction is fluid. Although Americans resent being reminded of it, their history as an independent nation begins with the act of treachery by which they (as a whole, regardless of the intentions of certain individuals) induced General Burgoyne and his army to surrender by solemnly pledging that the defeated army could return to Britain, and then violated that agreement by confining the cozened troops in conditions of such hardship and severity that many of them, even among the officers, perished before the end of the war. For such treachery no apology can be offered in terms of the standards of our race (although it would have been merely normal for most other races), but gentlemen among the Americans probably salved their consciences by telling themselves that they, the rebels, were weak while Great Britain was strong. The disgraceful episode, however, should check any tendency of Americans to a Narcissistic doting on their own virtues.

and associates are astonished when some accident or indiscretion discloses the race of a person who seemed to be an American, Englishman, South African, German, Frenchman, or other member of our own race. But even when we make every allowance for the Jews' mastery of disguise, we must admit that they are still a minority in the United States, where they are surely outnumbered by the Aryans, who are probably still an absolute majority in their own country and outnumber the total of all the aliens in their midst, Jews, Congoids, mulattoes, mestizos, Mongolians, and the like. If the feeble-minded Aryans, instead of subsidizing the prodigious breeding and proliferation of their domestic enemies and even importing hordes of others from Vietnam, Haiti, and elsewhere as "refugees" for the eventual extermination of the Aryans' own children, were sufficiently intelligent and resolute, they would still have the power to expel or otherwise eliminate *all of* their alien parasites, among which the Jews are a small, though prepollent, minority.

Throughout history, the Jews have everywhere been a minority in the countries into which they have intruded themselves, and they have necessarily employed the weapons of the physically weak against the physically strong. The Jews have *never* captured a territory by open warfare and invasion: they have never been sufficiently numerous and strong to attempt an open conquest, even if they had been so temerarious as to waste their own lives to attain what they could more easily and safely attain by deceit.

It is true that the Jews' myths include two claims of open conquest, but both of these are indubitably fictitious.

One of those stories is well known, since it is found in the collection of Jewish tales commonly called the "Old Testament" by our people. According to that myth, the Jews (with the help of their tribal deity) openly invaded the land of Canaan, ruthlessly butchered all the inhabitants and even the inhabitants' domestic animals, and then appropriated the country they had made a bloody desert. The tale, even when divested of such nonsense as a claim that the Jews' god stopped the sun and moon, luminous disks that were floating in the atmosphere at an altitude of about 50,000 feet, and held them stationary for a time to facilitate the rapine, is utterly incredible and no reputable historian, not even among those who profess to be Christians, pretends to believe it. The tale of armed conquest is intrinsically so incredible that Philo Judaeus, one of the ablest of the Jews' apologists and propagandists, who, in the early years of the First Century, tried to convince intelligent Greeks and Romans that the Jews were not a menace to civilization, had to admit (*Hypoth.* 6.5-8) that the story was preposterous and that what *must* have happened was that the Canaanites voluntarily permitted the Jews to penetrate their country peacefully and set up synagogues and the rest of the Jewish racial organization, after which the Jews, of course, took over. Philo candidly admits that when the Jews peacefully penetrate a country to despoil it, they, in their own minds, naturally regard the inhabitants as

enemies, but he seems to hesitate between alternative explanations of the Canaanites' suicidal folly in permitting the Jewish immigration: the stupid Canaanites were either impressed by the holiness and superiority of their covert invaders or had their minds befuddled by the Jews' god.

It is true that the Jews at some time obtained control of the territory that was thereafter known as Judaea, but there is no way of determining what part of the population was composed of racial Jews as distinct from the subjugated and mongrelized descendants of the original inhabitants, who, despite the Jews' boasts, were not exterminated in war. It is possible, of course, that some nucleus of truth may underlie the Jews' story that they captured city after city of the Canaanites, butchered all the men, butchered all the women, butchered all the children, butchered all the oxen, butchered all the sheep, butchered all the donkeys, and then relaxed in blissful contemplation of their own holiness (e.g., Jos. 6.21). There is archaeological evidence of the destruction of cities by war as well as by earthquakes in or near the time of the supposed conquest, but from what we know of the Jews' racial habits, we may guess that after their "peaceful" immigration, they promptly started subversion and civil wars and were soon able to use one army of stupid *goyim* against another army of stupid *goyim*, so that the natives slew one another and destroyed themselves, while the Jews egged on the contestants and rubbed their hands gleefully together, much as recently they stampeded their British and American cattle into Germany to facilitate their pious appropriation of the earth that their tribal god contracted to give them.

The second story of armed conquest comes from another Jewish propagandist, Josephus, who was a little younger than Philo, and whose story (Cont. *Ap.* 1.75-94, 224) of a conquest of Egypt by the Hyksos long imposed on historians who did not take into account the Jews' racial genius for forgery and deception, which is now so vividly illustrated by such hoaxes as "Anne Frank's Diary" and the nonsense about the "six millions" of God's Race that the Germans supposedly killed before the six million crawled into the United States and other Western nations. Whether Josephus forged the passage that he claims to quote from Manetho or utilized the work of some earlier Jew is uncertain; he relies heavily on the Jewish forgers of earlier centuries, especially the ones who assumed Greek names, much as Jews now masquerade under such names as Ashley Montagu, Lyle Stuart, and Craig Schiller, so that Josephus can pretend that they were Aryans who testified to the vast superiority of God's Race. What is certain is that there was no conquest of Egypt by the Hyksos.

It is now known (see *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. II, 1, pp. 54-64, 288-296; and especially the definitive work on this subject, *The Hyksos*, by John Van Seters, Yale University Press, 1966) that the "Hyksos" were peoples, probably of several different tribes that spoke Semitic languages, whom the Egyptians indiscriminately described as "Asiatics," and who infiltrated Egypt by gradual immigration across the Sinai peninsula, and probably never were

numerous enough to form a very large fraction of the population; they were clever enough, however, to spread sedition and incite civil wars until they attained a rule over the entire nation, placing as governors in each district tributaries and stooges, many of whom were certainly or probably native Egyptian traitors, and using an uncertain proportion of Egyptians in the troops by which they maintained their dominion for almost two centuries. An Egyptian revolt finally succeeded in overthrowing the alien rulers and expelling many of them (for we may be sure that some of the aliens managed to blend themselves into the native population and escape notice). But during their control of Egypt, the immigrants incited massacres of the upper classes and promoted the mongrelization that the stupid Egyptians had themselves begun by importing black slaves from the south, and they left the nation genetically impoverished by a great infusion of both black and Semitic blood, from which Egypt never recovered.

There are some indications that the "Asiatic" immigrants came from the regions that are now Syria and Palestine, and the methods they employed to ruin Egypt make us consider seriously Josephus's claim that they were Jews and that when they condescended to leave Egypt, they built Jerusalem as the capital of the region they then occupied. Unfortunately, there is no evidence (other than the remarkable similarity of methods) to confirm or refute a conjecture that the "Hyksos" were organized and directed by Jews. In the past century, before the Jews' habitual duplicity and mendacity were generally recognized by historians, Josephus's story was rejected *because* the enemy aliens brought with them into Egypt a god named Set (Seth), whom they regarded as the enemy of the Egyptian gods, although they also talked about religious toleration when it suited their purposes in keeping their stupid subjects bemused. They evidently proselytized for their patron deity so effectively that he remained in the huge crowd of Egyptian gods after the end of their rule, although he was then most commonly represented as the diabolic assassin of Osiris and other native deities.

So long as it was supposed that the Jews were uniquely devoted to a tribal god whom they called Yahweh or Ya'ō (who is designated in the "Old Testament" by a wide variety of names that have been concealed by the translators, who, beginning with the Septuagint, use a word meaning 'Lord' to translate a number of different names), it was thought axiomatic that the worshippers of Set could not be the holy Jews; but it is now known that the Jewish colony at Elephantine, which was regarded as perfectly orthodox in Jerusalem, had five gods in a pantheon of which Ya'ō was merely the chief, and that the Jews worked any convenient religious racket, for example, claiming in Egypt that the Egyptian god Osiris, the greatest of all gods, had inspired Moses and the "prophets of Israel" and had chosen the Jews as his special pets. (A translation of the late papyrus, which dates from about 100 B.C., may most conveniently be found in E. A. Wallis Budge's *Egyptian Magic*, London, 1901 (= New York, 1971), p. 176, with a reference to the publication of the original.) There is, furthermore, the distinct possibility — some Egyptologists would say certainty — that Set was originally a name or epithet of an Egyptian

god and was applied by the cunning invaders to their own deity to deceive the natives. (The name may be older than the "Hyksos," and if it was Egyptian in origin, it becomes less remarkable that after the dominion of the execrated "Hyksos" had been broken, Set, despite his generally evil reputation, found votaries among the Egyptians, including some Egyptian kings.) So, in the present state of knowledge, we must leave it an open question whether or not the enemy immigrants into Egypt were led by Jews; if they were, the Jews were at work as early as c. 1760 B.C.; if not, we have no *certain* historical trace of the race before more than a thousand years later.

The Jewish Strategy Itself: In Their Own Words

The origin of the Jews as a race is unknown, but there are indications that they early began to exploit the superstitions of the populations on which they fastened themselves. The Jews have a tale that their ancestor, named Abraham, came from Ur in Sumeria (with mortgages on half the Sumerians' real estate in his pocket?), and some scholars, not highly regarded today, have suggested that some of the Semitic-speaking peoples with whom the Sumerians foolishly tried to coexist meddled extensively with the Sumerian religion and perhaps even had an influence on the white, pre-Aryan civilization of the Indus Valley. There is a firmer basis for a conjecture — but *only* a conjecture, mind you — that would explain one of the oddities of the "New Testament," which was assembled by a Christian sect that professed a religion that was obviously a Judaized form of Zoroastrianism. Everyone has noticed the curious detail that in the story about the birth of the christ named Jesus which gives the earlier date for the event, the nativity is said to have been attended by Zoroastrian priests, who were said to have been guided to the spot by an obliging star or planet that floated in the atmosphere at an altitude no greater than that of cumulus clouds to show them the way. It is possible that the Magi, the professional holy men of the religion that was spread through the old Persian Empire, were Jews. The Jews have a tradition (IV. *Reg.* 17.6; 18.11) that there were colonies of Israelites in Media (in the cities, naturally!), and the Magi not only claimed to come from Media, but were a closed caste racially and (like the Jews) propagated themselves through the female line, often obtaining pure offspring by impregnating their sisters or mothers. It is now virtually certain that at least the greater part of the extant holy books of the supposedly "Aryan" religion, although now in an odd dialect of Old Persian, were translated from a Semitic language. Diogenes Laertius (1.9) mentions in passing unnamed Greek geographers who thought that the Magi were early Jews, but since those works are now lost, we cannot say whether that opinion was based on more than the fact that after the fall of the Persian Empire, many of the Magi who peddled their cult in other lands were known to be Jews. Herodotus's description (III.79) of the Magophonia, the Persian reaction when one of the Magi attempted a particularly outrageous fraud, sounds very much like a *racial* outbreak, and How and Wells in their commentary on Herodotus (*ad* 1.101) suggest that the Magi may have been "non-Aryan." From these and a few minor traces one can construct an hypothesis that would be highly significant, if there were any real proof of it.

Whatever their origin, there cannot be the slightest doubt about the method that the Jews have always regarded as ideal in capturing control of a country: it is set forth clearly and explicitly in the "Old Testament" (Gen. 47.1-27). The hero of this tale is a Jew named Joseph, who is said to have been brought to Egypt as a slave, but who cleverly wriggled upward in Egyptian society until he was in a position to prey upon the good nature and superstitions of the Egyptian king, whom he first manipulated to permit an influx of Jews, who somehow take possession of the best land in the nation; then he uses the king's authority to corner the grain market and is thus able to take from the Egyptians all their money, all their cattle, and then all their land, so that he has all the Egyptians (except the Egyptian priests, with whom he evidently maintains a prudent but odd alliance) at his mercy, forces the famished wretches to sell themselves into slavery, and then shrewdly transports groups of the slaves from one end of the

country to the other, mixing up the population so thoroughly that all his victims find themselves among strangers with whom they would scarcely dare to concert an effective protest — and the Jews, no doubt snickering in private, annexed property and “multiplied exceedingly.” Joseph used the Egyptian king as a convenient puppet in this operation, and the tale implies, of course, that he enjoyed the cooperation of his tribe’s special god, at least when he was operating as a fortune-teller on his way up. It is hard to say how much fact may underlie the story, which is obviously an exposition of the Jews’ ideal methods. Some kings of Egypt appear to have been feeble-minded, and there is even a record that one of them admitted some desert nomads who put up a piteous plea that their pastures had dried up, but the principal features of the tale more probably reflect Jewish ambitions than actual events. However that may be, the tale certainly sketches an ideal *modus operandi* for subjugating the *goyim*. And the Jews of today will surely not have the audacity to claim that *that* description of their methods was forged by the secret police of Russia under the Czars!

The Jews claim that the so-called “Protocols of the Elders of Zion,” which were certainly published as early as 1904 and reportedly much earlier in books that were destroyed when the Jews seized Russia in 1917, are a “forgery,” as, indeed, they may be, although they describe in detail and with complete accuracy the methods that the Jews have consistently used throughout this century to subvert our civilization and destroy our race. But Aryans who wish to understand the Jewish mentality need not rely on that document: they have only to read the “Old Testament” with minds that are not immobilized in a fog of superstitious awe. There is scarcely a chapter of that pseudo-historical narrative that is not highly revealing; for example, there never was a Persian king named Ahasuerus (Assuerus; Christian holy men usually claim that the name is a “mistake” for Artaxerxes!), but the fiction about Esther is an inspirational apologue to remind Jewesses that while they may find it expedient to marry a male of the lower races, they must always remember their duty to manipulate the stupid *goy* to exploit him for the advantage of their Master Race.

A Unique Mentality

The racial mentality of the Jews is so different from our own that we can only draw inferences from observation of their conduct and such of their statements as appear more or less candid and worthy of belief (e.g., Maurice Samuel's excellent *You Gentiles*,¹ New York, 1924), but we must remember that all forms of life instinctively and necessarily make the preservation and increase of their species their highest purpose, and if vampire bats were capable of reason, they would undoubtedly describe their furtive blood-sucking as a righteous exercise and identify as diabolically evil the various animals (including men) who in one way or another interfere with their noble exercise of their god-given right. No species could think of itself as evil. As an ex-Communist once reminded me, "You must remember that when Communists betray a nation or murder innocent people by the thousands, they think of themselves as highly moral individuals who righteously obey a higher purpose." We may be absolutely certain that whatever the Jews do as a race, no matter how vile and dastardly it may seem to us who suffer its effects, seems to them just and righteous — as indeed it is, if we consider it objectively in terms of the biological law that makes survival and increase the highest law of every species.²

The great strength of the Jews and the bond of their racial cohesion is their religion, which, in the widest sense, is an unlimited faith in the absolute superiority of their race, for, as Maurice Samuel reminds us, Jewish atheists, who deride a belief in supernatural beings, worship the Immortal Jewish People. Beyond this, we cannot be definite, for doubtless there always has

¹ Available via HRP, Box 62, Uckfield UK TN22 1ZY; ety.com/HRP.

² The Aryans are an apparent exception, since everywhere, and most conspicuously in the United States, Britain, and now South Africa, they are evidently driven by a subconscious death-wish. The species may be biologically degenerate or, as the Jews believe, inferior and innately stupid, easily herded by its credulity and cupidity. Some optimists believe that the species could recover its will-to-live and become viable again, if it were somehow to escape the control of its Jewish herdsmen.

Before the political murder of Dr. Verwoerd, many rational Americans saw in South Africa a bright hope for our ill-starred race and regarded the Afrikaners as conspicuously intelligent and uncorrupted members of it, attributing their prudence to the fact that they were separated by only a generation from the pioneers who fought an heroic war for independence, and perhaps also to some peculiar integrity in the Dutch Reformed Church, which appeared to have retained some belief in the traditional Christianity of the West at a time when churches elsewhere had been bought and converted into mere instruments of subversion.

Since the murder of Dr. Verwoerd, which was made to seem fortuitous to persons who do not understand the rule of *cui bono?*, it has become painfully apparent that the Afrikaners are as gullible and venal, as befuddled and stultified, as the majority of British and Americans; that what we mistakenly attributed to a people was only the genius of one man, whose achievements remind one of Philipomen, who led the Greeks in their last stand for independence and to whose influence over his decadent and demoralized people Baudelaire paid tribute in the memorable lines of his earliest poem:

*Cum te mirantur, ad alta
se credunt genitos...*

been the widest gamut of personal belief, and there is every evidence of wild and grotesquely emotional fanaticism among the lower classes, as among the rabble that was stirred up by the numerous *goëtae* and self-appointed christs in the first century B.C. and the First Century of our era with perennial outbreaks of insane violence; and many Jewish sects have bizarre notions that must be sincerely entertained, as, for example, by the Polish *Hasidim*, who mated their male and female children as soon as they were pubertate to raise the birthrate to the maximum for the express purpose of exhausting God's stock of good Jewish souls as soon as possible and thus forcing him to bring the world to an end sooner than he intended. But such vagaries among the excitable and irrational lower classes have really little significance for the racial faith. On the other hand, when one turns to the literate Jews, one cannot confidently distinguish between what they believe and what they deem expedient to profess. Fighting between various Jewish sects has often been violent, bloody, and viciously inhuman, but seems not to have been so much over doctrinal differences as over the ambitions of leaders who were ruthlessly slugging it out for power and wealth and used a religious peculiarity to recruit and excite their private armies. And at the limit, we have no assurance that the psychological process that we call 'belief,' and distinguish from hypocrisy and mendacity, occurs in the Jewish mind, which may not distinguish between truth and falsity in terms of some objective reality, as Aryans do even when the reality is merely a product of their imaginations; so far as we can tell, indeed, the racial mentality of this alien species may, by a psychological process beyond our understanding, think only in terms of what is good for the Jewish People, the Divine Race, and may only simulate, in discourse with our species, our distinction between what is objectively true and what is not, much as we train animals by teaching them lessons in terms of their mental conformation.³

Our minds boggle when we try to understand such statements as Rabbi Solomon Goldman's "God is absorbed [sic] in the nationalism of Israel... He [God] creates the world [sic] in the Hebrew language," Dr. Joseph Kastein's "It was not God who willed these people [the Jews]... It was this people [the Jews] who willed this God," or any one of a hundred comparable statements, which seem to us to be the ravings of madness, but are only typical of the Jewish mind, which, we must remember, has regularly, throughout history, outwitted our race. We, of course,

³ Or superstitious human beings; Ivor Benson gave an example when he wrote: "In North Africa during the last World War, one of our tasks was to teach raw Negroes from the jungle to drive three-ton trucks. Problem No. 1 was how to explain the gears. Common sense produced the answer. Engaging the first gear, the recruits were told, harnessed 'the spirit of the elephant' — slow but very strong, just the sort of power needed to pull a truck up a steep hill or out of mud. The second gear meant 'the spirit of the horse' — a power faster but not as strong as that of the elephant. And moving into top gear, it was 'the spirit of the antelope' which was harnessed — very fast, but not of much use in heavy going.

"Now, insofar as this mythology worked with these Blacks it can be said to have been true, or at any rate to have an element of the truth which could not be conveyed to these primitive minds in any other way.

"So far as religious myths are concerned, we are, of course, all in the condition of those African savages."

often remark that men create God in their own image, thus stating a psychological and anthropological truth, and what we mean by that statement is that gods do not exist, but are mere figments of the imagination, and if a man of our race, having thus affirmed his atheism, were then to profess belief in the divinity and reality of a god or gods, we should rightly adjudge him insane; but it is obvious that the Jewish mind sees no illogic in worshipping a god it has knowingly created — in worshipping its own image in a mirror. That *is* insanity — we cannot honestly call it anything else in our terminology — but it is the insanity of a species that has successfully preyed on all others for millennia and is now achieving ownership of the entire earth.

If we are to be both fair and objective, we must bear in mind the difference — perhaps an enormous difference — between the Jewish mentality and our own.⁴ When we consider the Jews' religion and describe it in our terms, we attribute to them, explicitly or by implication, such hypocrisy as we see in our clergymen today, and we are tempted to convict them of a conscious dissimulation that is odious to us, but we must remember that what seems repugnant to us seems good and righteous to their peculiar mentality.

4 There can be no doubt, I think, but that Jews perceive the physical world about us quite differently from our perception of it. Since Jews communicate with our race in Indo-European languages and in the West even use those languages to communicate with each other (although probably attaching different meanings to many key words) or distort Indo-European languages into special dialects of their own, such as their variety of the Greek *koine* in Antiquity and Ladino and Yiddish in more recent times, the vast psychological difference may be most clearly seen when one examines Hebrew, a dialect they formed from Western Semitic (Phoenician) and impressed with their own mentality, since it has many peculiarities not found in other Semitic languages. These are set forth by Dr. Thorleif Boman in his *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1960), a work that deserves the most careful study by Aryans. Dr. Boman is a Christian and thus obligated himself to find a “moral” value in the radically different Jewish mentality, and a comparable study by an unprejudiced philologist is greatly to be desired. It is entirely possible that the schizophrenic daubs that are peddled to the boobs as “modern art” actually correspond to the Jewish perception of reality and instinctive hatred of what seems beautiful and noble to us, and should not therefore be regarded as merely a means of corrupting our culture and displaying contempt for us.

The Jewish Religion

While it is scarcely possible that Jews do not know they are practicing deceit and fraud when they cozen *goyim*, it is likely that they feel much as do members of our race when they shoot deer or ducks from blinds, but we can only make precarious guesses about their own feelings about their religion. What is clear is its usefulness to them in their attacks on other races.

(1) The religion is the perfect cover for the Jews' racial arrogance. If they claimed on any other grounds to be the Master Race and proclaimed that the members of other races were so inferior that they were little, if at all, better than swine, the Jews would arouse resentment from persons who were unwilling to accept that status. But peoples that have emerged from barbarism, even if still deeply imbued with superstitions themselves, have learned to be tolerant of many strange superstitions and strange gods and know that there is virtually no limit to what votaries can believe. The Jews further disarm resentment by professing to share their status as a Master Race with any 'convert' and profess to be eager proselytizers, but have taken the precaution to impose on proselytes sexual mutilations that alone suffice to exclude virile men and grotesquely barbarous taboos that are certain to repel every *goy* except a few females who are so lightheaded that they will make useful puppets. Their faith in their *innate* superiority is thus shrewdly disguised.

(2) The religion is a perfect cover for conspiracy. When the Jews invade a country, they normally make themselves inconspicuous by infiltrating, a few at a time, and planting a few of their number in every city, town, or even village where there is money to be made by exploiting the stupid natives. If the scattered groups of invaders maintained a close liaison with other members of their race both within and without the nation they are attacking and claimed to do so on the basis of any common interest except religion, they would soon be identified as an alien and enemy conspiracy, but by claiming that they have a common interest in the worship of some god, they persuade the citizens to think of them as merely the votaries of some absurd, but harmlessly foolish, cult, and to overlook the real solidarity of the invaders.

(3) The religion is the perfect means — and this is most important — the perfect means of making certain that Jews will be persecuted. It must be realized that *the Jews' success depends on their cunning in having themselves "persecuted."*

By perpetually whining that they are a poor, helpless, persecuted minority, they effectively disguise their real power and their success in wrapping their tentacles about their victims, and by exciting the pity of soft-hearted and soft-headed *goyim*, they can use those *goyim* as weapons against the others.

By establishing a reputation for being persecuted for their religion by awfully wicked pagans, they can make it seem that they, poor innocents, are suffering for their piety whenever their depredations and malevolence have so exasperated their victims that the latter try by legislation or violence to free themselves from the aliens who are exploiting and oppressing them.

(4) The religion is perfect camouflage, whether or not it was consciously designed for that function. First of all, it enjoins on the race practices so barbarous and taboos so absurd and inconvenient that members of other races can not believe that any rational beings would voluntarily submit themselves to what the Jews call their "Law" and therefore assume that the Jews do so only from a slavish fear of their capricious and ferocious deity: that convinces the *goyim* that the Jews never dare to disobey the supposed will of their god. The Jews have equipped themselves with holy books containing specific regulations, such as the so-called Ten Commandments, which were, of course, designed only to promote solidarity within the race and to apply only to members of it, but which can be represented to the stupid "Gentiles" as governing the Jews' conduct toward them. Thus have the Jews enveloped themselves in a reputation for so fearing their deity that they obey his written instructions punctiliously, even in their relations with other races. So thoroughly have the Jews implanted this notion in our people that many Aryans, even if they have no religious preconceptions, almost automatically exonerate Jews from charges that are supported by evidence that would suffice to convict members of any other race. The testimony of eye-witnesses who entered the inner sanctum of the temple in Jerusalem is rejected out of hand: the pious Jews wouldn't have had such a shrine. Strong circumstantial evidence of ritual murders is simply disregarded: the God-fearing Jews wouldn't indulge in human sacrifice. Every nation on which the Jews have fastened themselves since they first appear in history has been destroyed by internal subversion and corruption, but no one inquires to what extent the alien body lodged within the nation was responsible for its disintegration and final doom: the high-minded Jews would not harm their hosts. And so it goes. Our people have been conditioned automatically to accord to the Jews an exemption from the rules of evidence that we observe among ourselves. So far as I know, no Aryan charged with theft or murder has even thought of proving his innocence by asserting he is a Christian and producing his Bible as proof that Christians cannot steal or murder. No one has ever claimed that the Thirty Years' War must be an invention by pagan historians to slander Christians, since it is unthinkable that two sects of gentle, loving, lamb-like Christians would have so barbarously slaughtered one another.

(5) The religion provides a means of penetrating even the inmost circles of nations and societies of credulous *goyim*. A Jew has only to claim that he rejects the religion and to have himself sprinkled with holy water to make Christians fancy that he has been miraculously transformed and is no longer a Jew; nonChristians are as gullible, for if a Jew does not observe

some of the taboos and is seen to eat pork, and if he affects adherence to their culture, they accept him as one of themselves. The Jewish religion could have been designed to facilitate the planting of Marranos in the heart of invaded nations.

(6) Their reputation as being on intimate terms with supernatural beings gives the Jews a great advantage in peddling sorcery and similar hokum in societies marked by a high level of ignorance. In the Middle Ages, for example, and even during the Renaissance and Reformation, the practice of magic to bilk the credulous and to impose even on the rulers of states and learn their secrets was almost as useful to the Jews as usury and commercial fraud in subverting European society. A quick glance at any grimoire of the time or at the summary in Arthur E. Waite's *Book of Ceremonial Magic* (London, 1912; New York, 1961) will suffice to show that both terminology and practices come from Jewish sources, especially the Kabbalah, adapted to impose on the *goyim*.

(7) Their expertise in superstition has always given the "God-people," as the Jews like to call themselves, the ability to influence and divert native religions for their own benefit. Since such work is done covertly through Marranos and dupes, we can only suspect Jewish influence in many religious civil wars without being able to prove it. It is, for example, historically certain that when Cyrus the Great undertook the conquest of the Babylonian Empire, the Jews in that nation operated, as they always do, as agents of subversion to weaken and betray their hosts, and that after Cyrus captured Babylon without a prolonged siege and fighting, he repaid the Jews for their good work, which had spared the lives of many of his soldiers, and (as many another conqueror was to do later) rewarded them for their betrayal of his enemies with special privileges. The Jews, according to their traditions, flattered the triumphant *goy* by calling him their christ, and probably rubbed their hands together in glee as they prepared to use those privileges to exploit the natives of various regions in the expanding Persian Empire, including eventually the native Egyptians, as we have learned from the Jewish papyri found at Elephantine. We may reasonably infer that the Jews stealthily opened the gates of Babylon to the Persians, so that Cyrus could take the strongly walled city without fighting, but we can only conjecture what contributions they made to the agitation and demoralization of the Babylonians that weakened the Empire before the Persians invaded it. The tale of the fall of Babylon in the Jews' story-book is, of course, an impressive fiction, probably composed almost four hundred years after the event by an author who did not even know the name of the last king of Babylon, who was Nabonidus (= Nabu-na'id), and evidently a great benefactor of the Jews,¹ who naturally

¹ It is virtually certain that Nabonidus gave the Jews possession of the strategic oases that controlled trade routes to southern Arabia (Arabia Felix), which were still in Jewish hands in the time of Mahomet and long thereafter; see, e.g., Chapter V of Professor H. W. F. Saggs' *The Greatness That Was Babylon* (New York, 1962; 1968). Even after the Persian conquest, Babylon continued to swarm with Jews, and, in the time of the Roman Empire, was the capital of

knifed the sucker in the back when they had a chance to do so. There may be some truth, however, in the Jews' tradition that their hatred of the Babylonians was given a religious coloring, and the ranting attributed to Isaiah as well as parts of the tale called "Daniel" may preserve a memory of religious agitation carried out by the Jews in Babylon. Now one major cause of Nabonidus's difficulties was what amounted to a religious civil war in his domains, ostensibly between votaries of Sin and the votaries of Marduk, carried out with a ferocious fanaticism that seems strange among peoples long accustomed to polytheism, even though some of them are Semitic by race. And there is evidence that some (we know not whether few or many) of the votaries of Marduk were peddling a kind of monotheism, claiming that he was the only (good?) god and that other gods were merely aspects of him. The Jews, of course, never hesitate to promote whatever god is useful to them (e.g., Sebazius in Rome and Osiris in Egypt during the second century B.C.) in manipulating *goyim*, and we may suspect that they were meddling with the Babylonian religion as well as contributing in all probability to the economic depression and inflation in Nabonidus's realm — but, so far as I know, we have no proof. The same is true of many later events in history.

Although a few obscurities remain, the origin and evolution of Christianity is now well known, but the subject is far too complex for full exposition here. We may note, however, one stage in that evolution, the Protestant Reformation, which was, if considered historically, a terrible calamity that drenched the streets and fields of Europe with much of the best blood of our race, impoverishing it genetically, while the Jews watched gleefully and profited enormously from both sides and, with the fragmentation of Protestantism, *all* sides. Now many causes contributed to that disaster, but if we try to identify one single incident that triggered the explosion, we must fix on the cleverness of the Jews in Florence, when, in 1485, they bamboozled and exploited Giovanni Pico, Count della Mirandola and titular Prince of Concordia, extracting enormous sums from the too wealthy young man while filling his vigorous, but adolescent, mind with Kabbalistic hocus- pocus, telling him it was the true essence of Christianity. From Pico the clue leads directly to Reuchlin, Pfefferkorn, Luther (who was tactfully guided by his helpful Jewish friends until late in his life, when he perceived how they had used him), Ulrich von Hutten, and the ghastly Wars of Religion that convulsed Europe for three centuries. It would be absurd to claim that the catastrophe was the result of a Jewish plot, but it is legitimate to pose the question to what extent Jewish intrigues and manipulations contributed to it. That is a problem that could be the *Hauptwerk* of a diligent and objective historian willing to devote his life to the requisite research.

their international nation and the residence of their chief (*Resh-galutha*), who may have directed the great Jewish Conspiracy of 117.

(8) The Jews' religion, which, as presented to the *goyim*, seems to validate their boasts of a peculiar "righteousness," makes possible the greater part of their secular (i.e., economic and social) subversion and eventual destruction of the nations they invade. It must be remembered that the Jews operate by discovering' and exploiting causes of dissent within nations, inciting classes and comparable groups within the nation to reciprocal antagonism, and exacerbating the rivalries to the point of civil war, until the nation is paralyzed and reduced to masses of individuals who no longer feel they have anything in common except the geographical territory they inhabit. The Jewish technique, as was too candidly explained by the notorious agitator, Herbert Aptheker, consists in finding large groups of *goyim* who can be isolated from the rest of the society on the basis of some economic, occupational, regional, cultural, sexual, or racial interest they have in common, persuading them that they are "oppressed" by the wicked society, inciting them to hatred of their "oppressors" and making them greedy for the profits they think they can gain by "demanding their rights," and thus setting each group against all others until the nation is paralysed by pseudo-legal contention that may hopefully be expected to eventuate in civil wars, massive massacres, and a reversion to total barbarism. The Jews, who are always careful to wail that they are a "persecuted minority" with a passion for godly "justice," are thus ideally prepared to incite the "underprivileged" to outbreaks for "social justice," and it is, of course, well known that all of the multiple forms of subversion are directed by Jews, often quite openly, although they usually try to associate with them some hired or light-headed members of each group they are inciting to what will be, in the end, self-destruction.

(9) The same parade of religiosity facilitates the other principal offensive against the occupied nation, if it belongs to our race, which is morbidly susceptible to rhetorical appeals to sentimentality and "ideals," i.e., fancied changes of the real world to make it more pleasant, usually by some magical transformation of human nature. Aryans, especially females, are easily intoxicated by rhapsodic talk about "all mankind," "the brotherhood of man," "world peace," "equality of races," "all men are born equal," and similar nonsense. That adult Aryans believe in such things without help from lysergic acid or even alcohol is simply proof of Kipling's observation that "Words are the most powerful drugs used by mankind." The Jews cannot be held responsible for the mental weakness they exploit, nor even for their success in exploiting it. In the United States, for example, they have for decades been openly inciting the Congoids to plunder, beat, rape, and murder their white "oppressors," and the white Americans are not only so craven and masochistic that they submit themselves and their children to the savages' outrages, but so fatuous that they believe the Jews' pretense that they are acting out of concern for the "underprivileged" savages rather than out of hatred for the Aryans as well as to profit from the misfortunes of the modern Canaanites, whose country they have effectively occupied. The Jews' contempt

for their befuddled and spineless victims is probably justified, but I think it obvious that their success was made possible in the United States, as, according to Philo, it was in Canaan, by the awe excited by their religious professions in the minds of the unwitting enemies whose country they invaded.

Conspiracy or Instinct?

This summary of the Jews' most useful devices leaves us, of course, with the question how it is possible for the dispersed and widely scattered members of the race to act with what amounts to unanimity and perfect coordination. It is scarcely credible that so large a number of individuals, many of them showing a low order of intelligence, could carry out such operations according to a consciously formed plan on which they have all previously agreed. The great mass of Jews seem to be, almost without exception, under the tight control and discipline of their fairly numerous leaders, who could, in turn, be equally subject to the orders of a supreme and secret directorate, which plans and directs a conscious strategy as set forth in the famous "Protocols." This is possible, although Aryans are apt to think most unlikely an operation of which they would be utterly incapable — of which they are, we must believe, genetically incapable, since their earliest records, in the Homeric traditions, the Norse legends, and even the Vedas, attest the great difficulty of maintaining an effective consensus within even compact and comparatively small bands for specific, immediate, and limited ends. It is a pernicious and perhaps fatal error, characteristic of our race, to assume that other races have approximately the same nature as ours, so that argument against a conscious and concerted conspiracy must be discarded. The alternative to that theory, so far as I can see, can be only an hypothesis that the Jews are directed by instinct, at least to a large extent. They may represent a complex and highly advanced form of the biological phenomenon of which a simple manifestation is seen in mammals that hunt in packs or bands. As is well known, wolves and African wild dogs, for example, hunt in organized packs and stalk and bring down their game by a kind of strategy that is carried out by the pack as a unit but with each individual in it having a definite function and adapting himself to the needs of a specific situation. This activity we attribute to instincts operating entirely below the level of real consciousness. African baboons form bands that are really small tribes having an oligarchic government, and their survival under very adverse conditions is proof that they adapt their presumably instinctive methods to new conditions, and that they learn by experience and observation. It is assumed, however, partly from the structure of the baboon's brain and the absence of a real language, that the species is not capable of conscious thought. On the other hand, we are aware that, although we may, on strictly objective grounds, identify our race as having a peculiar capacity for objective thought, many of our actions are determined by instinctual and subconscious reactions (e.g., our perception of beauty, fear of death, reaction to odors and sounds, etc.), however much we may consciously try to rationalize them or to alter them by efforts of the will that are likely to produce schizophrenia.

It is entirely possible, therefore, that a species could have been formed by biological selection that automatically preys on our species as instinctively as wolves prey on caribou, although, of course, with much greater cunning and versatility.

Extermination

This hypothesis is open to the objection that, so far as we can tell, a distinct change has taken place in the Jews' activity in this century and at approximately the time of the "Protocols."

Before this, the aliens seem to have been content to exploit the Aryans and, in biological terms, feed on them; the present objective is obviously extermination of our species through mongrelization and massacres, so that it would seem that the organization and domination of the Jewish colonies by the Zionists produced a change in purpose that must, to a large extent at least, have been consciously determined and planned.

This implies some measure of rule by some kind of directorate that has the ability and power to set objectives for the race. The alternative is to explain the change as a natural result of the progressive weakening of our race by less direct attacks during the past thousand years or more, comparable to the change in the activity of a wolf pack when it senses that the harried caribou are nearing exhaustion.

Whatever the explanation, the Jews' determination to exterminate the Aryans is not unreasonable.

One may see a good analogy in the cattle that are raised in the southwestern part of the United States. For a long time, the favorite breed was the 'Texas Long-horn,' which was hardy, able to fight off coyotes and other predators, and to survive in the wilds until it was rounded up by the cowboys for a long drive to the market, but it was also a dangerous animal that would attack its owners when provoked. It is now virtually extinct, having been replaced on the ranches by more docile breeds, such as the 'Black Angus,' since the predators have been exterminated and the cattle now graze within fences or are simply fattened on corn provided for them, and the vigor of the potentially dangerous 'Longhorn' is no longer needed, while the more docile and sluggish animals yield more tender meat.

Early in the Twentieth Century, Aryans had, for all practical purposes, subjugated the entire world and made it everywhere both safe and convenient for the Jews, whereas events in Germany in the 1930s proved that Aryans could be dangerous to the Master Race, if they got out of control. Elimination of the species seems therefore a logical step for the self-styled 'God-people.'

Genetic 'Integration'

I shall add a disquieting consideration that, so far as I know, no other Aryan has taken into account. It is based on the work of Dr. Alfred Nossig, whose manual of advice to his race on the best means of expeditiously taking possession of the entire planet, published simultaneously in Austria, Germany, and the United States (*Integrates Judentum*; Vienna, Berlin, New York, 1922), must once have been widely distributed, but has now become extremely rare, so that I had to search for years before finding even a battered copy of it. Most of what he says is, of course, mere commonplace to anyone who has observed the Jews' techniques, but there is one claim which, if true, explains much and leaves us with little or no hope, no matter what may happen in the future: he boasts of a *genetic* infiltration of our race that probably renders us helpless.

According to Dr. Nossig, any taint of Jewish blood ("ein einziges jüdisches Bluttröpfchen") will so alter the brain cells ("Gehirnganglien") of many subsequent generations of an apparently pure Aryan family that the descendants will be susceptible to Jewish propaganda and can readily be mobilized against their own race. What is more, Dr. Nossig seems to reject the usual Jewish view that the genes of Jewishness, like haemophilia, are transmitted only through females, so that only the offspring of Jewesses, regardless of the race of their father, are real Jews. (This, of course, explains such varied phenomena as the degeneration of the British aristocracy, which some observers trace partly to the common practice of covetous or necessitous Britons of marrying their sons to Jewesses who were provided with fat dowries and often dunked in holy water to make them more acceptable, and the kidnapping of male German infants in 1944-45, who were taken to Israel as breeding stock to improve the physique of the race.) Dr. Nossig, astonishingly, seems to believe that the heredity is transmitted by Jews of either sex. This means that, for example, if a Jew in 1800 seduced and impregnated an Aryan matron, her descendants, even today after many generations (which would still be less than "eine lange Reihe von Generationen") of marriages to pure Aryan stock, would *all* have the Jewish tumor in their brains and be subject to control through it. And when one tries to guess in how many nests the invading cuckoos may have laid their eggs through the centuries, one shudders.

Dr. Nossig is obviously convinced that the genes of Jewishness are not only dominant, but have a power of dominance greater than is attested for the genes of any physical trait. That does not conform to the theories held by most modern geneticists, but I can find no scientific corroboration or refutation of the claim, and I need not point out the methodological obstacles in the way of determination of the inheritance of specific mental traits in individuals, even if research on that subject were freely permitted.

Religiosity

The current intensive promotion of occult hocus-pocus, which so generally afflicts the young who have been intellectually disinherited and sabotaged in the public boob-incubators, seems to indicate that many people who have no religion have an instinctive appetite for some substitute for it. A few highly intelligent members of our race, including some I have observed in the graduate schools, men as well as members of the religious sex, who are, of course, too intelligent to practice witchcraft or drug themselves with mescaline or lysergic acid to “get in touch with the infinite,” *want* to believe in metempsychosis (an old Aryan faith, at least!) and in some cosmic intelligence roughly comparable to the Hindu *Brahma* (neuter) that governs the universe in conformity with some Higher Purpose.

A certain religiosity, a desire or need to believe in magic and miracles (which, of course, imply the existence of a praeterhuman power capable of producing them), may be biologically innate in all races and perhaps even in some species of mammals that are not anthropoid. That, at least, is an hypothesis that I have often considered. Many readers probably know Eugene Marais' major work, *The Soul of the Ape* (i.e., baboons — I am told that the misnomer comes in the translation from the Afrikaans, in which the title has a word that designates both apes and the larger monkeys), but may not have seen his earlier and much shorter work which was translated and published shortly after his death under the title *My Friends, the Baboons*. In it Marais reports that when he and his assistant were observing a colony of baboons and had succeeded in establishing friendly relations with them, they were awakened one night by an unprecedented visit from the dominant males who were the oligarchs of the baboon troop. They finally understood that they were being invited to visit the lair of the troop, and following those leaders they were conducted to the troop's sleeping place, where they found a number of females mourning over offspring that had apparently died of some epidemic disease. So far as Marais could determine, he had been invited in the hope that he could and would resurrect the dead baboon-children and restore them to life. There was sadness and howling when he departed without having performed the desired miracle. Anatole France has written a very plausible essay on dogs, who regard men as their gods with a piety which, France hints, does not essentially differ from the religious piety of human beings except that the dogs can see and touch their deities and so know that they exist, whereas human beings have to content themselves with figments of their imaginations.

We must consider the possibility that our race, though distinguished, of course, for its unique ability for scientific research, may also have a particular (and possibly related) tendency toward, or desire for, religious belief. This makes us vulnerable to numerous hoaxes and impostures, particularly the kinds typically, perhaps instinctively, created by Jews. There is, I think, a great

deal of truth in Spengler's identification and description of the Faustian soul of our civilization with its yearning for the infinite as its *idée maitresse*. Infinity can be temporal as well as spatial, and it is easy to see that this tendency of the racial mentality would naturally produce a very strong and intense desire for immortality. As Nietzsche said in his midnight hymn, "Doch alle Lust will Ewigkeit, — will tiefe, tiefe Ewigkeit!"

Christianity

In the preceding pages I have avoided specific consideration of Christianity, although, so far as I can judge from experience with my own writings, about 15% of the Christians are alert enough to see my implications.

I think I have a greater sympathy for Christianity than my readers imagine, for I not only recognize it as a belief that was for a long-time part of our civilization and produced such splendid monuments as the great cathedrals, but I also regard it as having been a consolation and boon to the great majority of our own people and one that I am sorry so many must now do without. (This is something quite different from the social utility of supernatural sanctions that may be the indispensable basis of a generally accepted and observed morality.) My feeling for Christianity is, I think, expressed by what I consider one of the best poems of Sir William Watson, "The Churchyard."

I wandered far in the wold,
And after the heat and glare,
I came at eve to a churchyard old:
The yew-trees seemed at prayer.
And around me was dust in dust;
And the fleeting light; and Repose;
And the infinite pathos of human trust
In a God whom no man knows.

It is that infinite pathos that touches me deeply. *Sunt lacrimae rerum*, if you remember your Vergil.

Before we consider Christianity *vis a vis* the Jewish survival strategy, let me first make two generalizations:

(1) The power and value of a religion has nothing to do with the personality or probity of its founder. The best example of that is provided by the Mormons, who are today the most solid and stable cult in the United States, and who successfully resisted longer than any other large church the contagious decay that quickly reduced all others, with the exception of some small, scattered, and discordant Fundamentalist churches and some pockets of Traditionalist Catholics, to the contemptible quackery of a "social gospel" and hypocritical irrationality. This really astonishing and massive religious edifice was founded by one Joseph Smith, a petty swindler who began his career by fleecing suckers by means of a magic stone through which he could see treasure buried in the earth, but after he was arrested and got off with a promise

not to do it again, turned to the safer and much more lucrative racket of swindling suckers with religion. He founded a great church, but there is reason to believe that he didn't give a damn what happened to it after he was dead and probably didn't expect it to last. Smith, of course, was a man about whom we have a great deal of information, both about his life and about his doctrines, whereas we know nothing whatsoever about Jesus except the myths associated with his name, and these are so various, contradictory, and late that he is, for all practical purposes, a mythical figure, like Adonis or Mithra, even if there was a man by that name (as is likely) about whom the myths were assembled. If it were possible to ascertain who he was and what he did, it would not in the least matter if he were found to be a character no more admirable than Joseph Smith.

(2) The Jesus-cults that existed in the Roman Empire are connected with Western Christianity only in that some of them provided a pseudo-historical story that was accepted by the West (our ancestors simply ignored the parts that our minds found distasteful), and a confused metaphysical doctrine expressed in words that our people misunderstood and progressively reinterpreted until the original meaning was completely forgotten. This is true not only of the rank jungle of Jesus-cults that flourished in the Second Century and thereafter, but also of the "orthodox" Christianity which came into being under the successors of Constantine. As Spengler points out in the second volume of the *Untergang*, even the "orthodox" Christianity of the last days of the Roman Empire was still essentially a Magian cult and, as such, was unintelligible to the Faustian mind, and he observes that Augustine, though revered by the Western church, would have regarded the Christianity of Anselm or St. Thomas or Luther as an abominable and incomprehensible heresy — and so would the other supposed "Fathers of the Church." They were fathers historically, of course, but had they known the Christianity of Mediaeval Europe, they would indignantly have repudiated it as a bastard with whom they had no connection.

There was no such thing as an 'orthodox' Christianity before the last two decades of the Fourth Century, when one bunch of holy men got hold of Theodosius (by explaining to him how advantageous it would be for him to cooperate with them) and so were able to use the police power of the state to repress and kill their competitors, the Arians, who had been the officially sanctioned brand of Christians (and so "orthodox"!) before that time. (The Arians, now called 'heretics' retrospectively, were guilty of being sufficiently logical to claim that a father was necessarily older than his son, and they naturally regarded as very stupid heretics the mystery-mongers who claimed that a father and his son had been born at the same time. The latter, however, were clever enough to back Theodosius before he pushed his way to the throne and to back Gratian against his father, and once they got their hands on the imperial power, they were clever enough to prevent potential competitors from muscling them out.) The neat trick that holy men use today is to describe as 'heretics' the innumerable Christian sects that did not

have doctrines that can conveniently be twisted into conformity with what became 'orthodox' by decree of Theodosius in 381, thus leading the unwary layman to suppose that there was an 'orthodox' Christianity before that time. They also conceal the fact that if the brand that got power in 381 is orthodoxy, then all Western Christianity is a heresy, and they themselves are, by that definition, heretics.)

The only honest thing to do is to apply the term 'Christian' to all the sects that claimed to be followers of a Jesus entitled 'Christus,' who was really or supposedly executed in Judaea in the time of Tiberius or thereabouts. When Christians become conspicuous, late in the Second Century, most of them were Jews, and it is probable that the numerous letters of Paul, including both those that were incorporated in the "New Testament" anthology when it was put together and those that were excluded for some reason, were manufactured at this time by Jews who wanted to take in *goyim on easy* terms. (These fabrications probably included the forged correspondence of Seneca with Paul, which seems to have been known to Tertullian.) This was a principal difference among the numerous Christian sects. The Nazarenes, whose holy book was a "Gospel According to the Hebrews," of which fragments survive, and who spoke only Aramaic in their rites, held that only Jews by race could be Christians, since Christ, when he returned to butcher the hated *goyim*, naturally wanted only Jews to rule the world. A compromise was made by the Ebionites, who had, inter *alia*, a "Gospel of Matthew" that was certainly older than the diluted *rifacimento* that got into the "New Testament," and who preached a perfect communism, with all property and women to belong to everyone in common; they held that *goyim*, if they were circumcised and went through ceremonies to purge them of their native vileness, could become Christians second-class, as I will show below. The Carpocratians, who seem to have been a numerous and powerful sect in their day, admitted *goyim on equal terms*, since Salvation was for all those who had been 'redeemed by Christ' from servitude to man-made laws and materialism. Christ had come to free mankind from oppression and to bestow on the righteous a new freedom: what matters is spiritual salvation, and we must show our emancipation from material things by recognizing no human law whatsoever and by feeling free to indulge any lust and perform any act to which the spirit may move us. Like the Ebionites, the Carpocratians preached a total communism, with all property and women to be for the use of everyone. They admitted women for the sake of general promiscuity in the modern manner, and although they had no objection to homosexuality, they thus differed from some other brands of Christians, who excluded females as "unworthy of the Kingdom of God" and practiced only male homosexuality. There were many other Christian sects, each with its own revelations from God via Jesus, such as the Naasenes, who worshipped snakes as symbols and incarnations of divine power because snakes shed their skins periodically and so are born again and live forever; the Adamites, whose specialty was going nude in public

to show that they had been redeemed by Christ from original sin and were thereby emancipated from all the laws of sinful man; and scores of others.

My guess is that the Carpocratians and similar *canaille* were the dominant sects of Christianity until the persecutions by the wicked pagan emperors in the Third Century made those forms of Christianity unpopular because likely to be unhealthy. The tales of the martyrs are all fiction, of course, (Jerome, in a letter that was included, doubtless by oversight, in the official collection of his correspondence, boasts of his skill in inventing martyrstories to edify the faithful), but some Roman emperors did make systematic attempts to enforce respect for law and accepted morality by trying to excise the Christian tumor on the state, and I think it likely that these persecutions were sufficiently successful to leave the Gospel-business open to sects that at least professed the relatively innocuous doctrines that finally became "orthodox."

Our holy men try to dodge the facts of early Christianity by calling "gnostic" all the sects that weren't "orthodox" by standards that were not devised before the Fourth Century. This, of course, is sheer dishonesty. A "Gnosticism" is a religious sect that claims to have a *gnosis*, a knowledge of supernatural things, revealed to them by some Savior who was either an incarnate god or a divinely-inspired superman. Obviously, all Christian sects are Gnostic in that sense, because they all claim to be based on revelations made by Christ, who, in the various sects, was regarded as having been either an incarnation of a god or a man whom John the Baptist or some other prophet had pumped full of Holy Spirit. In the first four centuries A.D. the world was full of Gnostics peddling special revelations, and, of course, Christ was only one of the Saviors: others were Baruch, Gamaliel, Tat (= the Egyptian god Toth), Seth (Egyptian god), Balaam, Ezechiel, Adam (whose books had just been discovered), Moses, Enoch, Marsanes, Nicotheus, Phosilampes, Mithra, Zoroaster, Zervan, et al., et al. In the early centuries of our era, the Near East was a Bedlam filled with the insane ravings of fakirs peddling their Saviors and their forged Gospels, and at this distance it is impossible to tell the difference between madmen, hallucinés who got visions of god from eating the sacred mushroom, *Amanita muscaria*, and shysters fleecing the yokels with mystic gabble. One cannot read much of the gibberish without feeling queasy and dizzy, but for a quick survey of the stuff that our holy men want to sweep under the rug, see Jean Doresse, *Les livres secrets des Gnostiques d'Égypte*, Paris, 1959, which surreys the books found at Chenoboskion a few years before. The one significant thing is that the peddlers of all forms of Gnosticism (including Christian cults before the Third Century) were almost all Jews. If you will look in your *Scientific American* for January 1973, pp. 80-87, you will note that the author has to admit that "it becomes increasingly evident that much of Gnosticism is probably of Jewish origin." He is naturally cautious, wary of offending God's Peculiar People. Although I admit that one cannot identify the race of some of the more prominent Salvation-hucksters, I think it significant that those whom one can identify racially

always turn out to be Jews, and I would delete “much of” and “probably” in the author’s statement.

There can be no question but that Christianity was originally a Jewish promotion, and it is noteworthy that the Christians who try to make their cult respectable in the Third Century claim that they repudiate the Jews. One of the earliest to do this was Tertullian, a Carthaginian slyster, whose *Apologeticum*, a defense of Christianity, was written at the very beginning of the Third Century. He asserts that Christianity is not a conspiracy of revolutionaries and degenerates, as was commonly believed, and claims that it is an association of loving brothers who have preserved the faith that the Jews forsook — which has been the common story ever since. Our holy men salvage Tertullian by claiming that he was “orthodox” in his early writings, but then, alas! became a Montanist heretic, poor fellow. Tertullian is the author of the famous dictum that he believes the impossible because it is absurd (*credo quia absurdum*), so he is naturally dear to the heart of the pious. How much Jerome and other saints have tampered with the facts to make Tertullian seem “orthodox” in his early works has been most fully shown by Timothy Barnes in his *Tertullian* (Oxford, 1971), but even he spends a hundred pages pawing over chronological difficulties that can be reconciled by what seems to me the simple and obvious solution: Tertullian, who was evidently a pettifogging lawyer before he got into the Gospel-business, had sense enough to eliminate from his brief for the Christians facts that would have displeased the pagans whom he was trying to convince that Christians represented no threat to civilized society; he accordingly concealed in his apologetic works the peculiar doctrines of the Christian sect to which he had been originally “converted,” but he naturally expounded those doctrines in writings intended, not for the eyes of wicked pagans, but for other brands of Christians, whom he wished to convert to his own sect, which was that of Montanus, a very Holy Prophet (divinely inspired, of course) who was a Phrygian, not a Jew, and who had learned from chats with God that since the Jews had muffed their big opportunity at the time of the Crucifixion, Jesus, when he returned next year or the year after that, was going to set up his New Jerusalem in Phrygia after he had raised hell with the pagans and tormented and butchered them in all of the delightful ways so lovingly described in the Apocalypse, the Hymn of Hate that still soothes the souls of “fundamentalist” Christians today. If, in his *Apologeticum* and similar works, Tertullian had told the stupid pagans that they were going to be tortured and exterminated in a year or two, they might have doubted that Christians were the innocent little lambs that Tertullian claimed they were.

Tertullian writes semi-literate bombast. The first Christian who can write decent Latin is Minucius Felix, whose *Octavius*, written in the first half (possibly the first quarter) of the Third Century must have done much to make Christianity respectable.

He concentrates on ridiculing pagan myths that no educated man believed anyway and on denying that Christians (he means his kind, of course!) practice incest (a favorite recreation of many sects that had been saved by Christ from the tyranny of human laws) or cut the throats of children to obtain blood for Holy Communion (as some groups undoubtedly did). He argues for a monotheism that is indistinguishable from the Stoic except that the One God is identified as the Christian deity, from whose worship the sinful Jews are apostates, and insists that Christians have nothing to do with the Jews, whom God is going to punish. What is interesting is that Minucius has nothing to say about any specifically Christian doctrine, and that the names of Jesus or Christ do not appear in his work. There is just one allusion: the pagans say that Christianity was founded by a felon (unnamed) who was crucified. That, says Minucius, is absurd: no criminal ever deserved, nor did a man of this world have the power, to be believed to be a god (*erratis, qui putatis deum credi aut meruisse noxium aut potuisse terrenum*). That ambiguous reference is all that he has to say about it; he turns at once to condemning the Egyptians for worshipping a mortal man, and then he argues that the sign of the cross represents:

(a) the mast and yard of a ship under sail, and

(b) the position of man who is worshipping God properly, i.e. standing with outstretched arms.

If Minucius is not merely trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the gullible pagans, it certainly sounds as though this Christian were denying the divinity of Christ, either regarding him, as did many of the early Christians, as man who was inspired but was not to be identified with God, or claiming, as did a number of later sects, that what appeared on earth and was crucified was merely a ghost, an insubstantial apparition sent by Christ, who himself prudently stayed in his heaven above the clouds and laughed at the fools who thought they could kill a phantom. Of course, our holy men are quite sure that he was "orthodox."

Whether the Christians, of whom there is no certain historical trace before c. 112, were simply a modified or disguised continuation of the *Chrestiani* (i.e., the followers of a Jewish christ who, under the assumed name of Chrestus, evidently persuaded at least the rabble of the huge Jewish colony planted in Rome that the time to start butchering the *goyim* had come) cannot be determined. The word that Tacitus used, as shown by the original reading of the Medicean manuscript (which can still be seen beneath the erasure and "correction" by a later hand) was *Chrestiani* ("quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Chrestianos appellabat"), and the accuracy of that spelling is guaranteed by the fact that Tertullian complains in 197 A.D. and later that the members of his sect are called *Chrestiani* by the wicked pagans, which isn't right at all, because the correct word is *Christiani*.

This is significant because χρηστός [Chrestus], 'useful, serviceable, good,' is a common Greek word and was a name frequently given to slaves of Oriental origin (retained by them as a cognomen when they were emancipated) and was also commonly taken as a name by persons of the lower classes in Asia Minor who wanted to be known by an intelligible Greek name in place of the outlandish Semitic or other native name that was properly theirs (much as Chinese in this country call themselves 'Charlie' or 'Mike'). Cicero's friend, Curio, for example, had a slave or freedman named Chrestus, whom he employed as a kind of journalist to draw up summaries of daily events in Rome for transmission as news to his friends who were out of Italy. Many persons of that name are known. One of them was a Jewish revolutionary agitator, Chrestus, who was regarded as the leader of one of the big Jewish outbreaks in Rome, which, as we know from Suetonius (*Claud.* 25.4), was accompanied by rioting and outrages so gross that Claudius ran all the Jews (except, of course, those who had bought citizenship) out of the city. (It did not work, of course, for while he was having one thrown out of the front door, two were probably crawling in the back windows, and a few years later Rome was more crowded with Jews than ever, and Claudius, when they again made themselves more obnoxious than usual, decided they were too numerous and too deeply entrenched in the economic life of the city to be expelled, and tried to control them by suppressing their synagogues in the city (*Cassius Dio*, LX.6.8). The date of the particular outbreak of which Chrestus was the leader is uncertain. It is assigned to 49-50 A.D. by Koestermann, who has a good article on this subject in *Historia*, XVI (1967), 456-469, but it could have been an outbreak of Jews six or seven years earlier. Accepting Koestermann's date, it occurred between fourteen and fifteen years before the burning of Rome in 64 A.D., for which Nero blamed the *Chrestiani*, who were certainly regarded as a gang or rather horde of Jews who were trying to destroy civilization in the manner of Chrestus, whom they may have venerated as their Karl Marx or Trotsky (Bronstein).

What happened to Chrestus is not known, but it is not impossible he hid to avoid arrest, got out of Rome, and went back to Judaea, if he had been there before, or, if he had not, chose it as a good place to stir up more trouble for civilized men. If so, he could have been arrested and executed there by the Roman authorities. If so, he could have been the basis on which the later myths about Jesus (a very common Jewish name, which could well have been his) were constructed. It is a curious fact that one of the earliest Christian forgeries, known already to Tertullian and antedating most or all of the New Testament, is a supposed letter from Pontius Pilatus describing the Crucifixion, and exists in two versions that are addressed to Claudius as well as in the standard versions in which the reigning emperor is Tiberius. It is hard to see why any Christians should have seen an advantage in placing the Crucifixion so late, but it would be understandable if the story originally concerned Chrestus and the date was moved farther back when it was decided that it would be better to change the name to Christus and pretend that there was no connection. A change from Chrestus to Christus would have been easy to put over

by the end of the Second Century, when the increasing itacism in Greek pronunciation gave *eta* and *iota* the same sound in popular speech. There would be the further advantage that the new name would be unique and unprecedented as a personal name, instead of being a very common name among the lower classes.

The word χριστός [Christus], 'salve, ointment,' was naturally never a name given to persons, but in contemporary Yiddish (i.e., the Jewish dialect of Greek) it was for some reason used as an epithet applied to the Jewish kings who appear in stories in the Old Testament, implying that they had been 'anointed' and so were legitimate. It does occur in the Septuagint. It thus acquired among Jews a connotation that would have made it a logical title to be assumed by a revolutionary agitator who claimed to be a legitimate king of the Jews and also the Messiah whom the Jews had long been awaiting with the expectation that his supernatural powers would enable them to butcher the hated Indo-Europeans without fear of reprisals. It is entirely possible that there was such an agitator, distinct from Chrestus, in the time of Tiberius and that he was executed by the Roman governor of Judaea at that time. You will notice that the stories in the New Testament contain clear vestiges of a claim to be the 'King of the Jews,' which the authors of the stories find it necessary to explain away. In the absence of any historical record one can only speculate, of course, but on the whole I think it more likely that there was an agitator or thaumaturgist named Jesus (i.e. *Yeshua'*, a common contraction of *Yehoshua'*, like Jake for Jacob) in the time of Tiberius than that the whole story was reconstructed from the career of Chrestus. Palestine was full of *goëtae*, fakirs, peddling miracles and revelations to the multitude, and it would not be at all astonishing if one of them tried to set himself up in competition to the established Jewish priests with fatal results or even started a revolutionary movement of some sort that the Roman government nipped in the bud.

The foregoing will explain why it is nearly certain that the *Chrestiani* executed by Nero in 64 A.D. were a mob of Jewish revolutionaries, followers of the notorious Chrestus, who had led the destructive outbreak fourteen or more years before. There is thus no historical evidence for the existence of Christians at so early a date. (The term 'Christian' should obviously be applied only to sects that claim to be derived from a Christus distinct from Chrestus.) For further information on this subject, see the article by Koestermann cited above.

Pliny's letter is our earliest historical evidence for Christians. Pliny was in Bithynia in 112 A.D., and at that time the Christians probably had not yet concocted any 'gospels,' although it is possible, of course, that they had some in secret and were able to conceal them from him. (There is a translation with the text of the letter in the Loeb series.) They convinced Pliny that they were just a bunch of ignorant and superstitious, but innoxious, fanatics, and, as is evident from the letter, Pliny was really astonished to find no evidence that they were guilty of the crimes (such as ritual murders) and anarchistic subversion that he naturally associated with the

name. Since his is the only historical evidence for Christians at so early a date, we have no means of knowing whether he confused *Christiani* with *Chrestiani* (who may still have been active at that time — the Jews were always conspiring against civilization and may have kept the name) — a confusion that was particularly easy because a Roman would have thought it unlikely that a group would call itself ‘the people of the salve,’ which is all the name would mean to anyone who was not a Jew — or there were Christians (i.e., persons who claimed to be followers of a Christus, not Chrestus) who did practice ritual murders and the like. There were such later.

It is certain that the earliest known sects of “Christians,” i.e., followers of one or another of the agitators named Jesus, were enemies of, and probably conspirators against, the Graeco-Romans. The Nazarenes admitted only Jews; the Ebionites, in conformity with the doctrine stated explicitly in the “New Testament” (*Marc. 7.27-29*), although most Christians are too stupid to understand what they read, admitted *goyim* to the status of “whining dogs,” provided they had themselves circumcised and obeyed their divinely-appointed masters, promising them that when Jesus returned with celestial reënforcements and inflicted on the hated Greeks and Romans all the slaughter and torment that is so enthusiastically described in the apocalypse that was included in the “New Testament,” the proselytes would be permitted to lie on the floor behind the tables at which the triumphant Jews banquet and to eat the table scraps thrown to them. This promise, however, understandably failed to attract large numbers of *goyim*, and the superstition got under way only when its doctrines had been modified to facilitate the “conversion” of large numbers of the mongrelized inhabitants of the once-Roman Empire. Many of the early Christian sects disclaimed in various ways a connection with the Jews, and it can scarcely be doubted that the anti-Jewish passages in the “New Testament” were designed to facilitate competition with those sects. It is, I think, most significant that the Christian sect which shrewdly made a deal with the despots of the decaying Roman Empire and thus acquired the legal and military power to exterminate its competitors was one which had assembled a hastily collected and slovenly edited anthology of a few of the numerous gospels and called it a “New Testament,” so that it could carry with it an “Old Testament” of Jewish tales to prove that the Jews were the Chosen Race of the tribal deity whom the Jews had impudently identified with the *animus mundi* of Stoic monotheism as well as with the Ahura-Mazda of the Zoroastrian cult. It may also be significant that the Christians have always used the normal Jewish techniques of fraud and forgery, most obviously when they concocted gospels that purport to have been written by eyewitnesses of miraculous and impossible events. The evidence does not permit us to affirm that Christianity was cunningly invented by the Jews as a means of paralysing the healthy instincts of other races, but we can affirm that *if* the Jews did set out to devise a mental poison that would eventually be lethal to our race, they could have concocted no drug that was more efficacious in the circumstances.

I emphatically call your attention to the obvious fact that the primitive Christian doctrine is a specific demand for the suicide of our race, which survived from the end of the Roman Empire to the present only because our ancestors, of fresh barbarian stock, simply ignored in practice a large part of the pernicious doctrine, especially in northern Europe under essentially aristocratic regimes. Until the disintegration of Protestantism made it possible for any ambitious tailor, clever confidence man, or disgruntled housewife to have "revelations" and pitch the woo at lower classes to make themselves important or fleece the suckers, the professional holy men either contented themselves with telling our people they were "sinful" or used the common devices of theologians to conceal the import of the holy book. (Even so, however, the Catholic dervishes are obviously responsible for the eventual dominance of mestizos in "Latin" America, and many similar misfortunes.)

For the deplorable acceptance of Christianity by the ignorant barbarians of our race, I have tried to account in my book, *Christianity and the Survival of the West*. I would now change nothing in that discussion except to make it more emphatic, for in the years since I wrote it, I have come to the conclusion that, with only numerically insignificant exceptions, the Christians are useless in any effort to preserve our race, and that our domestic enemies are, from their standpoint, well advised to subsidize, as they are now doing, the ranting of evangelical shamans and the revival of menticidal superstitions by every means, including the hiring of technicians who can pose as "scientists" and "prove," by subtle or impudent tricks, the "truth" of the flimsiest hoaxes and the most preposterous notions. The development of Christianity in all the sects of the Western world during the past two centuries has been the progressive elimination from all of them of the elements of our natively Aryan morality that were superimposed on the doctrine before and during the Middle Ages to make it acceptable to our race and so a religion that could not be exported as a whole to other races. With the progressive weakening of our racial instincts, all the cults have been restored to conformity with the "primitive" Christianity of the holy book, i.e., to the undiluted poison of the Jewish originals. I should, perhaps, have made it more explicit in my little book that the effective power of the alien cult is by no means confined to sects that affirm a belief in supernatural beings. As I have stressed in other writings, when the Christian myths became unbelievable, they left in the minds of even intelligent and educated men a residue, the detritus of the rejected mythology, in the form of superstitions about "all mankind," "human rights," and similar figments of the imagination that had gained currency only on the assumption that they had been decreed by an omnipotent deity, so that in practical terms we must regard as basically Christian and religious such irrational cults as Communism and the tangle of fancies that is called "Liberalism" and is the most widely accepted faith among our people today. I am a little encouraged that today some of the more intelligent "Liberals" are at last perceiving that their supposedly rational creed is simply based on the Christian myths they have consciously rejected. I note, for example, that Mary Kenny, who

describes herself as "a former radical" (*The Sunday Telegraph*, 27 January 1980, pp. 8-9), has come to the realization that "so many of the ["Liberals"] political ideas... are religious at root. The search for equality in the secular sense is a replacement of the Judaeo-Christian idea that God loves every individual equally. ...The feelings of guilt or, indeed, pity, which once went into the religious drive, are being transferred to secular ideas to the ultimate destruction of our civilisation."

So far as there is hope for us, it lies, I think, in this belated tendency to take account of biological realities.

-