

# Reflections on the Christ Myth

by Revalo P. Oliver

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

[This booklet and its addendum were previously published, in part, in *Liberty Bell* magazine. -- K.A.S.]

## Contents

**Chapter One: The Christ Myth**

**Chapter Two: Hellenism**

**Chapter Three: Heroic Failure**

**Chapter Four: The New Age**

**Chapter Five: One Hypothesis**

**Chapter Six: An Alternative**

**Appendix**

## CHAPTER ONE: THE CHRIST MYTH

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.

(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 *goēs* who won, and then lost, the favor of Queen Alexandra Helene (Salome), the widow of Alexander Jannaeus, c. 70 B.C.)

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

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 Saviour and worship him as a Son of God and an incarnation of their Yahweh, that would be astounding, wouldn't it? Yes, but not more incredible than the transformation of a Jewish christ into a Saviour 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."

(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.)

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)

(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).)

## CHAPTER TWO: 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)

(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.)

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., Amarah became Ariopolis, and Akko became Ptolemaïs. 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 Encyclopaedia* (12 vols. quarto; New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1901-1906) admits (s.v. 'Hellenism') that "Alexander ... and the first Ptolemies and Seleucids ... treated their Jewish subjects with much benevolence." (9)

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

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 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 Aristeas (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)

(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 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.)

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 Musaeus, 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 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.

(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 Hasmonaean (Maccabaeen) 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 67 B.C., and tried to suppress his elder brother, who was high priest, thus starting the civil war that finally forced the Romans to intervene and restore order in Judaea. A number of other Jews also took the common Greek name.)

A far more moderate and intelligent practitioner of the allegorical method was Philo Judaeus (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)

(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' ('Ihsoaj), 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.)

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 (IÒgoj Ò qe<oj) 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)

(16. *Quod Deus*, 176. "na æj m...a pÒlij 1 o`konmšnh p©sa t³/4u |r...sthñ politeiñ ðgh dhmokrat... an." 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 "dhmokrat...a.")

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 lumps together as the *Letzim*. But we must remember that he remained a Jew. You cannot read very far in Philo's rather copious writings (17) without becoming aware of an alien mentality. He had, as I have said, a good command of the noble language, but when he writes ἡλικία, the corresponding adjective, ἡλικίος, and their derivatives, he does not mean what the words mean in respectable Greek. (18) 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. 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.

(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 allegoriae*.)

(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.)

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).

(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*.)

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

### **CHAPTER THREE: 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 Judaea 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 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 Judaea, 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).

(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.)

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.

(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.)

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 Judaea, 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 rumour 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 following it up by the intervention of an envoy from the Roman Senate, Popillius Laenas, who, in effect, made Egypt a Roman protectorate.  
(22)

(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 Praetor 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.)

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 Hasmonaeus (Asamonaeus 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 Hasmonaeans, 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 Gabae, 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 Hasmonaeans were admitted to 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 Hasmonaeans 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 Hasmonaeans 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.

(23. The Jews never miss an opportunity for Holochoxing, 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.)

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

(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.)

We need not linger over the intricate history of what followed. The Hasmonaeans ruled Judaea, profited from the weakening of the Seleucid Empire to make their country independent, and occupied themselves with wars of aggression against their neighbours 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)

(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 surviving Hellenizers either escaped from Judaea 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.

#### **CHAPTER FOUR: 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 Century (28) in the era now in common use.

(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.)

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

(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 burn 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 christ. The text of Pliny's letter depends on copies made from a manuscript of uncertain date, discovered by a Dominican holy man, Iucundus 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. )

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.

(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.)

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 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.

(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 \Esshno... and \Essa<oi are best attested). The derivation of the word is unknown; for 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.)

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 (*Saošyant*) 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.

(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.)

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

(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).)

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 Judaea 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.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: ONE HYPOTHESIS**

RELATIONS BETWEEN Jews and *goyim* outside Judaea 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 Lacedaemonian 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)

(34. One unfortunate consequence of this theory was a dichotomy between the body (material and therefore subject to the Demiurge) 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.)

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 Lonkej, 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)

(35. The Marcionists were gradually absorbed by the more drastic (and ascetic) church founded by "Manichaeus, 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.)

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).

## **CHAPTER SIX: 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 (tšata ka<sup>^</sup> shme«a megfla) among the people," which sounds as though he were just another of the *goëtae* who swarmed through Asia Minor at that time. (36)

(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.)

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 JESUS (37) and a CHRIST in the minds of his worshipers, by at least the turn of the second century."

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

There was really no reason why the *Letzim* should not have sponsored such a novel cult. For one thing, the real centre of Jewish power was not in Judaea, but in Babylon, which, except for a very brief time, was outside the borders of the Graeco-Roman world, which was increasingly centered in Rome. The greater part of the wealthy Jewish colony in Babylon in 538 B.C. had never thought of migrating to Judaea, 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 Judaea took their orthodoxy lightly, ignoring even the famous injunction about not worshiping 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.

(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.)

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 Judaea 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)

(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.)

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)

(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.)

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 Graeco-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 Judaeans characterized those who worked with their hands ... or for slaves ... or for the 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 Israelites; 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)

(43. For a fuller conspectus of this flagitious record, see Joseph Wheless, *Forgery in Christianity* (New York, Knopf, 1930).)

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 Judaea at the long past time at which the fictitious events were supposed to take place.

## 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.  
(A1)

(A1. 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, Göttingen, 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.)

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. (A2)

(A2. Cf. Note 3 below.)

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 Piraeus, 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, *Politeia* (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 sucker-bait 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, 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. (A3)

(A3. 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.)

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. (A4) 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.

(A4. 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.)

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.

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 Panaetius 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 Panaetius, appealed chiefly to non-Aryan aliens and hybrids.

Panaetius (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. Panaetius 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, Panaetius went to Athens and became head of the Stoic school. His treatise on duty (*Per^ tou kaq»kontoj*) 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. (A5)

(A5. 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 Panaetius and at Rome became the teacher and friend of Cicero. He continued Panaetius'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.)

It is easy to see why Stoicism, which Panaetius 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'état*. 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 they specifically counseled abstention from politics: their most famous maxim was *live obscurely*, or 'avoid attracting public attention,' or 'stay out of the limelight'. (A6)

(A6. 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. )

The New Academy, founded by Carneades (214-128), who revised the radical scepticism of Arcesilaus, was philosophically the finest product of the Greek mind (A7), 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.

(A7. 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.)

The elements of Stoic doctrine which I think you should particularly notice are:

(1) 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. (A8) 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 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.)

(A8. This was neatly stated by Seneca in his *Epistulae morales*, 95 (=XV,3), 52: 'Omne hoc quod vides, quo divina atque humana conclusa sunt, unum est: membra sumus corporis magni; natum nos cognatos edidit. ... Haec nobis amorem indidit mutuum 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).)

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. Caecina Paetus ("*Paete, non dolet.*") Panaetius 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

### 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 (Hësaïas)*, 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 'alëmäh, 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 goy 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)

(1. Not long ago I mentioned the village of Fátima 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, Père Michel de la Sainte Trinité, 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!")

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.

(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 anēr*, 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.))

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 Holohoax that venal "educators" are ramming into the minds of Aryan children 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, Hornblower, 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 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.

(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.)

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 bom 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 Mariae*. (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 Shi'a (the party of 'Ali'), who have a different Prophetic Tradition. Both of these major divisions, needless to say, are split into a large number of sects. Mohammad (1) 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.

(1. 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.)

There are sects of the Shí‘a in many parts of the Moslem world, but that great division is centered in Persia (now called Iran), where the doctrines of the Shí‘a have long been incorporated in government. The recent revolution, which brought Khomeini (2) to power, deposed the Shah on the grounds that he, who was the servant of the occulted *imam* (3) had become a heretic and thus disqualified himself for his sacred office.

(2. 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.)

(3. 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‘iliyah) 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.)

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 successor, and he in turn was succeeded by Uthman. It was accepted that the next in the line of succession would be Ali, the husband of Fatima, Mohammad's daughter.

It was at this point that a Jew, Abdullah ibn Sabá, was converted to Islam and, in obedience to his racial instincts, immediately began to make trouble by paying quasi-divine honours to Ali, which, at least at first, acutely embarrassed that man, and proclaiming that Ali, 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 Uthman, having in some way acquired an ascendancy over A'isha, who had been the favorite wife of Mohammad, and who, as a widow, was implicated in the conspiracy and assassination.

After the murder of Uthman, Ali, the already designated successor, became the fourth and last of the "orthodox Caliphs." Abdullah's party (Shi'a), however, continually stirred up trouble with claims that the first three caliphs 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 Ali. A'isha now joined in a conspiracy against Ali, which paradoxically undertook to avenge the murder of Uthman, and thus precipitated a civil war, in which, no doubt, the parasitic race profited as usual from the losses of both sides. When Ali was assassinated, his succeeding son was still a stripling, but was recognized as the legitimate caliph by the Shi'a, which, when he was killed in battle, proceeded to maintain that the office of Imam, the divinely-ordained religious head of Islam and also ruler of the state, must descend by heredity in the family of Ali, 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

caliphate. And without 'Abdulláh, there would doubtless have been an endless succession of doctrinal heresies, 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 Shí'ite doctrine of taqíyah ('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 Shí'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. (4) 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.

(4. Modern Persian is a language descended (a long ways!) from the Old Persian of Darius and Xerxes.)

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 (Hesaiás), 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.

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 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's 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.

(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 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.)

The most reasonable creation-story that comes to my mind is one told in the fables of Phaedrus. 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 Maeterlinck, who believed in immortal souls and a divinity, remarked, "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 creation-myths 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 Mr. Dale Crowley, 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. Crowley 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. Crowley'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)

(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 (*ruk*) of the *Arabian Nights*), flew over the already existing and therefore uncreated waters in the abyss.)

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.

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)

(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 Graeco-Roman 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 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 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 biogenetic 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-rousing, 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)

(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.)

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 doomed themselves -- a chance, if there is any, of belatedly reviving their racial immune system and recovering from the Christian virus.

The *Sunday Times* published on 31 May 1987 twenty photographs of Labour candidates for the Parliament in the then imminent elections. The pictures must have given nightmares to sane Englishmen for weeks thereafter. There was scarcely a face that did not either show patent traces of racial decay or identify aliens or mongrels masquerading under British names. One candidate's face was that of a ferocious nigger; his counterpart was a black female (named Diane Abbott!), who was quoted as saying, 'All white people are racist.' If only she were right!

*Reflections on the Christ Myth* by R.P. Oliver (48 pages £ 3.00 incl. post & package) published by [Historical Review Press](http://larc.demon.co.uk), PO Box 62, Uckfield, Sussex, TN22 1ZY, UK. Please order now via e-mail [hrp@larc.demon.co.uk](mailto:hrp@larc.demon.co.uk).