

BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM

by Professor Revilo P. Oliver (*Liberty Bell*, August 1985)

I have just listened to a number of tape recordings made by the eminent Biblical scholar, John M. Allegro. Two of these tapes are speeches given when he visited this country in 1983-84, looking for a publisher brave enough to reprint on this side of the Atlantic his *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth*, which had been published in England in 1979. The major publishers, who flood the bookstores with every kind of subversive and demoralizing tripe that can be vended to the semi-literate, were naturally afraid of a book that was not warranted Kosher. As I reported promptly in *Liberty Bell* in September 1984, a publisher was found, Prometheus Books, a small firm in Buffalo, who had nothing to lose, since they had already published a number of volumes that are bad for the spook-business.

To a person already familiar with Allegro's work, the most interesting tape was a recording of an interview with the author followed by rejoinders from several of his former colleagues, now in France or Palestine.

In 1953, thirty-two years ago, an international team, composed of learned men selected for their expert knowledge of early Semitic scripts and languages, was formed to expedite the editing and translation of the great mass of scrolls that then remained unstudied and unpublished. The members of the team divided the work among themselves, and everyone expected that many scrolls of which the contents was still undisclosed would be edited and translated as promptly and satisfactorily as were the scrolls discovered in 1947 and shortly thereafter, of which adequate translations in English, French, or German were made available to the general public between 1949 and 1952. (1)

The papyri found in 1952, political rather than religious, evidently from the command post of Jesus ben Gilgolah, one of the captains of the Jewish insurrectionist, Simeon bar Kokhba, (2) whose revolt lasted from A.D. 132 to 135, were available in translation by 1954. (3) It was reasonable to expect, therefore, that the mass of scrolls entrusted to the international team would be edited and published in a steady stream, beginning no later than 1955.

John Allegro began to publish from his share of the scrolls in 1954 and completed his work on all of them as promptly as could be expected,

although it included what was by far the most difficult single task, the unrolling and reading of the now famous copper scroll which gave an inventory of cult treasures that had been concealed in some safe place, yet unfound; this required delicate work by expert metallurgists under his direction. But now, after thirty-two years, no other member of the team has published his part of the work or more than a few selected snippets. As Allegro says, they have been sitting on more than four hundred documents for more than thirty years. What is the reason?

I cannot be a mere coincidence that Allegro was the only member of the team who was an independent scholar--I am tempted to say that he was the only scholar, for I should like to think that scholarship in the fullest sense includes more than erudition and implies a moral responsibility. All the other members of the international team were connected, in one way or another, with the Jesus-business. They all hold positions in corporations that vend holiness, from the Roman Catholic Church to various of the more literate Protestant sects, and some of them bear names that are Semitic and may indicate that they are Marranos. They are doubtless too learned and intelligent to take seriously the myths that are the stock-in-trade of the salvation-mongers, but they are employed by their corporations, and they are undoubtedly aware that the scrolls first published aroused grave doubts in the minds of many customers who had not before thought about the spiritual wares they were complacently buying. The scrolls they are withholding from publication would certainly undermine the business even more drastically and further reduce the market for invisible and impalpable merchandise. Allegro charges that the holy men are deliberately withholding publication in the hope that public interest in the scrolls, which was so lively in the 1950s, will soon entirely evaporate and the texts can eventually be published quietly in obscure learned journals that only professionals ever see.

The rejoinders indignantly denied the charge. The other members of the team have been toiling with all due speed for thirty years, but haven't published the great mass of the scrolls because the work is difficult, and scholars are dilatory by nature, and anyway they have academic positions (as did Allegro, who held the equivalent of an American professorship in the University of Manchester), and anyway, well, they just haven't got around to it. It requires little knowledge of Christians to recognize the weasel words that are habitual, but what gives the whole show away is what happened in 1956, when Allegro published a text which showed that the Essenes had a "Teacher of Righteousness" who was crucified, c. 88. B.C., by Alexander Jannaeus, a Jewish king of the Maccabean family who had given himself a civilized name, and proved furthermore that the "Teacher of Righteousness" bore the extremely common name of Jesus. (4) This Jesus was recognized as a christ, at least after his death, so the Essene savior must have been at least one of the models for the tales in the

"New Testament" about a Jesus who was crucified about a hundred and twenty years later.

The parallel was sufficient to make even dullards think, and Allegro's colleagues on the international team accused him of "recklessness" in publishing such a text; they ostracized him; and they denied him access to the other scrolls. I refuse to call those shysters 'scholars.' I have no doubt that they are thoroughly proficient as palaeographers and masters of the tricky dialectical variations of Aramaic and cognate languages, but with them, obviously, business comes first. They are Christian holy men: truth is not in them.

(1. By 1956, two substantially complete English translations of all the texts then edited were published in the United States and rather widely sold: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, Viking, 1955), and Theodor H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (New York, Doubleday, 1956). I wrote a brief review of these, together with a worthless book by Edmund Wilson on the same subject, for *National Review*; it is reprinted in *America's Decline*, pp. 114 f. I do not pretend to be a scholar in this rather abstruse field, but I take some satisfaction in this review, written at a time when it was believed that the scrolls had been hidden in caves for safekeeping in anticipation of the Roman siege of Massada in A.D. 69-70. I was, so far as I know, the first to suggest that the real explanation of the storage of scrolls in caves could be found in the gospel called "The Assumption of Moses," which was partly preserved in a Sixth-Century Latin translation, first published in 1861. I indulge my vanity by remarking that that is the explanation accepted and set forth by Allegro in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (p.78) and many other scholars.

Another English translation of the Scrolls, which included two letters from the files of Jesus ben Gilgolah, was appended to the English translation of Gather Geza Vermes's *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (New York, Desclée, 1956,) which reached me too late for inclusion in my review.)

(2. His real name was first learned from these papyri: Simeon ben Kosbah. The designation "bar Kokhba ['son of the Star']" comes from the famous Rabbi Aqiba, the most influential of the many contemporaries who recognized the rebel as the long-awaited christ--until he (like earlier christs) failed, when they, in keeping with the racial habit, rebaptized him "bar Kozibha ['the son of lies']." The spelling of proper names varies considerably among various scholars and writers; e.g., 'Simeon' is more properly 'Simon' in some writers. I try to use here the forms that are most easily recognized. It must be remembered that we are dealing with a language in which only consonants were written and vowels are now supplied on the basis of various linguistic considerations. If I rendered the names exactly as they appear in the original and transliterated the letters into their Roman equivalents, the result would be a series of consonants that would puzzle everyone who is not a scholar in Aramaic and Hebrew. Incidentally, scholars were surprised to learn from the papyri that the insurrectionist made an attempt to revive the use of Hebrew as a racial language.)

(3. Including the letter to Captain Jesus which mentions 'Galileans,' which many take to be one of the early references to Christians, but which could represent, e.g., a contingent of revolutionaries from Galilee. The reading of the crucial words is uncertain, so we do not know what that Jesus was supposed to do with or to the 'Galileans.')

(4. This Jesus appears to have been one of the eight hundred revolutionary conspirators who were crucified by Alexander Jannaeus after he had suppressed their attempted revolt, which was begun while he was away with his army and busy butchering Semites in Asia Minor as industriously as his modern successors in the bandit state of Israel. The Essene Jesus, therefore, cannot have been the Jesus ben Pandera, a thaumaturge and agitator who at first imposed on Alexander's widow, Alexandra Helene (Salome), but lost her favor and was hanged in 70 B.C. (He is mentioned by Ralph Perier in *Religion and Race*, which was first published in *Liberty Bell*, November 1980, and is now available in a reprint from the magazine; Perier, following Dr. Larson, thought Jesus ben Pandera identical with the Essene "Teacher," but the difference in dates of execution makes that impossible.) The Hanging of Jesus ben Pandera probably took the form of binding him to a stake or tree and letting him die slowly as his body was desiccated by the hot sunlight. This was the favorite mode of execution, and was supposed to be especially pleasing to Yahweh, who, when he was dictating the appalling catalogue of his whims to Moses, was careful to frame his language in such a way as to preclude the chance that some recreant Jew might show the contemptible weakness of Aryan dogs and in pity cut short the agonies of the poor wretch tied to the tree, who must be made to suffer to the last moment as he dies of thirst while his body is baked by the blistering sunlight of Palestine. Yahweh's directions were taken down by Moses verbatim and the stenographic record is found on one of the longer Dead Sea scrolls, which was bought by the Jews and has now been translated by Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (New York, Random House, 1985). Yadin believes that this repulsive document was known to the early Christians, as is, of course, quite likely.

Incidentally, Perier is certainly quite right in following Celsus and recognizing 'Pandera' as the Greek (and Latin) word *panthera* ('panther, leopard') and in thinking that Joseph, the Jew who was the father of this Jesus, took the civilized alias because it had acquired a certain dignity from *Pantheras* ('huntsman'), the personal name of Macedonian soldiers in the armies of the Seleucids. Near Bingen on the Rhine was found the sepulchral inscription of an archer in a Roman army who died there at the age of 62 after 40 years of service. His name was Tiberius Julius Abdes Pantera and he came from the territory of Sidon in Phoenicia. The first two words are the Roman name he obligatorily took when he was given Roman citizenship; 'Abdes' is the Semitic name with which he was born, and 'Pant(h)era' is the personal name by which he was generally known to his friends and comrades. For the inscription, see *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, XIII, 7514 = Dessau, *Inscriptiones selectae*, 2571.)

Allegro thinks it likely that the early Christians were conspirators who used gospel stories as camouflage to hide their real purposes, specially their efforts to undermine the Roman Empire, and one of his earlier works, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross* (New York, Doubleday, 1970), presents cogent evidence that they made abundant use of the *Amanita*

muscaria, the mushroom that is one of the world's principal sources of religious inspiration and is portrayed in some early Christian frescoes as the Tree of Life. (5) That the Christians used the hallucinatory drug to induce divine visions and belief in their god is indubitable, but I must here mention evidence, evidently unknown to Allegro, that this source of faith remained in use until relatively recent times. I owe a generous friend specimens of ornaments [pictured in the original--ed.] that are abundantly used to decorate Christmas trees in Bavaria during the Christian celebration of the Winter Solstice.

These representations of the *Amanita muscaria* on the trees that are used in Germanic celebrations of the supposed birth of the supposedly authentic king of the Jews, who was also a piece of their god, are proof that through the Middle Ages, at least, some Christians knew why the sacred mushroom is sacred. One wonders how much use was made of it by theologians as well as mystics. For example, during the controversy over transubstantiation, when wicked sceptics insisted that the bread and wine of the Eucharist tasted like bread and wine and not portions of a cannibalized god, a judicious infusion of the sacred fungus would have convinced the most incredulous that they were really taking a bite of their Jesus, magic meat that gave them all sorts of delightful visions of the wonders they would see and the fun they would have when they retired from this world of unpleasant reality. Not for nothing was the sacred mushroom called "the flesh of the gods" by many primitive peoples. (6)

(5. The *Amanita muscaria* is probably the most common of all sources of religious faith, although, of course, many other hallucinatory drugs have been used for the same purpose. As R. Gordon Wasson (see my next footnote) has proved, it was the *soma* of the Vedas, which inspired the religions of India and Persia and hence had an enormous influence on the formation of ideas about the supernatural in a very large part of the ancient world, including, of course, Christianity. The fungus induces vivid hallucinations (e.g., the Apocalypse that was selected for inclusion in the "New Testament"), but it must be remembered that, as Baudelaire observed, the hallucinations are produced by an imagination set free from the control of waking consciousness, and therefore the hallucinations, as in dreams and the "recollections" of previous lives elicited by hypnosis, can take their departure only from images and ideas that were in the mind before it was alienated by the drug. The *Amanita muscaria* produces divine revelations from ideas already present in the mind by recombining and magnifying them. Infusions of the natural poison in the fungus are not lethal, even in large doses, because they contain both muscarine and atropine, but the muscarine, which can be extracted by a simple chemical process, is almost always deadly, unless atropine is promptly administered as an antidote; that is why muscarine is sometimes used instead of arsenic to resolve domestic difficulties. The sacred mushroom must not be confused with the *Amanita phalloides*, the most deadly of all mushrooms.)

(6. See *The Flesh of Gods, the Ritual Use of Hallucinogens*, a symposium edited by Peter T. Furst (New York, Praeger, 1972). The articles deal principally with the savages of the Western Hemisphere, but include a summary of Wasson's identification of *soma*. It is

often supposed that the *Amanita muscaria* was used in the early Christian's "Love-feast," called *agape* in Christian jargon. It would be a neat irony if, as is entirely possible, the idea of such "love-feasts" arose from the scribe's error when he, by a slip of his own pen or by misreading the text he was copying, wrote in the second letter forged in the name of Peter (2.13) _____ instead of _____ [cannot render to ASCII script; see original--Ed.], so that the meaning 'in their trick' was replaced by a word meaning 'in their loves,' which, being unintelligible in the context, was then assumed to designate 'love-feasts' in which the darling little Christians cuddled one another. (The copyists wrote Greek uncials, of course, in which the misreading would be even easier than in the capitals by which I have had to represent them, since uncial types are rare in modern printing.) The correct reading ('tricks') is preserved in some of the oldest manuscripts and is adopted in modern editions of the "New Testament." The earliest datable reference to such "love-feasts" was made by Tertullian in his *Apologeticum* (39.16: "cena nostra...id vocatur quod dilectio penes Graecos") written around 197 A.D. to claim, with a shyster lawyer's ingenuity, that Christians were innocent little lambs instead of political conspirators, as the Romans suspected (correctly, according to Allegro). The letter forged in the name of Peter had doubtless been concocted several decades before 197.)

Christian doctrine is deduced from the tales which Allegro believes to have been concocted as cover for the political conspiracy in which the cults or, at least, their leaders were secretly engaged. It is, of course, highly probable that Christianity was propagated as a conspiracy against the Roman Empire, as the historical evidence has always indicated. (7) It is significant that the scribbling of gospels seems not to have begun until quite some time after the year 112, (8) and the failure of the great Jewish conspiracy of 117, which finally gave conclusive evidence that old Yahweh couldn't argue with Roman Legions when they moved in. With the purposes and operation of that conspiracy, however, we need not concern ourselves here; a discussion of it would extend to an inordinate length, and we shall here consider only the exoteric doctrine.

The Christian myths, as set forth in the gospels that were selected for inclusion in the "New Testament," (9) are, as the Dead Sea Scrolls have now made indubitable, a sheaf of inconsistent narratives that represent the doctrines of the Jewish Essenes as modified by elements introduced to make them acceptable to *goyim* and to cover up their racial exclusiveness. It has long been a commonplace that Christianity is an Hellenized form of Judaism. The statement in that form has often been misleading.

As Allegro bluntly says, no intelligent Greek or Roman could have believed those ridiculous tales. When we say that the Jewish notions were Hellenized, we mean that they were made acceptable to the multi-racial masses that were Hellenized by the conquests of Alexander the Great, after which the populations of all the Asiatic nations within his empire learned Greek, the language of civilization, to imitate the externals of

Greek thinking and writing, and emulated the manners and customs of the Greek colonists who settled in their territories. They were no more Greek than English-speaking Hindus or Chinese are Englishmen. And under their veneer of Greek culture, they retained the mental proclivities of their various races and their propensity toward favorite superstitions, many of which had some superficial similarity to Greek myths. (10) The Greeks, like the Romans after them, were too intelligent to become fanatical about ghost stories; they were primarily interested in the real world, and while they in general thought it likely that gods did exist, they rationally saw that no one could know how many gods there were or what gods might exist in any given place. They were willing to tolerate and respect any cult, however absurd, so long as it did not menace them, and their Hellenized subjects developed all sorts of weird blends of native superstitions with Greek externals.

When Christianity was being peddled to the proletariat in the Roman Empire, intelligent Greeks and Romans would have been merely amused by its bizarre doctrines. A god who stupidly got himself crucified and then arose from the dead and sneaked out of town? Well, every town in Asia Minor had its own local god, identified as an aspect of a Greek god or at least given a name that sounded Greek, and worshipped by the townsmen as the "greatest of the gods" (*megistos t' n the' n*), and some of them were almost ridiculous. Women are nasty creatures that should be avoided as much as possible? Well, the damned fools are depriving themselves of one of the great joys of life, but it would be a waste of breath to try to talk sense to the perverted idiots who are harming only themselves.

Greeks and Romans, except a few neurotics, the tares of the race, who always try to attract attention by professing some grotesque eccentricity, would have had only an amused contempt for Christian doctrine, but by the middle of the Second Century, when the slightly disguised Jewish cult was being vended by apostles of ignorance, there were few Greeks and Romans left. They had destroyed themselves by miscegenation, internecine wars, and that fatuous tolerance with which they permitted themselves to be displaced by their subjects and slaves.

The populations of the European provinces were Aryan and racially compatible. To Italy came Celtiberians from Spain, Germanic and Celtic peoples from Gaul, Germans from the western part of Germany. But they were outnumbered and outwitted by hordes that were unalterably alien. To Rome from northern Africa came Berbers and Semites; from Egypt, degenerate Greeks and Hamitic mongrels, many of them bearing some taint of Black blood; from Asia, partly Greek hybrids, Semites, and all the fermenting mixture of the racial compost heap that Asia Minor had become; and, of course, to the capital of the ancient world flocked the ubiquitous Jews. (11)

The Hellenized aliens from the East spoke Greek and were the *Graeculi* of Cicero's sarcasms and Juvenal's satires; they multiplied and squeezed the Romans out of their own country. As Juvenal said, the mud that was drained out of Syria had polluted the Tiber; Rome had ceased to be Roman even in his time.

The Orientals brought with them their own racial superstitions ("Credat Iudaeus Apella, non ego, said Horace: a sexuality mutilated Jew may believe such stuff, but I can't); and they brought with them their cunning in peddling their superstitions to cheat the unwary. The Asiatic rabble could become Roman only in name. (12) Beneath a superficial acquaintance with Greek culture lay, innate and ineradicable, the slave mentality, devoid of self-respect, perfidious and obsequious to its masters, born to cringe and swindle, craving the despotism under which it flourishes. And with the slave mentality went the *Sklaven-Moral* which, as Nietzsche saw, was the essence of Christianity.

The barbaric new religion, adroitly promoted by its professional holy men with the covert support of the Jews, (13) naturally appealed to the mongrel proletariat of the rotting empire with its talk of love and brotherhood to cover its hatred of all superiority, of civilization itself. It was to "make folly of the wisdom of this world," thus negating all learning, all culture, and repudiating reason itself. It promised to envy and malice that the rich and prosperous would be tortured in Hell forever and forever, if they did not now make paupers of themselves, to the profit of the ranting witch-doctors. To the dregs of the Empire that was Roman only in name, Christianity was what catnip is to cats.

(7. The Romans were an eminently practical people who tried to disturb the native cultures of their various subjects as little as possible and certainly were not in the least interested in whatever silly superstitions the natives liked to believe. They tolerated all sorts of cults as absurd as Christianity and would have tolerated it, if they had not had good grounds for believing it to be politically subversive. Most of the evidence for the conspiratorial activities of the Christians has been lost together with the historical works in which it was recorded, which the Fathers of the Church were undoubtedly anxious to destroy as soon as they had cunningly climbed to political power. Their wish to find some evidence for the existence to their organized superstition as an impossibly earlier date preserved the record of the Jewish Bolsheviks who confessed to having set the great fire that destroyed much of Rome in A.D. 64, and who, together with their confederates, were condignly executed by Nero, although with deplorable cruelty. Those Bolsheviks were called Chrestiani at Rome, just as Marxists today take their name from the name assumed by the Jew who devised their superstition. A Jew who bore the Greek name Chrestos had incited among the Jews who had swarmed into Rome a riot or attempted revolt so formidable that the troops had to be called in to suppress it in the time of Claudius, so the followers of his revolutionary doctrine and conspiracy were naturally called Chrestiani

and they obviously constituted a latent menace with which the responsible Roman government had to deal. Whether the Chrestiani eventually disguised themselves as Christiani or the latter were a separate cult is made uncertain by the loss of the relevant evidence. Tertullian, who was as brazen a liar as any of the Fathers, admitted that his Christiani were the same cult as the Chrestiani, but had the effrontery to claim that the latter were so called from the meaning of the Greek common noun, *chrestos* ('useful, efficient, trustworthy'), because they were such excellent citizens!)

(8. If the Christians who were interrogated by Pliny in Bithynia in 112 or the following year had had any written gospels, they would certainly have produced them in support of their claim that they were just innocent, law-abiding, innocuous members of the lower classes. Pliny was a kindly man, who like to think the best of everyone, and they did succeed in convincing him they were guilty of nothing but a debased and preposterous superstition, which was beneath the notice of a Roman government, and he was gratified when he saw that the cult lost its popularity after he took judicial notice of it. His letter, probably written in 113, is the earliest historical evidence for the existence of Christians (as distinguished from Chrestiani). The learned Leon Herrmann has argued that Pliny's famous letter was grossly interpolated, if not forged, by the later Christians to whitewash their cult (see his *Chrestos*, Bruxells, Latomus, 1970), but Herrmann is prone to extravagant theses of all kinds, and I do not find his arguments convincing. I regard the letter as genuine, since the Christians' apologies for their cult are precisely what they would allege in such circumstances, and if they had secrets, they were able to prevent Pliny from finding proof of them. (There is a serious textual corruption in Chapter 10 of the letter, but this is not the place to discuss emendation of it.) In his reply to Pliny's letter, Trajan clearly believes that the Christian cult covers a subversive conspiracy, but that most of the Christians are just ignorant and probably inoffensive proletarians who will come to their senses and leave the cult, if governmental action is directed only against the contumacious leaders, who probably are conscious conspirators. The analogy with Communism today is obvious. The text of Pliny's letter depends on a Sixth-Century manuscript of which only copies now survive, so it is quite possible that, as Professor Renahan has argued, Pliny's spelling of the word was Chrestiani.)

(9. This is a necessary proviso, for obviously Allegro did not intend to consider, and we cannot here consider, the vast number of other gospels, most of which the Fathers of the Church succeeded in destroying when they got control and could start the savage persecutions that so delight Christian hearts. It is noteworthy that many of the Christian cults thus suppressed with fire and sword were overtly anti-Jewish ('Nazis,' no doubt!) and rejected the horrible god of the "Old Testament." Their myths were necessarily quite different. Marcion, for example, had letters attributed to Paul, who seems to have been the Jew who started peddling the Jewish cult to *goyim*, but his letters must have differed from the letters in the "New Testament" written under Paul's name by a committee that was in general agreement about the line they were to follow. The committee's work, however, is probably the oldest part of the "New Testament," for they seem to have worked before the leading gospels were composed, possibly even before A.D. 100 and certainly before c. 150. The earlier dates commonly given in reference works come from theologians and others who try or profess to believe as much of the Christian tradition as has not yet been exposed in detail as sheer mendacity.)

(10. The learned Michael C. Astour, in a very erudite work, *Hellenosemitica* (Leisden, Brill, 1967), traces many Greek myths to Semitic prototypes and thinks he has accomplished great things. What he overlooks or ignores is the fundamental difference in mentality between the two races. If, for example, we grant that the Semitic belief he cites suggested the well-known myth of Zeus and Io, the similarity between the stories is less than the contrast. In the Semitic version, the supreme god, Baal, admires a cow, copulates with her, and engenders a son. In the Greek myth, Zeus seduces a beautiful princess, but transforms her temporarily into a heifer to conceal her from the jealously of Hera, who, however, is not deceived and sends a gadfly to drive the heifer to Egypt. In Egypt, Io recovers her human form, gives birth to Zeus's child, and herself becomes the Egyptian goddess Hathor, i.e., a woman who retains of the bovine shape only the horns on her head (which, in the Egyptian iconography, held the solar disk between them, as was appropriate for a goddess of the sky.) The myth is obviously a syncretistic fancy, not a religious belief. Christians, their minds twisted by having to believe somehow that the wild tales in their holy book actually happened and are historical truth, find it difficult to understand the more rational religion of Greece and Rome, which acknowledged the existence of certain gods who were personifications of natural phenomena, but never believed that the myths about the personal conduct of those gods were history or more than exercises of the imagination, which any poet or story-teller was free to revise or invent to suit his fancy or his literary purpose. (By the way, if you are interested in determining whether or not the Jews originally thought of their Yahweh as having the form or the head of an onager (wild ass), you should note as possibly relevant what Astour says on p.86 about the primary meaning of the Hebrew word in *Genesis 16.12.*))

(11. By 179 B.C. the Jews had become so numerous in Rome and so active in spreading corruption and crime that P. Cornelius Scipio Hispalus, when he was Urban Pretor, tried to expel all of the Jews who had neglected to acquire Roman citizenship, but it is likely that for every one that he threw out of the front door, two crawled over the back fence, and the Jews were able to prevent his successors in that office from continuing the patriotic policy. In Cicero's time, the Jews in Rome were able to produce economic crises and profit from them, and to instigate, under various pretexts, political prosecution of provincial governors who impeded their spoliations. They naturally fostered subversion of the Republic and were, for their own purposes, devoted to Julius Caesar, whose revolution destroyed it. They bewailed his death as a calamity to their race, but of course, doubtless used it to gain more power and loot during the Civil Wars that followed it.)

(12. Christian ideology, even more than Christian lies, long distorted our perception of even the established facts of Roman history. Consider, for example, the recently republished book by Alexander Del Mar, *The Middle Ages Revisited, or The Roman Government and Religion and their Relations to Britain* (London, 1899, Hawthorpe, California, Omni, s.a. [1984]). It begins: "The corner-stone of the Empire was the worship of Octavius [sic] Caesar as the Son of God, Divus [sic, for 'Divi'] Filius. Augustus was worshipped not as a hero or demi-god, but as a Messiah, an incarnation of the Deity....sent on earth...in pursuance of a heavenly design, which was to bring peace on earth, heal the wounds and iniquities of the past, restore the Golden Age to Latium, and fulfill the prophesies of the Cumæan Sibyl." Nonsense! To begin with, the statement is largely based on Vergil's famous fourth eclogue, which had nothing to do with Octavian (who, at that time, was only second in the Triumvirate and scheming to knock out his colleagues). The poem, which must be read in its context, a collection of poems dealing with the dream-world of the pastorals, is a fantasy that reflects extravagant hopes for an end to the Civil Wars that had racked and half-destroyed three generations of

Romans. It is a romantic transfiguration of the hopes that contemporaries were able to cherish for a year or two, that domestic peace would at last be inaugurated by the fusion of rival ambitions in a son to be born of Mark Antony and Octavian's sister, Ocatavia. (On the identity of the child, see W.W. Tarn in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXII (1932), pp. 132 ff.) The confusion began when Eusebius, one of the most wily and mendacious of the Fathers of the Church, probably told his fellow directors of the business, "Let's tell the suckers that Vergil's fourth eclogue was a prediction of our Jesus: that'll wow'em!" He then proceeded to put that imposture in the mouth of Constantine, to whom he attributed it in one of his orations. The hoax was so successful that it was still taken seriously by educated men (e.g., Alexander Pope) in the Eighteenth Century.

There is nothing Jewish and "messianic" about the eclogue, which merely complemented the pleasing illusions of the pastoral poems that surround it. *Redeunt Saturnia regna*: we shall return to the simple and honest life of the shepherds in the Golden Age, before men became corrupted by greed and ambition. There is no nonsense about Salvation and the postmortem joys of spooks made immortal by magic.

What is more serious, is the total misconception of religion and government at Rome. At Rome, Octavian, even after he attained sole power, had to content himself with the ambiguous title 'Augustus' and a tradition that the Julian family, into which he had been adopted, owed its origin, eight hundred years before, to a hero who was the child of a mortal man and goddess. And at Rome, Octavian Augustus exerted himself to make it seem that he was only the First Citizen of Rome, a man charged with administering the true will of the Roman people. At Rome, he never dared to pretend to superhuman distinction, but in Egypt he was a god *ex officio*, being the successor of the Egyptian rulers who are now called pharaohs because the ignorant Jew who composed the silly and well-known tale about Moses in the Jew-book didn't know what the Egyptian word meant and was too lazy to find out. Like Egyptian rulers, the monarchs of the early Orient, especially the Semites, liked to impress their ignorant subjects by posing as Sons of Gods and Gods themselves, and after the conquests of Alexander, the Greek-speaking Orientals were glad to flatter any ruler by calling him a god and worshipping him, and they naturally worshipped Roman emperors, and tried to worship even Roman governors, in the hope that the adulation would bring them some baksheesh.

It is true that after his death, Augustus was deified by a transparent hoax that made Romans chuckle, and the newly created divinity was placated by the *Augustales*, a kind of priesthood that was instituted for freedmen and others whose low birth prevented them from attaining any of the respectable quasi-religious distinctions.

It became customary to deify emperors who were adroit enough to die in their beds, and the cynical Vespasian died with a jest on his lips, "Hell! I guess I'm becoming a god!" And for a very long time the rulers of Rome, though great gods in the Orient, had to content themselves with a post-mortem apotheosis that was no more deceptive to rational men than the mummery of the elaborate funerals, at which a caged eagle was placed atop the high funeral pyre and, when the flames mounted, released and, as he flew aloft, identified as the soul of the deceased on its way to Heaven. Deification was a kind of posthumous honor that at Rome the Senate awarded to emperors who had deserved it or had successors who extorted it. During their lifetimes, prudent emperors before the time of Diocletian, no matter how absolute their power, at Rome claimed to be only *principes* and *imperatores*: the ruler was only First Citizen and General of the Armies.

But would you guess the facts from Del Mar's generalization, which I quoted above, or what you will find in comparable works?)

(13. It cannot be a coincidence that the brand of Christianity that the Fathers put over was one which lugged with it the "Old Testament" and identified Yahweh, the big Jew up in the clouds, as the Christian god, or that the first concern of the fathers, as soon as they got their hands on governmental power, was to exterminate the Marconists, the Manichaeans, and all the other Christian sects that refused to accept as their god the fiend of the "Old Testament." By utilizing some passages in the gospels that sprang from antagonism between rival Jewish factions and stigmatized opponents as a "synagogue of Satan," the Fathers could serve the Jews by promoting a factitious antagonism between the Jews and their Judaized *goyim*. That was simply in keeping with the Hegelian principle of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. It was comparable to the factitious animosity between "Trotskyites" and "Stalinists," between "Communists" and "Capitalists," between "Fabian" and "Soviet Socialists," and currently between the government in Washington and the one in Moscow. Such spurious animosities, which are genuine enough among the small fry, serve to keep the victims confused and to conceal the direction of both factions by the same occult power behind both. In the Roman Empire, the Christians served as a perfect screen for the Jews, whom they professed to hate, thus conciliating the sympathies and soliciting the adherence of all the people of every other race who naturally hated the Jews, and at the same time keeping the attention of the Roman government focused on the Christians while the Jews professed to be innocent of all revolutionary designs.)

The facts of race explain the success of the Christian sect headed by the Fathers of the Church in taking over the decaying Roman Empire. We have a different racial problem when we ask why our Germanic ancestors, the barbarians who invaded and conquered the western half of that empire, succumbed to the same epidemic.

The most pervasive arguments for Christianity were the monuments of greatness that the sect had not destroyed: the great Roman roads, the amazing bridges and aqueducts, the amphitheatres, the massive baths and other edifices, the sculpture and painting that had escaped proletarian righteousness, the literature that could by its sonority delight even those who could not understand it, the elaborate system of laws and social organization, the technology which was faltering but still impressive, and the tactics and discipline that made formidable armies recruited largely from the Germanic barbarians. All these achievements the marvelling invaders credited to the Christians, who also adapted ancient showmanship to their own impressive ceremonies.

The Northern mythologies, although they reached sublimity in their grim pessimism and prevision of the *Gotterdämmerung*, were, like the Classical, inventions of poetic imaginations in their reports of the activities of the various gods, obviously fanciful and subject to revision by the skalds who recited them or alluded to them. Some were overtly unbelievable, (14) and many, unlike the Classical myths, were so crude

and grotesque that they may have been devised to excite ribald laughter rather than to charm by a sensuous grace. (15) They could not be, and did not purport to be, reports of ascertained fact.

(14. E.g., the famous story that Heimdall created the human race by successively visiting three households and enabling the wives to conceive, whether by their husbands or himself is not clear. The story is obviously a fanciful account of two successive Aryan migrations into a land occupied by Lapps. Heimdall, by the way, did better than Jesus: he was born, not of just one, but of nine virgins (meyja), which, you must admit, is nine times as miraculous.)

(15. E.g. the trick played on Odin, who drank from a horn connected with the sea and was able to gulp down only part of the ocean, or the adventures of Thor when he put on a skirt and women's ornaments and pretended to be a blushing bride. (I suppose he shaved first!))

In opposition to the Northern religions, the Christians were able to offer the collection of pseudo-historical fiction called the Bible, which despite its many internal contradictions, purports to be a record of ascertained facts, history as distinct from mythology.

It seemed to be true history, written down in an enormous book and in a language, much more cultivated and exact than Norse, which the holy men could read, and it referred to places in the real world, such as Rome and Egypt, of which everyone had heard, and to historical persons, such as Augustus, who had ruled the empire that had once ruled the world. And if the terrible god whose deeds were recorded in imperishable writing by eye-witnesses, behaved capriciously, unjustly, and brutally, so, according to traditions that had been handed down by word of mouth in many versions, had Odin; and if the Christians' old god had an eccentric son, who chose to sacrifice himself to himself, why Odin had done that, too -- so some verse-singer said, who didn't name a time and place, as the written history did so precisely!

One can understand why our ancestors took the bait offered them by the zealous Christian missionaries, some of whom were prestidigitators who could demonstrate magic, and all of whom were skilled in dialectical subtleties and the clever sophistries of theologians. Then there was the practical side, too. If you got yourself spattered with magic water and ate a *filet de J_sus* washed down with some of his divinely invigorating blood, you, if you had a good army, could invade the land of some pagans or, better yet, heretics, and the Christians' god would help you, if your army

was much larger and better equipped, and you could not only carry off a lot of booty and have a lot of fun plundering for the Lord, but you would be lavishly rewarded for your piety when you zipped up to Heaven after death. That was a real bargain. Odin never gave you a deal like that!

It happens all the time. Nice people, their minds aglow with all the nice things the fast-talking salesman has told them, sign of the dotted line, without reading the two pages of small print. Our simple-minded ancestors mortgaged their future and ours without knowing what they had done. And those remote ancestors never suspected what they had done. Jewish holiness was imposed on our people only slowly, much as the American boobs today are being subjected to Soviet-type Communism by easy stages and never guess how each little surrender of personal liberty to achieve some righteous purpose tightens the bonds they put upon themselves, and do not even now perceive that they have already made themselves virtually helpless.

Christianity was imposed on the barbarian "converts" gradually. At first, it was only a matter of learning to say "Christ" (supposed to be the personal name of a god) instead of "Thor," and to fee a different priest. Established customs and conventions were not radically changed but slowly eroded. Transgressors of the new rules were at first told, "You really shouldn't, but if you will do penance by paying for a new altar in the church, we'll make it all right with the boss." It was not until the monopoly of the international holiness business was broken by Protestant competitors that a strict enforcement of the "Thou shalt not" rules was attempted.

The erosion of our racial mentality can be neatly summarized by noting three stages from "paganism" to the present. If you invade a country because you want to take it over for your own people and annex it, your act may not be prudent, but it is at least honest. If you invade a territory to occupy and annex it because you know that Jesus is of the *same* substance as his daddy and want to save the souls of the poor wretches who will be fried for all eternity if they continue to hold to the damnable opinion that Jesus's substance is only *like* his papa's, well, you have become a pious hypocrite and may even endanger your own sanity by lying to yourself, but at least you get the territory after you have killed enough of the miscreants to convince them you know more about the physiology of gods. But if you invade a country you do not intend to annex, and impoverish your own nation genetically by squandering the lives of your young men, and economically by wasting its resources, just to slaughter enough of another country's inhabitants to redeem them from the sins of Arminianism or Militarism or Nationalism and to convince them of the superior righteousness of your "democracy," you may succeed in sacrificing your own people to impose your brand of holiness on people who don't want it, but you have become a homicidal maniac and menace

to all the rest of the world. And such insanity is the terminal phase of the disease our ancestors ignorantly contracted so many centuries ago.

One could fill many volumes by tracing the decay of our racial mentality, but one example will suffice.

In the seventeenth Century a considerable number of Englishmen, who had read the Jew-book until their minds were so warped they couldn't get along with their neighbors in England, migrated to what is now New England. We have all heard about the "stern and rockbound coast" and the land they made "holy ground" by their determination to worship their god in their own way, and it is true that they bore many hardships bravely and that, although they wasted some time by preaching to Indians instead of killing them, they did acquire the territory they wanted. They are said to have shown a certain admirable commercial honesty, although it is not clear how that is to be reconciled to the reputation of Yankees as being second only to Jews in diddling unwary customers. The Puritans had an especially Judaic form of Christianity, but so long as they were content to harass only each other with their righteousness, we have no reason for censuring them. *De gustibus* and all that.

The Puritans, however, soon felt the religious itch to spread their holiness by meddling in other people's affairs, and they doubtless have some responsibility for accelerating the progress of the disease in this country and bringing it to the stage of high fever and delirium. When their malice and envy was excited by the prosperity and culture of the southern states and, no doubt, the contrast between the climate of the South and the harsh winters of the bleak land they had chosen for themselves, their Christian lust to destroy became acute, and from New England came the plague of Abolitionists, who hypocritically pretended love for niggers to cover their yearning to impoverish and ruin the South.

The hate-crazed fanatics were eventually able to instigate an armed invasion of the Southern states, with, of course, the clandestine but powerful help of the Jews, who know how to profit richly from every disaster to the nation in which they have lodged themselves. And they do so righteously, for, as all Christians know, old Yahweh promised (Exod. 23.27-30 *et passim*) to help his pet bandits destroy every people whose territory they infiltrate, and to do it by stages until the Jews have multiplied sufficiently to take the whole territory for themselves.

I shall now quote three pages from the booklet, *The Black Death*, by Andrew Grayson, which, reproduced photographically from typewritten copy, has been distributed by the Southern National Party.

Beginning in the early years of the 19th Century and rising to a crescendo by mid-century, a veritable theology of hate came to be espoused in the North Meetings were held throughout the Northern states--especially in New England--and from the pulpits, rostrums, stumps, and public halls enemies of the South called for a grand crusade of extermination against the Southern people.

Lamar Fontaine, C.E., Ph.D., of Lyons, Mississippi, who lived through Reconstruction, wrote: "Thus it was that for two years after the close of the Great War [the War of Southern Independence] in every hamlet and convention hall in the North thousands of preachers, orators, and teachers dinned into the ears of the listening multitudes their fiendish venom until a wild wave of fanatical, insane New England Puritan hate swept like an East Indian hurricane over the entire North... Then a species of Negro insanity raged among the Negrophiles of the New England states and it too spread like a prairie fire and took possession of the unthinking masses. Books and pamphlets fell from the New England presses like hail from a passing cloud. Men and women, from the pulpit and rostrum, advocated the mixing of the Negro and the White races and the establishment of a Negro Republic in the South after its conquered people had first been destroyed and the land rendered, as Parson Brownlow expressed, 'as God found it, without form and void.' "

Within eight hours of U.S. President Lincoln's death, a caucus of radical Republicans under Thaddeus Stevens went to work setting into motion the evil machination which would come to be called "Radical Reconstruction"--an experience which would be lasered into the mind, heart, soul, and fibre of the Southland and her people forever.

During the era of rabid, all-consuming hate, Henry Ward Beecher asserted: "The Negro is superior to the White race. If the latter do not forget their pride and color, and amalgamate with the purer and richer blood of the Blacks, they will die out and wither away in unprolific skinniness."

Judge Salmon P. Chase, a member of Lincoln's Cabinet, paid a visit to the South after the surrender. Returning home, he said: "I found the Whites a worn out, effete race, without vigor, mental or physical. On the contrary, the Negroes are alive, alert, and full of energy. I predict in 25 years the Negroes of the South will be at the head of all affairs, political, religious, the arts and sciences."

From the pulpit of Beecher's church, Wendell Phillips delivered the following words: "You may plant a fort in every district of the South, you may take possession of her capitols and hold them with your armies, but you have not begun to subdue her people. I know it means something like absolute barbarian conquest, but I do not believe there will be any peace until 347,000 men of the South are either hanged or exiled."

At a New York convention, Parson William G. Brownlow, one-time Carpetbag governor of Tennessee, said: "If I had the power, I would arm every wolf, panther, catamount, and bear in the mountains of America, every crocodile in the swamps of Florida, every Negro in the South, and every devil in Hell, clothe them in the uniform of the Federal Army and turn them loose on the Rebels of the South and exterminate every man, woman and child south of Mason and Dixon's Line. I would like to see Negro troops, under the command of (U.S. General Benjamin F.) Butler, crowd every rebel into the Gulf of Mexico and drown them as the Devil did the hogs in the Sea of Galilee."

In another spot Brownlow said: "I am one who believes the war ended too soon. We have whipped the South, but not enough. The loyal masses [of the North]...intend to march again on the South, and they intend this [second] war shall be no child's play. The second army will, as [it] ought to, make the entire South as God found the Earth--without form, and void."

Following Brownlow's speech, Governor Yates of Illinois rose from his seat and said: "Illinois furnished 250,000 troops to fight the South, and now we are ready to furnish 500,000 more to finish the good work."

Even as late as 1875--ten years after the end of the war--William Gray, Mississippi Governor Ames' right-hand man, "assailed the Whites before his Colored audiences

asserting that the Republicans would win [the next election] even if it were necessary 'to kill every White man, woman, and child in the state.'"

With the support and approval of such fine Christian men--expressing as they were such beautiful sentiments of humanitarian compassion and brotherhood--the Congress of the United States of America forged ahead in pursuit of fulfilling these Yankee dreams of morbid utopia. The Union President, Andrew Jackson, and the Union Supreme Court were castrated and nullified in quick succession, and the Republican Party, which was for all intents and purposes the government of the United States of America, set about constructing a stacked deck in every southern state, built upon a solid base of Negroes, and enforced by federal bayonets. Behind even the pettiest local Carpetbagger, Scallawag, or Negro, there stretched an obscene hierarchy leading to the very highest layers of the government of the United States of America; a hierarchy which encompassed all local and state government including the governor and the Federal government, including the Army, the Congress, and, after the election of 1868, the President of the United States of America.

The institution of radical Reconstruction marked the beginning of the largest, most malicious and most malignant social, political, and racial experiment in the history of the Northern European White race up to that time. It was a premeditated program of economic colonialism, social and political Africanization, and racial and national genocide.

Never before had one White government, people, or nation sought to subjugate another White people or nation, and make of that second nation a colony to be bled bone dry, rather than employing the standard practice of developing a colony into a source of long-term return on investments.

THIS the Government of the United States of America DID.

Never before had one White government, people, or nation sought to place the whole multi-million population of another White people or nation under the heel, rule, and tyranny of a non-White people.

THIS the Government of the United States of America
DID.

And never before had one White government, people, nation sought to place another White people or nation in a position of absolute defencelessness so as to enable and ensure that the second White people or nation would be bred and butchered out of existence by a non-White people or race.

THIS the Government of the United States of America
DID.

Under this malevolent experiment, the South very nearly perished in a maelstrom of hate and corruption, terror, and vampirism. As it took shape, this toxic policy exposed to the South an indescribably evil fact of the U.S.

Government; a facet which the U.S. Government would keep hidden from the rest of the Union, and from the world, for another seven to ten decades; a facet which would spread during those seven to ten decades until it came to dominate every other facet of the U.S. Government and deeply influence its every thought and act, its every policy and deed.

The government of the United States of America was to become to the South what Attila the Hun had been to the nations of Eastern Europe: "The Scourge of God." Had the South intentionally conjured up the worst possible enemy imaginable, it could not have invented one worse than the government of the United States, not even in its most fevered dreams and nightmares.

You will have noticed that in the foregoing excerpts from Mr. Grayson's booklet, all of the screams of righteous blood-lust that he quotes were uttered *after* the conclusion of an iniquitous war in which the aggressors also suffered, although their homes were not destroyed and their country made desolate. About a million men were killed or grievously wounded (losing arms or legs or suffering other permanent injuries) in that catastrophe--approximately 21% of all men of military age in both the North and the South, and 60% in the South alone. That was not enough blood to slake the lusts of the diseased creatures he quotes.

Let me particularly and emphatically call your attention to the fact that none of the homicidal maniacs he quotes was a Jew, and, so far as can be determined, none of them had a drop of Jewish blood. They were all Anglo-Saxons whose minds had been rotted by a disease as deadly as kuru and more disastrous, for it did not prevent them from gesticulating and talking and inducing nitwits to listen to them as with foaming mouths they raved in their pulpits or university chairs or the governmental offices to which fools elected them. What was even more disastrous, they infected with their loathsome disease generations of men and women of our race, whose multitudinous descendants you hear every day as they howl about "brotherhood" and "civil rights" and, whether consciously or subconsciously, obey their murderous yearning to exterminate the race to which they *and we* belong.

If any of the quotations in the excerpt above astonished you, remember that for generations venal "American historians" most of them also Anglo-Saxons, have been as ready as the Fathers of the Church to lie and forge for sweet righteousness's sake, and "educators" have injected their lies into the minds of school children, who are told about our glorious "Civil War" and how noble it was to emancipate those darling savages by killing so many of the young men who included the best blood of our race and thus genetically impoverishing our nation and our race forever.

As a result of that great catastrophe, the level of intelligence in America sank so low that, instead of learning from the terrible Holy War against the South, hordes of nitwits rushed to Europe in 1917 and 1941 to fight more insane Holy Wars and destroy what was left of civilization.

It is true that the American herds were stampeded into those frantic jihads by the Jews, but let me remind you again that while you may deplore or resent the Jews' manipulations of our people, you cannot reasonably condemn them for advancing the interests of *their* race by all means authorized by their racial morality. If you belong to a race that is now so far inferior to the Jews that it does not even want to defend itself, it was your misfortune to be born into a species that is joyfully headed for extinction.

If our race was not made inferior to other races by its evolutionary origins--and its accomplishments for some centuries makes that seem unlikely--it must have been made so by an epidemic disease. And if you trace that plague back to its ultimate source, you find it in the sect of Jewish fanatics whose morbific godliness was recorded in the Dead Sea Scrolls, most of which, as John Allegro charges, are now being hidden from you by Christian holy men in the interests of the corporate swindles to which they belong. Enough has been published, however, to prove that the Essenes' grotesque doctrines, mixed with other Oriental delusions to conceal its

racial animus, produced the mental poison, commonly called righteousness, that paralysed in our race the instincts that are a race's immune system, its racial will to live, to survive and increase and dominate.

So now, when Christians try to tell you how glorious was the victory of their cults over 'paganism,' and what a blessing Christianity has been to us, answer them by quoting the words of their own god, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS SYNDROME

In the foregoing comments I suggested that the celebrated Bishop Eusebius may have invented the canard about Vergil's (1) fourth eclogue and, as the proud inventor, may have told a close coadjutor, "Let's put it over on the suckers." The reader will not need to be told that while Eusebius is, so far as I know, the first to have recorded the hokum in a writing that has come down to our time. I have no evidence that it was really he who first devised it. The clever idea may first have occurred to some clever evangelist who propagated it orally or in some pious scribble now lost, and Eusebius may have taken it from that now unknown vendor of otherworldly dreams.

As for the words that I attribute to Eusebius (who would, of course, have spoken the decadent Greek that was the common language of the fathers), they may be too candid. He might have conveyed the idea with circumlocution, such as was used by Clement in a letter that, to the consternation of our Christian contemporaries, was partly preserved and discovered in a remote monastery by Professor Morton Smith. (2) In the letter, S. Clement says, in substance, "We holy men have a duty to conceal the facts and lie to our congregations, under oath if necessary, perjuring ourselves to help disseminate the True Faith." That was certainly as much as it was prudent to put down in writing, even in a private letter. In conversation with a close associate, the Saint might have used the same words, accompanying them with a wink, or, so far as we can tell now, feeling so full of righteousness that he thought the statement self-evident. Likewise, we have no means of knowing whether Eusebius knew that he was a scoundrel or was buoyed up by a conviction of his own righteousness. That is a problem in psychology that is ordinarily insoluble.

As for Thaddeus Stevens (3) and other rabid beasts whose howls for White blood were quoted above, it is possible or even likely that most of them felt themselves Apostles of the Lord and just sizzling with righteousness.

Such mental states are common in evangelical religions and may be termed 'the righteousness syndrome.'

It is the form of mental alienation that occurs when an individual's overheated imagination convinces him that he has become a satellite or lieutenant of a powerful and terrible god, who has instructed him to "preach the gospel to every creature" and thus make the whole world conform to that god's will, which, by a happy coincidence, coincides with the individual's own innate or acquired itches and appetites. The preaching of the god's spiel is, of course, a device for effecting social changes that the promoters do not have the power to impose by force. (4) And since the changes supposedly represent the will of god, promotion of them is imagined to be righteous, whence, of course, it follows that opposition to them is wickedness, which must be suppressed by *all* means, which, *whatever* they are, are righteous since they promote righteousness, which supersedes all natural morality. And, needless to say, a little ego, inflated by the god's spiel, expands like the envelope of a simple balloon as it is filled with hot air.

Gospels do effect changes. When they are promulgated, they carry conviction only to adults whose proclivities and desires they flatter, but when they are administered to children in their formative years, when growing minds are still unformed and their innate powers will be developed only by a kind of mental adolescence in later years, the gospels, inculcated by fear of the terrible supernatural monster whose will they are supposed to represent, commonly so distort the child's understanding that he becomes an adult whose mentality is limited by the hokum that molded it. Thus gospels persistently administered to children for generation after generation can and do produce drastic changes in nations and races that may eventually simulate a biological evolution.

The righteousness syndrome is, of course, characteristic of Christians. It has been their inspiration from the first, and they often describe it in terms of a muddled sentiment they call "love." (5) This usually takes the form of a morbid doting on everything that is inferior, debased, diseased, and degenerate, which is simply the obverse of a proletarian rancor against all physical, mental, or moral superiority. It is a festering lust for equality, which, as is obvious, can be attained only by reducing the whole world to a uniform level of degradation. But Christians are elated by their own righteousness, because they love everybody so much that they want to rip the guts out of everybody who doesn't love everybody as much as they do.

Two aspects of the syndrome are obvious. Evangelism necessarily involves some hypocrisy and simulation to "win souls for Jesus" and, given the highly immoral basis of Christianity, (6) it implicitly authorizes whatever chicanery, lying, and forgery may be useful in herding the saved

sheep into their fold. It also provides a perfect disguise for any intelligent scoundrel who simulates belief in the superstition in order to fleece the sheep or to appease his own organic hatreds. And if he is clever, acts consistently in public, and eschews accomplices who may betray him, it is usually impossible to determine whether or not he actually believes all or part of the nonsense he professes, although a significant discrepancy between his intelligence and his professions may give us good grounds for suspicion.

It is also clear that the syndrome does not depend of the identity of the suppositious god, but the bivalent meaning of 'religion' often obscures the fact that the Christian syndrome does not require a god at all. The Marxian Reformation has shown the Big Daddy in the clouds to be as dispensable as the Protestant Reformation proved the Pope to be. When the Marxian cult is called "the social gospel" or "liberation theology," it makes a claim, not entirely unjustified, that it revives the subversive doctrines of the Jewish revolutionary agitator commemorated in the "New Testament," but when the same superstition is called "Communism," it explicitly dispenses with Jesus and his papa, and excites equal or even greater fanaticism and righteousness in its votaries. Paul Knutson's article, "Aryan Asses," includes a vivid description of the Bolsheviks in Russia when, having captured the country, they used iron crow bars to split open the skulls of Russians who wickedly did not love God's Race or evinced an odiously high level of intelligence and culture. Many or most of the happy wielders of crow bars were Jews, who were merely expressing the characteristic idealism of their race, but in all probability some of the social reformers were Russians inspired by their faith in Marx and his gospel. And we may be sure that they felt every bit as much righteousness as did the Christians who, in Fifth-Century Alexandria, at the behest of the pious S. Cyril, seize the too beautiful and intelligent Hypatia and held her down while they used oyster shells to scrape the flesh from her bones.

A typical case of modern righteousness appears in a quotation I have noticed in the *American Sunbeam* for 3 June. It is attributed to Dr. C.M. Pierce of Harvard and purportedly comes from his address to the Childhood Education International Association in 1973. I have made no efforts to verify the quotation: it is simply typical of the mentality of the educational gangsters who operate the boob-hatcheries to which Americans are forced to send their children, and is no more surprising than would be a quotation of "Praise the Lord" attributed to a different kind of evangelist. Pierce is quoted as having said:

"Every child in America entering school at the age of 5 is insane, because he comes to school with certain allegiances toward our founding fathers, towards his parents, toward a belief in a supernatural being, toward the sovereignty of this nation as a separate entity...It's up to you teachers to make all of these sick children well, by creating the international children of the future."

The international children of the future will, of course, fulfill the ideals of old Brock Chisholm, whose enormous brain, forever fizzing and popping with "mental health" like an overheated tea-kettle, demanding that the globe be populated by a mass of uniformly coffee-colored mongrels--except, as it goes without saying, the holy race that must be maintained in the purity required by the Jew god.

Pierce, to judge by his name, must be an Aryan infected with the insane hatred of his own race that is so often induced by depraving superstitions, but what should interest us here is that his statement shows that he repudiates belief in a supernatural being. He therefore believes that he is not a Christian. It is also quite obvious that he repudiates the rational alternative, biological evolution, from which he would have learned that human beings are the product of a long evolution that eliminated as biological failures any proto-human species of which the individuals were not members of a pack. (7) The several races evolved differently even in the stage of *homines erecti*, but, greatly as the races now differ from one another, they are all species of mammals that are tribal by nature. Every child is born with a biologically necessary membership in his family, his tribe of kinsfolk in the larger sense, and his nation, an aggregate of tribes of the same race. This may be regretted by big-brained do-gooders, just as they may regret that when children come into the world they do not have gills, which would do so much to reduce the risks of swimming. But the improvement in the species they desire is impossible: several million years of biological evolution cannot be reversed by the squawkings of addle-pated intellectuals.

The conspirators who call themselves "educators" are disappointed that some children escape from the tax-supported boob-hatcheries with instincts and minds that have not been effaced, and they are now openly demanding that children be taken from their mothers as soon as they are weaned and raised in pens in which expert "educators" can leach out their

brains and prepare them for the mindless bliss of "One World." Whether creatures produced in such pens would be a viable species of animals may be doubted; they certainly would not be human.

It is clear that the mighty-minded Dr. Pierce repudiates both "creation science" and Darwinian evolution. What he would propose in their stead, if indeed his thinking goes so far, it is hard to imagine. But since we shall do him the courtesy of supposing he believes what he says, we must see in him an evangelist, inflated, like a hot-air balloon, with some irrational faith, perhaps the Marxian version of Christianity or something equivalent. And so we may assume that his zeal to destroy our families, our nation, our race, and, indeed, our civilization gives him a delicious sense of being just chock-full of righteousness.

For decades the United States has been afflicted with swarms of nasty little creatures that come pouring out of the sewers of our society whenever our rulers ring the bell and summon them to "demonstrate" and create disorders that will hold the attention of the boobs and prevent them from noticing what new treason is being committed in Washington. Currently the creatures are creating an uproar and disturbances that are almost riots (8) to exhibit their righteous indignation at *apartheid* in South Africa, evidently ignorant that the stupid White population of Africa has already surrendered and opted for suicide. (9) The majority of South Africans have shown themselves too feeble-minded to understand the awful lesson of Rhodesia and have elected to undergo the same fate, submitting to what one of their reputedly "conservative" jewspapers called "the will of the Creator." It is true that they hope to defer their end for some years, in order to enrich more Jews and cadge a few rand themselves, and that they even express surprise at the present plight of the United States, (10) but they are already showing symptoms of the *folie circulaire* that appears among trapped animals that are crowded together, (11) and the White men and women who do not escape in time will, before long, be massacred by the Black savages, who are now biologically superior to a race that has been rotted by a poisonous superstition that the Jews concocted for the White races long ago. (12)

There could be nothing more absurd and pointless than the hysterical indignation over *apartheid* by the zombie-like creatures that are "demonstrating" against it, but while it is not easy to guess what may go on in their dim consciousness, it is only too likely that the trained geese preen themselves on their righteousness and provide us with another example of the syndrome of our racial disease.

For fifteen centuries the members of our race have had constantly injected into them, from the cradle onward, the virus that came out of the fermenting compost-heap in Palestine, and the only vital question now is

whether, after so many generations, the righteousness syndrome has become endemic and hereditary, and hence incurable, so that for it, as for kuru, the only remedy is extinction.

(1. The poet's name was P(ublius) Vergilius Maro, but during the Dark Ages the spelling *Vergilius* became prevalent, probably because Christians wanted to derive the name for *virgo*, which, when applied to a male, was taken to mean a man who had never polluted himself by intimacy with one of those nasty females, i.e., a male homosexual, corresponding to the monastic ideal. Thus the English word was spelled "Virgil" for a long time and is so spelled today by persons who feel that one should maintain a spelling that became traditional in English. I incline to correct the English spelling for the correct Latin word, but you may decide for yourself which spelling is to be preferred.)

(2. For the text of the letter accompanied by a full commentary, see Smith's *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*, Harvard University Press, 1973. For an English translation, see his *The Secret Gospel*, New York, Harper & Row, s.a. (1973?).)

(3. It may be worthy of note that Stevens was physically deformed and so morally deformed that he kept a mullatta as a servile concubine to avoid marrying a White woman, who would have expected to be treated with some respect.)

(4. Evangelism, needless to say, is not a native Jewish idea. The Jews' racial religion, of course, is only for members of the Master Race with which Old Yahweh made the famous deal (b'rith) that gave them title to the whole earth; and the methods by which Jews should enslave or destroy *goyim* are outlined in myths in the Jew-book which have no relation to any historical events, but are exemplary tales devised to show later Jews how to go about the good work of taking possession of the world Yahweh bargained to give them: note especially the tales about the first Jesus (whom the Jews called Joshua by changing the unwritten vowels after they wanted to differentiate themselves from the Christians), the Joseph who cleverly enslaved the whole population of Egypt, and Hadassah (who took the alias of 'Esther' when she masqueraded as a White woman.)

The whole pernicious idea of evangelism almost certainly comes from a man, said to been an Aryan, who is commonly known as Zoroaster, Zaraustra, Zaratustra, Zaradost, Zarahust, etc. According to the tradition, he made himself a nice cup of *homa* (i.e., a broth or tincture of the sacred mushroom, *Amanita muscaria*) and went to see the supreme god, who told him what gospel he should preach to all the world to enlist mortals, regardless of their race, on the side of the good god in his desperate war with the anti-god of evil. I consider Zoroaster's hallucinations one of the world's epochal catastrophes, but the whole question of Zoroastrianism is too intricate for discussion here. That religion contributed essential elements to the Christian amalgam, and the reader will remember that, according to a tale in the "New Testament," Zoroastrian priests (Magi)

came post-haste to salute the new-born Jesus who was to become another Saviour and who, like Zoroaster, had been born of a virgin, as is customary for Saviours.)

(5. This is, of course, a great abuse of language, since love must be a special affection that one person feels for another individual. The Christian perversion of the word accounts for the nonsense uttered by unthinking people who claim "to love all mankind," and for the barbarous jargon of school girls, who used to say they "love ice-cream" and now say they "love sexual intercourse," although they often designate their favorite exercise by some expression from the gutter dialect that is used in low-class brothels and public schools.)

(6. Perhaps the most demoralizing effect of Christianity has been the imposition of its morality on the higher morality that is instinctive in our race. We, for example, have an innate racial quality that makes us feel compassion for thousands of impuberate and barely puberate girls who, after their parents had been slaughtered before their eyes and they had been sexually manhandled by grinning Jews, were sold to become slave prostitutes in water-front brothels, but we are required by our religion to harden our hearts and affirm that they were treated justly and as they deserved, since they were merely *goyim*, like us. The "Old Testament" that Christians are required to accept as the "inerrant" transcription of "God's Word" is filled with accounts of the foulest crimes, from treacherous assassinations to insane butchery and rape, that are repugnant to our morality, but which were approved by the Christian god, who was an accomplice in most of them. With that revolting record of his god's viciousness before him, even the sainted Thomas Aquinas, although he is much admired for his mastery of theological double-talk, had to admit that it is entirely proper and right to murder innocent persons, rob people of their property, and rape women, if that god wanted it done, and William of Occam and the Nominalists came to the only possible conclusion for a Christian: their god is not just and indeed has no conception of justice, so we are obliged to call 'justice' whatever that god does or ordains. And that is a conclusion that the Aryan mind cannot accept without strangling its own instincts and rationality. Jack Bays has assembled a few examples of the atrocious crimes committed by the Christian's god or carried out with his help as a supernatural accomplice, and from these he draws the entirely plausible conclusion that the Bible has suggested and thus instigated many appalling crimes and is probably the most morally corrupting book ever printed.)

(7. Some anthropologists conjecture that the pre-human species called Proconsul, which was a relatively huge stature, was a solitary creature like the orang-outang, with each individual living by and for itself and having no relation to others of the species except for copulation during the mating season. If that is so, it is also significant that the Proconsul became extinct. It is virtually certain that even the Australopithecini hunted in packs and that a male and his females cared for their offspring for some years, thus forming a family that was probably as permanent as that of gorillas today. The succeeding species in the evolutionary line of all races formed tribal societies as they evolved to the present. And while our "Educators" labor so hard to prepare the United States for the eventual amalgamation with the Jews' other large colony, the Soviet, by making White children young punks and sluts who hate their parents and their race, thus severing their natural biological ties and making them proletarians who will be spiritually solitary creatures, like the Proconsul, having no real relation to others, even when they

meet for copulation, those righteous idealists should remember that their Bolshevik precursors eventually found that it was not feasible completely to abolish families in the Soviet--not even after the more cultivated and civilized part of the White population had been exterminated.)

(8. Creatures with strong exhibitionist tendencies appear to riot just enough to make sure they will be arrested. It was amusing to see in the press a photograph of a bedraggled female, identified as the daughter of the peanut-headed peanut-vendor who did the star turns in the White House until he was replaced by the actor from Hollywood. She was being felt over, purportedly to ascertain whether her dress conceal a weapon, by an unkempt creature, dressed as a lout, but identified as a nigger policeman. Like the famous picture of Reagan's wife on the knee of a burly black ape, the picture of the Carter female and her captor was a perfect epitome of the "democracy" of which the boobs are so proud.)

(9. I commented on the South African referendum in *Liberty Bell* for December 1983 and May 1984. Since then, the toboggan has picked up velocity in its slide to the abyss. Most recently, a great majority in the Parliament repealed the law against miscegenation legalized by marriage, thus accelerating the breeding of diseased mongrels inflamed with a justified hatred of the authors of their schizophrenic existence. And now the Jews' stooges in the government, who were elected by White morons, are clamoring openly for an end to "Social injustice" by an "equal partnership" with the darling Blacks, which, of course, means delivering the government to the savages, who are in an overwhelming numerical majority.)

(10. The White boobs' attention was caught by a recent incident. In a relatively innocuous "beauty contest" promoted by some of the principal newspapers, a White South African girl, quite pretty to judge from the photographs, was chosen as "Miss South Africa" to compete in Florida for the modest title of "Miss Universe," although, so far as is known, no contestants from other planets (if any) in our galaxy, to say nothing of the many others galaxies, are to appear. The unfortunate "Miss South Africa" was forbidden to compete in Florida because the authorities there announced that their state was so filled with venomous vermin, indignant because she is a White woman and not a beauteous negress, that her life would be in danger. The South African newspaper hypocritically expressed surprise at our multi-racial barbarism, while, of course, yelling daily for its speedy establishment in their own country. To the impudence of editorial hirelings there is no limit.)

(11. The current issue of *News of the World*, published in Honeydew, Transvaal, reports that an ostensible "conservative" Afrikaans newspaper, *Die Stem*, is demanding the immediate expulsion from South Africa of all persons of British descent. One can only infer that the supposedly intransigent Afrikaners (who are of Dutch descent), not daring to look up at their Jewish captors, are working off their despair by biting the English-speaking persons who have been trapped with them. It is true that twenty-five years ago most of the big-brained boobs who were yelling for "civil rights" for the sweet niggers

were of English descent, but since that time the Afrikaners, most of whom are godly folk who believe that it rains whenever Yahweh personally turns on the faucet upstairs, have shown themselves as venal and feckless as Americans, and the Jews had only to hold a bundle of inflated counterfeit currency in front of the curs' noses to make them sit up and beg. Today, the political parties that think White men have a right to continue living in their own country find it impossible to elect a member of Parliament from districts in which Afrikaners form the overwhelming majority and the local newspapers are printed in Afrikaans (a dialect of Dutch). It is true that there has been a smouldering animosity between the English and the Dutch ever since an English degenerate, crazed with envy and hatred of his betters, the Reverend Dr. John Philip, was sent to South Africa by the London Missionary Society to cuddle niggers and harass White men. See my '*Populism*' and '*Elitism*', pp. 49 ff. -- The *News of the World* does not say who *really* owns *Die Stem*, the newspaper which is launching the insanely divisive campaign, and perhaps could not find out, but its current issue, undated but published late in May, comes close to overt despair. Under the heading, "Weep, For You Will Surely Die!," is published an excellent summary of the present plight of White men in South Africa, including, of course, the open pressures and covert intrigues of the Jews' government in Washington and the slightly disguised Communist churches in the United States.)

(12. The biological superiority of the Blacks was recently demonstrated by one of the "homelands" which befuddled Whites set up for them, giving the territory to the Blacks and then building towns, schools, "universities," hospitals, roads, etc., for them and providing Whites to do the work of teaching and administration. One of the nominally independent "homelands" has just enacted a law which restricts ownership of property within its territory to niggers. The other "homelands," I am informed by a correspondent, will take the same action in the near future. Naturally, big-brained "Liberals" in South Africa emitted a few feeble squawks about such "racism" because they wanted to seem consistent, but they rejoiced in their own hearts, because as everyone knows, the biological imperative of racial loyalty is abominably wicked only when it appears among White owners. Needless to say, the White imbeciles in South Africa will continue to tax themselves ever more heavily to provide necessities and luxuries for the Blacks, who are, of course, multiplying like guinea pigs in their "independent homelands." And that is only natural, for, as has happened throughout all history, biologically superior peoples always enslave the biologically inferior peoples whom they choose not to exterminate.)