

# **Counterfeit Classics 1**

**The Forging of Greek Classics  
by the Roman Catholic Church**

By Peter Dudink, MA

HIB Vol. 2

To understand evil one must think like the devil.

Anonymous

The world is so corrupt that even the word *propaganda* is propaganda created by the anti-pagan-agenda of the Catholic Church. *Antipaganda* is the correct word, for the Catholic Church was the master-creator of anti-pagan information war.

George Orwell

Even the Greeks must be overcome.

Friedrich Nietzsche

# General Introduction:

## The Catholic Conspiracy: The Rewriting of Greek Literature

### Who Cares about Greek Classics?

This is an unscholarly book; it shuns all the conventions and gods enshrined in the Church of the Scholar. For among Western scholars of the humanities, nothing is held more sacred than the Bible and the Greco-Roman classics. Scholars from Europe to the United States continue to view those classics as fountains of wisdom and as the foundation of our moral and intellectual superiority over Asia, Africa, and the rest of the world. Despite the warnings uttered by men like Friedrich Nietzsche and Karl Popper, our leading thinkers continue to approvingly quote ancient Greek and Roman poets, philosophers, dramatists, and politicians. Sadly, they do not know what they are doing—for nearly every ancient Greek and Roman book is a cunning forgery crammed with propaganda, lies, and both ideas and emotions that are poisonous to happiness, sanity, and the good life.

The influence of Ancient Greek Literature on Western Literature has been enormous. In fact, the frame of Greek literary genres has been almost perfectly adopted by Latin literature, firstly, and then by the European literatures, until the 18th century. The Greek works were well known by Roman writers, as well as by European writers since Renaissance. So, these works, particularly the Homeric poems and the tragedies were the model for the successive writers of the same genres.

### What Are the Greek Classics?

According to Hesiod, who appears to have been quite a heretic and critic of one of the loveliest myths of Greek culture,

The Muses, who sing on Olympus ... know how to tell numerous lies which seem to be truthful. (*The Theogony*)

The truth he should have spoken is this: The Catholic scribes, who wrote their forgeries in Rome .... they knew how to make their forgeries *seem* authentic. In fact, they did such good work that the whole world still believes the lie that the Greek classics are authentic.

They are not. Everything is corrupted by the Church. As the saying goes, history is written by the victors, but as I say, sometimes history is *rewritten* by them, both literally and architecturally. This is the norm. When Muslims took Constantinople, and renamed it, they took its greatest church, *redesigned* it and turned it into a mosque with traces of the original Christian design still detectable. They also turned the Greek Parthenon was turned into a mosque and later into a church, but its pagan roots are still evident.

Augustus Caesar seized Troy, put Roman bureaucrats in charge, made the populace obey Roman laws, and renamed the city Ilium (Ilion in Greek). Modern art-historians study *spoila*, a term used to describe how conquerors re-used the cultural and religious artifacts they stole from their enemies.

So, let us ask, what are the Greek and Roman classics? According to most experts, they are a collection of authentic literature dating back to antiquity, written between two and three thousand years ago and magically preserved by the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. According to the utterly naïve and frankly absurd words of Michael Petruzelli, the Catholic Church was almost singlehandedly responsible for ‘saving’ the intellectual inheritance of the West’s greatest or founding civilizations. It acted as a modern archivist, carefully and *faithfully* preserving literature written by men of non-Christian *faiths*. In Michael’s own words,

Manuscripts, copies and translations of Scripture, the Greek and Latin Fathers, Church histories and documents from Church councils as well as, perhaps, classical [*Greek and Roman*] writings from non-Christian sources, formed a valuable library of western faith and culture which was left at the [Catholic] monastery founded by Cassiodorus [which] endured at least until after his death in 583... It would be reasonable to conjecture [guess] that at least some of Cassiodorus’s library may have found its way into the monasteries of the Benedictine order... We should emphasize, however, that the Benedictine monks were trained in classical Latin but not in Greek. The works which they would preserve and copy in their scriptoria [writing rooms] would be those of the western Church Fathers and Roman writers. (CatholicCulture.org).

Michael’s opening phrase “copies and translations” announces the author’s naïve belief in his Church’s kind and caring attitude towards *preserving* other cultures. The enormity of such naivety is simply astounding. History shows that the Church was single-mindedly devoted to *destroying* other cultures. But this same trust in the Catholic Church’s work is shared by all scholars of the classics. Consider the words of Christopher Dawson,

It was only the Church and, particularly, by the monks that the tradition of classical culture and the writings of classical authors, 'the Latin classics,' were preserved . . . monastic schools and libraries and scriptoria became the chief organs of higher intellectual culture in Western Europe. (*Religion and the Rise of Western Culture*, 1950)

Of course, Christopher Dawson openly promoted the laughably naïve belief that the Catholic Church worked tirelessly to help create European civilization, which he believes the most advanced civilization on Earth.

Please, let us be a little sceptical. Why would the Catholic Church invest enormous time and energy into accurately preserving the literature of other cultures and religions? It has a long criminal record of systematically eradicating other cultures and of persecuting anyone practicing other religions. So, why would they preserve the texts of Greek,

Roman and even Nordic traditions? They had no motivation to preserve them. On the other hand, they had numerous reasons to *forge* and *adulterate* them.

What motivations? First and foremost, the Catholic Church was expansionist and rabidly evangelical, so competition was not tolerated and books that promote or simply reflect well on a foreign culture were not permitted to exist. Secondly, Europeans were fascinated with Greek and Roman culture and wished to study it, and since the Catholic Church was Western Europe's primary educator, instead of destroying Greco-Roman classics it revised and invented them *so that they controlled the message and profited from teaching their literary frauds*. Thirdly, a lucrative market existed in the selling of ancient manuscripts. For these reasons, the Catholic Church did not *preserve* the classics; instead, it *converted* them into books that do not present non-Christian religions in a positive light, even into books that make Greek and Roman philosophy agree with Christian doctrine and support the Church's agenda.

### Who Wrote the Classics?

Who were the Greek authors of antiquity? Who were Homer, Hippocrates, Plato, Euripides and others? Let us be clear about authorship in ancient times: authors were always hired hacks, speech writers, ghost-writers and people with crimes to hide and who, therefore, wanted their identities kept secret. Whoever they were, their real names were not preserved. Why? *Because writing was the exclusive power of the ruling class, and writing was a tool for mass manipulation*. If laws could be attributed to gods, that made the masses more willing to obey them. If prophets with imaginary miraculous powers were made the authors of sacred texts, that made them more believable. If Greek forgeries bore the names of Greek authors – well, obviously that's the bare minimum needed to deceive readers.

The tradition of assigning the name of the actual author to a book is relatively recent. Islamic writings might have begun the tradition during the Middle Ages; but, in the Christian world, it did not appear until after the Catholic Inquisition or Holy Age of Terror subsided, perhaps not until the Enlightenment.

In other words, at a bare minimum this means that none of the Greek classics were written by people bearing the names assigned to their writings. In fact, a Greek author might once have used the pseudonyms we now recognize, but their writings were later revised by Christian authors whose names we do not know, either.

Well, if this seems too shocking to be true, consider that the times have not changed much. Nowadays, much of our news is being written by anonymous algorithmic programs, Zionists and CIA agents pretending to be investigative journalists. The popular business magazine, *The Economist*, recently produced an article discussing its policy of publishing anonymously.

Historically, many publications printed articles without bylines or under pseudonyms—a subject worthy of a forthcoming explainer of its own—to give individual writers the freedom to assume different voices and to enable early newspapers to give the impression that their editorial teams were larger than they really were. (*Why Are The Economist's Articles Anonymous?* 2013)

In other words, many publications deceive their readers by using pseudonyms, and anonymous publishing also keeps people ignorant about who is writing and how many people are writing. Of course, the least flattering explanation, that The Economist authors *want to be anonymous because they want to avoid justice when people realize that these authors are writing lies to manipulate public opinion for paychecks and for the benefit of elites* – that is not an explanation offered by the dishonest anonymous author of the semi-informative article.

In contrast, authors of conscience who dare to challenge, question and defy state- and corporate-sponsored lies and deception must sometimes use pseudonyms to protect their lives from assassination. This phenomenon also has ancient precedents in men like Ovid.

In conclusion, let us be aware that the names ascribed to classical texts are pseudonyms created by people with much to hide.

\*

The authors of Asian and Egyptian classic writings pretended to be mystics and traditionalists while they secretly supported the unjust status quo. Roman Catholic literati, however, represents a significant advance in *corruption*. Roman Catholic literati are the first to introduce theft and forgery into literature. They rewrote Greek historical records and revised the records to reflect their agendas and biases.

Consequently, you will not find a single criticism of Rome in the works of any allegedly Greek historian. *Somehow* those historians only concerned themselves with recording their wars with their neighbors to the east, the Persians, and with fellow Greeks. It is rather suspicious that they avoided criticizing their Roman rivals and conquerors, is it not?

With their victories over Greek states, the Roman conquerors seized control of Greek literature and record keeping, erased its own crimes from the historical records and rewrote much of that history as Greek forgeries, forgeries that served Rome and made a mockery of Greece, forgeries so cleverly written that to this day the experts continue to treat them as Greek originals.

Forgery was employed by highest levels of government in the Roman Empire. Just as they corrupted their coins, their currency, to deceive and impoverish the masses, so they corrupted *their* literature. Nothing was sacred and nothing is sacred. The wealthy 1% are still masters of forgery, only now they do it by secretly rewriting constitutions and laws, by using fait and fictional reserve currencies, by legalizing securities, by back-dating and robo-signing documents, and so on and on we build the mountain of our corruption.

\*

To grasp the difference between Eastern and Western classical literature, one must consider the political system in which Western literati were raised. Unlike Indian monks and Chinese bureaucrats, the Greek and Roman literati were raised in so-called democracies, that is, in political environments that engaged in endless debates and discussions.

While bureaucracies operate with mindless obedience, and monks content themselves with mindless mysticism, the Greek political genius needed to learn poetry and complex literary devices that would—arguably—serve primarily to win arguments in the Senate. Greek and Roman education was primarily designed to create adult men capable of winning political arguments by use of rhetoric and logic. While this sounds sophisticated, ultimately we are speaking of bullshit. Rhetoric was merely the art of using language to manipulate the thoughts and feelings of others without respect for the good of humanity. Logic was the art of making trivia and imperialism sound reasonable and logical. Together, logic and rhetoric were the evil twins that turned young nobles into masters of verbal conquest.

\*

Unlike modern propaganda, which is almost always intended for mass consumption, for a number of reasons Roman propaganda was only intended for the ruling class, for its own indoctrination. In Rome, propaganda primarily spread through Greek and Roman schools and tutors. Roman schools taught speaking skills, Greek language and literature, poetry (Greek philosophy to a much lesser degree) and other genres that indoctrinated the youth by discreetly delivering imperial propaganda. Although no official state curriculum existed; however, one cannot help but notice that to this day the most popular Greek and Roman classics, while providing good material for learning grammar and reading skills, are (as we shall see) also help students passively absorb the prejudices and delusions of the ruling classes.

This doesn't mean that everything Roman is propaganda. Towards the end of the Roman Republic and the beginning of the Roman Empire, thanks to a steady rise in literacy, we find the first books written for private, silent reading. Writers who enjoyed some financial independence and cared little for imperial recognition wrote for this emerging market of wealthy sit-about who wished to entertain themselves without attending cruel public sporting events and theatre productions. Ovid probably wrote his early erotic works for such stay-at-homes, many of whom would have been female. The brash, self-indulgent and juvenile poetry of Catullus, the abrasive wisdom of Martial and the farcical satires of Lucian were likely intended for a small market of intelligent but idle nobles. It was a curious market that disappeared during the Middle Ages and reappeared in medieval European court poetry and drama.

### How and Why Were the Classics Rewritten

For centuries, Rome and the whole Italian peninsula was nothing compared to the opulent, glorious and victorious Empire of Greece. Obviously, ambitious and envious Roman toads hated the superior wealth of the Hellenes (Greeks). Obviously they dreamed of conquering the jewel of Europe. And so it happened that over a period of nearly 200 years, Roman murderers and plunderers came and took everything. But murdering and looting was not enough.

The most cunning criminals do not record their crimes for posterity. And so, while many ancient conquests are remarkably well documented by Roman historians, about

Rome's conquest of Greece we hardly hear a whisper. We have a few details about how Rome burned Greek-ruled Carthage and conquered the Greek forces of Corinth; beyond this, nothing but mundane paragraphs in Polybius, Paulus Orosius, Pseudo-Lucian and Titus Livius of Patavium—none of whom see no connection between war and imperialism, all of whom report on wars with an affected air of objectivity, as if wars were chess matches. About the conquest of Athens itself they offer silence. A hundred years later, when Julius Caesar conquered Western Europe, the conqueror himself (so we are led to believe) left us 200 hundred pages of unrevealing reportage. Apparently, no one who experienced the conquest of Greece considered it worth their time to record what happened when Athens fell in 86 B.C. and Greece was completely conquered in 30 B.C.

What happened? As I said, murdering and looting wasn't enough. The Roman imperialists were not illiterate Mongol conquerors who bravely lived in the cities they conquered. The Roman conquerors destroyed out of envy. They destroyed much of the Acropolis, as later they would destroy virtually every synagogue in Jerusalem. And they destroyed almost every Greek written work they could find. A few plays were spared. Perhaps a tenth of Aeschylus' works survived the devastation.

But by the Middle Ages, long after the fall of the Roman Empire, European Roman Catholic elites began to suffer from nostalgia and began to romanticize the 'glorious past of the great and mighty' Roman and Hellenic Empires. They wanted to study Roman and Hellenic culture, and this threatened the Roman Catholic Church, so, since it controlled what people studied, it began to rewrite the Greek and Roman classics, turning them into secret works of anti-Greek, anti-Roman and pro-Roman Catholic propaganda.

### Rome's History of Stealing from Greece

The capital of the Roman Catholic world is the Vatican, also known as the Holy Roman See, is the institution lead by the Pope who—according to Catholics—is God's living bullhorn, prophet and megaphone, just as Jesus was before him. But like nearly all things Roman, the Vatican has roots that stretch back to ancient Greece. Before the Holy (Catholic) Empire that ruled Europe during the Middle Ages, even before the Western Roman Empire (27 BC – 476 AD), and even before the Roman Republic (504 – 27 BC), the Oracle of Delphi provided a similar function as the Pope still provides today. Minor differences separate them. The Oracle was a female priestess who prophesied for the sky god Apollo, while the Pope is a male priest who prophesies or speaks for God.

Gender differences explain very little about the historical roles of the Oracle and the Pope. To understand their function, one must understand how class warfare and conspiracy shapes all things imperial. In very ancient times, perhaps the Oracle was merely a female shaman, someone the common people had access to and trusted to give medicinal, mystical or astrological advice. However, as Greek society stratified and a ruthless ruling class emerged, one can hardly doubt that the people's access to her 'wisdom' was restricted and confined to the patriarchs, or ruling men, who used her to promote profit and empire.

Of course, rulers never become rulers without using force or deception or both, and we would be naïve that to think that they would not use and exploit the people's trust in the Oracle, and take advantage of their power to influence and even dictate what the Oracle said, forcing to say only what promoted their desires. Any assumption that she did

not lose her autonomy with the rise of kingdoms is utterly naïve. If the empire builders wanted prophecies—meaning excuses—to start war campaigns, if they wanted prophecies predicting another attack by ‘evil’ foreigners, if they wanted her to repeat any fabricated excuse for attacking any Greek or non-Greek, she would have to provide it. Please—don’t pretend to be shocked by my allegations of fraud. In modern times, the same fraud is committed by the mainstream media—an institution which, as we know, is mainly controlled by just five corporations—five men who force the media to say only what will promote corporate profits.

Many of the traditions found in the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire were borrowed from the Greeks, and the tradition of using religion to serve political and imperial ends is no exception. The Vatican continued the functions served by Delphi, and the Pope is the figurative grandson of the Oracle. Between them is the Pontifex Maximus, or Ultimate High Priest of the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire. Again, unlike the Oracle, the Pontifex was male—and again, gender differences are minor differences for both the Oracle and the Pontifex made religion support the ultimate profiteer—the state.

Actual historical details about Pontifex Maximus are scant and likely destroyed by the criminals who used its power. Existing ancient writings about the Pontifex Maximus are contradictory. Some writings claim that, unlike the Oracle of Delphi, the PM possessed much personal freedom; others claim he had little personal freedom. Who cares? One claim implies that the PM is an unfree and therefore innocent cog in the imperial machine; the other might imply that the PM was partly responsible for imperial Roman corruption. It’s a tiresome argument still being used by politicians to excuse policies, political corruption and political inaction.

Of greater relevance is how the Vatican, the Papacy and the role of the Pope developed into Western Europe’s leading religious and political institution, an institution that was not only influenced by Europe’s kings, but more often exerted influence over those kings, and institution that not only issued prophecies, or Papal Decrees, but created a vast network of cathedral schools, monasteries, scriptoriums and libraries, an institution that used literacy, fear and hope to brainwash anyone wealthy enough to be educated by it, an institution that used its ‘educated’ priests to brainwash anyone foolish enough to attend its religious services. This interests me because it reveals how the Catholic Church (or the Vatican) is the direct prototype or predecessor of both the mainstream media and public education. Of course, the mainstream media is now, even more than the Church was in the past, inescapable, pervasive, and controlled by avaricious, ignorant and reckless politicians and a handful of ultra-wealthy sociopaths—men and women who share an allergy to truth. Another just as the Church promoted fear and ignorance to promote faith, so the mainstream media uses fear and ignorance to increase ratings and to spread a vision of the world that profits a few psychopathic rulers and corporate elites. Finally, public education has inherited the role of the Catholic Church, and, like the Church, it promotes ignorance of state crimes, ignorance of corporate crimes, the illusion of economic justice, the illusion of political justice, and the development of skills that help generate government and corporate profits.

However, I am not a prophet or oracle, nor do I have a window into secret meetings held centuries ago between high-ranking Church officials, so my evidence for a grand conspiracy in the Catholic Church will depend on an examination of the surviving texts

that the Church forged, fabricated and corrupted in order to ensure that everything read in Europe served to promote its values and profits by brainwashing their believers.

Specifically, these two volumes will focus on exposing how Greco-Roman literature was corrupted by the Church, which erased from those texts any positive portrayals of Greek and Roman gods, and at the same time attempted to insert Catholic and theocratic values into those texts.

This investigation will operate on two levels. First, it will expose how Europe's Greco-Roman classics—everything from comedies to histories—were rewritten in order to desensitize young noble readers to aggressive war, slavery, sexism, racism and a host of other crimes. In short, they were designed to prepare them for service to the empire. Second, this investigation will expose how many of the Greco-Roman texts were designed to secretly reflect Catholic values, prejudices, symbols and themes.

Finally, later volumes will explore how the age of the printing press exposed and destroyed the Catholic Church's control over education and indoctrination, and how the internet is now destroying both state and corporate control over our thoughts and actions.

### A History of Forgery

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literary\\_forgery](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literary_forgery)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Onomacritus>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Protocols\\_of\\_the\\_Elders\\_of\\_Zion](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Protocols_of_the_Elders_of_Zion)

Lucian, who wrote in Greek and allegedly lived in the second century AD, wrote *The Ignorant Book Collector*, a satire of gullible art collectors. This is curious. Was there actually a market for ancient texts in ancient Rome? I doubt it. Lucian's works are probably forgeries, too. While no research has been done in this field, what little I know of history and books suggests that a market for ancient texts did not exist until after the Crusaders pillaged Greece, modern-day Turkey, and parts of the Levant or West Asia. Their loot would have ignited interest in ancient works of art from West Asia just as, much later, European colonists-conquerors ignited interest in works of art from Africa, India, China and the Americas.

Who was positioned to exploit medieval Europe's obsession with foreign cultures and, specifically, ancient texts from foreign nations? The sponsor and promoter of the Crusades: the Roman Catholic Church. This unholy institution had the world's most extensive network of literate monks, and besides having a profit motive it had a pedagogical one, for it would have been eager to create forgeries that produced negative impressions of other religions.

If you doubt that forgery could be an issue for scholars of classical literature, you might also doubt the following claim made by an expert at Sotheby's, one of the world's premier auction houses of ancient artifacts from around the world: "Ninety-nine point nine nine percent of what you see in the market is fake" (Al Jazeera, 101 East – China: Faking It).

- The classics as mere diversions ... Goethe had loved them, but became more critical later in life, and in *Faust*, Pt 2, page 75...

Thanks to the propaganda produced by our schools and our movie industry, today the myth of glorious Europe and glorious America still persists. The year 2012 saw three movies set during the Roman Empire, and the people involved in producing *Spartacus: Vengeance* did an excellent job of glorifying Rome's sick execution-for-entertainment culture. Mel Gibson's *The Passion of Christ* likewise served to keep a religious halo around the Roman atrocity of crucifying rebels and beneath-the-law criminals. And so, we remain oblivious of the fact that Rome was an empire of criminals who operated above-the-law and who rebelled against justice.

Printed propaganda was not invented by Capitalists, Communists, or Nazis; it predates the Middle Ages and begins when the first empires in Egypt and China began producing books for the indoctrination of court officials and bureaucrats. The common people were content with speech and folklore, while empires, being by definition oppressive and unjust, needed ways to suppress conscience and stifle free thought with long scrolls, multi-volumes works and libraries crammed with imperial propaganda.

We are hardly aware of the extent to which propaganda and imperial agendas have shaped literature. And our scholars love to promote the illusion that literary classics were written by free minds endowed with profound consciences. They would be unemployed if they dared to challenge this modern myth, and nowhere is this myth more devoutly believed than in the West. Here (I am still here, for the moment) people, both educated and uneducated, regularly blow their horns and boast that the art produced in ancient Greece, Rome, and in Renaissance Europe represents the epitome of civilization and the fulfillment of our humanity.

The truth is that the art produced by ancient Greece and Rome reflects little more than the imperial fantasies and fears of greedy, immoral, ruling elites.

Possibly the first book of the West, the superstitious Sybiline Books, served to satisfy the imperial fantasies of the ruling class. It was consulted by moronic priests, who "interpreted" it to create the illusion that the gods supported this or that imperial action or policy—everything from decisions regarding war, marriage, and trade. The oracles gave the ruling class the illusion of divine support for imperial crimes. Thus, pro-pagan-da should really be known as pro-imperialism. Indeed, the word *propaganda* is itself a piece of Christian propaganda intended to imply that only pagans would lie about themselves.

Propaganda, if I must use that word, has its roots in religion. All the gods we now associate with Greek and Roman religions are imperial gods, not the gods or spirits that the common people believed in before they were conquered and enslaved by imperialists. The Greek and Roman gods that we know are the imperial gods imposed on the people. Each one reflects imperial values. Ares, the god of war, reflects the imperial need for war, Ganymede, the household slave of the gods, legitimizes the imperial custom of having domestic slaves; Zeus' great power reflects contempt for democracy and egalitarianism; Poseidon reflects an obsession with seafaring for war and profit; Athena reflects a prejudice for cities; and Aphrodite serves to legitimize the imperial habit of

viewing some women as sex objects. Rural Greeks certainly did not spawn this abominable religion, and since it is abominable, we can hardly blame the Greek masses for turning to the sweet poison of Christianity when Greek and Roman imperialists oppressed them, took away their land and their freedom, and demanded that they respect their psychopathic gods.

Also, the central ritual of the imperial Greek and Roman religions is nothing more than capitalism in religious disguise. I refer to the imperial ritual of using wealth to purchase imaginary favors from the gods. Thus, the god of war's support had to be purchased with a giant barbeque offering—I mean a great sacrifice or “hecatomb”. If the seas and winds were not favorable to sailing, the support of the gods of wind and water had to be *purchased* with similar gifts. These superstition greatly profited the religious elite and did little for the consumer.

Similarly, the poor had to pay tithes and taxes to the ruling class—and this economic relationship is the whole basis of the imperial religion. Everything has a price, and if it doesn't profit them, it is not holy.

For the lower class, imperial gods and imperial rulers are hard to distinguish.

### What Happened to the Originals?

Sadly, art historians have yet to study how Western European conquerors *spoiled* and appropriated the literary works of conquered nations such as Greece. Opportunities were not lacking. Rome had the following list of opportunities to steal the soul of Greece:

1. In 197 BC Philip V of Greece is defeated by the Romans at Kynoskephalai
2. In 168 BC the Romans defeat Perseus and end the Antigonid dynasty
3. In 149 BC the Romans annex Macedonia as a province
4. In 86 BC Roman general Sulla burns Athens and steals books from the Lyceum
5. In 30 BC the Romans conquer all of Greece and who knows what they took
6. In 1204 AD the Roman Catholics of the Fourth Crusade took Constantinople, burnt its library and looted the city.

What if the men who conquered Greece stole Greece's literary treasures from her libraries and rewrote them to serve their agenda? What if they rewrote everything so thoroughly that modern historians, archeologists and anthropologists cannot detect it? Why not? In antiquity, copies of books were always limited in number and in distribution. All existing manuscripts of a literary classic could easily fall into the hands of your enemies, giving them the perfect opportunity to revise them and make them reflect new values. And many Romans already spoke in Greek and wrote in Greek. Roman education was heavily influenced by Greek literature and philosophy. Proud, conquering and racist Rome was perfectly positioned and motivated to corrupt Greece's greatest literary works.

And what if the truth is still worse, what if Homer's epics were not corrupted by pagan Romans but by medieval Catholic Romans?

There's a funny story that historians tell about the Middle Ages. The story claims that Greek and Roman literature was transmitted back to the West (meaning to the Church), by the Muslims who had conquered Constantinople. Imagine, westerners, meaning Romans and Roman Catholics, had pillaged Byzantium (Greece/Hellas) repeatedly, but they needed the easterners to give them the literary treasures of Greece. This is preposterous. No precedent for such cooperative behavior exists. Islamic, Catholic and Roman conquerors have always destroyed the cultural identities of their victims, and even the most tolerant among them would never make an effort to *preserve* the culture of the conquered subjects.

Another reason to doubt the dominant story about the history and transmission of the Greek classics is the immense evidence that they were either forged or heavily revised to reflect a late medieval and Christian imperial agenda. But, you be the judge, and forgive me if I cannot convince you.

\*

Ironically, even the word 'propaganda' is a bit of propaganda created by Christians to help discredit Roman pagans—very likely after Rome's calculating leaders had already realized that it was politically expedient and advantageous to reject paganism. Ironically, the supposedly Greek pagan texts are full of anti-paganda and subliminal Christian messaging.

\*

The church's effort to destroy Western Europe's obsession with classical Rome and Greece. The legends of Troy and the Trojans were destroyed, in part, through the anti-paganda of the works attributed to Homer and Virgil. During Chaucer's time, the obsession with Greco-Roman civilization was so powerful that London considered renaming itself the New Troy (Jason Tondro, lecture #4, The Aeneid, Youtube)

## Who Are the Classics Scholars?

I don't hold a special grudge against scholars of literature. All experts have their own gods and illusions. The computer engineer sees a wonderful future for computers; the professor of economics loves his vapid theories; the professor of classical literature adores the classics and insists that they represent the epitomes of beauty, wisdom, and humanity. In short, professionals are rarely critical of their own fields, much less of themselves.

Our engineers still believe that they can save life and even improve life on Earth with their tech-fixes, for they believe in engineering as if it were a religion, that is, as if it were not the problem but the solution. Our professors of literature are no better. They treat their books as if they were gods full of wisdom and humanity. I don't deny that some books are worth reading, but when speaking of Greek and Roman classics are, perhaps without exception, dangerous frauds and Catholic propaganda parading as literature.

Now contrast my critical perspective with the naïve, almost boyish exuberance of the scholar and professor. They know Zeus and Polyphemus didn't exist, but they won't criticize Homer for his superstitions and they wouldn't dream of blaming him for writing stories that promote classism, patriarchy, monogamy, poor diet, and xenophobia. Nor would they dare criticize Homer for wallowing in senseless violence and offering no practical advice on how to establish a peaceful world.

Ironically, the Greek classics are Catholic frauds meant to discredit the Greek religion, and they succeed insofar as our professors are not *so deeply smitten* with them that they wish to convert to the ancient Greek religion; however, they are determined defenders of the classics – for their jobs depend on everyone believing in the authenticity and profundity of their books. Essentially, this means that the experts are reading Catholic propaganda precisely as it was intended to be read – just as most readers of the Bible read it *in the manner intended by the liars who wrote it*.

Among the naïve, racist and ignorant experts who consider the Greco-Roman tradition the epitome of classical civilization, some actually believe the nonsense that Athens was the birthplace of democracy. Honestly—*democracy* in ancient Greece? Elections for the 1% and debates among the ruling elite do not a democracy make. The classical Athenian model of democracy-for-the-few does not represent the “birth” of democracy; instead, it represents a *decline* in democracy. More “primitive” cultures were more democratic. They lacked castes, classes and hierarchies, and—on average—the smaller their populations the more democratic they were. But the self-glorifying myth survives thanks to our professors, imperialists and Euro-supremacists. They proudly trace modern “democracy” to Greece and Rome—and I commend them for noting the similarity! Modern democracies are also tyrannies in disguise. When our governments are corrupted by corporate interests, we all suffer a tyranny of the minority; and when governments genuinely represent the majority, the minority suffers a tyranny of the majority. The difference is minor when almost no one knows how to live well. This is why, when Rome changed from being a republic to a dictatorship, very little changed for the 99%.

Let us be honest: essentially, the Roman republic was an oligarchy just as the American republic today is an oligarchy—a state ruled by the few for the few. When

Rome changed into a dictatorship, this meant nothing for the working masses. Whether one is robbed by three men or one man makes little difference. The rise of the dictatorship was only tragic for ambitious politician who suddenly felt castrated by the imperial power of the all-powerful emperor. But, as I said, the change means little or *nothing* to the vast majority who, in ancient times, lived outside the urban power centers of the world. For this reason, I treat all republics and dictatorships as empires and governments by tyranny.

Will university professors and PhD scholars support my work? Of course not! Their jobs rely on them rejecting my work, for they love their ‘authentic’ classics.

Two conscientious critics with university teaching experience recently explained that the university culture in our ‘civilized’ world is deeply corrupted. Tenured professors profit from the work done by underpaid part-timers, and very few professors will warn students that they are enrolled in an exploitative institution founded on empty promises that will lead many students into debt and poverty. The moral fiber needed for a revolution in our educational institutions does not exist—and if it did, those institutions would not be reformed, instead, they would be abandoned.

### I Am not Original

Everything that this immodest volume reveals was already foreshadowed by Francois Rabelais in his global satire, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. In the Prologue to that book of wisdom, he claims that, according to Plato, Socrates was “always laughing ... always playing the fool.” Of course, nothing in Plato’s works indicates anything of the sort. The behavior Rabelais jokingly hints at the possibility that Plato’s works are jokes made at our expense, or at least at the expense of those who do not recognize that a joke or fraud is being played upon them. In a similar spirit, he calls Homer “the paragon of all philologists,” which is blatantly false but might also hint at the possibility that Homer was not an illiterate Greek bard from antiquity.

What else can we learn about the inner secrets of Rabelais’s masterpiece? Rabelais amuses us by warning against looking for a Christian substratum in his Prologue, for he says only fools ‘find’ allegories in Homer and only fools find “the Gospel mysteries” in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Ironically, these are veiled clues, for such things do exist in Homer and Ovid, but they certainly do not exist in Rabelais.

## The Evidence of Forgery in Greek Literature

### MYTHOLOGY

#### Introduction

Mythologies are the stories of our religions, and since religion is the opium for all the classes, mythology is also opium. But let’s not simplify and generalize. Religions are opioids, but some religions are worse than others, and the ancient religions were generally better than later religions. The rulers of the Catholic and perhaps also the

Orthodox Church would certainly have believed the opposite, and considered their new religions superior to the old Roman and Greek religions. They would have wanted to make all competing religions disappear; however, knowing that was impossible, they instead focused on smearing and degrading the competition by slandering them and by rewriting their myths in the manner that made their respective religions seem deplorable, barbaric and unattractive. In addition, the revised, degraded and counterfeited Greek myths were designed to encourage precisely the behaviors that the Catholic Church wanted. Finally, perhaps coincidentally and certainly ironically, the new, degraded myths attributed the same barbaric qualities to the Greek gods that actually belonged to some Christian rulers.

In short, virtually all the surviving Greco-Roman myths are early forms of propaganda that degrade the already highly imperfect culture of ancient Greece and promote, sanctify and legitimize the imperial crimes of the Catholic Church.

### The Myth of Zeus the Rapist

Let's not waste any time and go straight to the heart of the ancient Greek empire, straight to Zeus, whose Roman equivalent is Jupiter. They are both serial rapists. Zeus copulated with over 20 goddesses and over 50 demi-goddesses and humans. The temptation is to treat this as mere fairy-tale, or as a curious piece of fiction. But, all myths are based on reality and/or desire. What reality? Wealthy Greek men wrote no laws against rape and frequently indulged. The wives of wealthy men were kept at home so that the men could have the freedom to seduce and rape widows, slaves, prisoners of war and peasants.

### The Myth of Antaeus and Arachne

As Edgar Allen Poe hinted in "The Cask of Amontillado," the upper class are a breed of bigoted, intolerant and vindictive monsters. The Greek myths of Antaeus and Arachne, despite being composed by the upper class and for the upper class, reveal the all the negative qualities Poe warned about.

Antaeus, according to the myth, was a powerful wrestler none could defeat—none, that is, until a Greek demi-god named Hercules showed up. Hercules repeatedly defeated Antaeus; he literally threw him to the ground, but each time Antaeus touched the ground his strength revived and the battle resumed. The trouble was that Antaeus was not a child of the sky god Zeus but of Gaia, the Earth, and she is the source of his strength. In other words, Antaeus represents the rural or lower classes that still worshipped earth-based gods and spirits, while Hercules represents the ruling class that engages in conquest and empire building.

To finally defeat Antaeus, Hercules simply holds him above the ground, the earth. But let's be careful to note that this isn't mere symbolism. The earth, or land, really was and is the source of our strength, and removing or lifting Antaeus off the land represents the imperial project of conquering native people and dispossessing them of their land. This injustice is at the heart or root of imperialism: it generates profits because originally land and earth are sources of free food, nutrition, energy, building materials and shelters. Once this is lost to a conqueror, you are expected to work for what the earth gave to your ancestors for free.

The Antaeus myth is set in Libya because it was conquered and colonized by ancient Greeks. So, specifically speaking, Antaeus symbolizes the defeated, prostrated and enslaved people of Libya—a people who are again being separated from their land thanks, once again, to western actions. According to the UN, over 130,000 people have fled Libya and Tunisia in the first half of 2014. Many leave homes and land to become renters in Europe—the continent that, along with America, bears responsibility for ruining Libya.

### The Myth of Atlas

Atlas is a Titan, not an Olympian god; he represents the defeated, prostrated and enslaved Titans, the common people. Zeus and his kin rule them and exploit them, and the fate of Atlas is symbolic of their fate. You see, according to the myth, Atlas bears the weight of Heaven on a pillar balanced on his back. We can gape like fools at the thought of a man performing such a circus-like feat, or we can understand that Atlas' mythic fate symbolizes the real economic fate of the lower classes: they carry the burdensome rich on their shoulders, backs and necks as they toil to keep them comfortable in their high places, their cities, their heavens.

The pillar carried by Atlas also alludes to the upper class, for its members could afford pillared palaces and temples. And Heaven symbolizes the acropolis (and vice versa). Finally, Atlas symbolizes the lower class—the working class—the people who are crushed by the parasites above.

But according to the myth, Atlas, the lower class, does not merely toil like a common slave, hauling stone pillars for the wealthy; sometimes his services must be enlisted in military campaigns. Thus Hercules, who represents the military elite, enlists the help of Atlas in his campaign to defeat a dragon and loot his riches. A single arrow supposedly killed the dragon that ruled the garden of the golden apples, but Hercules, being a coward, sends Atlas into the walled garden to fetch the treasure. Well, as Martin Luther King explained, even in war, the upper class uses the lower class to do its dirty work.

Perhaps the worst part of the Atlas myth is that Atlas only risks his life and fetches the useless golden apples because Hercules offered to relieve him of the heavy pillar on his back. However, when Atlas returns from his dangerous assignment, Hercules expects him to resume the gruelling work of carrying the pillar and Heaven and shares none of the ill-gotten profits for which Atlas risked his life. Doesn't that just sum up the whole history of imperialism?

### The Myth of Medusa

The spirit of cruelty and misogyny inspired some male Greeks to write the Medusa myth. According to their myth, Medusa was so beautiful that Poseidon went mad with lust for her, and when she declined his advances he turned her and her sisters into monsters. That sounds *fantastical*, like something from a nice cartoon, but it's actually depraved and unconscionable. The myth glorifies the power of the gods (males) over the women they lust for. If women refuse to comply with male lust, they are condemned.

The Medusa myth continues with Perseus. He pursues Medusa, whose hair has transformed into snakes. What does this mean? Is snakes-for-hair a wonderful bit of

imaginative thinking? Not at all! Snake-like hair isn't mere fiction. Typically, Greek hair is neither straight nor tightly curled. It can flow in long, undulating curves, much like a serpent. So, this Greek image of a woman with snakes for hair is imagination based on the observation that the flowing, undulating, decorative curls of the Greek woman help her seduce men.

In short, the Medusa myth expresses fear of women. The point is emphasized by the claim that even after her hair transformed into actual snakes, Medusa's beauty was still so powerful that men who saw her were turned into stone. Why stone, you ask? It suggests that they were paralyzed with desire, or turned hard with lust. In any case, the Medusa myth speaks of a struggle for power between the sexes, and this and other male-centric myths were designed to give paranoid men an excuse to control women.

Today, Greek women are free to display their hair, and many are paid by men to display themselves in advertisements designed to entice both male and female consumers. Brazen capitalism does not suppress fears or desires, it exploits them in order to stimulate sales and profits.

### The Myth of Ceres

Ceres, goddess of grains and imperial agriculture, was the child of Necessity. After repeated droughts, famines and uprisings from the agrarian masses, the ruling urban classes created Ceres in order to redirect the frustration of the masses away from the ruling class, for they always ate well in times of famine, and they feared a popular uprising. They encouraged the masses to redirect their anger, despair and prayers for mercy to this imaginary deity, Ceres, the goddess of *cereal* crops, meaning grains. There was no Roman goddess of fruits and vegetables because, being hard to ship and store in cities, they were not important to empire building.

### The Myth of Hephaestus/Vulcan

Hephaestus, the Greek god of metallurgy, was worshipped by the Roman ruling class because he represented the key and the secret of their powers, for all imperial power stems from violence, and to this day, metal and metallurgy are central to military power. But blacksmith, or metal worker, is never a noble. His work is too dirty and difficult to interest them. So, slaves were employed, and to prevent these slaves from fleeing and sharing their knowledge with others, the imperial smith was a prisoner for life and literally or figuratively kept in shackles or rendered lame. This is why Hephaestus was commonly portrayed as a man with a lame leg. This detail was not a flight of fancy; it reflected the brutal reality of the blacksmith. Since blacksmiths were not nobles, the Hephaestus myth claims that his place on Olympus was not secure and that, for a period, he was exiled.

### The Myth of Daedalus

The Greeks worshipped Nature, and they worshipped the Sun as a god who was possibly named Helios and later Apollo. But the myth of Daedalus portrays the Sun as a danger

and an obstacle to the human ambition to fly—possibly the religious ambition to ‘fly’ away from planet Earth. Therefore, the myth is probably a forgery.

The Greeks worshipped Nature, and they worshipped the Sea as a god, possibly a god named Poseidon. When the Sun causes Daedalus to crash into the Sea, Poseidon does not save him. In contrast, the Christian scriptures have a few stories of people being saved despite being thrown into the Sea, as its penultimate hero walks over water and saves his disciple from drowning. So, which religion would you prefer if you were a sailor?

According to the myth, both Daedalus and his father wished to escape from a city. Did they pray to the Greek gods for help? No. Why not? Apparently, the author wanted us to conclude that Greeks didn’t expect salvation from their gods. So, instead of praying, they try to be more practical and turn to inventing. So, they invent wings. Of course, the authors did not want their readers to think that technology could replace religion, so the improvised wings fail and Daedalus dies.

Now, technology is part of the new religion. Instead of listening to priests, the modern citizen is glued to a screen through which the undiscerning and naïve mind is easily controlled by the technocratic ruling class. Yes, we are trying to build ‘wings,’ but instead of being betrayed by our wings and falling from the Sky and dying in the Sea, our technologies are destroying the air, the sky, the seas, the lands and even the natural, healthy electromagnetic radiation with which all life was designed to harmonize and thrive.

### The Myth of Arachne

Arachne’s ‘crime,’ for which she was turned into a spider, was beating Athena in a weaving competition. Again, this is not a harmless fairy tale. Arachne symbolizes the servant or slave who weaves, while Athena symbolizes upper class women—women who, like Odysseus’ Penelope, also spent much time weaving. The powerful are so proud and intolerant that they will punish anyone who proves them inferior.

The images woven by the two competitors also deserve scrutiny. Athena, not surprisingly, wove a selfie, a scene glorifying and flattering her. Perhaps the notion of divine vanity sounds amusing, but the truth is not amusing; the truth speaks of the shameless vanity and vindictiveness of the ruling class.

In contrast, Arachne wove a scene illustrating the truth about the infidelities of Zeus. Athena, being the daughter of Zeus, was not ready to accept this truth, so she had a fit of righteous wrath and destroyed Arachne’s work, destroyed her loom, touched her forehead to make her feel guilty, and turned her into a spider. In other words, if you dare to publicize the truth about your rulers, be prepared to suffer.

Finally, the myth is set in Lydia, so Arachne represents the people of Lydia, or modern day Turkey, the land famous for its rug weaving. Indeed, prior to the Industrial Revolution, Europe was a cultural backwater that produced hardly any value-added goods, certainly nothing to compete with Asia’s rugs, silks, spices, and so on. The Arachne myth merely captures the fury and nagging sense of inferiority felt by pre-modern Europeans.

### The Myth of Alexander the Great

Of course, Alexander the Great earned his title: he was great, noble, a patron of the arts, pure of heart, without a trace of racism. *Of course he was*. Why do you think he extended his empire east, towards India, and sought into Egypt, not west and north into Europe? Obviously he did not want to build an empire of uncivilized deer, rabbits, Druids and pre-feudal forest dwellers. He wasn't interested in Egypt's and Asia's wealth; he just loved darker skinned peoples.

## THE ANCIENTS

The Greek classics are the poisonous excrement of Catholic theocrats, and their fingerprints still betray them. Consider the supposedly authentic fragments attributed to the ancient Greek philosopher, Heraclitus. They parody philosophy while they glorify theocracy. Fragment 126 says, "Cold things grow hot, hot things grow cold, the wet dries, the dried is moistened." This is mere trivia, not philosophy. Heraclitus also expresses the conservative religious view that physical pleasure is bad: "If happiness lay in bodily pleasures, we could call oxen happy when they find vetch to eat" (4). Heraclitus also expresses such strong criticisms of the Greek religion that he sounds not like a Greek philosopher but like a Catholic inquisitor, someone devoid of religious tolerance: "The rites accepted by mankind in the Mysteries are an unholy performance" (14) and "If it were not in honour of Dionysus that they conducted the procession and sang the hymn to the male organ their activity would be completely shameless." Excuse me, who instructed you to speak so badly of sex, pleasure and the male organ?

Heraclitus also uses the classist metaphors commonly used by Catholic priests: "The majority are satisfied, like well-fed cattle" (29). His statement that "Every creature is driven to pasture with a blow" (11) clearly echoes the Bible's pro-violence and pro-child-abuse statement: "Spare the rod and spoil the child" (Proverbs 13:24).

Curiously, knowledge of the so-called pre-Socratic philosophers depends largely on what we are told about them by Plato and Aristotle. In his *Republic*, Plato claims that the ancient Orphic doctrine supports a belief in "Rewards and punishments in the next world" (363C). This view was certainly not dominant among ancient Greeks; it is the Judeo-Christian view of the afterlife. And whereas ancient Greeks and pagan religions generally did not concern themselves with a world after death but with this world, Plato nevertheless claims that "the Orphic books give instruction on purification ... which if performed will save us from hurt in the next world" (364E). Aristotle insists that the ancient poets "agree that the Ruler [of the universe] is not Night and Heaven or Chaos or Ocean, but Zeus" (*Metaphysics* 1071b, 1091b). This is highly unlikely. Before imperial elites turn the Greek religion into a pantheon of human-like gods, the ancient Greek poets certainly did not have some Christian-like belief that one god rules everything. They had no interest in totalitarian rulers—and would have scorned the mere idea of absolute power invested in one being. But Aristotle and Plato are both cowardly theocrats pretending to be knowledgeable philosophers and historians.

## FABLES

Fables are the heritage of no particular persons; they belong to pre-literate cultures and to humanity. So, when Aesop claims ownership of 207 fables, we have to be suspicious. We have to wonder, who gave him enough paper and *leisure* to write so many fables? And, for what purpose were they put in writing? Did he “write” them like the 19<sup>th</sup> century Grimm brothers, who collected German folktales in order to save the oral tradition? This is unlikely. Anthropology did not even exist in Aesop’s time, and we lack any evidence that the rising ruling class, that is, the rising literate class, was ever concerned about losing its oral tradition. Indeed, they viewed their literacy as a trait that distinguished them from the uneducated common, serf and slave classes. So, it’s highly unlikely that they would save the oral tradition.

Besides, we have to remember that the ruling classes were (and are) always founded on plunder, thievery and murder. So, the likeliest scenario is that Aesop “stole” his fables from the Greek oral tradition—from the lower classes—and intentionally revised them. Or, he stole the fable genre and turned it into an imperial genre. In any case, almost all of Aesop’s fables reflect imperial, elitist values because the elite needed material that could serve as “teaching” material in Greek and/or Roman academies for the wealthy.

This conclusion is supported by Aesop’s name, which is unique, and is likely a corruption of Joseph, which in some European languages ends with a “p”, and since the modern “j” sound was not fully pronounced in ancient languages, Aesop really might be the same as Joseph. So what? Experts agree that “Joseph” originates in Hebrew words meaning “God will add.” Indeed, through Aesop, God—that is, the ruling class—did add a lot of imperial fables to a few token authentic fables.

In modern editions, the “morals” written beneath each fable do not reflect their true meaning, and appear to be appended by a later editor, either a liar or an idiot.

### The She-Goats and Their Beards

THE SHE-GOATS having obtained a beard by request to Jupiter, The He-Goats were sorely displeased and made complaint that the females equaled them in dignity. "Allow them," said Jupiter, "to enjoy an empty honor and to assume the badge of your nobler sex, so long as they are not your equals in strength or courage."

It matters little if those who are inferior to us in merit  
should be like us in outside appearances.

### The Aethiop

THE PURCHASER of a black servant was persuaded that the color of his skin arose from dirt contracted through the neglect of his former masters. On bringing him home he resorted to every means of cleaning, and subjected the man to incessant scrubblings. The

servant caught a severe cold, but he never changed his color or complexion.

What's bred in the bone will stick to the flesh.

### The First Ten Fables

“The Tortoise and the Hare” is a widely known Aesopian fable. It is popularly thought to mean that if you want to achieve a goal, just stick to it, pursue it relentlessly, and however slowly you progress, know that eventually you will accomplish your goal. The moral is that a strict work ethic wins the day. This slave’s work ethic is emphasized by the speedy hare losing the race by taking naps and finding time for entertainment, two human rights which the leisure class—as Veblen Thorsteinsen called the ruling class—claimed as its exclusive luxury. In short, this first fable promotes drudgery and slavery behind its good-work-ethic bullshit—and fails to mention that the leisure class don’t race; they are born “winners.”

“The Woman and the Fat Hen” teaches us that egg-laying hens do not improve their work if they receive better compensation, and that improving their compensation will only make them lazy and completely unproductive. What nonsense! Should we really treat workers as badly as we treat our domestic animals, rewarding them with just enough money to keep them alive and dependent on continual wage-earning? Aesop has no shame in teaching the future rulers of the world the wisdom of slavery.

In “The Trees and the Ax” we meet a woodcutter, once a common symbol for the poor man. The woodcutter has an axhead but no axhandle, so he asks the trees to give him one. The king of the trees volunteers an ash tree, and he quickly regrets his decision, for the woodcutter, now armed with a complete ax, chops down all the trees—presumably the king of the trees included. I have read enough folktales to know this doesn’t sound authentic. In the first place, similar folktales always contain an environmental lesson or a warning against greed. Aesop’s version seems to be a strong warning against arming the poor masses—and such warnings are patently uncharacteristic of folklore, folklore being primarily the voice and entertainment of the poor.

The next fable, “The Lion, the Ass and the Fox Who Went Hunting” also contain a moral that is utterly foreign to folklore. It teaches that lions, meaning kings, deserve the lion’s share, and that anyone who dares to “cheat” this king of his unfair share will be killed. Logicians will identify this fable as an example of false analogy; revolutionaries will see identify it as a motive for anarchy.

In “The Travellers and the Bear” two men meet a bear, one takes flight into a tree, the other plays dead on the ground. The bear smells the man on the ground and leaves. Then the same man tells the friend who fled that the bear told him not to trust people who abandon their friends. This fable has no precedent that I know of. Its admonition for men to stick together and fight or stand side by side reflects the military code of honor of the Greek and Roman ruling class. Authentic European folklore never portrays bears as man hunters.

“The Belly and the Members” is another wonderful lesson about the importance of devoting one’s life and energy to someone—the belly—who does nothing but has the power to kill you if you don’t feed him. Thank you for that enlightening message, oh

wise Aesop. The belly is your metaphor for the ruling class, the parasites who ate but did no work beyond telling others to work. Greek and Roman writers pioneered the metaphor in which the human body is the state, with the heart or head symbolizing the ruling class; Aesop's version, with the stomach as the powerful dictator, makes this metaphor seem rather embarrassing for the ruling class; however, apparently his readers had no shame.

In "The Dolphins and the Sprat," a small fish, a sprat, tries to stop a war between the whales and the dolphins. The sprat is told by the warring parties that a warrior's death is preferable to peace through reconciliation. This is precisely the policy one needs to achieve imperial "growth" and expansion. Soldiers are expendable; even the young nobles were expendable. Do I speak in euphemisms? Doesn't Aesop misrepresent war by comparing soldiers to whales and dolphins? Two parasites competing for a single host makes a better image, but nature knows no such horrors.

In "The Fox and the Grapes," a hungry fox jumps to snatch a mouthful of grapes, fails, and consoles himself with the idea that the grapes were sour anyhow. This story warns the common people not to reach too high. Bread and water for the common herd, and wine and meat for the ruling class: such is the morality of empire. Just don't ask how the ruling class gets its bloody hands on its hoard of delicious, vine-ripened grapes.

In "The Wolf and the Crane," a wolf has a bone stuck in his throat. It is removed by a crane. When the crane demands the reward promised by the wolf, the wolf is angered and haughtily explains that its reward is to be allowed to live and boast about surviving the jaws of a wolf. Some would interpret this as a warning against helping the people's devourers, but Aesop probably meant that the powerful, predator class, should feel no need to reward the common people for anything, not even for good deeds.

The tenth fable, "The Archer and the Lion," teaches us to respect physical power. This is also very enlightening for the oppressed. Thank you, Aesop.

### Aesop Makes Slavery Look Good

In "The Heifer and the Ox," a young cow, a heifer, mocks the ox for living yoked to wagons and ploughs like a slave. When the proud heifer is taken to be sacrificed for its meat, the ox explains that a life of drudgery and endless work is better than death. How wonderfully enlightening is that? Slaves and serfs had to choose between being killed for refusing to work (insurrection) and being killed for agreeing to work (a Roman slave was typically worked to death in about 10 years. We can grant a Greek slave double that time). Are these the only choices that we can offer our fellow human beings, Aesop?

### Aesop Promotes Endless Toil

In "The Farmer and his Sons," a farmer dies, leaving his sons nothing but the property they must continue to work upon. The sons are rightfully disappointed, but Aesop makes their desire for a greater inheritance seem foolish. Doesn't a father who has toiled his entire life deserve to leave his sons with something more than a lot of soil? Maybe Aesop didn't know that, with every generation of farming the quality of the soil deteriorated significantly, so that the father leaves his children less than his father left him, and every generation has less than the one before it (unto our own day, when not only farmers, but every parent leaves his children with a more polluted world). The soil-deterioration

process was especially true for plough-based monoculture farming, the kind required for grain production, which is precisely the best kind for building empires. But the soil and environmental issues aside, Aesop has completely glossed over the fact that farmers did not enjoy being the hands that fed the gluttonous, many-headed Oligarchon that was the Greek military state.

### Aesop Promotes Consumerism

In “The Miser” we are instructed against saving and taught to dismiss stealing. I’m quite serious. The miser, having saved a pile of gold, buries it. Later, after finding it stolen—and likely by his own workers, the miser is told by his neighbor that, since he never intended to use the money, he really lost nothing and so has no basis for complaint. There is plenty of truth here, and yet this fable is a nice piece of misdirection. Stealing is the specialization of the upper class, not the slave class. Aesop should have recommended that the miser give his gold to his workers, use it to buy them freedom, or save it for his sons and daughters. He didn’t because he was only interested in preventing savers (Jews, perhaps?) from accumulating more wealth than their rulers.

### Aesop Promotes Royal Abuses of Power

“The Frogs Who Desired a King” is a ridiculous fable about the frogs who *wanted* a king because they felt life was too chaotic without one. But this fable does not merely assume that humans can be so pitiful and base as to desire a king to control them, it suggests that the frogs themselves are to blame for the violence kings sometimes *need* in order to control a populace. Aesop makes *this lie* very clear by stating that the first king was so nice that the frogs didn’t respect him, so the next king had to crush the frogs and actually devoured them. And, when the frogs begged Jupiter for mercy, the almighty god replied, “You are being justly punished for your mistake.” Thus does Aesop sanctify the abuses of power without which not a single government can exist—*because political and economic power will always be abused.*

### The Trumpeter

Not every fable by Aesop is blatant propaganda. In rare cases he almost criticizes imperialism, in others it’s hard to detect any imperial values. “The Trumpeter Taken Prisoner” is one such oddity. Roman trumpeters served their empires by communicating coded messages to soldiers scattered across a battlefield, so he is an excellent symbol for the author. Aesop trumpets the imperial value system, its morals and conventions, and the people respond like trained soldiers, marching to the blasts of his imperial (im)moral code. When the trumpeter is captured, the war grinds to a halt.

### The Blind Moralists

In “The Old Woman and the Physician,” a blind woman promises to pay a doctor in return for her eyesight. The doctor steals everything the blind woman has, so when she recovers her eyesight she humorously denies—before a judge—that any payment is due

to the doctor because if her eyesight had been restored she would see all her possessions. That's how the fable ends. No evidence that the case of the missing possessions will be solved and the doctor prosecuted. And yet the moral written underneath insists that the fable warns readers that people who "play tricks" will face consequences. This flies in the face of the story and of history. For thousands of years, people have been robbed blind by physicians and other fools and scoundrels. The 300 million or so citizens of the U.S. are perfect examples—although generally speaking the world has no shortage of examples. Millions of people suffering from cancer, diabetes, incontinence, impotence, flatulence and depression are regularly prescribed expensive treatments and our moral majority suspects nothing. Doctors might be sued for malpractice, but it's the entire profession that ought to be sued *for robbery and aiding and abetting...*

### Zeus Intervenes to Help the Powerful

A beetle rebels against an oppressive and violent eagle. Despite the eagle's best efforts, the beetle continues to destroy its eggs. At last, Zeus saves the eagle by giving it a breeding season when beetles are absent. The naïve moral insists that the fable warns powerful people against oppressing the poor, but there's no hint that the eagle felt any remorse, and obviously, thanks to Zeus' help, the eagle *will* resume its predatory practices.

### The Class System Is Sacred

In my little collection, the last fable is "The Ass and his Purchaser." A man judges the character of a new ass by the company it keeps. Seeing that the new ass prefers the company of his laziest ass, he takes the new ass back to its owner and declines to purchase it. The moral provided by the publisher? "A person is judged by the company he keeps." Idiot! The moral is this: The ruling class will never work and if you do not work yourself into an early grave for their benefit, they will not hire you or fire you.

## Conclusions

The vast majority of Aesop's fables contain evidence of imperial doctrine and dogma. The lion is always a successful imperialist, while the wolf is always a failed imperialist. Is this proof that they were written by and for the ruling class? To be honest, authentic folklore can also express a certain naivety about royalty and war, but naivety is quite distinct from explicit support for imperial practices.

The imperial bias in Aesop's fables marks them as distinctly western and unlike the Panchatantra and Bidpai fables, as well as the Jataka tales, of India. Those fables and tales reveal a relatively cheerful spirit and distinctly anti-imperial content that is alien to and frankly superior to Aesop.

Now the "genius" of using animal fables to communicate imperial values is that talking animals are naturally delightful and sweet. Today, animation is still used this way, though often animation produces sugary stories devoid of any useful understanding of nature and human nature. At least Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book* criticizes imperialism and submission to imperialism. In contrast, the "animals" in present-day animated stories behave like ordinary law-abiding humans who eat junk, use money and machines, and never question their world or take a moment to think about their errors, about their place in nature, about their similarities to other creatures and peoples, or about their common mortality. In short, modern children's stories are kiddie propaganda. If you cannot see that virtually everything is at least soft propaganda, then you cannot see beyond your own culture. But, doesn't that mean all entertainment is propaganda? Indeed, it is, insofar as everything promotes itself and the culture it represents to the exclusion of other cultures or art forms (this is soft propaganda), or directly promotes something beyond itself (traditional or hard propaganda). The propaganda question leads nowhere because all forms of life promote and propagate themselves and their offspring. What is necessary is a form of human life, of culture, that is rational, sustainable, and satisfying for all.

## THEATRE

### Introduction

Classical Greek tragedies are dead, not because we lost them but because we are forever barred from *feeling* them. Nevertheless, some people think literature speaks louder than the tombs of Egypt. They insist that human nature has not changed and that literature is about the universals that all men and women can understand and feel regardless of their location, education, age, era, or class.

To deflate this incredible piece of naivety, consider Orestes. Perhaps we can feel his pain at losing his father, Agamemnon, to the murderous hands of his mother's lover, but can we imagine ruthlessly killing a mother for any reason? Perhaps you can, but the ancient Greeks did not consider a man who kills his mother deserving of any punishment from the patriarchal state. So, Orestes only suffers pangs of guilt, pangs figuratively represented by the monstrous Erinyes that haunt him.

Who can comprehend such a play? On the one hand, we modern people believe that any intentional homicide should be punished, unless, of course, it's committed by a soldier or policeman. On the other hand, many of us, like medieval Christians, still scorn adulterers like Orestes' mother. Finally, on the third hand, some of us belong to a future era. We are already so transformed that we see another crime entirely, not the crimes of Orestes, his mother or her lover, but the crime Agamemnon committed against his family by leaving them for a foreign land and not returning for a decade. Honestly, did he expect his wife to wither alone and unloved while he committed crimes abroad by plundering Troy? We might not condone the murder of Agamemnon, but what choice did her lover have? Agamemnon would have killed him.

Humanity is changing and it is still heterogeneous. Today we live in an increasingly secular society, and this raises problems for literature, for ancient literature is deeply religious. Even with Shakespeare, religion is crucial to understanding his tragedies. And, with Greek tragedies, religion is even more central. In fact, the *Oedipus* trilogy has no other function but to frighten and fear monger people into obeying religious authorities like oracles, priests or prophets *regardless of what madness they demand from us*.

Thanks to the great gulf that separates us from ancient Greece, the *Oedipus* trilogy is now a mere curiosity. It is more suitable for museums than for the stage. Even Zeus is now only suitable for cartoons.

Besides, Greek tragedies were not written for commoners like myself; they were expressly written for Greek aristocrats, people whose values and life experiences are entirely unlike those of the modern voting wage slave.

For Aristotle, tragedy did not need to be about war, oppression, corruption, poverty, rapine, economic rape, inequality or any of the crimes committed by the ruling class. Somehow, as if he'd been raised on the Bible, he considered irreligious behavior, adultery, and the mysterious ways of the gods appropriate themes for tragedy.

Aristotle also had some unique ideas about the function of tragedy. Rather than claim its purpose is to enlighten people about the errors of their ways, he argued that tragedy serves to provide a therapeutic experience. Well, he was right; Greek tragedy did serve to give relief—but only to the ruling class. He called this therapeutic experience “catharsis,” which is a good euphemism for *brainwashing* or *guilt washing*.

But, from what, precisely, did tragedy provide relief? What did it wash away? What profound stresses troubled the noble Greek soul? Was it, perhaps, the guilt that comes with being an imperialist—: 1) Guilt for mistreating children, 2) Guilt for mistreating women, 3) Guilt for using military violence, and 4) Guilt for profiting from the poor masses whose lives are short and brutish because they are exploited by the privileged class.

#### Euripides' *Medea*

- Despicable racist and sexist depiction of foreign women --- and a complex pun of *media/medea* confirmed by the plot, in which *text(tiles)*, meaning clothing, is used to punish and kill Greeks.

#### Aeschylus' *The Persians*

*The Persians* is a tragedy that likely wasn't very popular. What Greek would have cared to watch about a play about the grief felt by the enemies Greece had defeated? This play could never have been staged in Greece. Can you imagine a movie about the suffering of the Iraqi people during the U.S. invasion and occupation? Would it be popular in the U.S.? Did any British script-writer dare to write about the grief felt by Nazi survivors who lamented the fall of their empire and their comrades? This is what we have in *The Persians*.

Was the Greek noble audience composed of sadists who savoured the grief of their enemies?

#### Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*

We can thank Aeschylus for providing the world with examples of pure imperial prejudice, fear mongering and moralizing. King Agamemnon abandoned his family for 10 years and embarked on an insane military campaign to save his brother's marriage and reclaim his brother's strumpet wife from the Trojans. Did he seriously expect his wife to chain herself to chastity *for 10 years*? If I may interject, if you love a woman, but cannot please her, let another man do better. I cannot feel pathos for Agamemnon when his wife "cheats" on him, but the stupid, arrogant and insensitive Greek audience—the *men, of course*—did feel pathos for Agamemnon, and perhaps the women went away feeling the requisite dose of fear at Aeschylus' warning about what happens to women who cheat. No doubt, the men in the audience were outraged when King Agamemnon was killed by his wife's lover, Aigisthos. And when the dead king's son rose up to kill the murderer, all the righteous men and women felt justice was served. And what about the young prince who killed Aigisthos? Of course, the prince would have to suffer the wrath of the Furies because however evil he was, Aigisthos was a *noble*. But, how would the script read differently if Aigisthos had been an ex-slave? Right, skip the Furies.

While I mercilessly *destroy* Greek tragedies, my contemporaries remain spellbound by the myth of their sublime and ennobling virtues. Educated men still dare to quote Greek tragedies as if they taught moral lessons.

#### Sophocles' *Oedipus*

We must pity the millions of students who are forced to find morals in this piece of Catholic excrement. How blind must one be to imagine that a story in which a family is commanded by a god to kill its son and because the mother spares her son's life, divine retribution requires that the whole family suffer from murder, suicide and incest while the whole city of Thebes suffers from a plague? Do you really want to suck a moral out of that poison brew?

And the author of this *forgery* had so little respect for his readers that he thought we would believe that wealthy Greek nobles would watch a play in which a Greek king kills his father and fucks his mother *because Apollo required it*? What appalling and repugnant nonsense. Every Greek noble would have left the theater and burned Sophocles alive.

Obviously, the *Oedipus* is an onerous piece of Catholic excrement. The best proof of this is its rabid theo-centricism and misogyny. The gods and the priests are all-powerful, and kings and queens must submit to their laws and pronouncements. That is its ultimate message.

Secondly, the fraudster behind Sophocles teaches that women are evil. Jocasta, the mother of Oedipus, is worse than Eve; within the story, from the author's perspective, she is a monster because she is atheistic, blasphemous and *knowingly* committed incest with her son and allowed an entire city to suffer. *She knew* – how could she not have known? The prophet had told her that if her son was not killed, he would kill her husband and copulate with her. Well, she let the child live abroad, and soon after her husband was killed she married a man who was obviously younger than herself. Therefore, she intentionally sinned.

But Jocasta is just the tip of the misogynistic, Catholic fingerprint. The Sphinx provides more evidence. It devoured the men who tried to solve its riddle, and when Oedipus solved its riddle it acknowledged his fitness to be king, and the results were disastrous—a horrible plague for the city. Of course, according to Sophocles, the Sphinx is a woman!

And, of course, all the men are good and noble. Even Oedipus is somewhat heroic as he struggles to ignore his mother's evil advice and pursues the truth about his life. Finally, all the good gods are male. Female gods are mentioned, but they do nothing but sit in degrading places like the marketplace—a place despised by the priest type.

\*

Following Aristotle's theory, we can assume that playwrights help the guilt-ridden ruling class identify with tragic heroes on the stage so that pent up feelings of guilt about their actions in the real world are redirected onto the state and released as the guilty heroes or villains are punished or absolved. To make this kind of medicine work, the play must not be about the real world, certainly not about imperialism, because the imperialists who visit the theatre do not want to be preached to. Secondly, the play must not be too fantastical and divorced from the world of crime and guilt, otherwise the elites will not experience a little catharsis.

Let's apply this psycho-logic to the *Oedipus* trilogy: Oedipus' accidentally sleeps with his mother because this most rare and unimagined sex "crime" reminds the noble audience of the then very common sex crimes committed by the male nobility against their slaves and war prisoners. Moreover, all aristocratic cultures emphasize the need to avoid any sort of intimacy with parents; parents are supposed to be distant and aloof, and sleeping with one's mother absolutely violates this custom.

Therefore, *Oedipus* allowed the Greek aristocratic theatre-goer to release the suppressed guilt associated with normalized sex crimes against slaves and servants and to increase and reinforce the culture of fear of parental intimacy.

If Aristotle's theory is correct, the ancient Greeks must have considered Oedipus worthy of their sympathy. But, for intelligent people, the appropriate response to the Oedipus story is not sympathy for Oedipus but outrage at the gods or at the idiots who believed that a child is destined to commit crimes and therefore must be killed in infancy.

Moreover, the entire premise that Oedipus is guilty of sleeping with his mother and killing his father is absurd. After all, he did not know the man he killed was his father, and he did not know that his wife was his mother. And perhaps his murder of his father, King Laius, represents a case of divine justice; after all, Laius may not have had the courage to kill Oedipus, but he did expect a servant to commit that crime for him.

Of course, the servant didn't have the heart to kill Oedipus either, so Oedipus lived, but the gods marked him with a lame foot. This illustrates the Greek obsession with physical beauty. It was a pathological obsession, so much so that any physically "imperfect" child was considered impure and left to die, just like Oedipus with his deformed foot.

What have I done? I've demonstrated that Aristotle was deceptive. Greek tragedy did not merely function to give the audience a cathartic thrill, but served to purge the audience of guilt felt for actual crimes, so that it could continue committing those crimes, and Greek tragedy functioned to affirm the immoral and irrational habits of the ruling class: infanticide, theocracy, superstition, and scapegoating. The entire Aristotelian explanation of Greek tragedy has fallen apart. In its place stands revealed an elaborate psychological device that serves to promote imperialism and insanity.

\*

Another reason for dismissing the assumed greatness of the *Oedipus* tragedy is that the plot is weak and implausible. By no stretch of the imagination can I believe that a young man could accidentally and unknowingly kill his father and marry his mother. Of course, Sophocles attempted to make it believable by telling us that King Laius was in disguise when Oedipus killed him, but this raises a new problem, for according to Sophocles Oedipus was alone and armed only with a stick when he killed the king. This is laughable.

Moreover, assuming the king was in disguise, the whole region would have been upset and shocked by his murder, yet we are expected to believe that Oedipus took the dead king's throne without making the connection between the dead king and the man he had killed shortly before taking his throne. Could you kill your nation's elected leader and never realize who you had killed? This is absurd.

And how could Oedipus have walked into Thebes and married the widowed queen so easily? She could not have forgotten the prophecy that a young man, her son, would commit incest with her; and what kind of prince would marry a woman old enough to be his mother? It's all just very silly.

\*

This western classic has an appalling and despicable purpose, and the means it employs to achieve that purpose are equally appalling and despicable. The purpose of the play, as mentioned above, was to demonstrate that anyone who defies religious authority will suffer severe consequences. Even if the religious authority commands you to do something appalling and despicable, like murder your newborn son, you *must* do it, and—here is the biggest lie and piece of fear-mongering—if you refuse to do, thousands of people, an entire city, will suffer enormously, and you could even cause them to suffer

from a widespread plague! Imagine, to have the audacity to write such lies. The Greeks really didn't know what caused plagues, but their religious authorities and playwrights were quick to explain it in the manner that served to promote and preserve their authority. *Do what we say or everyone will suffer and die on account of you.*

Today, secular authorities use the same lies. They argue that if children are not "immunized" with their "shots" they could catch some fatal disease, allow it to mutate into a more deadly form, and spread and devastate an innocent population. Of course, despite a century of incomplete immunization programs, no such event has occurred, and evidence exists that shows communicable diseases have become rare for reasons other than our medicines.

But let's return to *Oedipus* and its despicable theocratic agenda. The playwright even dared to argue that royalty, namely King Laius and Queen Jocasta, must obey religious authorities, even if those authorities demand the execution of their newborn son. Did ancient Greece actually have such powerful religious authorities? Western historians and Grecophiles portray ancient Greece as a place of progressive and tolerant government and culture... Could they be any further from the truth?

Finally, to save the city, the king—King Oedipus—must be killed. This plot seems to have been influenced by anti-monarchic, republican values, although this belief in the power of kings to save people by dying also reeks of Pharaohism and Christianity.

#### Euripides's *Helen*

The classics scholar Philip Vellacott attempted to turn Euripides into someone with modern, humanistic values who had to hide these values under a veil of irony, but that is wishful thinking. I'll grant that Euripides' plays often express anti-war sentiments, but violence merely becomes the privilege of the gods, and I deny that Euripides wrote a single word against the exploitation of women, slaves and children. Indeed, he did not hesitate to write the following lie for his Empire of Death: "The noblest thing a slave can do is die for his master" (*Helen*). The same play expresses a racist view of Egypt when Menelaus realizes he's in Egypt and remarks, "Egypt! Could anything be worse? What a place to have reached!" When an old Egyptian woman takes offense, he says, "I was only groaning at my own misfortune," which is not an apology, not even an explanation; it merely confirms Menelaus' earlier statement that Egypt is an awful place. Ironically, if historians are to be trusted, later Greeks desired Egypt and conquered and colonized it. Helen isn't happy about being in Egypt, either: "the gods have uprooted me from my home and planted me among an outlandish race ... in a country like this all are slaves except one man." These are slurs and patent lies about ancient Egypt. Whoever Euripides was, his portrait of Egypt is almost as hateful as the Bible's.

I could fill a book with more evidence of Euripides' pro-imperial values, but I wouldn't want you to go blind from reading.

#### RFK's Aeschylus

The influence of Greek literature on modern, university graduates was on display on the occasion of the assassination of MLK, when Robert Kennedy decided to quote lines from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* instead of from the Bible. This shouldn't surprise us, for while

the Greek tragedians were imperial prostitutes and literary medicine men, Greek tragedies to articulate the pain and the chaos that infects the imperial soul. For such souls, however cruel and stupid, however crass and callous, do struggle to excuse the pain and misery they cause, and suppressing this inner struggle like a good stoic might not be as pleasant or cathartic as indulging in a bit of staged melodrama.

So, RFK, unable to articulate his feelings in his own words, or choosing to impress his listeners with a classical quotation, turned to Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. The quotation was supposed to read, "In our sleep, pain which cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart until, in our own *despair*, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God." However, Robert misquoted Aeschylus, reading *despite* where the text reads *despair*. Well, perhaps it was no accident, for I think that *despite* his government's assassination of MLK, RFK did not quite *despair* at MLK's death. You can still watch recordings of his speech, and judge for yourself, but *despair* is too strong a word for a man who showed little emotion.

And little understanding. The lines quoted by RFK speak of wisdom but deliver none, for Aeschylus was not wise except that he kept himself alive by writing what pleased his rulers. Therefore he did not write,

In the clarity of thought,  
we reflect on the injustice of the Trojan War  
on the daily cruelties that make our rulers wealthy,  
and we understand the wisdom of refusing to comply  
and we tell our war hungry rulers—  
Go jump off a bridge!

Wisdom would have gotten Aeschylus killed or banished, so he could speak of wisdom but deliver none, and so RFK could safely quote the hollow breast of the imperial bard. He could safely advise the angry African-Americans and other supporters of MLK that they should do as the "the ancient Greeks wrote so many years ago, to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world," for those are the words of a man who wants gentle, sheep-like people, not outspoken critics. And, they are also the words of a man who did not know that we could only create that gentler world by walking away from this world and creating the new one elsewhere.

Finally, anyone who knows the *Agamemnon* story and the life of Martin Luther King would know that it is ridiculous to compare words that honor the death of a Greek warlord in memory of a pacifist like Martin Luther King. But, understanding does not come from the mouths of our politicians.

### Prometheus and Other Heroes

Prometheus is the story of a hero who defied tyranny and sought to help the poor, so it is arguably the world's most explicitly anti-imperial story—precisely why it was favoured by Shelley and others. So, why didn't the Roman conquerors burn it along with all the other Greek treasures they seized? Perhaps they enjoyed Aeschylus' negative portrayal of the Greek arch-god, Zeus. But, then what about the Greek nobles? Why did they tolerate a play in which someone rebels against Zeus, who, despite being their chief God, is

portrayed as a merciless tyrant while Prometheus is portrayed as the helper of mankind? Did the play speak to the tormented conscience of the merciless, tyrannical ruling class?

Scholars consider *Prometheus Bound* an oddity verging on heresy, but really, it's quite typical of Greek tragedy, so neither the Romans nor the Greeks would have taken much notice of it. Like Aeschylus, Euripides also portrayed Greek gods as tyrants; and Sophocles' Oedipus, despite being a helper of mankind, is condemned. And the pattern continues into our own time, as people who stand up to tyranny in almost every country are fired from their jobs, abused by police, thrown into jail cells, denied trials, subjected to forms of torture that would rival the agonies endured by Prometheus, and are assassinated or executed. We don't need a list of their names; we just need to remember that, while Hollywood has not yet revived the hero's fame, his story is our reality.

### Euripides, the Exile

In contrast to the works of Aeschylus and Sophocles, Euripides is so progressive that I can hardly fathom how the ruling elite managed to tolerate him. In *The Trojan Women*, Euripides demands sympathy from his Greek audience for Trojan women, including those Trojan women who were taken captive as concubines. Additionally, he uses the Trojan prophetess, Cassandra, to draw a conclusion that would have pleased feminists and infuriated the rulers. Cassandra drew the conclusion that, since Helen went willingly with her lover, perhaps she was not happy with her husband, a conclusion that redirects the blame to Menelaus, her husband, and this would have been an unthinkable heresy—at least for the noblemen, for they always thought of themselves as blameless, just as today our rulers consider themselves blameless, no matter the dissatisfaction of the 99%.

Euripides' play also slanders Odysseus, the legendary Greek nobleman who neglects his family, sleeps around, profits from war, and feels no regret at losing the lives of the men who served him—Odysseus, that clever, determined Odysseus who represents the aristocratic "virtues" excellence in war planning, cunning in negotiating the terms of war, freedom from hand-to-hand combat, readiness to kill unarmed men without warning, control over women, suppression of lust, pity, grief and sympathy, and a talent for profiting under any circumstance. How does Euripides slander this icon of aristocratic greatness? When Hecuba learns that she has been condemned to be Odysseus' slave (sex slave), she laments,

Odysseus? Oh! Odysseus! Now  
Shear the head, tear the cheek,  
Beat the brow!  
Cruellest fate of all! Now I belong  
To a perjured impious outcast, who defies  
Man's law and God's; monster of wickedness  
Whose tongue twists straight to crooked, truth to lies,  
Friendship to hatred, mocks right and honours wrong!

But is this actually slanderous? We are tempted to think so because Homer has most students of Greek literature believing that Odysseus was a Greek hero. However, Homer's view is not supported by Greek tragedians. According to my limited reading,

both Euripides and Sophocles (in *Philoctetes*) did not paint flattering portraits of Odysseus. They portray him as an *odious* character. Perhaps, then, the real mystery is why Homer contradicts the *authentic* Greek tradition.

### Aristophanes

I sigh and grow weary of this man's love of laughing at others. But, at least I will grant him that he laughed heartily and mocked without restraint. The Romans ruined comedy. They suppressed it. They let pride and morals start to creep in, and they killed comedy by cleaning it up. Nothing raunchy or irreligious is allowed to creep in. They sneer and snort at portraits of wealthy men who couldn't control their slaves, their women and their sons; they laugh scornfully at ignorant foreigners, impudent slaves, lazy spendthrift women, girl-infatuated sons, cowardly sons, and so on and so forth. Unlike middle-class and working-class Americans, who laugh at their politicians, the Romans upper class would never tolerate comedies about them. But then, compared to a dangerous mind like that of George Carlin, even Greece's Aristophanes played it safe. Aristophanes mocked populist politicians (politicians who tend to be mild-mannered); he mocked innovative, liberal tragedians like Euripides (Euripides introduced strong female characters and intelligent slaves); and he mocked Socrates, a rather harmless philosopher. Why didn't Aristophanes mock a conservative politician, you know the kind, one of those old-school tyrants? Why didn't he mock Sophocles and the greedy, superstitious, backwards-thinking priests who managed the lucrative temples on the Athenian acropolis? Why didn't he? Well, perhaps he wanted to live.

*Lysistrata* is a good example of Aristophanes' conservatism (cowardice, bullshit, etc.). The plot concerns Lysistrata's attempt to stop the Peloponnesian War by persuading Greek and Spartan women to go on a sex strike until peace is established. I laugh to think that a war might be cancelled for sex, but Aristophanes' audience likely laughed for other reasons. First, they likely laughed because during Aristophanes' lifetime, aristocratic men often went to the battlefields, so sex with women was never an option. Second, they likely laughed because Greek men devalued sex with women and prized homosexuality and paedophilia. Third, they never imagined women capable of such acts of resistance. In short, the sex strike is funny for Greek noblemen because they viewed women as powerless, base creatures whose primary value lay in reproduction.

Lysistrata's effort to stop the war includes a second act of disobedience as the older women seize the state treasury on the Acropolis. It's a brilliant stratagem. It prevents Athens from paying its soldiers. But some old men arrive to break down the "doors" and the whole scene devolves into a heap of timelessly funny sexual metaphors and puns. It's funny in an infantile sort of way, and it's not funny because this scene, and indeed the entire play, reveals that Aristophanes never voiced any serious anti-war sympathies. Instead, he helped the ruling elite find laughter in the horror of war.

The funny thing is that sex strikes have actually been effective in modern times. Sex strikes in Liberia and Columbia have been effective. It's heartening news; and, I suspect it sets intellectuals far apart from ordinary criminals.

## ARISTOPHANES

I am a devoted and sworn amateur comedian, so Aristophanes was like my sacred ground, a beloved favorite I understood poorly and who long avoided my book-burning revisionary reading. However, one day I perused some of his pages again, and I was struck by the bitter realization that I was once again up to my eyebrows in fraud. For decades I passively accepted the notion that Aristophanes' brazenly critical, satirical, slanderous, ribald and blasphemous plays were living proof that the ancient Greek politicians and land owners were profoundly philosophical and tolerant of heresy and slander, but experience has taught me that this is absurd. There never has been and never will be a ruling class that rewards comedians for making a mockery of them, their habits and their religion. I think a quick sampling of some of the most egregious insults to the Greeks rulers will suffice to persuade you that the works of Aristophanes could not have been staged in ancient Athens, Greece, and that 'his' works are foreign frauds.

### The Birds

**Damning Evidence 1:** Euelpides explains that he's abandoning Athens because it's overrun with laws and lawyers, but he jokingly insists that he doesn't hate Athens, "that blessed land where men are free—to pay their fees [or *taxes*]." Many similar jokes are equally unpatriotic. Did Athenian Greeks actually enjoy mocking their own country? This is the kind of comedy we find over 2,000 years later in contemporary western nations. Here, the lower and middle classes enjoy watching televised evening political satires aimed at their leaders. But such satires could never have existed in ancient Athens because its comedies were entirely staged for the amusement of the ruling class.

**Damning Evidence 2:** Pisthetairos advises Hoopoe to build a city in the sky, and adds, "As for the gods, if they object or get in your way, you can wipe them all out by starvation." Hoopoe asks how he could starve them, and his advisor recommends forcing the gods to pay a poll tax or tribute on anything they take from the world below. Hoopoe likes the idea, and no one accuses him or his advisor of heresy. The exchange is meant to be funny, but let us consider the utter unlikelihood of this being funny for ancient Greeks. You might as well stage Monty Python's irreverent *The Life of Brian* or read my *An American Satire* in the Vatican and expect the clergy to enjoy it.

**Damning Evidence 3:** In accordance with the title, *The Birds* makes a mockery of the Greek tradition of associating birds with their gods. The chorus is actually made to sing a heretical song about the birds being older than the gods and being the first offspring of Love and being quite successful at supposedly seducing young boys into being the objects of anal sex. Then, not satisfied with lechery, the chorus claims that it is Apollo.

### The Frogs

**Damning Evidence 4:** Dionysus, the Greek god of festivities and wine, among other things, stars in Aristophanes' *The Frogs* and is the butt of numerous jokes. He even slanders himself, calling himself the "son of Grapejuice." His costume further degrades him, as he comes dressed in a lion skin loincloth and a nighty. Finally, he claims that his

home is among the dead, for he asks Charon, the boatman of the dead, to take him home. Later in the play, a frightened donkey renders Dionysus yellow, meaning the donkey pissed on the god. Ah, it's all very funny—if you're not Greek and if you get your thrills *mocking others*.

**Damning Evidence 5:** The play viciously parodies the sacred rituals of ancient Greece. Aristophanes jokes that a hymn sung by Athenian worshippers was written by an atheist called Diagoras.

**Damning Evidence 6:** Dionysus is portrayed as a lecherous old beast who lusts for young girls.

## The Clouds

**Damning Evidence 7:** Philosophy represented the pride and a jewel on the crown of classical Greek education. Philosophy was supposed to ennoble and hone the minds of Greece's youth. So, why does Aristophanes reduce it Socrates—Greece's iconic philosopher—to a laughingstock? Why does he turn Socrates into a charlatan who makes money teaching spendthrifts how to use logic to weasel out of their debts? Why? Because Aristophanes was not Aristophanes but some vile Catholic liar who wanted to mock and discredit everything Greek. And since all Aristophanic comedies were written by Catholic hacks, 'Aristophanes' gladly mocks people who do not respect their debts and does not dare satirize the system that creates debts through usury and the fraud we call fractional reserve banking.

**Damning Evidence 8:** When Socrates refuses to swear by the gods, whom he calls figments of "vulgar superstition," Strepsiades asks if he wishes to swear by "Bars of iron, as do the Byzantines." This little sentence exposes a treasure trove of fraud. I consider it impossible for a Greek comedian to mock his own nation's legends to an audience of Greek imperialists and patriots. What legend did Aristophanes mock? According to legend, Byzantium was the first name of the city later called Constantinople and now known as Istanbul. It was the capital of Christian Greece or Byzantium. So, for Aristophanes to allege that the Byzantines used debased and fraudulent currency amounts to slander and economic treason. Moreover, there's no evidence that ancient Byzantines used iron coins. However, during the Middle Ages the Byzantine Empire did struggle to maintain its reputation as the producers of the best gold coins, and not coincidentally, as the crusading Catholics pillaged Byzantium her coins were debased as gold 'vanished' and coins contained an ever decreasing quantity of gold, until Venetian bankers, stuffed with stolen gold, monopolized Europe's minting market. In short, Strepsiades' joke sounds like it was minted (made) after the Crusaders destroyed Byzantium during the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries.

**Damning Evidence 9:** Strepsiades is corrupted by Socrates and calls Zeus a fraud and a joke. He is not punished for his blasphemies, nor does he feel regret; instead, he somehow de-corrupts himself and punishes Socrates for blaspheming the gods. Finally, the Thinkery, a parody of a university, is set aflame by the pyromaniac *inquisitor*. Honestly, this so-called comedy ends with an attempt to burn heretics alive, and the survivors are whipped! Maybe, Aristophanes was a prophet who knew a thing or two about medieval Western Europe.

**Damning Evidence 10:** A good comedian would not dare mock *his entire audience*, especially *unprovoked*. Conventional comedy typically directs mockery at everyone except the audience, its country and its religion. But Aristophanes must have wanted to get himself killed, for in *The Clouds* he repeatedly insults his audience and specifically Athenian poets, lawyers and politicians. Casting prudence aside, he accuses the elite of Athens of buggery, or sodomy. Next, he insults Athenians by calling them a pallid-faced people. Finally, he explodes with vicious slanders, calling his audience “suckers,” “shysterbait,” “dupes,” “asses” and other slurs. But look! The first three slurs in my list are more than slurs; they are fraudian slips.

Lysistrata

**Damning Evidence 11:** *Lysistrata* is Aristophanes’ most popular play because it appears to promote a humanistic value: peace, not war. Commentators and scholars actually believe that Aristophanes used the Athenian stage as a soap box from which to denounce Athens’ involvement in the civil war known as the Peloponnesian War. This is ridiculous. Could an American playwright, 150 years ago, have staged a play in Washington that portrayed Washington’s ruling elite as a bunch of lecherous dolts who could be beaten and controlled by their wives? A plot of this sort might appeal to the idealist and feminist in us, but the idea that it was performed for warlords is a fantasy. Even in our own ‘liberal’ times, Hollywood would not dare produce a movie advising America’s rulers to prefer sex and love to war and money. Besides, Athens was under mortal threat, so its surrender of weapons would have resulted in its annihilation—but undoubtedly the author would have enjoyed that.

**Damning Evidence 12:** This play is named after the Athenian woman whose anti-war strategy is to persuade all Athenian women to go on a sex strike until the men renounce war. While two sex strikes have achieved peace during the past century, Aristophanes’ plot is not believable because its sex strike is limited to heterosexual sex between married partners, and this limiting is strange because in other plays he freely accuses Athenians of homosexuality. Moreover, prostitution was common, and prostitutes would not have dared to go on strike, so the notion that a marital sex strike could persuade rich Greek men to give up their war effort is simply ridiculous. And, more than *The Clouds*, this play insults Athenian men by portraying them as a bunch of weak-kneed and debauched morons. If Aristophanes had existed and staged this play, he would certainly have been exiled or executed.

**Damning Evidence 13:** Water is associated with peace, and fire with war and the medieval Catholic practice of burning people alive. The commissioner says to the female chorus, “I’ll wield my trusty torch and scorch the lot!” Of course, the torch is a phallic symbol, but even here, threatening a chorus with rape would have been as funny as hearing Tom Cruise threaten to rape all his co-actresses.

**Damning Evidence 14:** Finally, Aristophanes betrays his Catholic prejudice by frequently recommending wine. Even in *Lysistrata*, where abstinence from sex is the way to peace, the character named Kinesias credits wine with making the Spartans friendly towards Athens. And, of course, the notion that abstinence could be good is a very Catholic idea, though it wasn’t made mandatory for priests until the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

## SOPHOCLES

How to make Christianity look good – child sacrifice in Greece – but God-Isaac-Ram and Jesus are the solution

### Oedipus the Tyrant

Sophocles set *Oedipus* in Thebes, but in which Thebes? One was in Greece proper, the other in Egypt, which Greece ruled from 323-30 BC. In my unpopular contrarian view, all ambiguities aside, the best argument supports Egyptian Thebes as the location. My reasons are as follows:

**Reason 1:** The play blames a deadly plague on an Egyptian monument, the Sphinx. Admittedly, this is weak evidence, but more and better evidence will come.

**Problem 1:** Sophocles supposedly died well before the Greeks conquered and colonized Egypt. Why would Sophocles have blamed an exotic Egyptian monument in his Greek tragedy at a time when Egypt was not a problem for Greece, had never attacked it and had done nothing to antagonize it?

**More Problems:** Sophocles' decision to blame the plagues on the Sphinx instead of on Apollo is strange. Apollo usually takes the blame for plagues in other Greek classics. But that is also very strange, since Apollo was the god of medicine. How can we explain this unGreek portrayal of Apollo? Was someone paid to make a mockery of the Greek religions?

**Damning Evidence 1:** Greek classics like the *Theogony* by Hesiod also demonize Egyptian gods and even claim that Egypt's Sphinx is a monstrous evil. Besides the fact that this is pure, xenophobic slander, the Hesiod connection *does not add credibility to Sophocles*. In fact, since Hesiod *reputedly* lived centuries before Sophocles, during a time when Greeks could not have had any interest in demonizing Egyptian gods, Hesiod is under suspicion for yet another reason.

**Damning Evidence 2:** The priest says of Oedipus: “[Y]ou freed us from the tribute which we paid that cruel singer, the Sphinx.” This Greek nonsense translated into English nonsense. *No tribute was ever paid by Greeks to any sphinx*. Quite the opposite was true. *Tributes were paid by the Egyptians to their Greek conquerors*. And who invented this nonsense about the Sphinx singing like some legendary mermaid leading sailors to their destruction? And why connect singing with evil? This also stinks of the Bible.

**Damning Evidence 3:** Two sentences prior to the above quotation, Sophocles wrote, “The black god of death is made rich with wailing and funeral ornaments. Simon and Schuster's commentator claims the “black god of death” refers to Hades, but the color black is not one of Hades' attributes. The racist liar who *rewrote* the play thought it was clever to attribute African skin color to the most loathed god. Moreover, the great wailing associated with the plague is reminiscent of the grief expressed in the Bible by the Jewish mourners for Joseph, in Egypt, but that's mere coincidence, right?

**Damning Evidence 4:** In his second expansive speech, the priest calls the wrath of Zeus down on Ares, the war god, whom the priest blames for the plague. He calls Ares “without honor among all other gods.” But this blasphemy could never have been spoken on a Greek stage. What Greek priest dared to talk like this about an imperial god? Ares was not without honor; Greece was ruled by warriors and owed its existence to war and

violence. For a priest to blame him for the plague, that is unpatriotic, blasphemous and grounds for suspicion. Why would Sophocles want to suggest that Greece's war god is evil? Before you raise your hopes and call him a pacifist, remember that this play legitimizes infanticide.

**Damning Evidence 5:** The theme of infanticide again finds a parallel in the first book of the Bible, Genesis, where God asks Abraham to sacrifice his son. Like Oedipus, who was not killed by his parents, Abraham's son suffered greatly and lived like a homeless nomad. Elsewhere, the Bible's God legitimizes child sacrifice (see Psalms 137).

**Damning Evidence 6:** Next, the Corinthian messenger states that Oedipus is "stained with guilt" by his parents, or, in an even more tantalizing translation, Oedipus "will be stained with guilt through [his] parents." These phrases closely match the Catholic notion that mankind inherits a state of sinfulness thanks to Adam and Eve, the imaginary original parents of our species.

**Damning Evidence 7:** In the Sophocles' play, the shepherd calls himself Oedipus' savior. And, *coincidentally*, Jesus is called a shepherd throughout the Bible's New Testament.

**Damning Evidence 8:** Once Oedipus is blind, he tells Creon to ignore his two sons and two let him touch and talk to his two daughters. The scene is reminiscent of two scenes in Genesis; in one, Isaac is blind and blesses the wrong son, just as—in the mind of the sexist pigs who wrote this—blind Oedipus favored the wrong children, his daughters instead of his sons. Jacob similarly blessed two descendants, grandsons, when he was on his deathbed.

**Damning Evidence 9:** Oedipus' most conspicuous personality trait is pride. Pride causes him to deny the decree of the gods. Pride—oh, how Biblical and Christian is that?

**Damning Evidence 10:** According to an ancient Greek myth, Oedipus belonged to the Agenor dynasty, and his great-great-grandfather was Cadmus, the founder of Thebes. This ancestor brought a curse on his family after he killed a sacred serpent. This detail might explain why the gods demanded the death of Oedipus, but 'Sophocles' choose to exclude this detail because it contradicts the Christian teaching that serpents are evil and—by implication—that the killers of serpents are good, like their serpent-killer Saint George.

**Damning Evidence 11:** Sophocles' portrait of Jocasta resembles the Bible's portrait of Eve. Jocasta is the only character who encourages Oedipus to defy the oracle, the prophets and the gods, and she tempts Oedipus to continue sinning with her. Although Oedipus refuses, it's too late. Eve tempted Adam to sin with her.

**Damning Evidence 12:** Incest was fairly common among Greek, Egyptian and European noble families, so no Greek playwright could have associated incest with sin and horror on a Greek stage. It was too taboo, while the murder of sons, brothers or fathers was always common knowledge, so far more acceptable subjects for tragedy. But the play only condemns incest between the closest family members, and the Bible agrees, for Abraham and Sarah are only half-siblings, and they are not condemned. Apparently, whoever wrote Genesis and *Oedipus* had the same beliefs about incest. This link in *Oedipus* between Egypt and incest between close relatives parallels the ancient Egyptian custom that treated incest as a sacred practice among the ruling class, which again suggests that the play was set in Egyptian Thebes.

**Problem:** If we maintain that the tragedy was set in Greek Thebes we face yet another problem: when Sophocles allegedly wrote his play, Greek Thebes was already a fallen city. It had fallen decades earlier when it opposed powerful Athens and Thebes allied itself with King Xerxes, the Persian ruler who invaded Greece in 480 BC. So why would Athenians watch a play in which a fellow Greek man named Oedipus saves Thebes—a hated rival city—from two plagues, plagues that a Greek named Oedipus also *caused*? They would have killed the dramatist who staged so an unpatriotic play.

**Damning Evidence 13:** It seems beyond coincidence that both Sophocles and Moses set their imaginary plagues in Egypt.

**Damning Evidence 14:** In both Genesis and *Oedipus*, knowledge leads to suffering.

What can we conclude? Why is the text a hodgepodge of lies and anachronistic anti-Egyptian racism and Catholicism? And why so many parallels to the Bible's first book, Genesis? It makes me wonder...

### Oedipus at Colonus

Oedipus has left Thebes and found refuge in a secluded and holy sanctuary near Athens. But, King Creon claims that the people of Thebes want him back. Oedipus declines the invitation and takes refuge in the gods of the holy sanctuary. He has reformed himself. No longer killing old men on the roads, no longer defying the gods and their priests, he is now a holy man—and this is why, I suppose, he feels authorized to call Creon a “devil” and a “blasphemer” for initially kicking him out of Thebes.

**Damning Evidence 15:** Since Oedipus is a murderer and is guilty of incest, his hiding in the holy sanctuary strongly resembles the medieval Christian custom whereby criminals could avoid the law by going to a holy sanctuary. The Church supported this custom because the Church always acted above the laws of secular rulers. Moreover, the Church, being itself a criminal enterprise, likely viewed the criminals who came to it for help as potential recruits—to become priests, monks or servants of the Church. A shortage would surely have existed at a time when common parish priests lived an impoverished, childless and sexless life.

**Explanation:** Why would the Church revise a Greek classic so that it seems to support its policy of offering refuge to criminals? Since Europe's aristocrats studied Greek and Roman classics, not the Bible, the Church needed Greek and Roman texts to reflect Catholic values, customs and practices. For more on this, see the Conclusions to Book Two.

**Damning Evidence 16:** Oedipus seeks refuge in Colonus. It's a curious name for a town in a country/empire that was *colonized* by Latin-speaking Romans. In fact, according the Online Etymology Dictionary, the word colony originated in the “late 14<sup>th</sup> century, and referred to any ‘ancient Roman settlement outside Italy,’ and comes from Latin *colonia*, meaning ‘settled land, farm, landed estate,’ and comes from *colonus*, meaning ‘husbandman, tenant farmer, settler in new land.’” Now, since the Colonus described in the play is a rural farm-like area with vines, olive trees and so on, the decision to name the locale Colonus must be intentional, and since this name of medieval and Latin origin, the damning conclusion follows...

**Damning Evidence 17:** Strangely, Oedipus demands that his burial place be kept secret. For some reason, he imagines that if this secret is kept by King Theseus and his

sons, Athens will be protected by the gods. This blessing-through-death helps Oedipus undo the damage done by his birth and life. However, this life-is-evil and death-is-good pattern echoes the Christian notions of inherited or original sin and salvation through the death of Jesus Christ.

**Damning Evidence 18:** The Chorus informs Oedipus that he must conduct certain rituals in order to cleanse himself of the sin of trespassing onto the sacred ground of Colonus. The rituals, however, strongly resemble Christian practice. It involves “holy water” and it requires the suppliant to “face towards the dawn.” I do not know of any evidence that ancient Greeks believed in holy water or faced the east when praying. However, holy water remains central to the Catholic Church practice, and Christian churches used to face east and Christian custom once required priests and worshippers to face east. It’s a remnant of sun worship likely inherited from Jews or Egyptians.

**Damning Evidence 19:** Oedipus’ daughter, Ismene, volunteers to perform the sacred rituals. Oedipus says of this service to be performed for him, “One soul, sincere in faith, may stand for thousands.” The notion that the faith of one person can save another is patently Christian and makes Ismene Christ-like.

**Damning Evidence 20:** Oedipus tells Theseus that he need not swear an oath, and Theseus replies, “I have given my word; no oath could bind me more.” This suggests that oaths were not required by Greek royalty, and again, it *coincides* with the words of Jesus in the New Testament, where he says, “Let your yes mean yes, and your no mean no. Anything more than this comes from the evil one (Matthew 5:37).

**Damning Evidence 21:** Oedipus claims that his teachers or guides are “Phoebus and his almighty father, Zeus.” I do not know of any precedent for this in Greece’s pagan culture, while such claims are closely paralleled by the Catholic papal claim that Jesus and his almighty father dictate their wishes to the Pope. And, even though Oedipus is not a priest, he claims to have the ability to prophecy the future of Thebes, “have I not more skill ... to draw the horoscope of Thebes?” (trans. By F. Storr). Apparently, the author ignore this problem because he had to write a story that gives an ancient Greek basis for the Catholic belief that God communicated directly to certain people (not kings, but sometimes ex-kings like Oedipus).

**Damning Evidence 22:** Oedipus excuses his murdering of his father by claiming it was an act of self-defense: “If ... someone ... threatened your life ... I’m sure ... you’d pay the assailant in his own coin, not look for legal warrant.” In his own coin implies the legal principle of an eye for an eye, which the Bible made popular in the Old Testament. In fact, the Bible consistently argues that laws can be broken and ignored, and Jesus himself refused to add a single law and preferred to break them whenever he considered it his divine duty to break them. So, both *Oedipus at Colonus* and the Bible dismiss the need for human laws.

**Damning Evidence 23:** The Chorus promotes the anti-life idea that death is better than life, that “in the accumulation of many years / pain is in plenty, and joy not anywhere ... life begun, soonest to end is best.” This repugnant philosophy has no better parallels than the ones on the Bible, where the entire Book of Ecclesiastes is devoted to persuading readers that life is vanity.

**Damning Evidence 24:** Oedipus’ eldest son is ousted and exiled by the younger son. Oedipus does not come to the defense of the older son, so, apparently he does not support the tradition whereby the eldest son inherits everything. And the same point is made by

the Bible, which frequently tells stories of younger sons taking by stealth (Jacob) or violence (Solomon) the traditional rights of older sons.

**Damning Evidence 25:** In original Greek myths, dragons and serpents are good, but later an imperial mythology claims that Apollo killed the sacred serpent at Delphi. And a sacred serpent, or dragon, was killed by Cadmus lived near the spring of Ismene in Thebes. But in Sophocles' forgery, Oedipus claims that his secret burial will protect Athens "against the power of the Sons of the Dragon's Seed." Clearly, this portrayal of a dragon is anachronistic, not of Greek but of Catholic and Western European origin.

**Damning Evidence 26:** After the Chorus learns that Oedipus is dead, it sings, "Surely a just God's hand will raise him up again." Again, this wish for the resurrection of a man has no precedent in Greek paganism but is central to Christianity.

## Antigone

**Damning Evidence 27:** The Chorus poetically compares the army of Polynices to clouds and calls them "white invaders ... with white wings". This strongly hints at the image of Christian angels. There might also be a play on *Nike* in *Polynices*, for Nike was a winged god of war, and *Poly-nices* suggests *many* Nikes. The failure of Polynices to take the city of Thebes suggests that the Greek gods were too weak to overthrow Eteocles and the forces of Thebes. In fact, the name *Eteocles* might be a cryptic reference to *theos*, of God.

**Damning Evidence 28:** Creon calls Polynices "a man who came to burn [Thebes'] temples down, ransack their holy shrines, their land, their laws". These allegations are absurd because they suggests that Polynices wanted to destroy the Theban culture rather than reclaim its throne. In other words, the liar who wrote this made a 'Freudian' slip by attributing to Polynices the crimes committed by Rome.

**Damning Evidence 29:** The sentry claims that a holy burial consists of sprinkling dust over a corpse. Although the corpse in question belonged to a traitor, I have serious doubts about this practice being an authentic Greek practice. One reason for doubt is that sprinkling dust over a corpse seems flagrantly disrespectful and unholy. Another reason for doubt is that the Bible pushes the same policy. It never treats funerals with respect. Moses and all the prophets die and disappear without ceremony. Only Jesus' corpse is wrapped in a burial cloth and properly buried. What could have inspired this policy against providing decent funerals and burials to traitors? In medieval Europe, Christians were frequently at war with Christians, and the Church would have been in the awkward position of being asked to give proper funerals to warring factions of Christians. Perhaps by suggesting that a dust-burial constitutes a holy burial it wished to make everyone happy.

Could the author have seriously believed in the holiness of a dust-burial and still write, four pages later, that after the Thebans removed the dust from the corpse, Apollo the sun-god produced "a storm of dust like a plague from heaven"?

**Damning Evidence 30:** Creon believes that absolution or forgiveness can be gotten by paying, just as the Catholic Church notoriously practiced simony and charged sinners for forgiveness. Creon says that to expiate the sin murder from his soul, he can simply place food in the tomb of his victim, burying her alive "with food enough to acquit ourselves of the blood-guiltiness." However, since he wasted his food and did not offer it to the gods or to a priest, his scheme failed and he was not acquitted by the gods.

**Damning Evidence 31:** When Tiresias appears in the king's court, Creon fawningly calls him "father Tiresias" and "father." This appears to echo the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic practice of calling their religious leaders father. Indeed, the Roman title Pope is derived from the Greek Papa, meaning father.

**Damning Evidence 32:** Both *Antigone* and *Oedipus the King* (*Oedipus Tyrannus*) portray pride as the great sin committed by King Oedipus and King Creon. The trilogy's last line denounces pride: "This is the law: that, upon seeing the stricken heart of pride brought down, we learn when we are old." This view of pride has no precedent in ancient Greek culture. But, for Catholics, pride was the greatest sin. Coincidence?

## EURIPIDES

### Anti-Paganda

The works of Euripides are not tragedies. They are poorly written, absurd and grotesque comedies best left ignored or burned in the fires of Knowledge and Conscience. To this day, thanks to thousands of corrupted scholars, innocent students around the world are still under the illusion that the works of Euripides are dramatic masterpieces and profound expressions of the Greek polytheistic religion—though many scholars treat them as too obscure for us to understand or too cleverly written for ordinary readers to notice that Euripides hid within his plays some very progressive and humanistic values about war and women. Both views, both the ignorant and the naïve, are absolute nonsense.

The writings of Euripides have two purposes: 1) to smear the Greek religion, to make it look like a deranged version of Christianity, and thereby 2) to make Christianity look like the rational religion.

The author, who pretended to be an ancient Greek, smeared the ancient Greek religion in numerous ways—often by making his characters insult their gods and voice such heretical statements that the playwright—if he had lived in ancient Greece—would certainly have been executed for writing them. For example, in *Ion*, Teucer says, "The daughter of Zeus [Athena] is hated all over Hellas." Such blasphemous *lies* would never have been tolerated on a stage anywhere in the Hellas, which is Greece. And in *Iphigenia in Tauris* Orestes dares to say of the gods, "The gods themselves, even those we call prophetic, are no more trustworthy than fleeting dreams." Such atheistic sentiments would never have been tolerated on the ancient Greek stage. But, they exist in Euripides' writings *because they were not written in ancient Greece*.

Let's collect a little more evidence that the plays allegedly written by Euripides were not written by an ancient Greek but by a foreigner who wanted to disparage the Greek gods. The play named *Alcestis* is a good example of how all of Euripides' plays insult and mock the gods. It begins by telling the story of how Apollo gave King Admetus' a chance to live—which is fine, since Apollo was considered the god of healing and of oracles, but he gives King Admetus neither a cure nor a prophecy. Instead, Apollo tells the king that he can avoid death if he finds someone willing to die in his place. Excuse me, but what kind of sick god would make such a deal?

Anyway, King Admetus is a sick man, for he asks his elderly parents to die for him. They refuse, but his goodly wife, Alcestis, volunteers and dies for him. Then the idiotic

King Admetus immediately laments her death, wishes he were dead, and generally wallows in melodrama until Heracles brings him his wife hidden behind a veil and won back from the grave by Heracles's defeat of Death ... *in a wrestling match*. Admetus praises the gods for this rarest of miracles by Heracles. It's one of the few instances of a character praising the gods—though, unfortunately—the Greek gods never dabbled in resurrecting people. Whoever wrote this ridiculous play must have known that and had some mischievous purpose. Can you guess it?

Euripides does a fine job at reducing most or all of the Greek gods to caricatures fit for laughter. While Apollo was the god of healing, Euripides associates him with disease by claiming that Apollo arranges for the king's wife Alcestis to die *of sickness*. How brilliant is that? How ironic is that? And of course, to glorify the patriarchy, Alcestis volunteers to die for her man. Thanks, Euripides.

When Admetus mourns and protests the death of his wife, Apollo disappears, probably to tend to his sheep. That's right, Euripides has Apollo reduced to a lowly shepherd *employed* by Admetus. This enslavement is Apollo's punishment from his father, Zeus. That's right, Zeus had to punish his divine son. Funny, isn't it? Funny—unless you're an ancient Greek who loves his gods.

Wait, you say, maybe Zeus had a good reason for punishing Apollo. Hahaha! He does have a good reason; you see, Apollo murdered his Zeus' blacksmiths, the Cyclopes. But their murder was committed because Zeus killed Apollo's son Asclepius *for no reason*. That's right, Euripides provides no reason for Zeus' murder of his own grandson, Asclepius. Why not? Let me guess: Euripides wanted to portray the Greek gods as a bunch of violent barbarians only a fool would worship.

In any case, to conclude their childish cycle of revenge, Zeus reduces Apollo to a mortal slave. Now, how wise is that? Very wise, if you're an old fashioned imperialist. You see, using slavery as a form of divine punishment serves to validate slavery and serves to validate any empire that reduces millions of people to slavery—*for no good reason*. Now wonders the Trojan women lament, "Zeus, our God, you have forsaken us" (*The Women of Troy*).

Apollo, perhaps the most popular of the Greek gods, is also slandered in *Ion*, where we learn that Apollo is responsible for raping and impregnating one of his worshippers, and when he's confronted with the truth, he makes some awful excuses. Well, you can just imagine how popular such plays would have been on the Greek stage—about as popular as photos of priests raping young boys would be among Catholics.

Not surprisingly, Poseidon suffers the same fate as his nephew, Apollo. He is falsely accused of destroying the Greek war heroes sailing home from the Trojan War. In *Hippolytus* the hero's father bitterly remarks of Poseidon, "O that his name had never passed my lips." For this blasphemy, he continues living, unpunished. In fact, the goddess Artemis *supports* his criticism of Poseidon and Aphrodite.

In *The Trojan Women* Euripides lampoons Poseidon and Apollo. The play begins with Poseidon proudly confirming that he and Apollo helped the enemies of the Greeks, the Trojans, by building the city walls. That's right, Apollo and Poseidon are portrayed as bricklayers and labourers. Then, instead of rewarding the Trojans for fighting the Greeks for ten years, Poseidon abandons them and says even Troy's King Priam could not find refuge from death—not even on "the God's high altar-stair." Why not? Wasn't the altar his? And why must Priam die on the holy place? He must die there because it helps

‘prove’ that the Greek gods will not defend anyone, not even in their temples and sanctuaries.

Next, instead of crediting Ares the war-god or some other mighty male divinity with leading the Greeks to victory, Euripides credits Zeus’ wife, Hera. Poseidon even feels personally defeated, and like a child he says he walked away from defeated Troy with his head hanging. But Palas Athena offers him a consolation. She asks him to punish the Greeks, the same Greeks to whom she gave victory! Why has she changed her alliances? Because a Greek laid hands on Cassandra, her prophetess. For this, at Athena’s request, many Greek must suffer a watery grave. Why such disproportionate and unjust punishment? No reason—the author just wanted *to discredit the Greek goddess*.

In *Ion* Athena is again the object of slander. Here she works as a messenger for her rapist brother, Apollo. She tells his victim, Creusa, to “tell no one that Ion is your true son; so that Xuthus [her husband] can enjoy the delusion [of thinking Creusa is a virgin, I suppose].” Consider the enormity of this advice: here a goddess the victim of rape to keep silent about the crime committed by Apollo! What kind of criminal wrote this unconscionable and *criminal* piece of ... writing?

In *The Bacchae*, Euripides turns Dionysus into a non-European, a foreigner from the east, and into a monster with a violent and lecherous cult. When King Pentheus vows to rid Athens of Dionysus and his female mystery cult, Dionysus leads him to his death by giving him a chance to participate in his sacred pagan ritual. Pentheus accepts the offer and climbs a tree to get a better view of the scene. The moment the Bacchic women see Pentheus, the tree becomes the center of his grizzly murder. In her Bacchic frenzy his own mother tears off his first limb and others finish him off with nails and teeth. It’s a horrific scene *designed* to smear pagan rituals involving trees and designed to discourage interest in Dionysian cults and secret pagan rituals.

Each play appears designed to discredit one or more gods. In *Hippolytus* Euripides turns Aphrodite into a vindictive and vicious bitch. Being upset that Hippolytus would not submit to love and lust for Phaedra, his *father’s* “royal wife,” Aphrodite devises a plan that will lead the boy’s father to kill him “with curses” and end with a second death for the mother. Imagine—Aphrodite is upset that a boy did not lust for his mother and commit incest! Can you hear the goddess scream as she falls from the Pantheon?

Euripides even has the goddess Artemis call Aphrodite “corrupt.” And in *Helen*, the heroine utters the following brazen complaints against Aphrodite: “Why are you never sated with mortal suffering? You traffic in lust and falsehood, crooked intrigue and secret drugs are your instruments of death.” Strong condemnation is hardly possible. What ancient Greek dared to speak ill of sexuality? Only a *Christian* would dare.

To spoil Artemis’ reputation, Artemis says she will punish Aphrodite in the stupidest manner imaginable: “I will strike down with my unfailing bow whatever man her heart holds dearest.” Why must the men she loves be punished for their love? This kind of punishment does more harm to humans than to Aphrodite—but that is the way Euripides intended it, for he wanted to trample the pagan gods into the mud.

In *Hippolytus*, Euripides turns Artemis into a demon. After a father has killed his abstinent son for worshipping Artemis, Artemis rails at the murderous father, “I shall cause you pain. I came here for this purpose.” Of course, the goddess came to cause pain. What else can a goddess do? In these libellous frauds, the Greek gods *always* give mankind pain. Orestes confirms this view with his own about Phoebus Apollo: “Oh

Phoebus, where has your oracle lead me again ... I killed my mother ... and now I'm an outcast ... hounded by the Furies" (*Iphigenia in Tauris*).

Euripides turned Hermes into a joke. Hermes, son of Zeus, was the messenger boy of the gods, but in *Ion* he's employed as a common dramatic narrator. He reads a few lines to introduce the play to the audience, and afterwards Euripides found no further use for him.

Euripides makes a mockery of Heracles. In *Alcestis*, after playing the horse-tamer, Heracles asks for lodging at King Admetus' palace. The timing isn't good, because Admetus is clearly distraught and distressed about his wife's death, but he doesn't tell Heracles the truth, and Heracles, like a perfect dolt, believes the lie that Admetus' isn't grieving for anyone close to him. Much later, when ignorant Heracles suspects the truth and asks if the king's wife is dead, Admetus says, "She is and is no more," to which Heracles stupidly replies, "I am still no wiser. What you say mystifies me."

And in *Helen* Euripides casts a slur on Pan, god of forests and life, by comparing the sound of grief to the "scream of a woodland nymph ... caught and spoiled by the lust of Pan." Apparently the author couldn't think of new crimes to blame on Greek gods, so, like Zeus and Apollo, Pan is also a rapist.

Euripides even turned the Dioscori into Greek traitors. The twin Dioscori, sons of Zeus, were protectors or patron gods of sailors, but in *Helen* they promise to grant Helen and Menelaus a safe passage home, but 'home' appears to have meant the underworld, for they add, "Menelaus ... wins by the will of Heaven a home in the Isle of the Blest." In other words, the Dioscori, rather than helping sailors home, only help sailors return to the underworld, or rather to the realm of death and non-existence. Obviously this helps to discourage anyone from appealing to them for help.

Finally, Euripides often claims that the Greek gods were powerless against Necessity and Fate—though reasonable students of religion will doubt the veracity of this claim. People generally do not worship gods who have limited powers; arguably, the whole point of believing in gods is to believe that through them one can overcome Fate and Necessity. I might entertain the possibility that a few *philosophical* Greeks used the concept of Fate to help explain why the gods rarely helped anyone, but Euripides could never have flaunted this inherently unpopular and blasphemous concept on the stage. Of Fate, one of his characters says, "Even Zeus looks to your help to perform what he ordains" (*Alcestis*). Zeus needs help? Expressing such opinions on stage would very likely have turned the stage into a bloodbath.

### A Christian Agenda

Why would some preposterous and audacious fraudster take so much trouble to discredit the Greek gods? The fraudster worked for the Church, which educated young nobles with Greek classics, so to prevent those classics from inspiring the young to become pagans instead of Christians, the Church revised and adulterated all the classics in its possession, and turned them all into anti-paganda.

The secret Christian agenda becomes even more evident if we look for Christian themes and values in the Greek classics, and there are a few startling parallels. For example, a scene in *Iphigenia in Tauris* closely matches a scene in the Christian scriptures. In the play, the heroine Iphigenia describes how her father attempted to

sacrifice her on an altar, and she adds that “as the sword fell, Artemis snatched me from death, gave the Achaeans in my place a deer.” Isn’t that miraculous? I mean, this is almost precisely what happened to Isaac in the Bible. When his father prepared to sacrifice him, God snatched him from the jaws of death by providing his father a ram as a substitute.

The theme of human sacrifice is central to Euripide’s plays, which in itself is suspicious, since there’s little evidence that human sacrifice was a Greek religious practice. The Christian authors who forged the Greek classics added the theme of human sacrifice in order to create the illusion that Greek paganism was murderous and barbaric. They did this in order to discredit the ancient Greek religion and to make Christianity look like the more civilized religion. After all, according to the Christian religion, the sacrifice of Jesus Christ abolishes the need for any other human sacrifice—provided you believe in Jesus. The same argument is made by the Bible: the first three quarters of it details how God punished and ‘sacrificed’ the Jews for their sins, but the last quarter, the New Testament, claims that by sacrificing his own son *for the world* God somehow freed humanity from sacrifice and suffering.

Sacrifice is also central to Sophocles’ *Oedipus* trilogy. Oedipus’ parents were supposed to sacrifice him, and their failure to do so condemned an entire city to sickness and death. The required sacrifice of a child is so cowardly, inhumane and irrational that it makes the voluntary sacrifice of Jesus Christ look brave, which means the Christian religion looks more desirable than the ancient Greek religion.

The idea that the sacrifice of one man, namely Jesus, could save others from suffering and death is also echoed by Theseus in *Hippolytus* when he says, “If only, my son, I could die in place of you.” This sentiment might be common enough among despairing parents in any nation, but it nearly all of Euripides’ works deal with sacrifice of one sort or another. In *Alcestis*, the wife of Admetus actually dies “in place” of her husband, just as—according to Christianity—Jesus died for humanity.

Brian V. Lush, in *Recognition and the Limits of Knowledge in Euripides*, briefly discusses the importance of sacrifice to Euripides’ *Electra* and points us that this play includes the sacrifice of a lamb, or a bull, of Aegisthus and of Clytemnestra at a ritual that required still further sacrifice. However, the good scholar never questioned the Euripidean suggestion that Greek culture was obsessed with animal and human sacrifice. Of course, the animal sacrifice theme is rooted in the historical reality of *taxation*—for taxes, or tithes, were once paid with livestock, and human’s sacrifice themselves by working to pay their taxes to their rulers and by going to war for their rulers.

According to Lush’s, knowledge is Euripides’ central concern, and the playwright treats knowledge as something humans have limited access to. This is in complete agreement with Socrates and, more importantly, with the Biblical view that God made knowledge inaccessible by banning humanity from the fruit of knowledge. If that’s not a close enough parallel, consider that for Euripedes, knowledge and recognition of truth always spells tragedy, just as in the Bible eating the forbidden fruit of knowledge led to pain and misery. Now, is that coincidental?

Regarding human sacrifice, I have not read or seen any physical evidence that ancient Greeks practiced human sacrifice, and I have not read or seen any empirical evidence that they believed in resurrection from the dead. Christians believe in resurrection, so why does this belief in resurrection rear its silly head in *Alcestis*? There a woman is actually

resurrected by Heracles! This is absurd because Heracles was never associated with the underworld or the dead. So, why would the author imply that ancient Greeks believed in resurrection? Did he, perhaps, wish to justify the Christian belief in resurrection by forging Greek plays in which resurrection occurs.

What else? In *The Bacchae*, Cadmus tells Dionysus that “gods should not be like mortals in vindictiveness,” but Dionysus answers that the murder of Pentheus “*was ordained by my Father Zeus from the beginning.*” This view of Zeus is completely false. Zeus did not plan everything from some definite “beginning.” How could he if Hesiod states that Zeus didn’t even exist in the beginning? Well, never mind that discrepancy. Euripides didn’t mind; he just wanted to imply that the chief god of the Greek pantheon could plan everything far in advance—just as God does in the Abrahamic religions. Exactly like God. In fact, although sometimes Zeus’ plans seem dependent on Fate, Euripides also suggests that Zeus simply takes Fate into consideration when he makes his plans, as if Fate might alter his plans but could never thwart them. In fact, in *Helen*, the gods say, “We bowed to Fate, and [so] the divine purpose of Zeus was fulfilled.” This suggests that Fate and Zeus’ plan are one. But, I repeat, the authentic Zeus was not an omniscient planner—and the claim that he was omniscient stinks of a very late Christian influence.

Apollo, Zeus’ son, resembles Jesus, God’s son, so it’s rather suspicious that both Apollo and Jesus are portrayed as shepherds, Apollo in *Alcestis* and Jesus in the New Testament. Moreover, according to Euripides, while Apollo was a shepherd he played the flute so well that “spotted lynxes loved his music and came to feed beside his flock” and lions danced with deer. This fantastic nonsense bears stunning resemblance to an Old Testament verse that reads, “he wolf will live with the lamb, the leopard will lie down with the goat, the calf and the yearling and the lion together; and a little child will lead them” (Isaiah 11:6).

In *Iphigenia in Tauris*, we learn that Apollo requires Orestes to perform penance for the sin of murdering his father. But this idea that a god can require penance for past sins is *Christian*. Euripides would have us believe that the ancient Greeks had no laws, no policies for dealing with patricides and murderers. He would have us believe that the Greek relied on their gods, a notion the Vatican could have used to defend its ‘right’ to influence the laws of Western Europe. For historically the head of the Vatican, the Pope, considered himself an incarnation of Jesus, so a god of sorts, so if the Greek classics imply that the gods administered justice on Earth, then the Church, I mean the Vatican, has good precedent for administering justice, right?

Consider, too, just how the gods punished Orestes for his crime: banishment from his community. Well—the Church might call it *excommunication*—or the Church’s banishing of a sinner, excluding him or her from religious services.

And consider this bit of divine madness: In order to end his banishment and wandering, Orestes must please Apollo by stealing the statue of Artemis from the people of Tauris. This is absurd! There is no evidence that the ancient Greeks were religious zealots interested in stealing religious artifacts from their rivals. Here I detect the spirit of the Crusaders, Catholic knights and other scoundrels who pillaged Greek, Jewish and other temples for all their gold, treasures and statues. The play, in claiming that Apollo required such criminal behavior, serves to indoctrinate young Christian men to accept the notion that a god can justly command us to steal and violate another’s religion.

Euripides also found a way to legitimize the practice of not adopting and not caring for the children of impious or irreligious persons. Iphigenia's father, Agamemnon, is guilty of offending the goddess Artemis, so he's asked to sacrifice his daughter, but she is saved only to be excommunicated, expelled, and forced to marry Achilles. This was, according to Euripides, authorized by Fate, so the text reads as a legitimization of excommunication and sex slavery—both of which were acceptable to the medieval Catholic Church.

Finally, after Achilles dies, Iphigenia spends her time involved sacrificing and killing of foreigners: "I drench an altar with blood of travellers." She also claims that she does not do the actual killing and that she merely casts water on the heads of victims in order to make them acceptable to Artemis. Of course, this and other references to ritually placing water on human heads echoes the Christian practice of baptism, although Iphigenia's version makes the Christian practice look relatively civilized.

Of course, a woman could not do more than cast water; the actual sacrifice is performed by men. This legitimizes the Christian practice of banishing women from any work of religious importance.

*Iphigenia in Tauris* is blasphemous and despicable; it claims that Artemis, the goddess of chastity, required the ritual sacrifice of foreign *men*. During the play, a herdsman announces that two young men have arrived and will be "suitable victims and a pleasing sacrifice for divine Artemis." This information serves no other purpose but to discredit Artemis and—hypocritically—to legitimize the belief that gods and God consider the murder of foreigners a *holy act*.

Not only Euripides, but other supposedly Greek poets and playwrights obsess with adultery and impiety, and treat any violation of the religious or marital codes as the greatest sins. Not coincidentally, the Bible paints the same picture of lies, sanctifying religious intolerance and marital oppression. This is why Poseidon denounces the Greeks as follows, "When a man who seizes a city includes in the general destruction temples of the high gods and tombs ... he is a fool: his own destruction is imminent" (*The Women of Troy*). That's right—Poseidon, I mean the author—did not care that thousands of innocent women and children were killed and that important infrastructure was destroyed, but if you break his temples, oh, then there's hell to pay.

In short, Euripides' plays are excellent tools for discrediting the ancient Greek religion, for legitimizing the practices of Christian imperialists, and for brainwashing proud, ruthless and morally bankrupt Christians.

## PHILOSOPHY

Something is rotten in Greek philosophy. It is too convenient – particularly for Christians. Granted, Greek philosophers could not challenge the foundations of a religion that would not come for several centuries, and yet, some of the core concepts of Christianity were shared by the ancient Greek, Egyptian and other mostly polytheistic religions. Anaxagoras, for example, might have risked his life when he rejected the Greek and Egyptian belief that the sun was a god, so why didn't he and his peers challenge the belief that ghosts, or spirits, exists, or that human life can survive death? They couldn't travel to the sun to determine what it is, but they could certainly observe that no part of

the observable and measurable human body survives death. So, why reject the belief in a sun god and not the belief in an afterlife? The latter is, at least empirically if not psychologically, easier to prove. Doesn't this support my hypothesis that the Greek philosophy as we have it was corrupted by Christian scribes?

Why assume that Greek philosophy was corrupted instead of invented from nothing by Christians swindlers and propagandists? Because the most corrupt people are always the least creative. Our own billionaires and millionaires are, almost without exception, white collar thieves who invented almost nothing and depend on copyright laws, buy patents and use other lawful forms of swindling to legally own, 'develop' and repackage the inventions of poor creators.

What inspired Greece's 5<sup>th</sup> century nobles to write philosophy? We can dream that the ruthless, Hellenic imperialism actually provided the fertile soil for an explosion in creative and rational thinking, but I do not find that plausible. Imperialism is always hostile towards honesty, reason, and philosophy. It always promotes delusion and dishonesty. That said, we should grant the possibility that the tragic wages of imperialism *provoke* honest minds to reflect and question everything they and their ancestors believed. *However*, then as now, such minds would mostly be censored and silenced.

While its loss likely benefitted the Catholic Church, which strove to prevent foreign cultures from challenging Christian beliefs and appealing to Christians, I do not imagine that Greek philosophy ever contained anything that modern philosophers and scientists have not said to little effect. So, whatever was lost is of no consequence to us now, and if it were ever rediscovered in some new 'Dead Sea Scrolls,' it would still be inconsequential – as inconsequential as the actual Dead Sea Scrolls.

If we want to identify a cause for the birth of Greek philosophy and culture, we should probably give a good deal of credit to Greece's conquest of Egypt, since this likely resulted in giving Greek nobles access to paper. Without paper, the ancients could never have written dramas, scriptures and philosophical treatises.

We can also safely propose that classical Greek philosophy is an expression of imperial power and attitude. This explains why it muses on the nature of the body, the existence of planetary or astrological gods, the nature of justice, matter, the mind, and so on, but consistently fails to question patriarchy, monarchy, sexism, racism, classism, war, immortality and all the values and beliefs on which empires was founded.

Indeed, Democritus of Abdera didn't hesitate to express the values of the empire: "Use slaves as parts of the body: each to his own function" (270) and "A woman is far sharper than a man in malign thoughts" (273).

Gorgias of Leontini could not imagine a world far better than his world, a world without slaves and parasites, and so he writes, "No one would choose slavery instead of kingship, the worst instead of the best" (14). *The best?* Was it so great, Gorgias, to expect your sons to go to war and to constantly fear a slave revolt?

Critias of Athens is full of commonplaces. In one of his plays (these philosophers wrote plays—how else could they influence their world?) in wrote the dangerous heresy that religion and wrathful gods were invented in order to control the wicked (25).

The extant writings of Empedocles of Acragas are exceptional for daring to touch on topics ordinarily silenced by Shame and Guilt. In his writings, he draws our attention to the fact that he and his fellow rulers literally lived above ordinary citizens, in an acropolis. He addresses his fellow rulers as follows: "Friends, who dwell in the great

town on the city's heights, looking down on yellow Acragas [the city where slaves and ordinary citizens lived. Why is it yellow? Is it void of life?]" (fragment 112, *Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers*). He draws our attention to what the rulers and the ruled generally avoided thinking about. He also suggests that he would prefer to speak differently, but that he's constrained by his culture: "The terms that Right demands they do not use; but through custom I myself also apply these names" (9). What names would he have preferred to use when he, in another passage, promises to others Christ-like powers: "You shall bring out of Hades a dead man restored to strength" and portrays himself as if he were a prophet or a Christ: "they follow me in thousands, to [...] to hear a word of healing for their manifold diseases since they have long been pierced with cruel pains" (111-112) Perhaps Democles held a religious post in Acragas, perhaps a post similar to the Pontifex Maximus of imperial Rome. In any case, Empedocles does not claim to have healed anyone, and after the above quote he asks why he bothers to portray himself in his story "as if" he were greater than "mortal men." Well, it's a good question he did not dare to answer directly. By force of habit and necessity, truth is censored. Therefore, he continues, "Friends, I know that Truth is present in the story that I shall tell, but it is actually very difficult for men [to discern and accept], and the impact of conviction on their minds is unwelcome" [114]. Empedocles draws our attention to his inability to use words other than those approved by the empire and to the people's willingness to imagine that their rulers are greater than the ruler and capable of saving them. Empedocles also warns us that Truth, if it is present at all in classical Greek philosophy, is "sealed fast" (115) like an oracle. Empedocles offers a glimpse of the Truth that the ruled are fools and victims, while the rulers are violent bigots: "Of this number am I too now, a fugitive from heaven and a wanderer, because I trusted in raging Hate."

As the Greek empire grew larger and more powerful in the Hellenistic period, so it also became more centralized and repressive, and philosophy ceases to even mention the Truth sealed fast. Two centuries later, after the expansions of the Greek Empire under Alexander the Great, with Greece in charge of Egypt, Greek authors have access to a great deal more paper and, not surprisingly, write longer works. Epicurus, like others at this time, appears to have written volumes. And, though I grant that he is more scientific than Empedocles, and I admit that his views on health and happiness represent a refreshing change from the trivialities and irrelevancies found in most other Greek philosophical works, nevertheless, Epicurus hardly dared speak against the empire or even suggest that an alternative political system was necessary.

In short, Greek philosophy is very probably the product of Catholic fraudsters and imperialists. This is the best explanation I know for the fact that it consistently fails to challenge a single monotheistic and imperialistic belief. Thus, it functions to prevent Christians from thinking critically of their religion and their imperialistic and criminal policies, habits, and traditions; indeed, sometimes it implicitly supports Christian beliefs about God and explicitly supports imperialistic beliefs about power. Finally, the bulk of Greek philosophy serves to draw attention away from truth and conscience by directing our attention into meaningless disputations and explications. Thus, for the most part, Greek philosophy is pure *fantasophy* and *philopathy*.

## The Atheists

Historical records of criticism of religion goes back to at least 5th century BCE in [ancient Greece](#), with [Diagoras "the Atheist" of Melos](#). In [ancient Rome](#), an early known example is [Lucretius' \*De Rerum Natura\*](#) from the 1st century BCE.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diagoras\\_of\\_Melos#Ancient\\_anecdotes](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diagoras_of_Melos#Ancient_anecdotes)

Little is known for certain concerning his philosophical views or the nature of his alleged atheism. All that is known for certain on the point is that Diagoras was offended by the worship of the Athenian [national gods](#).

### Ancient anecdotes[[edit](#)]

[Cicero](#),<sup>[8]</sup> writing in the 1st century BC, tells of how a friend of Diagoras tried to convince him of the existence of the gods, by pointing out how many votive pictures tell about people being saved from storms at sea by "dint of vows to the gods", to which Diagoras replied that "there are nowhere any pictures of those who have been shipwrecked and drowned at sea." And Cicero goes on to give another example, where Diagoras was on a ship in hard weather, and the crew thought that they had brought it on themselves by taking this ungodly man on board. He then wondered if the other boats out in the same storm also had a Diagoras on board.<sup>[9]</sup>

This and similar anecdotes<sup>[10]</sup> accurately describe the relation in which he stood to the popular religion. That he maintained his own position with great firmness, and perhaps with more freedom, wit, and boldness than was advisable, seems to be attested by the fact that he in particular obtained the epithet of atheist in antiquity. It is possible that he merely denied the direct interference of gods with the world, but that, since he did not believe in the personal existence of the Athenian gods and their human mode of acting, the Athenians could hardly have regarded him as other than an atheist.

The Christian writer [Athenagoras of Athens](#) (2nd century AD) writes about Diagoras:

With reason did the Athenians adjudge Diagoras guilty of atheism, in that he not only divulged the Orphic doctrine, and published the mysteries of Eleusis and of the [Cabiri](#), and chopped up the wooden statue of [Hercules](#) to boil his turnips, but openly declared that there was no God at all.<sup>[11]</sup>

To return to the accusation against Diagoras which obliged him to quit Athens, the time was one in which [scepticism](#) was beginning to undermine the foundations of the ancient popular belief. The trial of those who had broken down the statues of [Hermes](#), the profanation of the [mysteries](#), and the accusation of Alcibiades, are symptoms which show that the unbelief, nourished by the speculations of [philosophers](#) and the [sophists](#), began to appear very dangerous to the conservative party at Athens. There is no doubt that Diagoras paid no regard to the established religion of the people, and he may occasionally have ridiculed it; but he also ventured on direct attacks upon public institutions of the Athenian worship, such as the [Eleusinian mysteries](#), which he endeavoured to lower in public estimation, and he is said to have prevented many persons from becoming initiated in them. These at least are the points of which the ancients accuse him,<sup>[12]</sup> and [Melanthis](#), in his work on the mysteries, mentions the decree passed against Diagoras. There were undoubtedly political motives in all these religious disputes. Diagoras was a Melian, and consequently belonged to the [Dorian](#) race; he was a friend of the Dorian [Mantineia](#), which was hated by Athens, and had only recently given up its alliance with Athens; the Dorians and [Ionians](#) were opposed to each other in various points of their worship, and this spark of hostility was kindled into a

growing hatred by the [Peloponnesian war](#). Diagoras fled from Athens in time to escape the consequences of the attacks which his enemies had made upon him. He was therefore condemned, and the *psephisma* was engraved on a column, promising a prize for his head, and one [talent](#) to the person who should bring his dead body to Athens, and two talents to him who should deliver him up alive to the Athenians.<sup>[13]</sup>

## Hellenistic Philosophy

Lucretius, a Roman disciple of Epicurus, lived after Rome had conquered the Greek Hellenistic Empire. He made his great claim to fame by taking the ideas of his Greek idol, the freethinking Epicurus, and turning them into metered verse. I'm not sure Epicurus would have been flattered, but it might have renewed interest in his works.

Hellenistic philosophy might not have quarrelled with imperialism, but it's still a wonder that it was allowed to flourish as long as it did. At least the sceptical strain in Hellenic philosophy undermined the attitudes and values on which the Hellenic Empire were founded: piety, chauvinism, exceptionalism, superstition and belief in oracles. Inquiring into the nature of the gods—a habit common to early Greek and Roman philosophy—is impious and threatening. Scepticism and the spirit of inquiry that characterizes philosophy is anathema to imperialism. To tame scepticism, scepticism had to be turned upon trivial matters like astronomy and physics; scepticism had to become a means of creating a harmless little cloud of unknowing that protected the ruling class (and the ruled) from fear and guilt. So, scepticism was suppressed and co-opted by the ruling class. Ultimately Socrates, the circus sceptic, won the day and academic philosophers like Plato and Aristotle received the support of the ruling elites and of Alexander himself.

## Stoicism as Statism

Like any example of an imperial education system, classical Greco-Roman education produced a class of cold hearted 'stoics'—if I may use the classical euphemism. The stoics were caricatures of humanity.

Greek and Roman actors wore masks because they considered it unseemly and improper to have emotions.

Pity and love are despised by every ruling class. The word "pathos" is associated with pity in English and the original Greek, and because the ruling class despised pity *path* came to be associated with any disease. Thus we have psychopathy, cardiomyopathy, and sympathy. The last comes from the Greek *sympatheia*; the fact that this word contains the *path* associated with disease tells us quite clearly that the creators of this word feared, despised and repressed all feelings of pity and did so by falsely treating it as a symptom of personal weakness rather than as a symptom of injustices that must be addressed. How did the ruling class turn itself into stone? In the words of Petronius, "No, I tell you, we don't educate our children at school; we stultify them and then send them out into the world half-baked." Sadly, his observation remains true to our own day.

## Socrates as Propaganda

The Catholic Church needed to convince European nobles that the Greek culture they loved resembled their Roman Catholic Empire in its intolerance for heretics, so the Church invented a new Socrates, one who did not choose death in order to end his suffering in old age, but one who was persecuted for his views and chose death to please his intolerant government *just as Jesus accepted his execution in order to please his God and government*. It's the same disgusting propaganda.

Perhaps the most famous case of censorship in ancient times is that of Socrates, sentenced to drink poison in 399 BC for his corruption of youth and his acknowledgement of unorthodox divinities. It is fair to assume that Socrates was not the first person to be severely punished for violating the moral and political code of his time. This ancient view of censorship, as a benevolent task in the best interest of the public, is still upheld in many countries, for example China. This notion was advocated by the rulers of the Soviet Union (USSR), who were responsible for the longest lasting and most extensive censorship era of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. "The Long History of Censorship," Mette Newth

### Sophistry or Philosophy

We love truth—we are superior

*In comparison, Socrates accepted no fee, instead professed a self-effacing posture, which he exemplified by Socratic questioning (i.e. the Socratic method, although Diogenes Laertius wrote that Protagoras — a sophist — invented the "Socratic" method[5][6]). His attitude towards the Sophists was by no means oppositional; in one dialogue Socrates even stated that the Sophists were better educators than he was,[7] which he validated by sending one of his students to study under a sophist.[8] W. K. C. Guthrie classified Socrates as a Sophist in his History of Greek Philosophy.[8]*

*Only portions of the Sophists' writings have survived and they are mainly known from Plato, a philosopher who helped lay the foundations of Western philosophy and science. Plato studied philosophy under the guidance from Socrates. Plato discusses his view on the Sophists' thought, although his attitude is generally hostile. Due to his opposition, he is largely responsible for the modern view of the sophist as a stingy instructor to deceive. He depicts Socrates as refuting some sophists in several Dialogues. These texts depict the sophists in an unflattering light, and it is unclear how accurate or fair Plato's representation of them may be; however, Protagoras and Prodicus are portrayed in a largely positive light in Protagoras (dialogue). Another contemporary, the comic playwright Aristophanes, criticizes the sophists as hairsplitting wordsmiths. Aristophanes made no distinction between sophists and philosophers such as Socrates and believed both would argue any position for the right fee. In the comedic play The Clouds by Aristophanes, Strepsiades seeks the help of Socrates (a parody of the actual philosopher)*

*in avoiding paying his debts. In the play, Socrates promises to teach Strepsiades' son to argue his way out of paying his debts.*

### Socratic Ignorance

going to explain to you why I have such an evil name. When I heard the answer, I said to myself, What can the god mean? and what is the interpretation of this riddle? for I know that I have no wisdom, small or great. What can he mean when he says that I am the wisest of men? And yet he is a god and cannot lie; that would be against his nature. After a long consideration, I at last thought of a method of trying the question. I reflected that if I could only find a man wiser than myself, then I might go to the god with a refutation in my hand. I should say to him, "Here is a man who is wiser than I am; but you said that I was the wisest." Accordingly I went to one who had the reputation of wisdom, and observed to him - his name I need not mention; he was a politician whom I selected for examination - and the result was as follows: When I began to talk with him, I could not help thinking that he was not really wise, although he was thought wise by many, and wiser still by himself; and I went and tried to explain to him that he thought himself wise, but was not really wise; and the consequence was that he hated me, and his enmity was shared by several who were present and heard me. So I left him, saying to myself, as I went away: Well, although I do not suppose that either of us knows anything really beautiful and good, I am better off than he is - for he knows nothing, and thinks that he knows. I neither know nor think that I know. In this latter particular, then, I seem to have slightly the advantage of him. Then I went to another, who had still higher philosophical pretensions, and my conclusion was exactly the same. I made another enemy of him, and of many others besides him.

### Socratic Faith

He begins with *IF* but continues to speak as if the existence of the gods was not doubtful but actual.

And consider this convoluted sentence, also spoken by Socrates in *The Apology*,

*IF* indeed when the pilgrim arrives in the world below, he is delivered from the professors of justice in this world, and finds the true judges who are said to give judgment there, Minos and Rhadamanthus and Aeacus and Triptolemus, and other sons of God who were righteous in their own life, then that pilgrimage will be worth making.

This isn't completely faithful to Greek religion. Socrates mentions four judges of the underworld, but Greeks typically believed in just the first three in his list, whom they considered sons of Zeus.

“If indeed when the pilgrim arrives in the world below, he is delivered from the professors of justice in this world, and finds the true judges who are said to give judgment there, Minos and Rhadamanthus and Aeacus and Triptolemus, and other sons of God who were righteous in their own life, that pilgrimage will be worth making. What would not a man give if he might converse with Orpheus and Musaeus and Hesiod and Homer? Nay, if this be true, let me die again and again. I, too, shall have a wonderful interest in a place where I can converse with Palamedes, and Ajax the son of Telamon, and other heroes of old, who have suffered death through an unjust judgment; and there will be no small pleasure, as I think, in comparing my own sufferings with theirs. Above all, I shall be able to continue my search into true and false knowledge; as in this world, so also in that; I shall find out who is wise, and who pretends to be wise, and is not. What would not a man give, O judges, to be able to examine the leader of the great Trojan expedition; or Odysseus or Sisyphus, or numberless others, men and women too! What infinite delight would there be in conversing with them and asking them questions! For in that world they do not put a man to death for this; certainly not. For besides being happier in that world than in this, they will be immortal, **if what is said is true.**”

Wherefore, O judges, be of good cheer about death, and know this of a truth - that no evil can happen to a good man, either in life or after death. He and his are not neglected by the gods; nor has my own approaching end happened by mere chance. But I see clearly that to die and be released was better for me; and therefore the oracle gave no sign. For which reason also, I am not angry with my accusers, or my condemners; they have done me no harm, although neither of them meant to do me any good; and for this I may gently blame them.”

Plato

### The Allegory of the Cave

*It contains a clandestine defense for anyone wishes to suppress the truth*

“SOCRATES: Now if once again, along with those who had remained shackled there, the freed person had to engage in the business of asserting and maintaining opinions about the shadows -- while his eyes are still weak and before they have readjusted, an adjustment that would require quite a bit of time -- would he not then be exposed to ridicule down there? And would they not let him know that he had gone up but only

in order to come back down into the cave with his eyes ruined -- and thus it certainly does not pay to go up.

And the final outcome:

SOCRATES: And if they can get hold of this person who takes it in hand to free them from their

chains and to lead them up, and if they **could kill him**, will **they not actually kill him**?

GLAUCON: They certainly will.”

Republic, VII

514 a, 2 to 517 a, 7

and Aristotle

Thoreau wrote little because he did not take dictation from state employers, corporate powers, ivory cowards or target markets. Consequently he wondered how classical authors managed to be so productive. Plato and Aristotle are prime examples. They write a lot. How was that possible? They were prolific because they served *the empire*. They represent the spoiled imperial class that scorns to look at their Egyptian slaves laboring in the dust and at their victims dying on the empire's battlefields. These giants of hubris strut through their imaginary worlds and specialize in creating illusions of justice and intellectual clarity—but freedom from reality can only help avoid emotions and create the illusion of clarity. A crossword puzzle might even rival Aristotle in effectiveness at producing intellectual clarity. A crossword puzzle would be almost equally stimulating. For your philosophy avoids addressing everything that makes us human, everything that gives us a pulse ... if you cravenly or arrogantly refuse to address very heart of humanity, if you don't even address the manifold injustices committed by your empire and your class, what use are you?

We who see reality clearly, we also know *rage* when Plato speaks of needing to use “persuasion and compulsion” to make some people conform to his inhumane vision a republic with a class system.

Plato and Aristotle were the first great European poisoners of the intellect.

\*

Of course, their real names were not Plato (*Plátōn* in Greek) and Aristotle (*Aristotélēs* in Greek). Ancient writers commonly used pseudonyms, often pennames that reflected something about them. In Greek, “platon” means broad and so “Plato” might have been chosen to refer to the broad *plateau* of the Acropolis, the place from which the Greek aristocracy once ruled Athens and her territories. The Catholic Encyclopedia notes that “Platonia” is related to Platona, marble pavement, marble way, the way of kings. Aristotle's original name (*Aristotélēs*) means “best purpose” and can be derived from the Greek words “aristos” meaning “best” or “aristokratia,” meaning, “rule by the best” + “telos,” meaning purpose. Both Plato's and Aristotle's names are clever inventions that hint at their alliance to the ruling class.

\*

Plato and Aristotle made philosophy useful to the ruling class by including ethical and political theories that served the preservation of the ruling class. Aristotle speaks in favor of using a fiat currency, a form of money that puts infinite financial power in the hands of military and financial dictators. Class division is sanctified in the *Republic*. Plato's inclusion of a military class sanctifies violence.

Judging from their works, both men were likely embarrassed by the excesses of the ruling class, not by the *normal* injustices committed by them. Nevertheless, the dominant function of their works is to sanctify the status quo and prevent their class from gaining true self-knowledge. Plato's Socrates is a harmless buffoon who ultimately bows to the tyrant state. Socrates is virtually the antithesis of Democritus. He makes a mockery of knowledge and at the same time turns scepticism into an irrelevant, inoffensive and ultimately annoying chatter. Dangerous questions are nowhere to be found; all evidence of self-knowledge, that is, all knowledge of the workings of imperialism, is everywhere *silenced*. The intended, aristocratic reader enters a convenient cloud of ignorance. The problem of slavery is not addressed. The problem of predatory lending is not addressed. Bribery is not addressed (not even in Plato's *Laws*). The use of violence for the maintenance of the state is not addressed. Rape is not addressed. Paedophilia is not addressed. The destruction of the soil, of forests, and wildlife diversity, is not addressed. Imperialism is not addressed. The suppression of empathy is not addressed. All matters related to the crimes committed by the empire are smoothed over or censored in these scholarly textbooks because the ruling class did not want it spoken about by their child "scholars" and peripatoi.

"If the [village] wardens impose unjust tasks on the villagers, or take by force their crops or implements, or yield to flattery or bribes in deciding suits, let them be publicly dishonored." (*Laws* V) – But what are "unjust tasks"? Let us be careful not to impose 21<sup>st</sup> century meaning into ancient words. What is "unjust" was and to a lesser degree still is determined by the ruling class will decide what is "unjust" according to its needs. If it needs back-breaking labor, such labor will be justified. The wardens may not "take by force their crops or implements" because the wardens are not armed and are not designated tithe or tax collectors. Crops and implements, of course, can be *taken by force* by the military the moment the ruling class considers it necessary, a matter Plato neglects to mention.

Regarding slaves, Plato offers the following contradictory and repugnant advice: "Two rules may be given for slave management: first that they should not, if possible, be of the same country or have a common language [this prevents them from communicating and organizing]; and secondly, that they should be treated by their master with more justice even than equals [patently nonsense], out of regard to himself quite as much as to them. For the master who is righteous in the treatment of his slaves ["the master who is righteous in the treatment of slaves"—this is an oxymoron in a world free of slavery], or of any inferiors [wait, but these "inferiors" are to be treated as equals?], will sow in them the seed of virtue [the virtue of being submissive]. Masters should never jest with their slaves: this, which is a common but foolish practice, increases the difficulty and painfulness of managing them [it increases the difficulty because it creates a human relationship]" (*Laws* V).

Aristotle does less to rationalize the crimes of the ruling class and more to praise its imaginary virtues. A few sentences from a single paragraph from sec. 4.2 of his *Nicomachean Ethics* are instructive. It begins with the following: “The magnificent man [any man from the ruling class] is like an artist; for he can *see what is fitting*, and spend large sums tastefully.” In other words, the magnificent man avoids seeing whatever aggravates his guilty conscience and his priggish tastes ... and he spends large sums *of the people’s wealth* on extravagant architectural buildings, on “beautiful” satin imports, on whatever *they* consider tasteful. Three sentences later he continues, “Therefore the result [of the tasteful spending] should be worthy of the expense, and the expense should be worthy of the result, or should even exceed it [...] for honor’s sake [...] and he will do so gladly and lavishly, for restraint in spending is a niggardly thing.” In other words it is honorable to spend, without restraint, the wealth extracted from slaves and newly conquered peoples. He does go on, but I shall not try your patience.

As for religion, well, the ruling class did everything religiously. Everything is “serious” to them, but for them “serious” never emphasizes the severity of a crimes, serious meant severe, heartless, a face like a statue (unless drunk) and a head incapable of wondering. Thus Socrates is prosecuted for offending the gods instead for offending the informed conscience.

\*

According to some liars, Alexander the Great patronized Aristotle, making him his tutor before Aristotle opened his own school. Is the story true? If not Alexander the “Great,” then some other greedy, warmongering, imperial expansionist patronized him. Why else doesn’t Aristotle openly challenge the injustices and inequalities enshrined by classical aristocratic imperialism?

So Aristotle founded a school on state funds. He needed textbooks, so he wrote them, or commissioned them, whatever. The same story applies to his predecessor and teacher, Plato. According to the available propaganda, Plato was a wealthy aristocrat (therefore a good man, right?) who founded his own school, The Academy, in Athens. So what was taught in his school? Plato likely wrote or commissioned all his dialogues and epistles (letters) to serve as teaching material in his school for the wealthy. The state didn’t officially regulate what was taught in its schools, but you can be sure that unofficial or informal “forces” prevented anyone from teaching anything that remotely challenged the class system and the culture of imperialism. Plato’s pedagogical centrepiece, the *Republic*, recommends a world ruled by philosophers, possibly one philosopher at a time. You can imagine his students, all upper class spawn, elatedly remarking, “Right on! Leaders should be philosophers! Blessed are we, for we are in an academy that teaches philosophy!”

Dear Plato, couldn’t you find a more transparent way to promote your school?

Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* exemplifies his talent for passing garbage off as learning material. The *Metaphysics* intentionally leads readers through endless labyrinths of pointless meditations, comparisons, analogies, categories and so on, all the while keeping his imperial bias hidden. He ends Chapter 12 of the *Metaphysics* with the following glimpse of his imperial bias, “The rule of many is not good; one ruler let there be” (a quote attributed to Homer). *Everything* Aristotle wrote reflects this imperial principle

that the One (i.e. one man, one god, it's all the same) is superior to the Many and shall dictate to the Many, as Alexander the Great did, as Emperor Augustus did. Our age is only different insofar as our emperors, I mean our presidents and prime ministers, are the puppets of oligarchs.

Aristotle also wrote about the meaningless theological question of whether the quality of being "good" is something separate or independent from the universe. He even ventured to enlighten us with an imperial analogy: "[It is both separate and inseparable] like an army whose goodness exists in both its orderly behavior and in its leader, and more in the latter, for the leader does not depend on the order [of the army] but it depends on him" (12:10). In other words, the goodness of an army [excuse the oxymoron] depends largely on something separate from it, its *good* leader. But what kind of analogy is this, anyway? Why compare the movements and arrangements of the universe to those of an army? Because the universe is ordered by a god? Was Aristotle, perhaps, a proto-Christian? And why suggest that soldiers are like inanimate material? It's the philosophy of a psychopath.

For Plato and Aristotle, the old adage holds true: if you want to run a successful school, provide state approved textbooks and crush all meaningful independent thinking with books, and the bigger and "denser" the books (or scrolls), the better. Thus their works served to *corrupt* entire generations of young students.

In *The Open Society and its Enemies*, Karl Popper presented my own views with similar eloquence, including such memorable charges as that Plato's masterpiece of imperial ideology, *The Republic*, is marked by "intellectual poverty." Imagine how much better I feel knowing that I do not stand entirely alone.

\*

Socrates is an imperial invention designed to seduce and hypnotize young nobles. He is the kind of philosopher the state loves to have. Not once did he dare to address a single actual injustice committed by Greek imperialists.

Socrates, Socrates,—even as he lay on his deathbed, he had nothing to say about death and no advice on how to enjoy life. Instead, like a good imperial slave, he attended to his debts and instructed his friend to deliver a payment to Asclepius! Oh Socrates, oh Plato, how disgusting! To think your Greek empire was so desperate and uncharitable that giving had ceased to exist and even the smallest 'debt' had to be repaid!

Socrates: what was he but a foreshadowing of an even more despicable character, the Gospel Christ? He too was convicted and condemned in absurdity. Plato would have us believe the ancient Greeks were such religious fanatics they could not tolerate a man whose vision of the divine Forms challenged the existence of the Greek deities. This outrageous claim that Greeks in the time of Alexander the Great were religious fanatics has no support from history, archeology or anthropology. Then how do we explain Plato's lie? What, are Plato and Aristotle, perhaps, adulterated texts and forgeries from a later time, a time of extreme religious intolerance, perhaps the time of Emperor Justinian I? Nietzsche half suspected something of the sort.

\*

I have a confession to make. I find Plato refreshing because he bravely wrote about the horrifying excrement modern philosophers still recoil from. Money, capital and commodities are still taboo topics among post-Enlightenment philosophers, but not so with Plato. With a brave face he tackled the latter topic and wrote, “None of these commodities [i.e. grains and articles of clothing], any more than barley or flour, or any other food, may be retailed by a citizen to a citizen” (*Laws*). My goodness, but this is wonderfully enlightening stuff! Let us ask: Why must every sale pass through state hands? Why else but because bartering had become *illegal*. Why was it made illegal? Because the state profited by *forcing* everyone to use its medium of exchange, its so-called “money,” which it created on the backs of slave miners. This, of course, is covert parasitism. It also marks the birth of the western stock market, and the birth of both monetary and economic tyranny. Obviously, this continues in our own time. Bartering is illegal because it prevents the state from collecting taxes and funding its insane programs. The time may be near when all economic transactions will have to be done using state-monitored electronic devices.

What was I saying? Oh, yes, Plato made bartering illegal for all but a few people, then smooths over the fact that the state, the only authorized minter or creator of money, also dictated the price or “value” of all goods sold. “All other goods must be sold in the market [kiss goodbye to liberty, say hello to centralization], at some place indicated by the magistrates, and shall be *paid* for on the spot. He who gives credit, and is cheated [i.e. given too little of a commodity], will have no redress.” No redress? Why isn’t the payer of gold or silver coins (credit) allowed to address the crime of being cheated? No, the payer cannot address this problem because the problem, by definition, cannot exist, for the state sets the price and the state is usually the payer, and the state determines the value of its coins in the most profitable manner possible. Welcome to economics—I mean the not-so esoteric monetary con game—a con game that is now a global phenomenon.

### On catharsis

Aristotle, that old whitewasher, he argued that when people see tragic events happen to good people who became bad (like a good slave who killed his master and was therefore *tragically* executed), then we experience a supposedly healthy sensation he called catharsis. The exact same feeling is experienced by entertainment consumers who see their heroes suffer, struggle, and ultimately seize victory. Catharsis is nothing more than relief. But in the real world, this relief is meaningless. Our personal struggles continue. The economic systems that continually *violate* our sense of fairness continue to produce the stress that drives us back to our arenas, cinemas, and screens, where we experience a moment of relief that is actually momentary and useless.

Aristotle on Nature – saw Man and Nature as separate entities

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-natphil/>

Aristotle on revolution...

<http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.5.five.html>

Aristotle on slavery

“some men are by nature free” – Politics 5 -

<http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.1.one.html>

### The Academies and “Schools” of Thought

Aristocratic philosophers evolved and developed distinct schools of thought—i.e. “idea products”—that competed for students. The diversity and the relative individualism that was evident in the early days of Greece was gradually replaced by large, monopolistic schools of state-approved thought. Near-monopolies appeared in the lucrative education market. Gradually Academicism and Stoicism, and to a lesser extent Scepticism and Epicureanism, dominated the scene. Gradually the troublesome heretics and truth-tellers vanished. The terms “sophistry” and “sophist” were turned into their opposites, into terms of abuse. As philosophy became an integrated part of the education of nobles, voices that challenged the values and assumption of imperialism were gradually removed and the Sceptics avoided questioning the truths and the values of imperialism. They chose, instead, to question the clouds while academics like Plato, to roars of applause, directed the attention of their students beyond the clouds, into the completely meaningless world of imagination void of imagination. Naturally, the Epicureans fled the noise—or were already long gone.

### Epictetus

Epictetus (not to be mistaken with Epicurus-the-garden-philosopher), a second century A.D. Roman slave, received freedom, literacy, pens and paper, and vast amounts of education and free time and to develop superior writing skills, skills he then applied to writing the “Golden Sayings.” That’s the official story. Well, they *might* be in the realm of possibility, but we are in deep bullcrapland the moment we read what our ex-slave wrote. The famous “Golden Sayings” begins with an outpouring of such happiness that we might rightfully think, “That’s exactly how I would feel if I won a million dollars and quit my job.” But suddenly Epictetus changes his tune and endeavours to persuade us that life is great whether you’re a slave or not: “Whether we are digging or ploughing or eating, shouldn’t we praise God?” Without answering, Epictetus goes on to thank God for the ability to work with his hands, swallow his food and digest it! Oh, truly, this is a fantastical ex-slave’s gratitude! This is pure propaganda designed to appease and soothe the troubled conscience of the ruling elite. This is the whole message of Epictetus’ stoical Golden Shit: *do not strive for more than you can have, and if you wish to be happy, be content with the injustices that you suffer, praise God for giving you a tongue to praise him with, and serve him as a dutiful slave.*

Alas, the author or fraudster was not content to write only about matters that concerned slaves. The 89<sup>th</sup> Golden Saying is no mere “saying”, certainly not a slave’s saying; it reads like an official imperial edict commanding everyone to accept Rome’s fraudulent currency, its impure gold and silver coins: “Money-changers may not reject

Caesar's coins, and neither may the seller of herbs, for once the coin is shown they must deliver what is sold for it, whether he wishes to or not." This is damnable stuff to write in a time when Rome was awash in false coins, especially counterfeit coins minted by Rome itself so that Rome could pay its own debts? Of course he was aware! The trouble was that the secret was out, and people were beginning to refuse Roman coins, so the Golden Sayings were commissioned. Yes, commissioned. The Golden Sayings—that is, the invisible hand of an empire awash in cheap gold and silver (cheap because human blood was cheap)—probably intended Epictetus' works for use in schools for aspiring government officials. The Golden Sayings were intended as a means of indoctrinating and instructing the ruling class and its miserable clerks and bureaucrats.

Has anything changed? No. Today, currency fraud is the global norm. All paper-based money is fraud and debt, while all gold-based money is, if possible, even more idiotic.

### Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus

Does human incredulity know no end? An emperor who wrote philosophy? Oh, please. Emperors, like presidents, might be great rhetoricians; they might even, like Stalin, write poetic trash; or like Hitler, paint it. But write philosophy? That staggers the imagination. This is some rich pile of bullshit. But why not believe this, since we're also willing to believe that an ex-slave fortuitously named Epictetus also wrote some of the best musings on life in ancient Rome? Who cares that Emperor M. A. Antoninus's (he ruled from 161-180 A.D.) philosophical meditations sound a lot like the meditations of the ex-slave Epictetus? Anything is possible, right? Nothing should be doubted, right? The ancients were *incapable* of fraud and propaganda, right?

Even at first glance, *The Meditations* expresses a philosophy well suited to appeasing slaves. It celebrates poverty and de-emphasizes the importance of injustice, anger, and powerlessness. Could propaganda be more transparent?

On his first page, Antoninus humbly lists among *his* many virtues "simplicity in a lifestyle that is not like that of the rich." *Bullshit*. On the same page he adds that he learned from his governor "to endure labour, to desire little, to work with my own hands and to mind my own business". *You liar! If all that's true, why didn't you become a farm slave?* From Diogenes, Antoninus claims to have once upon a time "desired a wooden cot and skin for a bed and whatever else belongs to Grecian discipline." This is rich. George Orwell couldn't have said it better through his elitist liar, Squealer. Listen, Antoninus, your bare-faced hypocrite, perhaps you once took a stoic pride in sleeping without a mattress, but that is no reason to recommend it to your readers while *you sleep in imperial luxury!*

Am I out of line? Is *The Meditations* a Roman imperial fraud? Evidence to the contrary abounds. In the end our good Emperor Antoninus says, "[A]ct as your nature dictates, and endure what the common nature requires" (12:32). This is most wonderfully *vague*. What does "[my] nature dictate", that I be a slave? What does "the common nature require, that I endure a moderate poverty as a paper-pushing government clerk? The following words are even more peculiar from an emperor: "How does the ruling faculty employ itself? Everything depends on this" (12:33). The ruling faculty? This is imperial stoical psychobabble. The ruling faculty is to the body as the emperor is to the empire: it must rule brutally, listen to nothing and no one but itself, serve no purpose but

the perpetuation of its own rule, and use every resource for its personal glorification. Thus, sexuality becomes an expression of the ruling faculty's ability to dominate others or inhibit itself: *that* is aristocratic Greece and Rome and that is the way of the predators. The "ruling faculty" has no rejects Reason—except insofar as Reason can be used to pursue unreasonable ends, and the "ruling faculty" rejects Empathy—except insofar as it sympathizes with anyone except its victims.

What is *The Meditations*? What purpose and what readership was it designed to serve? "From my great-grandfather I learned not to attend public schools and to have good tutors at home, and to spend liberally on such things" (1.4). I call this a curiosity because Antoninus must have known that not everyone could afford private tutors. So why would the author advise people to spend liberally on private tutoring? Well, it turns out that during the Roman Empire two types of education were competing for students. One focused on the Greek imperial writing tradition of philosophy. It was largely taught by private Greek tutors. The other type of education, the Roman type, emphasized rhetoric, poetry, law and the development of the "noble" character trait of unsmilingness. This type of education was taught in small public schools. With fierce competition between these two sides, talented teachers might write their own books and fill them with all their personal biases. An especially shrewd and audacious tutor might even forge philosophical works claiming to be written by a respected Roman emperor and yet expressing pro-Greek education biases. Such a ruse would obviously help the tutor market himself and possibly his underlings to Roman clients. Is *The Meditations* the work of such an author? Its bias for philosophy and against the Roman school of thought is unmistakable. For example, Antoninus claims he learned to avoid "rhetoric, poetry and fine writing" (1:7). He even thanks the gods that "I did not become more proficient in rhetoric and poetry" (1:17). Furthermore, in meditation 1.5, he explains that he does not like the Roman mania for competitive team sports and gladiator fights at the Circus. He prefers "Grecian discipline" (1.6). These words are important, not only because they admit to a bias, but because they attest to Greece's fall from prosperity. By "discipline" Antoninus really means spartanism or austerity—the austerity that came to it after the Romans conquered it and extinguished the spirit of poetry and song and silenced its rhetoricians—its rulers.

How do we interpret the author's criticism that the Roman rulers, the Patricians, were "lacking paternal love" (1.11)? Presumably the author's clients were the wealthy Patricians, so why say they lacked paternal love? Was it, perhaps, a wry joke? The Patricians took pride in *not* loving their children, and took it as a matter of course that children had to be raised like soldiers and hardened in the fire of Roman *severity* and discipline.

In 1.14, two sentences after accusing his fellow men of being cold, the author writes that his brother, punningly named "Severus," taught him "to love my kin." Very funny—you imperialist pig. You loved your own blood, your own *skin*, and exploited the rest.

Wait! What's this? The same verse goes on to claim that the good Emperor M.A.A.A. learned that he should respect the principle of "equal rights." What do we make of this? Most learned readers with a sense of history will have avoided interpreting these words in the modern sense, as if Antoninus spoke about equal rights for everyone; learned readers likely inferred that the author meant equal rights for the ruling class, the patricians (ruling class) who patronized (supported) the Greek tutors.

## EPICURUS

The extremely short works attributed to Epicurus, the ancient Greek philosopher, appear to have survived nearly two and half thousand years uncorrupted. Apparently, the medieval scribes and fraudsters in charge of the Vatican's massive forgery, censorship and propaganda campaign wanted to preserve a few samples of writings produced by the most advanced thinker in ancient Greece. According to experts, one of these writings, the "Vatican Sayings," dates to the 14<sup>th</sup> century A.D., around the time the Vatican was probably busy forging Greek classics.

Of the six writings attributed to Epicurus, the three letters appear to be forgeries while the Principal Doctrines, the Vatican Sayings and the Last Will appear to be authentic because they express ideas that are far removed from Christian doctrine. These three authentic works contain a good deal of evidence that Epicurus was an atheist, an anarchist, and an agrarian who loved his garden and the simple rural life. However, Epicurus rarely explicitly supports these radical positions; instead, he casually mentions the gods and his country as if merely to keep oppressive authorities off his scent.

Let's examine the evidence in the 81 passages known as the Vatican Sayings. My comments are in italics:

### The Vatican Sayings

1. A blessed and indestructible being has no trouble himself and brings no trouble upon any other being; so he is free from anger and partiality, for all such things imply weakness. *Instead of stating that gods do not exist, Epicurus has stated that if they exist they could never be angry—which is precisely the opposite of the biblical and Roman God.*

2. Death is nothing to us; for that which has been dissolved into its elements experiences no sensations, and that which has no sensation is nothing to us. *Instead of saying that death is nothing because we go straight to Heaven or Hell, he says it is nothing because it cannot be felt or experienced, since it is the end of feeling and experience. This indicates an atheistic perspective.*

35. Don't spoil what you have by desiring what you don't have; but remember that what you now have you might have prayed for. *In other words, we should never pray for anything, because that always spoils what we have. Rational planning is another matter.*

65. It is pointless for a man to pray to the gods for that which he has the power to obtain by himself. *This reconfirms what is hinted at in passage 35—that prayer and belief in gods have no purpose but lead humanity to ruin.*

77. Freedom is the greatest fruit of self-sufficiency. *To be self-sufficient means to rely on no one else for one's basic needs. I'm not sure this is entirely possible, but it spells death for hierarchies. Wherever some people lead and others obey, we do not have self-*

*sufficiency, for the master needs the slave to maintain his lifestyle. How can we achieve self-sufficiency? Perhaps we, like Epicurus, must all become gardeners.*

### The Letters

In the Letter of Menoecus, the author speaks of one god as if he exists, but he warns against believing what most people believe about the gods, so what should people believe about the gods? Epicurus does not elaborate. Like a crypto-atheist, he keeps his true opinions hidden from most people:

First believe that God is a living being immortal and blessed, according to the notion of a god indicated by the common sense of mankind ... For there are gods, and the knowledge of them is manifest; but they are not such as the multitude believe ... Impious is the man who affirms of the gods what the multitude believes about them, and the man who denies the gods the multitude worships is not impious.

Granted, Epicurus says that God is “a living being immortal and blessed,” but, according to his own philosophy, this definition might also apply to living human beings. For Epicurus argues that mankind is blessed *by nature* and is immortal because we will never experience death, since death is the cessation of thought and sensation. From this perspective, we are gods—and, as if to help us or Menoecus come to this conclusion, the paragraph I quoted above is followed by paragraphs that explain his ideas about death.

The letter also expounds Epicurus’ thoughts on the importance of pleasure, but, and this is strange, he denies that physical pleasures are true pleasures: “[Pleasure] is not an unbroken succession of drinking-bouts and of revelry, not sexual lust, not the enjoyment of the fish and other delicacies of a luxurious table.” But, he provided some space between his lines, because by excluding “an unbroken succession of drinking-bouts” he did not exclude a broken succession, and by excluding “sexual lust” he did not exclude sexual stimulation, and by excluding the “delicacies of a luxurious table” he did not exclude the delicacies eaten without a table.

However, the Letter to Herodotus is utterly useless, vapid and worthless. It expounds on atoms and directions and then has the audacity to claim that these thoughts can be of service to men and bring peace of mind to students. The Letter to Pythocles is also a hodgepodge of proto-science. If such writings are authentic, I believe they supplement his atheistic writings by giving students the ability to view nature free of religious illusions.

### The Will

The will attributed to Epicurus also seems authentic. His love of humanity is manifest in his decisions to let his estate support the school and both boys and girls until the age of marriage. His respect for traditions he did not believe in is manifest in his decision to let his estate continue providing funds for annual ritual offerings made in memory of his dead parents and brothers. His personal atheism is evident from the

note, or joke, that some funds should be allocated for annual celebrations of his *birthday*—and not for his funeral. This amusing request is true to his teaching that death should not be mourned because it causes no pain.

Finally, he will bequeath his books to Hermarchus, a disciple and successor of Epicurus. According to ancient sources, Hermarchus wrote treatises against Plato, Aristotle and Empedocles, which is why his books have not survived. Rome's ruling elites had no place for diversity of opinion let alone contrarian minorities. I suspect that a few pages of Epicurus' works have survived only on account of the fact that he suppressed his atheism and exercised prudence and diplomacy.

## PLATO

### Introduction

Friedrich Nietzsche's suspicions

In the end, my mistrust of Plato goes deep: he represents such an aberration from all the basic Greek instincts, is so moralistic, so pseudo-Christian (he already takes the concept of "the good" as the highest concept) that I would prefer the harsh phrase "higher swindle" or, if it sounds better, "idealism" for the whole phenomenon of Plato. We have paid dearly for the fact that this Athenian got his schooling from the Egyptians (or from the Jews in Egypt?) In that great calamity called Christianity, Plato represents that ambiguity and fascination, called an "ideal," which made it possible for the nobler spirits of antiquity to misunderstand themselves and to set foot on the bridge leading to the Cross.  
(*Twilight of the Idols*, What I Owe to the Ancients, 2)

Also quote *Beyond Good and Evil*, 190 (p113)

Christian values are in essence imperial values. They denigrate or ignore nature, the body, sex, comedy, art, and all healthful and pleasant activities that are free, easy to access or master and therefore not profitable for people intent on exploiting everyone and everything for so-called profits. Platonic and Christian writings share these values and biases, but this does not prove that Plato's works were forged by Christian monks. Of course, a conspiracy could never be proved *beyond a shadow of a doubt*; however, more persuasive evidence might be mustered.

Consider, for example, the odd fact that Plato never ascribes any positive powers to the Greek gods. Like his teacher, Socrates, he appears to be something of a crypto-atheist. However, atheism cost Socrates his life, and all Greek authorities would have been required to support and respect the imperial Greek religion. So, why does Plato never ascribe positive powers to the Greek gods, oracles, priests, and rituals? This doesn't seem possible.

Plato the asshole – hated democracy ... good point but wrong premise about people being unqualified to vote for their betters but their betters being qualified by their ‘education’ hahahah – see my handout

Socratic Superstitions

<http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/s/socrates.html>

### The Socratic Method

The method of spinning dialogues that have no substance but appear to be quite serious. This is the language employed by our politicians, philosophers, etc.

### Vegetarianism

Recently, raw vegan guru, John Rose, brought to my attention the possibility that Plato might have supported vegetarianism or even veganism. Well, let’s have a close look at the text in question, Plato’s *Republic*, Chapter 2. There, Socrates discusses the ideal city with Glaucon, and he says that men in such a city will “make bread and wine ... they will provide meal from their barley and flour from their wheat, and kneading and cooking these will serve noble cakes”. This description of dietary choices in the ideal city strongly contradicts John’s ideal diet of raw food free of grains and alcohol—and the emphasis on bread and wine confirms my theory that the *Republic* is a Catholic forgery. The austere Catholic bias is evident when Glaucon asks Socrates if men won’t want to eat more delicious foods, and Socrates agrees and describes a smorgasbord of cheese, boiled vegetables, roasted berries and nuts, figs and olives and so on, and Glaucon comments that now the ideal city sounds like a city of pigs and asks Socrates what else his city needs. Socrates responds by saying if he wants a description of a sick or “fevered” state, he is willing to provide it and does indeed provide a long list of presumably unnecessary luxuries—a list that ends with a reference to the animals or cattle. John Rose and others like to quote this as if it were evidence that Plato was a vegetarian, but Plato has no interest in human health and merely treated meat as a luxury while promoting his unhealthy poor-man’s diet of “noble” cakes—meaning bread. Socrates also warned that meat eating leads to fighting for land—so apparently he understood that a meat-based diet requires more land than a plant-based diet. And, some editions say Socrates thought slaughtering domestic animals is bad for our health and conscience. These are important insights, but Socrates is essentially concerned with peace and wealth, not with health. Though I know of no scientific study that has confirmed this, I suspect a cooked grain-based diet is worse for our health than a cooked meat-based diet.

### The Eternal Forms

--- like God – everything was created and not meant to change... Contra heraclitus

## Socrates Was a Little Lamb

Did Socrates resist state sanctioned tyranny or denounce slavery and usury? He did not. He was a coward who had nothing radical or revolutionary or useful to say about anything. He smiled when officials of the state walked past him. He paid his taxes and well, of course, all this would be true *if he existed*.

And consider this: the crime for which he was executed by the state was teaching atheism and departing from the state religion. But *no historical evidence exists that any ancient Greek state was ever intolerant towards other religions*. Plato's claim that someone named Socrates was executed for his religious beliefs, or lack of them, is bogus and ridiculous.

Why didn't he make a more believable claim? Why didn't he claim that Socrates was executed for treason or for inspiring students to denounce state atrocities or for provoking his students to demand independence and access to free land? Such "crimes" would be provide probable cause for an execution.

The author, Plato, could not claim that Socrates was guilty of the above probable causes because that would draw attention to them and that could outrage impressionable young students. So, a bogus crime had to be invented, and its name is atheism or heterodoxy. It's a curious choice that makes little sense *unless the actual author lived in an age of intense religious persecution*. Was it, perhaps the age of the Inquisitions? Is Socrates, perhaps, a variation on that other man accused of departing from orthodoxy and also executed by the state, Jesus?

## Socratic Virtue

Well, through Plato's texts, Socrates never, not once, offered his students practical advice on how to survive in a predatory world that condemns the majority to poverty and misery. However, his last words finally give us a glimpse into how Socrates related to the real world. In those famous last words, he tells his disciple, "Crito, we owe a cock to Asclepius. Do pay it. Don't forget." Bravo, Socrates! Here you expose yourself. Here you teach your students that all debts are legitimate, that money is necessary, and that economic reality does not need to be investigated let alone questioned by a philosopher.

Luckily, I'm no student of Socrates. I can formulate my own questions, and one question that comes to mind is this: Why did the author make Asclepius the last creditor of the dying Socrates? Is it, perhaps, an ironic and blasphemous allusion to the Greek of medicine, whose name is identical to Socrates' creditor's name? How is this ironic? Well, Socrates was given poison to drink, and as he lies dying, he wants to repay the god of medicine? Absurd! Blasphemous! Or, did Socrates hope to save his life by appeasing the god of medicine with a last-minute payment?

Oh, but this stinks of *Catholicism* and *simony*. Socrates thinks he can save himself with money! There you have it, Socrates was a Catholic—a deathbed Catholic—but a Catholic nonetheless.

This brings me back to the Inquisition—that infernal age was marked by trials that ended with torture, executions and forced death-bed conversions to the Catholic faith.

Of course, the Church was never content with mere conversions. It always wanted *your money and your life*.

## Socrates' God

Now, if Socrates respected the state-approved gods, we might expect him to invoke them on occasion, yet he never does. And this is still more curious: whenever he mentions “the gods” he nearly always mentions them in the abstract, not as if he believed in them.

Notable exceptions to this rule occurred during the trial of Socrates. As if to make the witness speak honestly, Socrates said, “by the gods, Meletus ... tell me and the court...” He also said, “by the goddess Here [Hera],” but he said it ironically, which means he did not invoke Hera’s name in good faith, but as part of a joke, which is disrespectful to her. And, all this is doubly curious, for to my knowledge invoking a religion or a god in a court of law is a peculiarly Christian custom, not a Greek one.

Next, consider Socrates’ odd habit invoking neither the gods in general nor any individual Greek god in particular—and consider that Socrates instead invokes a nameless “God” or “god” (the lone, unnamed god is mentioned by him 16 times just in *The Apology* alone). Precisely which god did he mean? Or, did the author want to suggest that Socrates actually believed in the unnameable god of the Jews, the one they and Christians typically call “God”? That’s clever. Create an apparent paragon of wisdom and virtue, and then suggest that this paragon was actually a monotheist and proto-Christian. Is *The Apology*, then, more Christian propaganda?

## ARISTOTLE

### Introduction

- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tI5gNk9w7NM> – Morris Berman minutes 10:00-16:00
- Pleonexia – extreme greed – the catholic hypocrisy
- Popular with Christian theologians

“Aristotle (384 - 322 B.C.), a philosopher of ancient Greece, was the first ever to create systematic biology. He regarded nature as purposive, stating in *The Physics*,

If, then, artificial processes are purposeful, so are natural processes too; ... we find that plants too produce organs subservient to their perfect development-leaves, for instance, to shelter the fruit ... Hence, if it is by nature and also for a purpose ... that plants make leaves for the sake of the fruit and strike down (and not up) with their roots in order to get their nourishment, it is clear that causality of the kind we have described is at work in things that come about or exist in the course of Nature. (Aristotle, *The Physics*, 173 -75)

While reading another riveting article by theology graduate Chris Hedges, I was surprised to find that Chris had quoted Aristotle’s “*Politics*” to help support his polemic against

America's psychopathic upper class. The quotation used by Christ reads as follows: "Those who have too much of the goods of fortune, strength, wealth, friends, and the like, are neither willing nor able to submit to authority." Chris' point was to appeal to Aristotle's authority in order to strengthen his own denunciation of America's ruling class. But this is treading on thin ice. Aristotle belonged to the upper class and never called for a revolution against a corrupt class of rulers.

In fact, the quotation gives us good reason to be suspicious. Consider the "authority" to which Aristotle referred. *What authority did he mean?* This is not so clear. He does not say "the authority of the Senate" or any other Greek governing body. Then what authority did he mean? We don't know—and this is astounding! How could a philosopher, in a text devoted to the subject of politics, not be clear about the nature of the authority he refers to? This is our first problem.

Our second problem is this: if, as we are led to believe, Aristotle belonged to the rich upper class and was once employed by Alexander the Great, he could not have written the above strong criticism of corruption because—to be frank—corruption is the status quo and those whom he criticized would have had him killed and his books burned.

So, how do we resolve these twin problems?

Let's imagine, for a moment, that Aristotle's writings are late forgeries or corruptions written by Christian theocrats and expressly designed to serve an underlying theocratic agenda. This would mean that the "authority" Aristotle mentioned was intended to discretely hint at God, the Pope and the Church. This reading would resolve the identity of the "authority."

Is this theory believable and creditable? Certainly. If Aristotle's works are late Christian forgeries that goes a long way to explaining why he dabbled in ideas that reek of monotheism, ideas such as the uncaused cause, or—to speak plainly—the uncreated Creator. His entire "Metaphysics" could be reinterpreted as a deliberate attempt to strip Greek Hellenism of its gods, to Romanize them by turning them into planets, and to make the whole solar system seem like the expression of an intelligent being.

And, if Aristotle's works are medieval Christian forgeries we can understand how he had the freedom to criticize wealthy elites who scorned authority; he had that freedom because he wrote from within the Church and the Church loved to criticize the nobles and princes of Europe who habitually flouted the Church's authority.

So, we are back to my theory that all the Western classics are corrupted by Christian hands, that we are wadding through a massive medieval conspiracy of holy forgeries and corruptions.

### How to Rationalize Injustice

Let's examine another revealing passage from Aristotle's "Politics." I have arranged it into small pieces to help us analyze easily.

"[A]ll [humans] are not either slaves by nature or freemen by nature,"

This might be misunderstood to mean that all humans are born equal, but it merely means that *in an empire* we cannot all be slaves and we cannot all be freemen or masters. This

point is so obvious that only an idiot would write about it—and idiot or a skilled hack who was paid to make the obvious sound moral, acceptable and sophisticated.

“and ... there is in some cases a marked distinction between the two classes, rendering it expedient and right for the one to be slaves and the others to be masters: the one practicing obedience, the others exercising the authority and lordship which *nature* intended them to have.”

Here “nature” is the basis and justification Aristotle provides for his class system. But what is this “nature”? That he will never illuminate, though we can assume he agreed with Plato that this nature is founded on education, which of course only the wealthy elites could afford.

“The abuse of this authority is injurious to both sides; for the interests of part and whole, of body and soul, are the same, and *the slave is a part of the master, a living but separated part of his bodily frame.*”

Don’t you love this old Renaissance metaphor of the ruler being like the head or brain and the ruled masses being his body?

“Therefore, where the relation of master and slave between them is *natural* they are friends and have a common interest, but where it rests *merely on law and force* the reverse is true.” (1:6)

How dare Aristotle start that sentence with “Therefore”! There is no logic in the previous sentence(s)! A metaphor is not an argument. An analogy can be used to explain an argument, but it cannot be the argument.

Finally, he once again resorts to the “natural” as his true and justified authority, and here contrasts it with authority based on “mere law and force.” But my dear Aristotle, what else could serve as the basis of authority? Is your obscure “nature” perhaps your God?

### Aristotle the Scoundrel

The following analysis should suffice to persuade everyone that Aristotle is a not a philosopher but a scoundrel who whitewashes injustice, inequality, and imperialism. I have italicized and bolded some of Aristotle’s nefarious words to help focus attention on his insults to our humanity. Read at your own risk:

“A question may indeed be raised, whether there is any excellence at all in a slave beyond and higher than merely instrumental and ministerial qualities—whether he can have the virtues of temperance, courage, justice, and so on; or whether slaves possess only bodily and ministerial qualities. *And, whichever way we answer the question, a difficulty arises; for, if they have virtue, in what will they differ from freemen?* On the other hand, *since they are men and share in rational principle*, it **seems** absurd to say that they have no virtue. A similar question may be raised about women and children, whether they too have virtues: ought a woman to be temperate and brave and just, and is a child to

be called temperate, and intemperate, or not? So in general we may ask about the natural ruler, and the natural subject [slave, freeman, citizen, etc.], whether they have the same or different virtues. *For if a noble nature is equally required in both [ruler and subject], why should one of them always rule, and the other always be ruled?*] Nor can we say that this [this difference] is a question of degree, for the difference between ruler and subject is a difference of kind... Yet how strange is the supposition that the one ought, and that the other ought not, to have virtue! For if the ruler is intemperate and unjust, how can he rule well? If the subject, how can he obey well? If he be licentious and cowardly, he will certainly not do his duty. *It is evident, therefore, that both of them must have a share of virtue, but varying as natural subjects also vary among themselves.* Here the very constitution of the soul has shown us the way; in it one part naturally rules, and the other is subject, and the virtue of the ruler we maintain to be different from that of the subject; the one being the virtue of the rational, and the other of the irrational part. Now, it is obvious that the same principle applies generally, and therefore almost all things rule and are ruled according to nature. But the kind of rule differs; the freeman rules over the slave after another manner from that in which the male rules over the female, or the man over the child; although the parts of the soul are present in an of them, they are present in different degrees. For the slave has no deliberative faculty at all; the woman has, but it is without authority, and the child has, but it is immature. *So it must necessarily be supposed to be with the moral virtues also; all should have them, but only in such manner and degree as is required by each for the fulfillment of his duty.* Hence the ruler ought to have moral virtue in perfection, for his function, taken absolutely, demands a master artificer [or architect, a commander and creator] ...; the subjects, on the other hand, require only the quantity of virtue which is proper to each of them. Clearly[?], then, moral virtue belongs to all of them; but the temperance of a man and of a woman, or the courage and justice of a man and of a woman, are not, as Socrates maintained, the same; the courage of a man is shown in commanding, of a woman in obeying. [1:13]

## HISTORY

### Herodotus' Comedy

Herodotus also described people living on islands who "meet together in companies" throw cannabis on a fire, then "sit around in a circle; and by inhaling the fruit that has been thrown on, they become intoxicated by the odour, just as the Greeks do by wine; and more fruit is thrown on, the more intoxicated they become, until they rise up and dance and betake themselves to singing." Other passages from Pliny, Marco Polo, Abu Mansur Muwaffaq and The Arabian Nights show that cannabis was cultivated both for its fibre and for its psychoactive properties throughout Asia and the Near East from the earliest known times.

Herodotus is popularly known as the Father of History and the Father of Lies, which should give us sufficient reason for pause. According to one comical but widely believed source (Lucian), in the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Herodotus became famous for reciting his entire 350-page monster in public in a single sitting at the Olympic Games. Hmm, let's think about that. To read aloud 350 pages ... that would have been a 12-hour performance, at least. It's a marathon of ears and of patience, especially for Olympic Game goers—those being people who delight in spectacles and brief moments of suspense. The book doesn't even have a main character! The whole story about it being read in public is nonsense. *The History* was likely intended to provide “learning” material for upper class young men who found themselves enrolled in an education system that was heavily influenced by Greek history and knowledge.

Regardless of when or where it was read, *The History of the Greek and Persian War* is imperial propaganda that has so little respect for honesty that it insults intelligent readers. The absurdities begin with the very first sentence, in which Herodotus claims that he wrote his history so that the “great and wonderful actions of the Greeks and barbarians” would be preserved. Such statements are either contradictory or oxymoronic. The word “barbarians” implies a prejudice that reasonable readers must take to mean that Herodotus will not credit them—the barbarians—with “great and wonderful actions.”

The second sentence is also a killer: “According to the Persians, best informed in history, the Phoenicians began the quarrel.” *What?* One sentence earlier he called all non-Greeks barbarians, and now he wants us to believe that they are best informed in history? And worse, he wants to trust their account of history with respect to a violent quarrel that led to war? But wars and quarrels are precisely the kinds of actions about which the people involved can virtually never give an objective account. Well—as if these absurdities did not suffice, Herodotus' version of the “Persian” account turns out to sound totally Greek and totally ridiculous. It is ridiculous because it traces the origin of a war to a dispute over women—and I challenge any sober historian to prove to me that armies would ever go to war over women. Street brawls and duels are possible over women, but war? That is surely a joke. And why do you think the most famous war ever fought over a woman, the Trojan War, is famous in Western literature yet unheard of outside it? Is it, perhaps, some kind of myth?

Herodotus further tests my patience by repeatedly claiming to have intimate knowledge of all the foolish things Persian and other foreign rulers did, planned, and *thought*—not only in battle but even in their most private quarters. What little bird lived in your ear, dear Herodotus? No doubt your racist jokes amused your spellbound Eurocrats and imparted to them the noble bigotry of your time.

Herodotus' assumed omniscience is an important theme in his comedy, a theme that turns ironic when he claims that Croesus, a foreign tyrant occupying parts of modern Greece, decided to rely on the advice of a Greek oracle on whether or not he should fight against Cyrus, Emperor of Persia. Though this is absurd, the story becomes still more absurd through the allegation that Croesus didn't quite trust the Greek oracles and devised a clever scheme by which he could check which one spoke the *truth*. I dare say, however, that no oracle, prophet, or fortune-teller could pass the test Herodotus attributes to Croesus.

Herodotus is like a Roman fraud, probably written in the first or second century B.C. and written for the indoctrination and corruption of young nobles. It represents, like most other books treated here, a state-sponsored piece of doctrine disguised as history. It is a commissioned book meant for teachers and students at Greek or—more likely—Roman “schools” where students learned little more than to be unemotional, deceptive, manipulative, greedy, sexist, war-mongering bigots.

And what do men and women know about their “enemies” today? Despite huge advances in technology, or perhaps because of it, people still don’t understand their neighbors. It’s no wonder. We have put eyes in space, and cameras outnumber people, but Jews do not recite the Koran, Muslims do not meditate, Buddhists do not read the Bible, Christians do not enjoy Russel, Sartre or Nietzsche, and so on and so forth, so how can we expect people who do not build cultural bridges to understand one another?

### Thucydides’ Hidden Fraud and Racism

You have to laugh when someone claims he lived in the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C. (Before Caesar), worked as military general, owned gold mines and dares to claim he developed a more scientific form of history ... and yet, neither history nor science can prove that *he* existed. Excuse me, you were a military general who fought in battle and owned gold mines, yet there’s no evidence from your contemporaries that you existed? No evidence except what you provide in your fat book of lies—a book, by the way, that continues to be studied by gullible candidates at advanced military colleges.

Thucydides’ *The Peloponnesian War* was written after the Romans conquered Greece in 146 B.C. It is a Roman forgery that makes a mockery of the Greek golden age, of Greek marines and military tactics, of Greek people in general. *The Peloponnesian War* represents Rome spitting on the conquered Greek territories. But Thucydides spits with such a straight face, with such poise and noble demeanour, that modern readers easily overlook the offense.

But let us consider, among other things, how Thucydides indirectly validates Rome’s occupation of Greece by writing, “[T]he country now called Hellas had no settled population in ancient times”. In other words, Greeks do not really “belong” in Greece, so any occupation of its territory by a foreign imperial power is legitimate.

Next, in his third paragraph, this most scientific historian points out that, since Homer provides the earliest evidence of the existence of Hellas (Greeks), they didn’t exist before the Trojan War. Moreover, Thucydides explains, that Homer only applies the name Hellas to the followers of Achilles who came from quite another place, and from this brilliant insight it naturally follows that the Hellas (Greeks) do not belong in Hellas (Greece), which also nicely excuses the abuses committed against them by imperial Rome.

In his fifth paragraph, Thucydides proceeds to claim that all early Hellenes (Greeks) were more or less pirates, and as evidence of this he claims that mainland Greeks living in his time viewed piracy “as something to be proud of.” Are you kidding me? Doesn’t this reek of slander and racism? And, needless to say, if they approved of piracy, naturally we shouldn’t hesitate to conquer and subjugate them.

In his sixth paragraph, Thucydides claims that some Greeks still “follow the old way of life” and “the general custom” of the land, which he explains is the custom of making

a living through armed robbery! Then, this great scientific thinker says, “The fact that the peoples I have mentioned still live in this way is evidence that once this was the general rule among all the Hellenes.” Well, I’m sure such degrading views helped Rome quiet its deranged conscience as it imposed the Pax Romana (Roman Peace) on the equally civilized Greek people.

Why did the Roman author claiming to be Thucydides disguise his imperial propaganda and racism in the form of an objective Greek history? Why? This was done so that the young Roman noblemen destined to read his “Greek” book in Roman academies would never suspect that they were being brainwashed by a fellow Roman.

Not convinced yet? The seventh paragraph reads as follows (my comments in italics), “The Athenians were the first to give up the habit of carrying weapons [*So the Greeks voluntarily chose to lay down their weapons and live defenceless? It wasn’t Rome’s armies that stripped Greece of its arms?*] and adopt a way of living that was more relaxed a more luxurious [*I fail to see how a luxurious life requires one to stop being armed.*] In fact the older men of the rich families who had these luxurious tastes only recently gave up wearing linen undergarments [*You gotta be kidding! The Greeks wore nothing under their togas? Shame on them! But does Thucydides actually expect us to think that elderly Greek men who wore linen underwear indulged in luxury? Doesn’t this seem a little absurd? Did Thucydides, perhaps, want to mock the conquered Greek nobles whose wealth (even its linen) Rome had seized for itself?*] and tying their hair behind their heads in a knot fastened with a clasp of golden grasshoppers.” His paragraph ends by implying that Greeks are no different from any other “barbarian” peoples: “Indeed, one could point to a number of other instances where the manners of the ancient Hellenic world are very similar to the manners of foreigners [*barbarians*] today.” In other words, even though Rome is highly influenced by Greek culture, Thucydides defends Rome’s policy of treating the conquered Greek peoples like common barbarians by arguing that they really were no different from other barbarians.

Next, Thucydides mocks the Greeks who allegedly spent 10 years fighting the Trojan War; he accuses them of wasting too much time filling their bellies by plundering nearby villages and “cultivating the land.” The Trojan War was a symbol of the Greek fighting spirit, but Thucydides mocks it by suggesting that the soldiers spent most of their time gardening and filling their bellies.

And in my own time, some people still discriminate against Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, and, ironically, even Italy. In fact, no country is safe in this age of financial piracy.

Livy?

[http://www.amazon.com/Revolution-Penguin-Classics-Hannah-Arendt/dp/0143039903/ref=pd\\_sim\\_b\\_5#reader\\_0143039903](http://www.amazon.com/Revolution-Penguin-Classics-Hannah-Arendt/dp/0143039903/ref=pd_sim_b_5#reader_0143039903) --- see p.2  
Xenophon’s Noble Propaganda

Well, if Thucydide’s claims to fame didn’t make you laugh, consider his supposed contemporary, Xenophon. In the brief biography provided in a 1949 Penguin Classic, we read a scholar’s following remarks about Xenophon: “By his own (probably reliable) account he was a fine officer and outstanding leader.” How on Earth could any scholar assume that when a man brags about being fine and outstanding, the braggart’s

statements are “probably reliable”? Why would he assume it—especially when no historical sources corroborate his claim? I’ll tell you why he assumed it: he assumed it because most scholars and academics know nothing about the real world.

Of course, Xenophon is a pseudonym for a racist Roman forger, possibly the same racist who wrote stuff attributed to other Greeks. His name was likely derived from the Greek words meaning “foreign sound” because the Roman author wrote in a foreign language, Greek.

Xenophon’s motivation for writing *The Persian Expedition* should now be familiar: Roman rulers needed reading material with which to indoctrinate young Roman nobles. *The Persian Expedition*, like Arrian’s *The Campaigns of Alexander*, provides young Roman nobles with inspirational portraits of foreign leaders and military tacticians. King Cyrus provides Xenophon’s first model. Cyrus, the legendary Persian ruler, is said to have paid back with interest anyone who did him a good or an evil turn, so that “many people were eager to hand over [to him] their money, their cities and their own persons.” But *excuse me*, isn’t this a little absurd? Cities are never eagerly handed over, but Xenophon wants to inspire a new generation of empire builders with the belief that cities can be taken without risk and bloodshed.

Using Cyrus as an ennobling precedent, Xenophon virtually sanctifies the Roman practice of creating peace (i.e. crushing a people’s will to fight back) by lining roads with the corpses of crucified rebels. He writes that Cyrus created security for traders and peace for slave owners by lining his roads with “people who had been blinded or had had their feet or hands cut off.”

But Xenophon does not hesitate to lightly criticize the Persian legend either, for he says that Cyrus used to think he was being generous by sending his friends half empty bottles of wine and half eaten loaves of bread. Young Latin noblemen would have viewed this kind of behaviour with scorn. Unto this day, Italians still think that a host’s primary responsibility is to fatten their own egos by stuffing their guests. Xenophon pretends that Cyrus’ shady gifts actually inspired his men to support him in the war. But his true message is quite different, for Cyrus’ behaviour obviously inspired too little support, for soon afterwards we learn that Cyrus died in battle.

The rest of the book is hardly worth writing about. Xenophon would have us believe that the Greeks loved Cyrus, a Persian, so much that they voluntarily supported him in his battle against his Persian brother, King Artaxerxes. He would also have us believe that after defeating Artaxerxes on foreign soil, and after losing Cyrus, the Greek soldiers turned into a band of brigands who lived by robbing and looting foreign villages. Then, only after many years of wandering and robbing, Chirisophus finally takes command of the leaderless Greek soldiers (pirates?) and, in a stroke of genius, they sail home, to a Greek city—not because they are tired of looting foreigners or decided to bring their loot home, but because they wish to ask their fellow citizens for the money they need to continue their *famous* looting expedition. I call it a *famous* expedition because it is actually famous, at least among historians, some of whom are blind enough to call it “a great adventure.” Can’t they see it’s a racist joke made by an imperial propagandist?

You can tell that Xenophon is a racist author’s pen-name because Xenophon slanders himself in *The Persian Expedition*. He is constantly resorting to soothsayers and sacrificing precious meat to soothsayers. In the midst of battle he finds time to consult soothsayers, from whom he wants prophecies that will provide him imaginary advantages

over his enemies. One soothsayer, one bearing the curious name Euclides, even insults Xenophon to his face by calling him “a handicap to yourself” (7:8). And, incredibly, Xenophon responds by admitting that Euclides is right.

Well, does anything else need to be asked concerning Xenophon? Consider asking whether or not it’s plausible that both Xenophon and Thucydides were military men who somehow wrote eloquent, objective and detailed histories. Such claims stagger the imagination. Military men are by nature entirely unsuited to writing anything of quality. Napoleon’s letters will testify to that, and those recent American presidents-at-war-with-the-world haven’t written or printed a thing worth the paper it’s printed on, and they won’t.

### Arrian Glorifies Imperialism

Although Arrian lived in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D., nearly 500 years after Alexander the Great, he wrote an entire book about the old conqueror. What possessed him to write *The Campaigns of Alexander* during the Roman Empire? Was there a market for his flattering account? Why wasn’t a similarly flattering account written about Julius Caesar? Was that forbidden? And why wasn’t one written about Augustus Caesar? Actually, a short and incredibly vain autobiography is attributed to Augustus; perhaps a longer one would have been in bad taste—even for Romans.

In Book One of *The Campaigns*, Arrian relates how the most excellent Alexander freed various people and towns from the presumably oppressive Persian Empire. Arrian states that he “dispossessed their ruling cliques” which means he stole their land and probably much more. Arrian adds that Alexander established “popular government” in the place of the ruling cliques (so-called noble families), and he allowed every community to “enjoy its own laws and customs and discontinue payment of the taxes it had previously paid to the Persians.” Well, wasn’t Alexander great? So, Arrian, do you want us to believe that Alexander didn’t expect his conquered peoples to pay *any* taxes? Didn’t he instead command the conquered peoples to redirect their taxes away from Persia and into the pockets of Greek tax collectors? Do you want us to believe that a country can enjoy military or financial occupation? Ask my contemporaries how much they enjoy their debts and bombs. “[P]opular government”? Someone should have hung Arrian for writing that *lie*.

Did Arrian take the empire-building methods used by his Roman contemporaries and transpose them onto the life of Alexander the Great, so that the Roman methods would appear to be ennobled by Alexander the Great’s precedent? In other words, did Arrian write propaganda for Rome?

Whether Arrian worked for Greece or Rome is hardly significant. Nowadays thousands continue his work as media hacks, scriptwriters and movie directors. They transpose the violent actions of the American empire onto imaginary heroes of the screen. Thanks to them, dead U.S. soldiers are magically erased and never seen by the public. As Greece installed puppet governments, the U.S. installs so-called democratic governments for financial gain, and Arrian’s descendants are silent. While the U.S. and its co-conspirators tax the world through odious loans and interest payments, the mainstream media chases small-scale criminals, performs oral sex on celebrities and bows deeply as a large-scale murderer accepts the Nobel Peace Prize.

## Hannibal's Elephantasy

Some excellent classical Roman historians have written about the Roman Republic's infamous war with Hannibal of Carthage. If you believe those excellent Roman historians (somehow, Carthaginian historians left no record of the war), at no time did Rome go to Carthage, sack it, wipe out its culture, burn its libraries, and so on and so forth. Now, if you believe the Roman historians, a certain hot-headed Carthaginian warmonger named Hannibal declared war and marched towards Rome by—gasp—crossing the Alps with some 50 African elephants. Why did he take such pains to throttle Rome? Roman historians did not condescend to provide a reason for his hatred; I guess we were supposed to assume he was just a born terrorist. Or, maybe his religion (Baal worship) made him warlike and irascible. In any case, according to Roman historians, Hannibal hated Rome so much that he waged war against it for 15 years, won more battles against Rome than any other enemy in Rome's long history, conquered many Roman cities, but ... somehow ... just didn't have the nerve to defeat the old whore.

Isn't it a gripping story? The Roman historians take your breath away. They make Hannibal look invincible, unstoppable, and so on and so forth, and—just when you think Rome might fall, just when Hannibal is within striking distance of Rome, phew, you're spared from catastrophe and the barbarian warmonger and master of the battlefield kills himself.

Perhaps you're right to deduce that I'm not impressed by Hannibal, but I stand in awe of the perseverance and adaptability of the 50 legendary African elephants he led from their home in Spain (I'm not kidding) along the French coast, across the Alps (they drank the snow) and across rivers by rafts (no circus can match that trick). Wait, I'm having a vision of what those ravenous elephants ate during their hike. They ate all the papyrus that used to flourish on the Alps!

Knowing that African bush elephants are nearly impossible to tame, some very resourceful scholars have even taken the liberty of imagining that Hannibal used a docile subspecies of the African bush elephant, a subspecies that has, since Roman times, conveniently gone extinct. What a pity that Egyptians have no record of such docile animals and never thought to harness their mountain climbing skills to help build the pyramids. What a pity that palaeontologists have not yet found evidence of that subspecies. What a pity that instead of finding elephant excrement on the Alps, we have instead found human excrement on paper.

And who do you think will write Libya's modern history? The West is trying to rewrite it, but does it have the resources and the skills to silence the cries of the electronic papyrus that is springing up everywhere?

## Plato's *Timaeus*

The Roman who forged Plato's works was not content to forge Greek philosophy; he had to forge Greek history, too. In the *Timeaus* he entertains himself and drugs his readers by writing that once upon a flood came and *erased* all evidence of the "great and marvelous actions of Athens, actions which have passed into oblivion through lapse of time and the destruction of mankind." I'm sorry, but this is in bad taste. The great destruction or

oblivion suffered by Athens was inflicted upon it by a human flood—a flood of Roman legions that conquered and pillaged Athens and the Greek people. For centuries Roman idiots hated the superior Hellenes (Greeks). The brutal Roman conquerors were dying of envy, dreaming of conquering the jewel of Europe. Sick of living in the shadow of her glory, in 146 B.C., Roman murderers and plunderers came and took everything and—just as U.S. does in more subtle ways in our own time—installed a submissive government, a government that pretended to work in the interests of Greece but actually served Roman interests. This is simply logical speculation necessitated by the curious fact that the Roman conquest and destruction of the Greek cities of Corinth and Carthage is almost entirely ignored by ancient historians, as if indeed it too had been erased and condemned to oblivion. In its place, Roman historians pretend to know a great deal about much older Greek battles. And Plato, he mocks us by hinting at the cultural *erasure* that Rome performed on Greece, by speaking of Greece’s lost glory (as if he didn’t know that it was destroyed by Romans), by mocking the Greek people by claiming that they are related to Egyptians, and then by proceeding to bury us with *his* flood of idle, philosophical-theological blathering.

Plutarch

See Montaigne’s Essays p. 348-49.

<https://codeandculture.wordpress.com/2012/12/12/fake-plutarch/>

Allegedly, Plutarch is a first century Greek historian. His work on morals, the *Moralia*, was widely read and admired by later European intellectuals who suspected no mischief, and how could they when the *Moralia* never reveals its true agenda? How could they when the Greek and Roman classics are still considered the intelligent man’s alternative to vacuous theology and the barbarous Bible? Imagine the horror and confusion that would happen if we realized that these so-called alternatives support the Bible and Christian teaching and are, in a manner of speaking, the Bible in disguise? How many university lecture halls would echo with cries and laments?

The first evidence that Plutarch is a Christian of some sort is his complete misunderstanding of nature and his absurd attempts to argue that his conception of morality corresponds to a natural order and is therefore the correct order. In his opening chapter, he argues that formal education is a natural necessity without which children cannot become good, submissive citizens. He does not stop to ponder that animal parents generally do not rely on other animals to teach their children. But, to support his ridiculous view of education, he resorts to this false analogy: “And just as farmers prop up their trees, so good schoolmasters prop up the young by good advice and suggestions, that they may become upright.” This is transparently false. It implies that trees naturally lean and fall if they are not propped or tied to stakes, but this is not the natural order. Trees normally and naturally stand erect without the help of manmade props, so the analogy actually works against Plutarch’s intention, for if trees do not need props, the corollary is that children do not need a formal education provided by hired teachers and tutors.

Plutarch provides a wealth of false analogies. Earlier in the same chapter on education, he argues that education is necessary because without it all our children would grow up wild and violent. To support this elitist argument he compares our children to horses that will not carry riders unless they are first trained and ‘broken,’ which is absurd, for horses are quite content, even more content, when they are not broken and penned. Yes Plutarch adds, “And why should we be surprised at similar cases, seeing that we find many of the most savage animals docile and tame by training?” Well, some animals can be made docile, or peaceful, but these euphemisms obscure the reality that in Plutarch’s time animals were tamed so that they could be enslaved, so his analogies seem to validate slavery for children.

A third false analogy by Plutarch: “A soil [that is] naturally good becomes by neglect barren, and the better its original condition, the worse its ultimate state if uncared for.” This is nonsense. Soil does not need human intervention to become good; nature creates good soil without human aid. Historically, with few exceptions, farming has always destroyed soil and the Greeks were expert at it, as their country still attests. While human intervention can help to improve soil quality and greatly accelerate soil creation, there’s no evidence that Plutarch had any knowledge of such techniques.

Plutarch again displays his ignorance of farming and soil management in the following, “On the other hand, a soil exceedingly rough and sterile, if farmed well produces excellent crops.” This is deceptive because soil “exceedingly rough and sterile” is usually in this condition because it has been farmed to death, and the ancients knew no other means of rehabilitating such soils but by neglecting them, that is, by letting a field go fallow, to let nature flourish and make the soil soft and healthy. Of course, the implication for education is that it generally destroys our mental health, and the only way to rehabilitate our children is to remove them from the education system and let their natural teachers, their parents, raise them, or, better yet, let parents who understand nature raise them.

The fact that Plutarch consistently misunderstands nature is not surprising, for in his writings ‘nature’ is actually code for ‘God.’ This is evident when he says, “And providence has wisely provided women with two breasts, so that if they should bear twins, they would have a breast for each.” Here the fool has eschewed discretion and used the word “providence” where he normally writes “nature.” He treats the providence and nature as synonyms, which of course leads him to absurdity.

Plutarch’s Christian agenda can be detected in his opening paragraph. There he argues that good education begins with good birth—that fathers must not sleep with mistresses and prostitutes, because—he argues—bastard children are by nature a “disgrace” and “mean and wretched.” This cruel and stupid argument supports one of the lowest forms of discrimination, discrimination against ‘illegitimate’ children; additionally, it reeks of the Catholic obsession with marriage and of the now widespread desire to put every couple in a box and turn natural human relationships into contracts.

Plutarch even has advice on what kind of woman a king should marry. You’d think he would recommend a woman endowed with physical and mental health, with wit and wisdom, but his concern is only with the shape of her body. The idiot even scolds a king who married a short woman. Such a crass and stupid view of women is more evidence that Plutarch voices the values of a Catholic world, a world in which women were treated

as breeders of children while education was outsourced to the Church and to tutors trained by the Church.

The Catholic imperial value system is also detectable in the second chapter, *On Love to One's Children*. Here the author strongly recommends that mothers love their children, but not beyond pregnancy and breastfeeding. The implication is that, after breastfeeding a child, a woman should rush back to the bedroom for another pregnancy.

The Catholic bias is even more evident from Plutarch's claim that animals do not have sex for pleasure but only for procreation, therefore men should follow this natural model: "for its [man's] aim is not pleasure but procreation." The analogy is obviously false, since humans are not entirely like other animals. In fact, some animals do have sex for pleasure. Moreover, Plutarch's view of pleasure is a pernicious assault on the natural, health-giving pleasures that nature has refined for us humans in order to help us maintain peace and health. No rational or natural basis exists for promoting an anti-pleasure doctrine.

But you have to hand it to Plutarch: he was a resourceful man who never hesitated to invent lies in support of his Catholic madness. Here's an example: "Consider in their marriages how much the animals follow nature." Admittedly, some animals are monogamous, *but* this is hardly a law for all animals, so the analogy is false. In another lie, Plutarch praises the animals for their uninhibited and instinctive devotion to sexual reproduction: "They do not wait for any legislation about bachelor or late-married, like the citizens of Lycurgus and Solon, nor do they fear penalties for childlessness". Plutarch praises animals because they do not need written laws forbidding childless and unmarried lives. However, to my knowledge *penalties for childlessness* are a fiction. Such an abominable law has ever existed in any nation or empire. It imagines existence is only a Vatican fantasy. Moreover, the claim that such laws existed in ancient Greece is a cunning lie designed to create the illusion of an ancient precedent for the abominable Catholic doctrine that everyone should devote their lives to overpopulating the world.

How Catholic is Plutarch? At times, he sounds like the Holy Pope, the man who in medieval times considered himself Jesus incarnate and the voice of God on Earth. Plutarch actually claimed that he "speak[s] as an oracle" (1.8), which is extremely hubristic and blasphemous, for he was certainly not an oracle, and even if he were, he would still be a fraud.

Now, if Plutarch were a fundamentalist Catholic, he would not support the pursuit of knowledge, for the Jesus of the Gospels has no use for knowledge (or for education, for that matter). But Plutarch does recommend education, at least for the legitimate children of the wealthy, but even for them, just consider what he says regarding the quantity of the knowledge they should receive: "general knowledge ... a smattering of this will be sufficient, a taste as it were" (1.10). Indeed, a taste *as it were* for in fact he does not approve of even that much.

On the other hand, if we swallowed a mountain of Plutarch's so-called knowledge, we would still know nothing useful, as demonstrated by the following list taken from Plutarch's text with my comments in italics:

1. Knowledge of what is honourable and what is disgraceful. (*The nature of Plutarch's notion of honour will become clearer as we proceed down this list.*)

2. Knowledge of what is just and what is unjust. (*The nature of Plutarch's notion of justice ...*)
3. Knowledge of what is to be sought after, what to be avoided. (*Don't you love these perfectly vague generalizations?*)
4. Knowledge that we ought to worship the gods. (*Moses agrees.*)
5. Knowledge that we must honour parents and reverence elders and obey the laws. (*Moses said this, too.*)
6. Knowledge that we must submit ourselves to rulers. (*Jesus taught this by example, and the apostle Peter recommended it in his letters.*)
7. Knowledge that we must love our friends. (*Your friends must belong to your class and your gender.*)
8. Knowledge that we must be chaste in our relations with women. (*Right, ideally sex one every year or two and no responsible love-making with more than one person in your lifetime.*)
9. Knowledge that we must be kind to our children. (*Hypocrite!*)
10. Knowledge not to treat our slaves badly. (*But a slave is, by definition, treated badly.*)
11. Knowledge that we must never be elated in prosperity nor over depressed in adversity. (*In fact, Plutarch argues elsewhere that poverty should be tolerated quietly. Do this and you will "submit" yourself to your rulers.*)
12. Knowledge that one should never be dissolute in pleasures, nor fierce and brutish in anger. (*In other words, avoid pleasure, and if you must be angry, please be calculating and cold-blooded, not fierce and brutish.*)

Regarding education, the lying forger says, "it is useful, perhaps even necessary, not to neglect to procure old books, and to make a collection of them" (1.10). How self-serving! To recommend that people purchase old books—the same old books you were forging by writing your calculating bullshit!

Finally, any doubt that the author was a Catholic will have to explain how both Jesus in the Gospels and Plutarch in his *Moralia* both utter this same sentence: "Do not throw pearls before swine" (*Moralia* 1.17; The Gospel of Matthew 7:6).

In conclusion, Plutarch was a Christian *plutocrat*, in short, a theocrat.

### Mixed Nostalgia

Classical writers of history were fantastic liars and mockers, which makes them interesting to read, while most modern historians and biographers are artless writers who lie not by inventing absurd stories but by simply ignoring the facts that do not suit their patriotic souls.

## HESIOD

<https://ivu.org/history/williams/>

below – author misinterprets Hesiod – assumes a wise, humane author

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2020/01/15/australia-on-the-chasm-of-climate-catastrophe/>

### The Fraud

The Theogony is devoid of love, humor, vision, peace and understanding of the injustices in the world. The author(s) identified with the gods, who represent the ruling class.

The entire story expresses the values of the upper class: the gods' lust for power justifies any crime, even crimes against family, the Titans, and against anyone who, like Prometheus, attempts to help the lower classes.

The first sentence insults humanity, which represents the lower classes, for Hesiod calls humanity "mere stomachs." Yes, he must emphasize our physicality in order to emphasize that we are not gods.

But could he live without a stomach? Could he live without eating? Even Zeus eats – meat, of course. In ancient times, meat was the privilege and province of the ruling elites.

The Theogony is not authentic scripture. What kind of scripture tells readers that their God or Gods were created by other, more ancient immortal beings who are monstrous in appearance and so terrified of losing power that they eat their children, the younger gods destined to overthrow them? The Theogony paints a degrading portrait of Greek gods, therefore it is not a genuinely Greek scripture.

### Class Fear and Power

Hesiod's abominable stories reflect the fears and values of a ruling class.

The gods eat their creators, the titans. No other scripture dares to utter such horrors. How did the authors think of it? Perhaps it reflects the domestic reality of many dynastic families in which children killed siblings and parents for the throne.

When great wealth and power are inherited, the rulers live in fear of being overthrown by their sons. And *they* rejected the gods of their ancestors, the nature spirits portrayed as monstrous Titans in the Theogony, and *they* replaced those 'gods' with anthropocentric gods that reflected their egocentric and imperial values.

The Theogony revels in violence and cruelty but has escaped detection because it has dressed up its pathology in the language of myth.

The Titans fight the new gods, the new gods win, and Zeus reigns supreme. This lovely myth legitimizes war, monarchy and dictatorship.

### Famine and Cannibalism

## Hesiod's Prometheus

The Prometheus myth found in Hesiod's "Theogony" is supposedly 3,000 years old, but it is certainly a much more recent invention – no, it is certainly a recent corruption of a tale about the true dangers fire represent: cooking and metallurgy – the twin destroyers of our health and environment. The bad foods that cooking help us digest poorly lead to the intestinal hell, an idea still faintly evident in Hesiod's version, where an eagle – a symbol of imperial power – continually devours Prometheus' liver.

Hesiod's corrupted version only has two purposes: to legitimize the use of corporal punishment for any violation of law and custom, and to legitimize the upper class' policy of not sharing wealth and power – symbolized by fire.

## The Problem of Fire

Prometheus is a rebel, but he's portrayed by Hesiod as a sinner and a criminal. Although Prometheus steals fire from the gods, who represent the upper class, fire is not a limited resource, so why should he be punished for stealing it? Besides, he gave fire to the common people, which seems like a good deed, but for this he is punished by the gods. In other words, class divisions, abuses of power and policies against sharing resources such as fire—these evils are defended by Hesiod's Prometheus myth.

Prometheus means "forethought," but this should not be treated as evidence that some deep, philosophical meaning underlies the myth. The meaning of the name almost certainly meant as a warning, a *forewarning* to anyone dreaming of rebelling against their leaders. Prometheus is the ultimate rebel but his story is *the ultimate warning against rebellion*.

Prometheus does not merely steal fire; he also refuses to pay his tax (tithe, sacrifice) to the nobility. Not paying your taxes is powerful act of economic rebellion and *assuming the tax rebel has no intention of using government services, tax rebellion is a necessary step in the re-assertion of our independence and sovereignty as individuals*.

The second act of rebellion is the theft of fire. This a symbol of military power because Hesiod associates it with metallurgy, a craft used to forge weapons and armour—the tools the ruling class used to oppress its subjects. Prometheus gives fire to "mankind"—essentially to the lower classes—as if he wanted to arm them.

Why must he be punished for eternity by Zeus? The author saw no need to limit any form of corporal punishment and eternal punishment is holy because 'Hesiod' was a Christian and the author(s) was a writer of fake Greek literature.

Question: Why doesn't Prometheus give mankind the skills people needed to forge their own weapons and armour? Anyone can start or tend a fire, but only the elites may use fire to produce the *technologies* needed to oppress the people.

Historically, fire has been used to do much more than make things from metal. Fire is also used for heating and cooking. Wherever people hunt animals for food or build empires of false wealth, they almost always use fire to cook flesh and boil or bake their grains. This did not concern Hesiod, but it should have. With all due respect to the world's cultures, flesh and grain dependent diets diminish the health and vitality of

peoples. Hesiod probably did not know this, for the ruling elites in most cultures eat grain and animal products with little concern for their health.

### Rebels Are Discouraged

The Theogony also warns against rebellion by telling the story of Kronos, the Titan who committed rebellion by castrating his father, Ouranos. Following his castration, Ouranos dubbed his children titanontes because, according to Hesiod's fanciful but of etymology, titanontes means "striving"—striving in vain, no doubt, since "vengeance" was destined to follow.

Hesiod claim that iron metallurgy was developed before bronze metallurgy, and while most experts agree with him, Ovid does not. Why would Hesiod lie about this? He betrays his intention by associating iron tools with the primitive and savage Titans. Why would he make this negative association to iron? Notice that Hesiod spoke only of iron *tools*, not iron weapons. Iron weapons belong the gods, that is, to the ruling elite who conquered the "Titans."

In the final warning against rebellion, Hesiod describes how Zeus enlisted the Hundred Handers against the insurrection of the Titans. The Hundred Handers symbolize the common people and the hired hands who work with their hands rather than with their tongues and brains. The Hundred Handers also refers to *centurions*, the name for military officers who commanded men, possibly as many as 100, as their name implies. Originally centurions were nobles, but this changed over time. Hesiod claims they were "freed from bondage secure," implying they were lower class persons who became centurions and whose job, as centurions, was to police and oppress the people they left.

The brothers of the Hundred Handers are the Kyklopes. They are, according to Hesiod, "creatures of marvellous power: thundering Brontes, lightening Steropes, strong hearted Arges." Do you think Hesiod made this stuff up? Of course not. It turns out that a 2<sup>nd</sup> century Roman legion was nicknamed "The Thundering" or "The Lightning," depending on who translates. The nickname might date back to Emperor Octavian Augustus' reign, which still places the composition of the Theogony about 700 years later than the date set by scholars.

Perhaps the original inspiration for the Hundred Handers and the one-eyed Kyklopes lies in Egypt and India, both of which had one-eyed gods, and one of which is well known for its many-armed Hindu gods. Eastern allusions also fit well with the theme of metallurgy, for bronze and iron technology likely came to Europe through India from China.

Gods on the hills – on Olympus, etc. a class perspective... for the lower classes, who usually worked in fertile valleys and plains, the low areas are sacred. Historically, mountains have been the preferred strongholds of ruling thugs.

### The Gift of Fire

## Works and Days

While the *Theogony* ends by referring to the agricultural class, the agrios, *Works and Days* appears to be addressed entirely to the agricultural class, but this appearance is an illusion. *Works and Days* was never meant to be read by the working/agricultural class because that class could not read; the true intended readers and audience of *Works and Days* were young nobles. *Works and Days* was a tool for brainwashing them into thinking that the life of the common field laborer was honorable, tolerable, and divinely ordained. *Works and Days* sanctifies, rationalizes and even glorifies enslavement to fieldwork. The poem seeks to deceive readers into believing and accepting injustice as a divinely sanctioned reality. In his own words, Zeus does whatever he likes, without rhyme or reason, so get used to it and learn to like it.

This convenient excuse for maintaining a socially unjust world is elaborated when Hesiod explains that two kinds of strife or striving (see “striving” above) exist, a good kind and a bad. The good kind motivates men to work harder and to be as wealthy as their neighbors. In contrast, the bad kind of striving is violent and makes wealthy men waste time in courts of law fighting over their inheritance (it was common for governments to use any possible excuse to appropriate the land of a deceased man, so that his children had to fight for it) and overlook how wonderful it is to eat “mallow and asphodel,” symbols of the poor man’s food. To his credit, Hesiod does mention that the time is past when people could bribe “kings” ... but that is hardly relevant because *Works and Days* was likely written during the Roman Republic, when no kings existed, when senators were either bribed or no longer needed bribes because the political system was already so corrupt that people were compelled to give the ruling class all their energy and money *by law*, not by bribery. In fact, the degree to which laws replace bribery is a measure of a country’s so-called civilization...

Next, Hesiod launches into another story about how Zeus had to punish Prometheus for trying to help “mankind”—which is code for trying to liberate the common man. Apparently, because “mankind” didn’t reject Prometheus’ help, mankind was condemned to a life of slavery and toil, “For the gods keep hidden the livelihood of men. Otherwise you might easily do enough work in a day to have enough for a full year” (42). Thanks, Hesiod; thanks for excusing injustice by claiming that the gods ordained it.

If we read this story about Prometheus and Pandora as he intended, the rebel Prometheus is responsible for causing all men to suffer the curse of “woman,” and woman is the sole reason why men (he meant the common man, of course) have nothing, no land to call their own, no children to treasure, no happiness to share, nothing except their miserable Hope. How could anyone even want to live in a world that only offers hope? *Hope for what?* Hesiod does not even offer the religious lie/hope of immortal life in Heaven. Well, but that omission goes to his credit.

*Works and Days* describes the ages of civilization and prophesies a grim future full of corruption. Now there’s an interesting word. You can imagine what kind of corruption Hesiod implied; since he has done nothing to denounce abuses of power by the ruling class, let alone a system that requires a ruling class, the whole concept of corruption has been determined to serve the interests of the ruling class. Hesiod has prepared his readers to view corruption according to the terms he provided earlier: as the result of women and of bad striving or ambition.

Finally, the *Works and Days* address the fate of those men who would dare to cause the bad kind of strife (from *striving*). In a fable, or parable, about the hawk (symbol of imperial power) and the nightingale, the hawk eats the nightingale, and the poet says, “Foolish is the man who wishes to fight against those who are stronger” (210). Obviously, the nightingale literally symbolizes the weak masses, but the nightingale is also an old symbol for poets, so Hesiod’s suggests he was not able to sound the note of revolution.

Just in case anyone didn’t understand the warning to obey imperial power or be killed, Hesiod exhorts people to obey the laws and promises prosperity to those who obey and reject the example of Prometheus.

Hesiod also exhorts people to work hard, and, following this advice, he exhorts them to sacrifice a good portion of the fruits of their work to God’s altars, which is a lovely way of telling people to pay their tithes and taxes. Hesiod again compares lazy people to the lazy “stingless drones” of a beehive (304). The beehive analogy is obviously deceptive, since it legitimizes the gluttony and sloth of the queen bee—i.e. the royalty and the nobility.

The next six sections paint an idyllic picture of the farmer’s life of toil and offers advice on farming—advice stolen from farmers and given back to them by Hesiod’s imaginary Zeus.

This lovely and most uplifting poem ends by advising Greeks to heed various superstitions designed to sink the people’s consciousness deep into the mud of unreason while the wealthy class fills its palaces with laughter.

## The Gods

Imagine if, in the Bible, God never rewards but only promises and punishes people. Would any Christian read accept it as his or her scripture? And yet, in all the Greek classics I have read, the gods senselessly prolong war and cause diseases and never, not once, do they cure disease, provide rain of victory, produce pregnancy or perform any miracle. Apollo was the Greek god of the sun, of prophecy and of medicine, yet the Greek classics portray him as a rapist who causes plagues.

Like Homer’s voluminous works, “The Theogony,” has nothing flattering to say about his gods. For Hesiod, Zeus merely *carries* his thunder cloud, Artemis *showers* or *hurls* arrows (she doesn’t shoot arrows; the sexist joker made sure of that) and Poseidon *shakes* the Earth. Sure, Hera has golden slippers, but this just makes her vain and slow. Even the Muses have “piercing-sweet” voices—*piercing*, I suppose, is not a desirably quality in a voice. Yet, Hesiod expects us to believe that the Muses’ singing gives joy to the mind of Zeus (37).

Granted, sometimes Hesiod condescends to attach a positive adjective to a god’s name, but not one of his deities heals the sick, feeds the hungry, rescues sailors, provides fertility, calms the seas, or protects any Greeks. Doesn’t this suggest that the author was not a Greek but someone who hated Greeks and their religion?

Hesiod calls Zeus the “Father of Gods and Men.” Hesiod does not explain how Zeus became the father of men, so why call him father of men? Someone wanted

impressionable readers to think the Greek classics support the Christian tradition of calling God one's father.

Why is Zeus a symbol of the upper the class? Because the authors were not ancient Greeks but lived after Phillip II of Macedon, and were probably Romans, still more likely Roman Catholics, for in those times it was quite normal for leaders to consider themselves gods. The Catholic Popes considered themselves Jesus-on-Earth.

Why did the author claim that Kronos, father of Zeus, had to be defeated by Zeus? The reason is that the author was not ancient but medieval. At that time, Kronos was identified with the Roman deity, Saturn, who represented the unchristian traditions of "feasting, role reversals, free speech, gift-giving and revelry." All of these traditions were banished from medieval Christianity, so Hesiod's banishing of Kronos/Saturn to Tartarus (the underworld) seems to hint at a Christian prejudice and an invisible Christian hand.

And consider Hesiod's story about the origin of Aphrodite, the goddess of love. Why does he say she was born from her castrated father's testicles, as if she were the offspring of sexless relationship? This doesn't seem right for a goddess associated with sexuality and love. Still more curiously, when the severed testicles enter the sea, they produce foam that transforms into Aphrodite. In modern English, such foam can also be called scum, but I suspect that in any language the foam produced by the sea is not associated with anything desirable, so for Hesiod to associate Aphrodite with the foam of the sea is certainly to denigrate her and her worshippers. And, the fact that Hesiod reserved some of his most incisive mockery for Aphrodite suggests an extremely conservative agenda, possible a Roman Catholic one.

And consider Hekate. Before Christians and Shakespeare identified her with witchcraft and evil, she was the goddess of the underworld, of doorways and thresholds, of death and birth. Even the esteemed translator, R.M. Frazer cannot understand why Hesiod, whom he takes for a Greek, wrote so highly of Hekate, and glorified her far more than historical records suggest. But let's consider *exactly* how he glorifies her. First, as usual, he makes her a descendant of other gods. Her grandmother is Leto, who is "black robed". Why black robed? Is this a hint that she was a nun—perhaps a Dominican nun?

Well, but let's look at what happens next. Our nun, Leto, somehow bears a daughter! Who was the father? Hesiod mentions no father. It seems as if Leto, like the Christian Virgin Mary, managed immaculate conception. How curious.

Now Leto's child isn't Jesus, it's a girl named Asteria, or star, so in a sense, she is like Jesus, both being from 'Heaven.' Next, Asteria meets a man who takes her to his "great house" and makes her his wife without ceremony or priest, which might explain why Fate, or Zeus, caused her to give birth to Hekate, goddess of the underworld. Then Hesiod boasts of Hekate's power to bless warriors and athletes who appeal to her for help, and still more curiously, he turns her into a fertility goddess for animals and a nurse-goddess for humans. These qualities are never ascribed to her outside of Hesiod, so what was the good author hoping to achieve? What mischief was afoot? Did he, perhaps, know that the *Christian* readers for whom he was actually writing would be utterly horrified at the thought of praying to Hekate for victory and for life? Did the author intend to horrify his readers so that they would forever look with horror upon the "insane" pagan Greeks who prayed to a goddess of the underworld for life and victory?

Historically, Poseidon and Athena were *the chief gods of Athens, Corinth and elsewhere*, so how did Zeus, the sky god, become Hesiod's chief god and superstar? This

reeks of Christianity and its sky-god worship. Indeed, Hesiod figuratively banishes Athena from the urban world of the ruling elite by associating her with agriculture in his other text, *Works and Days*. And in the *Theogony* the greatest feat he grants to Poseidon is that of making the doors to the underworld. To modern readers, this sounds harmless and grand enough, but to ancient and medieval readers the act of making a door suggests that Poseidon is a mere craftsman. It's more evidence of mockery or blasphemy.

### The Titan

Prometheus' rebellion results in his being *crucified* to a cliff. But, not content with punishing Prometheus, Zeus also punishes all the *men* who received his stolen fire by giving them women. That's right, women are conceived as a curse on *mankind*. Hahaha, as if the men had lived without women prior to the gift of fire. According to the sexist pig, women were created to punish men for the original sin committed by Prometheus. How Catholic is that?

The sexist myth claims women are parasites, when in fact the nobles were the true parasites. "Woman, a great plague, make their abode with mortal men being ill-suited to Poverty's curse but suited to Plenty. Compare how the honey bees [men] in the protected cells of the hives garner food for the drones [the lazy women], conspirers in evil works."

But the parasitic nature of the ruling class is nicely captured by Hesiod's image of the eagle that feeds on Prometheus' liver. The eagle was a popular symbol of the Roman Empire.

Hesiod's myth about Prometheus is likely a corruption of an original myth in which the gift of fire was linked – not to the need to keep warm – but to cooking grains and flesh *and* to the subsequent decline in health and vitality of the grain- and flesh-eating person. In the existing tale, Prometheus' crime of giving fire to mankind results in his suffering intestinal pain as an eagle devours his liver; in the original, I imagine someone experiencing intestinal pain because they eat flesh, dairy and grain. In another Hesiodic episode, Prometheus disguises ... in a cow ...

### The Muses

Hesiod's introductory hymn begins by claiming that the Muses "are frequenters of Helikon, a mountain high and holy." I suppose the author—who obviously wasn't Greek but could write in Greek (like many medieval Romans who were tutored by Greeks)—I suppose the author didn't think his readers knew enough Greek to know that Helikon literally means "torturous mountain." Why would anyone claim that Greek goddesses frequently visited a mountain of *torture*? Was his intent, perhaps, to make a mockery of Greek mythology while hinting that torture is acceptable to the gods?

Next, according to Hesiod, while at Helikon the Muses danced "around some spring's dark water". Ha-ha-ha! *Dark* spring water? Springs are famously crystal clean, not dark. Dark spring water hardly sounds appropriate for worshipping. But if your intent is to make a mockery of Greek religion, you're doing an admirable job.

And according to Hesiod, the Muses washed their bodies “in the streams of the Permessos or the spring called Hippokrene or the holy brook Olmeios.” This is incredible detail reminiscent, interestingly, of the opening verses of the Bible, in which a spring is present and four rivers are named. But where are Hesiod’s rivers? They are not on any map. Permessos seems to hint at Parnassus, which is a mountain in Greece, but Permessos is a Catalan word that means *allowed*, or *permitted*, while Hippokrene sounds a lot like hypocrite, and the *meios* in Olmeios is Portuguese for *meaning*. What do we make from these three words? Did the author mean that hypocrisy—or saying one thing and *meaning* another—is permitted? Hmmm. By chance, he actually says on the same page, where he wrote that the Muses know how to say things that *seem* to be true. What a coincidence and what not-so-subtle hint that we Hesiod’s own words, being inspired by the Muses, cannot be trusted!

After listing the deities, Hesiod turns his attention to himself and the Muses who dictate to him. He speaks of himself in the third person, as if the Muses used him as a Dictaphone, even humiliating him by calling him shepherd and calling all shepherds “Base creatures, disgraceful, mere bellies” (26). So, even the poet is mocked and insulted—and of course an actual shepherd could never have composed Hesiod’s works; shepherds simply don’t have the time or the audience to create such works.

Finally, as I said above, Hesiod claims that the Muses “know how to tell numerous lies which seem to be truthful” (27). This is quite an admission. Traditionally, the Muses were never associated with lying. They inspired poetry and eloquence—why did the author write this lie about their lying? Why—except because it amused him to leave hints for his unsuspecting readers... hints of forgery and fraud.

### Anachronisms

About nine times Hesiod’s *Theogony* mentions a place called Tartarus. The first time it’s contrasted with high Olympus and explicitly said to be a dark place beneath the Earth. Zeus also banishes Typhoeus, the Titan, to Tartarus. Now, as I’ve argued again and again, nothing in an imperial myth is fantasy or otherworldly, everything is based on reality and plagiarized from history. So, on what reality is Hesiod’s Tartarus based? I suspect Tartarus is based on the actual land of the Tartars, land known as “Tartary (Latin: Tartaria) ... was a name used from the Middle Ages until the twentieth century to designate the great tract of northern and central Asia” (Wikipedia). This identification also explains Hesiod’s claim that Tartarus is dark, for northern regions are darker—at least during the winter months. Moreover, just as Hesiod’s Typhoeus is banished to Tartarus, the Romans often exiled or banished criminals and rebels to northern regions, towards Tartary. And, not coincidentally, historically Europe’s greatest foe has been the Tartars or Tatars and their allies, the Mongols. They pushed into Central Europe in 1241 and retreated the next year.

And there’s still more evidence of a connection between mythical Tartarus and historical Tartary. The historical Tartars famously depended on horse-riding and archery for their military exploits, and after the mythological Titans are banished to Tartarus, they angrily launch “shafts”—a reference to the arrows famously used by the Tartars, while Zeus employs the “hundred-handers.” Why a hundred hands? The number refers to

Roman *centurions*, for centurion means leader of a hundred soldiers. Although Roman centurions did not repel the Tartars and Mongols, Hesiod's allusion to ancient Rome does connect the forces of good with Europe and the forces of evil with Asia.

Hesiod's Theogony ends with the creation of godlike humans. For example, the goddess Circe has sexual intercourse with the Greek hero, Odysseus, and she bears twins named ... *Latinus* and Agrius. Isn't that first name curious? Why name the child of Odysseus *Latinus*? Of course, it's literary propaganda. Latinus is godlike, a demigod descended from a Greek man. What does this mean? This is history viewed through the eyes of a nationalist poet. It means that the *Latin* (Roman) Empire 'inherited' the empire of the Greeks—which in fact they did, through military force—and it implies that the Latin or Roman Empire was mightier than the Greek, which it was. (NOTE: The same Latin-Roman bias is evident in Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, in which the author claim that the victorious Greek leaders of the Trojan War were actually Italians, since their mother, according to the text, lived in Pisa, Italy.)

### Plagiarism

The morally and creatively bankrupt goons who wrote the Theogony didn't have enough imagination to create anything authentic, so they plagiarized the Hurrian theogony and mythology. According to the Hurrians, one god bit off his father's testicles and spat out three new gods, a story revised in Hesiod's story that Uranus was castrated and defeated by Kronos, and that Uranus' testicles gave rise to three new types of gods, the giants, the fairies and the love goddess Aphrodite. This is neither mere coincidence nor proof of a universal subconscious.

### Hesiod and the Bible

"The Theogony" describes how the evolution of gods culminated with Greek goddesses creating human beings, and Hesiod's second work, the "Works and Days," provides some curious advice to humans—specifically to Hesiod's brother, Perses. In fact, the commentator to my copy of the text was astute enough to inform readers that Hesiod's description of Zeus' powers is exactly like the description of Yahweh in the Bible.

**Exhibit 1:** After Hesiod introduces Zeus as his brother's "father," he says that through Zeus "mortal men are both dishonored and honored ... He strengthens the faltering, easily shatters the strong, easily makes the flourishing fade, the faded to flourish." Second, the Bible says, "The Lord kills and gives life; He brings down to the grave and he raises up; The Lord makes poor and rich..." (Samuel 2:6-7). We can hardly disagree with the commentator—Hesiod's and the Bible's god appear to be identical. But, I cannot accept the assumption that this close agreement between two ancient texts is coincidental. In fact, Hesiod's Zeus is not Greek at all. Hesiod's Zeus is all-mighty, omnipotent and omniscient, while the Greek Zeus was not omnipotent but subject to the whims of Fate and, like all the Greek gods, his abilities were limited and specialized. I'm sure that over the centuries, and towards the Christianity era, Zeus was increasingly considered an omnipotent god, but Hesiod allegedly lived around 700 B.C.

But one bit of evidence of forgery does not make a case, so let's move on to the next exhibit.

**Exhibit 2:** In the Bible, the creation of humans is quickly followed by their expulsion from the garden of life into the fields of toil, and Hesiod *Works and Days* provides a stunning parallel. In the second chapter we read that one kind of Eris leads to “the evil of war” and “legal disputes” while the good Eris “sets a man to his work ... hastening to plow and plant and build”. Both the Bible and Hesiod claim that man's appropriate lifestyle consists of working in the fields. And, both the Bible (specifically Jesus) and Hesiod heap scorn on secular laws, oaths and legal systems. The difference lies in their attitude towards war. The Bible, although it sometimes laments war and recommends peace to the enemies of God, it and its God is ultimately pro-war. “*Works and Days*,” however, is anti-war because it was not written to legitimize Catholic imperialism but to make Greeks peaceful and willing to negotiate with Catholic crusaders. In fact, when the Crusaders stepped in and turned Byzantium into a Crusader state, they had to destroy its elaborate law system and impose martial law, a dictatorship, so Hesiod just serves to provide them with the cultural validation they need to run a lawless dictatorship.

To grasp the audacity of the Hesiod forgeries, just imagine Americans stealing every Koran and revising it so that every copy had a verse that read, “If foreigners defeat you, that is Allah's will. If they destroy your laws, that is Allah's will. And if they abuse you, remember to be peaceful.”

**Exhibit 3:** *Works and Days* also tells the story of Prometheus' rebellion against Zeus. Of course, unlike other versions, in Hesiod's version Zeus punishes Prometheus for eternity, which happens to be how the Catholic God likes to punish rebels and faithless devils. Prometheus' crime was stealing Zeus' fire and sharing it with mankind—thus making them more like god, just as in the Bible Adam ate the forbidden fruit in order to become more like God. However, according to the Bible, Eve, a woman, is responsible for causing Adam to commit his crime, whereas in *Works and Days* Zeus punishes *mankind* by giving them a woman named Pandora. In each case, woman is portrayed as an evil. Again, I do not believe the assumption that this level of sexism—theologically ingrained sexism—is an authentic part of ancient Greek or Jewish culture. It reeks of the witch-hunting era ruled by Catholics.

As for the fire stolen by Zeus, it was not meant literally. Fire can easily be spread and shared, so there's no reason Zeus needs a monopoly over fire. However, his fire symbolizes the smithy, or metallurgy and the power to make bronze and iron weapons. In ancient times every ruling class protected this power, kept it secret from slaves and enemies so that they were unable to produce metal weapons. Metallurgy was an important military secret, and any advances in this ancient science could provide advantages on the battlefield. In short, the ‘fire’ of metallurgy was one of the pillars without which ancient empires could not exist. In fact, the Catholic conquerors of Greece likely forged this Hesiodic bullshit in order to legitimize their policy of denying Greeks the right to smelt, cast, and conduct metallurgical works.

**Exhibit 4:** The fourth chapter describes five historical eras. Hesiod names four of the five after metals: The Golden Race, the Silver Race, the Bronze Age, the Demigods and the Iron Race. Of course, these *do not* correspond very well to actual eras, but what's more curious is that they do correspond very well to Daniel's vision in the Bible:

The head of the statue was made of pure gold, its chest and arms of silver, its belly and thighs of bronze, its legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly of baked clay. While you were watching, a rock was cut out, but not by human hands. It struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashed them. (Daniel 2:32-34)

Daniel interprets the dream as Hesiod interprets his images—as symbolic of five different historical eras of which the first four represent successively more powerful empires, the fifth, being mixed with ‘mere’ earth or clay, is weak (the old anti-nature bias) and to be replaced by its destroyer, the rock, which will presumably usher in the stone age. This sounds funny to modern ears, but for the Book of Daniel’s Catholic author, the stone symbolized Saint Peter, the figurehead of Roman Catholicism whose name means “the rock.”

**Exhibit 5:** The next chapter relates the story of how a proud hawk captured a nightingale and warned her never to rebel against a hawk. The fable could be interpreted to mean that poets and peasants, represented by nightingales, should not rebel against their rulers, or that Greeks should not rebel against their western conquerors. However, the hawk was traditionally an Arab symbol of military power, which now suggests that the poem was written at a time when Arab forces had already conquered the eastern part of ancient Greece in 1453. This might explain why Hesiod claims that his brother’s name is Perses, after the Persians, another eastern people who invaded Greece and fought against Athens during the Peloponnesian War during the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.

**Exhibit 6:** Chapter six denounces pride, the foremost sin in Catholicism. In fact, many chapters denounce pride. It appears to have been something of an obsession. Of course, Hesiod didn’t dare denounce the pride of his contemporary rulers, or of any past rulers. Catholic priests were not that bold.

**Exhibit 7:** Hesiod says, “Often even a whole city pays for the wrong of one person who is a doer of evil.” This view is confirmed by the Oedipus tragedy and by the Old Testament, which repeatedly blames faithless kings for bringing misery upon their people. Like the Bible, Hesiod does not blame plague or famine on the greed and sheer incompetence of the ruling class—which forced the lower classes into conditions guaranteed to result in sickness and disaster. The notion that pride, or faithlessness, can cause suffering for many is a late medieval notion designed by an intellectually bankrupt Church to foist blame for any trouble suffered by people onto the shoulders of monarchs, witches, Jews, etc. The true causes of suffering and the true solutions are never mentioned.

Although Hesiod did not identify a king with his “doer of evil,” just a few lines later he states that Zeus punishes people “for the crimes of their kings who . . . twist what is right into wrong with crooked pronouncements of justice.” In other words, the Church was furious that European kings were becoming bold enough to challenge the authority of the Church, which considered itself God on Earth. Like the Bible, Hesiod considers crimes of speech and legislation the worst crimes of all, and he never denounces kings for abusing humanity through war, slavery, taxation, etc.

The authors’ antipathy for kings is evident from author passages as well. Hesiod denounces “insolent might” but does not dare denounce *might* and force in general, only if its insolent, which seems to mean *irreligious*. The authors’ theocratic bias is further

evident from their description of the Age of Silver, which claims that men suffered because they “refused to worship the gods and offer the blessed ones sacrifice on their holy altars,” which refers to the fact that late medieval European kings had begun to scorn the Church and to challenge its claim on royal wealth. This hostile, anti-ecclesiastical mood culminated with the expulsion of the Church from England by King Henry VIII in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

**Exhibit 8:** The greed of the Church is evident in Hesiod’s advice that we should “sacrifice to the immortals *all that you can*” (336). Although Hesiod’s image of sacrifice is of animal slaughter, the image is symbolic. Grain was also a welcome sacrifice and remained one during the Middle Ages. Of course, money was also welcome.

**Exhibit 9:** Hesiod claims that “there are 30,000 spirits on the bountiful earth, immortal sentinels of Zeus, strict guardians of mortal men who keep watch on cases at law and on hard-hearted deeds, being hidden in air and going all over the earth” (252-255). This lie has no basis in Greek mythology; it is transparently based on the Catholic angel fetish. And let’s not forget that some angels were believed to be *guardians*—meaning *guardian angels*, like Athena in *The Odyssey*.

**Exhibit 10:** Hesiod condemns the man who “commits with his sister-in-law secret adultery” (324). Why did he focus on sisters-in-law? Why not mothers and daughters? The reason is not flattering for Hesiod. In ancient and medieval times, rather than abandoned a widowed sister-in-law to the misery of poverty, brothers-in-law saved them by making them their wives with or without the approval of religious authorities. The Church wished to stop this custom because it prevented it from inheriting the dead man’s estate.

**Exhibit 11:** The Bible preaches respect for parents, and Hesiod condemns children who are harsh towards elderly fathers (329).

**Exhibit 12:** The Bible repeatedly instructs Jews and Christians to love their neighbors, and Hesiod says, “invite he who lives to the house next to yours ... a good neighbor is a gift and a profit” (343, 347).

**Exhibit 13:** The Bible promotes usury, the charging of interest on loans, between anyone except Jews, and Hesiod says, “Fairly judge the loan from your neighbor and fairly repay it, using the very same measure, or better if you are able, so that if you need help again, you creditor will be willing” (349-351). Hesiod’s sneaky words seems to mean that improved measures can make a creditor happy, but clearly what he meant was that we should pay our creditor more than we received from him.

**Exhibit 14:** The Bible portrays the first woman, Eve, as an untrustworthy woman, and Hesiod says, “He who trusts in women puts his trust in deceivers” (375).

**Exhibit 15:** In six verses, both the King James and the Douay Rheims versions of the Bible condemn or speak of people who “piss against the wall.” The phrase appears intended to refer to *any male*, particularly urban males, for in ancient and medieval times, when lavatories were lacking, peeing against walls was common among men under pressure. Hesiod also condemns men who piss in a particular fashion, specifically men who piss facing the sun (727), presumably because the sun symbolizes Apollo, or God, and he would be offended by the sight. Interestingly, Hesiod recommends that between sunset and sunrise, men should “sit or withdraw to one of the walls of a well-enclosed courtyard.” Obviously Hesiod’s works and the Bible were written by the same person, or by—assuming Hesiod’s writings are later—the author of Hesiod’s works knew the Bible

and cleverly, maliciously instructed Greek men to pee against walls *so that Christian rulers would have Biblical authority to condemn them*. Granted, the Bible does not treat wall-pissing as a sin, but it does associate the act with evil, so it makes the act a crime by association.

### Imperial Agriculture

The Theogony ends by describing the creation of the first divine men, or demigods, and among them is Agrios (1013). This is not a name; it is based on the root of the modern word *agriculture*. Agrios is a metonym, or symbol, for the working class, which in medieval times was the agricultural class. Agrios is born with Latinos, who represents the Latin-speaking class that ruled Greece during the Roman Republic and the age of the Crusades.

This is not a fanciful reading of “Agrios.” Agriculture is central to Hesiod’s second work, the Works and Days, because it was central to the Roman Catholic Empire. Many kinds of agriculture exist, but Hesiod speaks of a very narrow form of agriculture, the kind that requires ploughing and grain crops, a very limited form of open-field monoculture that is the foundation of all empires because grains are easily shipped and stored, and the planting and harvesting of grain crops is easily mechanized.

The first evidence that Hesiod is concerned with imperial agriculture occurs in the Theogony when he writes, “These are the [reckless] winds that blow on the vast earth’s flowering fields and ruin the beautiful crops of earth-engendered men, everywhere piling up dust and raising a terrible roar” (878-79). The phrase “earth-engendered” serves to distinguish field workers from the goddess-engendered rulers mentioned at the end of the Theogony. This classist piece of discrimination and fantasizing is reason enough for outrage, but consider the immense ignorance of Hesiod’s *blaming* “these winds” for reducing fields to dust. Excuse me, but the blame lies not with the winds but with imperial agriculture for stripping the land of its vegetation between crops—and often even your crops fail to prevent erosion. The fault lies at the heart of the imperial system.

However, Hesiod thinks so highly of imperial agriculture that he even makes the pathetic suggestion that the goddess Demeter loves to see fields ploughed not once but *thrice*, and loves it so much that she once “made passionate love with the hero Iason ... in a thrice-plowed field” (970-971).

The subject of agriculture is introduced in the second chapter of Works and Days as a false choice; Hesiod-the-liar claims that humanity has two choices: war and work. Tragedy or slavery. What kind of work and slavery? Although he mentions various trades, only agricultural work is mentioned twice and it becomes the dominant theme of the entire book. Thus, by claiming we must choose between war and work, Hesiod presented readers with a *false* choice, a choice that stood to benefit the Church, which had lost its power to wage war and which desired to maintain the old feudal and agricultural society it had exploited during most of the Middle Ages.

When and how did the Church lose its power to wage war? During the Renaissance, the Catholic Church’s military power vanished thanks to the rise of powerful European kings and thanks to the Church’s suddenly impotent strongman, the Holy Roman Emperor. Therefore, promoting work and peace was entirely in its interest because it meant promoting a return to the old status quo.

Another theme in *Works and Days* is the ridiculous idea that by working you will shiftless and lazy people envious of your gains (21, 312). Did Hesiod seriously expect us to believe that hard work would inspire kings, bankers, slave-owners, landowners and priests to start doing physical labor? Of course not! His intention was for us to ignore the fact that civilization is predicated on the existence of a working class and parasitic and unproductive class.

Hesiod also paints a false picture by implying that ancient agriculture did not concern itself with nuts, vegetables and fruit. To read him, you might think the ancient Greeks cared only for grain and bread. But this was a strategic portrayal of the past. Hesiod's works are not the works of an *honest* ancient Greek; indeed, they are not even the work of dishonest Greek; they are the works of a *medieval Catholic propagandist*.

**Conclusion 1:** Hesiod's works are Catholic forgeries written after the 14<sup>th</sup> century, possibly during the Renaissance, but as propaganda they are utter failures. The world did not revert back to the old feudal and agricultural order. Nation states arose, war flourished, international trade flourished, and the old order vanished.

**Conclusion 2:** Finally, Did Hesiod have the knowledge and vision needed to create a better world? Absolutely not. He admits as much when he makes the following lie: "The gods keep hidden the livelihood of men, otherwise you might easily do enough work in a day to have enough for a full year with no further need to be working." The rulers themselves, not the gods, hid from ordinary men how they did little to no work yet lived in luxury and decadence. Yet an even better world is waiting for mankind, one not dreamed of by Hesiod, a world in which no one works for a master, a world in which work is pleasant and relatively brief.

## APOLLONIUS AND HOMER

There are, I am afraid, certain academics and scholars who want people to *appreciate* the fact (which no one can prove to be a fact) that Greek epics of 6,000-15,000 lines were composed, memorized and recited by ancient singers or minstrels *without* pen and paper, *in their heads*. Is it possible? Well, plenty of folklorists recited far shorter works of about 500 words each, but those works, besides being shorter, were usually composed in free prose. In contrast, Greek epics, like medieval French epic poems, were painstakingly composed in rigid metre and rhyme that left no room for error. The least altered vowel could ruin a performance. The reciters and listeners of such epic monstrosities must either have suffered a great deal or become insensible to suffering. Yet students are asked to appreciate such epics. One might as well appreciate an Egyptian pyramid or a nuclear bomb: granted they are both works of skill and knowledge, I am not in the habit of appreciating works of oppression, destruction and stupidity.

And what on Earth was Homer thinking when he included his lengthy Catalogue of Ships and Soldiers in his *Iliad*? Who puts a military list in a poem and expects it to be memorized? Can anything be more unsuitable to an oral recitation?

One of my earliest professors wanted me to appreciate Homer. I responded by calling the *Odyssey* a pack of superstitions and adventures more suitable for young boys than for serious university students. Needless to say, I didn't do so well in that class.

Now that I've had a couple of decades to reconsider my initial assessment, I've come to even worse conclusions. For example, I consider Greek epics bad jokes. Just think: the *Iliad* builds no suspense, cuts straight to the battlefield and there ... well, there's no action. Instead we find General Agamemnon and Lord Achilles busy quibbling over a female slave. It's embarrassing. It might be informative for students of Greek antiquity, but it's certainly not epic. Anyhow, without detailing a single assault on the city of Troy, which after all is odd, since the entire poem is devoted to the battle for Troy, Homer ends his poem *before* the victory. Was he insane? And that's not all! *Instead* of ending with a victory scene, Homer paints a picture of Greek soldiers holding a mini-Olympics on the bloody battlefield. To help get the laughable absurdity of this in perspective, consider reading a novel about WWII that ends before the final assault, ends without the victory and has, instead of the victory, a scene with American soldiers playing softball outside Berlin. Wouldn't the author be accused of dishonoring his country and disrespecting the brave soldiers? Surely we don't take this stuff seriously, do we, my dear professors?

Stop laughing for a moment. I can hear a Harvard professor of classical Greek literature cursing me. He claims Homer's *Iliad* communicates "profound feelings of loss and pity." His evidence: Achilles mourns the death of his friend, Patroclus. Well, well, well, that is something. But let us examine the evidence. In the first place, Achilles, an immortal Greek war-god, is the incarnation of wrath, so it's extremely ridiculous for him to mourn. Besides that, the professor's idea of "mourning" appears to be—surprise surprise—*killing*. Achilles expresses his grief through the deeply touching act of murdering Hector and then desecrating his corpse. How touching. Who, who dares to call such behavior evidence of "profound feelings of loss and pity"? Your flattering assessment, good professor, is profoundly disturbing.

*Appreciate* the Greek classics? What, are you mad?

### Argonautica

Apollonius' epic *Argonautica* is a delightful tale about a hero sailing around the Mediterranean in search of the fabled "Golden Fleece." Hmmm. It sounds perfectly innocent, even infantile, right? Actually, it appears to be imperial propaganda promoting a culture of bigotry and wealth acquisition by force. Of course, Apollonius fogs the mirror of truth for his audience. The wealthy class never likes too much honesty, especially about itself. So, the Golden Fleece is supposed to be "taken" by Jason only so that he can *return* it to Thessaly, which is, if you believe Apollonius, its proper place. To achieve his noble deed, Jason has to use cunning and tricks, brute force and military might, to win the Golden Fleece. To help him do that, the *Argonautica* degrades and dehumanizes the foreigners, the "enemies" of Thessaly. For example, the women of Lemnos are monsters who killed all their husbands and want Jason and his men to help them breed new children (this appeals to male vanity and lust). In Doliones, the Argonauts *accidentally* kill the local king in warfare (imperial powers love this excuse for "regrettable" and "unforeseeable" consequences of using massive force and an army of oafs). In Berbryces, the Greeks accidentally kill another local king with their superior boxing skills (more cheap Greek vanity). In the land of the Amazons, the women make love in public (this both titillates noble readers and gives them an opportunity to feel morally superior). Finally, after "visiting" many weird lands, they reach Cochis. Here the

Golden Fleece is defended by a dragon, and Jason must *persuade* (trick) Medea, the foreign princess-witch, into helping him. Since he's a Greek and therefore a trained speaker, and since all Greek heroes are handsome, Medea agrees to help him and he gets his filthy hands on the Golden Fleece. And what do you think he happens next? Do you think he shared some of the loot with her? Do you think he vowed to keep an eternal bond between himself and Medea? But she's a foreigner, and if you're imperial scum like Jason was, well, than foreigners are disposable. That's just the way things were, and *are*. Aristocrats never questioned the practice of marrying women for political and especially for material reasons, and modern corpo-rats never question the practice of firing people who helped them get rich. The moment a fat cat has to tighten his belt, someone else will be downsized.

The lie that the Golden Fleece really belonged to Greece served to excuse Jason and his plunderers from their crimes. This excuse about rightful possession was perfected by Christian conquerors who believed that they were the rightful possessors of the Earth because the Earth was created by *their* God, a god who was, after all, also their *Father*, and Jesus himself said they would "inherit the Earth."

Ah, but we all inherit the Earth, if only posthumously.

## HOMER

### The Iliad

*The Iliad* really is war propaganda. The dismal brutality of war is actually blessed—blessed by the stupid Hellenic gods and goddesses who, after all, were concerned with the outcome of the war and *not* with making peace. Greeks already believed that the gods were involved in the national affairs of Greece, but Homer's tall-tale of gods and goddess discussing who should win the war and making efforts to influence the outcome of the war really sweetened the proverbial crap.

\*

*The Iliad* is wonderful war propaganda. After all, it paints a holy glow over war by claiming that the Achaeans were motivated by morality, namely the adultery of Helen. Of course, in reality, if there was a reality, the Trojan War had as little to do with morality and religion as the Crusades had to do with Christianity and as American wars of aggression have to do with democracy and justice. Greed is the underlying motive for all wars.

Actually, Homer does not lend much credence to the tradition that the Trojan War was started over Helen, King Menelaus's adulterous wife. His warriors never speak of her. Truth is, warriors never gave much thought to human life, women's lives especially. Many men went to war because they had little choice, or because they wanted promotions, bragging rights, blood, loot, slaves and pretty female captives. Achilles, the

demigod himself, blesses these unspoken motives by making a stink when his captive virgin is taken from him by King Agamemnon.

Every war is fought under the lie that morality is its motivation. But let us not be so gullible. Were the Greeks so morally upright that they went to war over a man's broken marriage? Ha-ha-ha! Did Rome conquer and expand because it wanted to include poor foreigners in its utopian world? Did the U.S.S.R. fight Germany because it gave a heartbeat about Jews and gypsies? Did the U.S. wait three or four years to fight Germany because it loved the Jews? Did it fight in Vietnam because it wanted to protect Vietnamese people from Communism? Did it fight Saddam Hussein because it felt pity for Iraqis? Let us not inspire our enemies to laugh. Let us not be so naïve about the reasons *they* launch their 1,000 ships of war. Fear of losing their empires greed for more wealth are the origins of wars.

Let's put *The Iliad* in its proper historical perspective: humanity, or at least literature, had to wait until the 20<sup>th</sup> century before it received Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*, perhaps the first humane and conscientious exploration of war.

\*

*The Iliad* promotes and sanctifies slavery. In Chapter 21, Achilles explains that he spent part of his time selling his captives beyond the sea. Thanks, Homer, for making Achilles give slavery the stamp of divine approval. Historians might also add that this is one of the earliest references to a slave trade involving shipping, and that this reference raises questions about the dating of the work, questions one should be ashamed to even consider in a world where the question of slavery is more important than ever.

\*

Like almost every work of ancient literature, *The Iliad* (and the *Odyssey*) diverts attention away from real tragedies and focuses attention on small, invented and moronic tragedies. Both *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* set the epic stage with some morally infantile outrage about adultery. *The Iliad* blames a plague on Agamemnon's adultery; the first pages of *The Odyssey* claim the gods were busy discussing the tragedies caused by the adultery of Aigisthos. The entire Trojan War is traditionally blamed on adultery. Finally, even the gods are troubled and worried about adultery, as we see when Haephestus, god of metallurgy, captures Aphrodite, his wife, committing adultery. Homer single-handedly invented the notion that Aphrodite was married only to support the moral hysteria that already existed around adultery.

\*

*The Iliad* promotes generally devalues life because it glosses over death, mocks those who fear death, glorifies mindless murder, and lets no one question the war or express a word of regret for deeds done or a word of longing for peace.

\*

Men have a long history of besieging cities and extracting their wealth from them. While this colorful part of our imperial history makes good material for Hollywood, we live in ignorance of the modern sieges: the recent siege of Baghdad, Tripoli, or a hundred others. Our moral excuses have changed, and nowadays entire countries, not cities, are besieged. Cuba has been under a U.S. economic siege for decades. Currently Iran is the target of an Israel-U.S.-led siege effort that includes plenty of assassinations, computer virus attacks and—EUPHEMISM ALERT—“sanctions”. All trade wars are effectively modern sieges. The de-industrialization of the U.S., the moving of its industrial base to Asia and Mexico, was effectively treason and a declaration of war on the U.S. working class. The financial terrorism practiced almost everywhere by central bankers and lesser bankers is a very real siege that, however easily it escapes detection and avoids spectacular photo-ops, nevertheless drives entire nations into hunger and dust. So, if you want to know why Homer didn't describe how the siege ended, or why Virgil skipped the raping, enslaving and looting of Troy, perhaps we must consider the notion that Homer didn't want his readers to think about all the innocent women and children, and about the shameless greed and brutality men can stoop to. So, Virgil describes the massacre of Hector's family, that is, of the most powerful family, the royal family, because killing them is essential for Greek imperial expansion. Don't ever believe the whitewashing lie that King Menelaus and Agamemnon just wanted Helen; they wanted *all of Troy*, and to have it they had to massacre its royal family and step in its place. That's how western imperialists usually operated, at least. Wars are always initiated by aristocrats, autocrats, petrocrats and families with too much money.

### The Odyssey

*The Odyssey* is xenophobic, racist and the work of Catholic forgers. The story creates the impression that Greeks – like Odysseus – are cunning liars and that other Mediterranean ethnic groups are monsters, drug addicts, witches and seducers. The only exception to this rule is the generous Phakaian people. But since they loved sports, recreation, and gave their women too much freedom, the authors made the gods hate the Phakaian people so much that their princess fell for Odysseus and Poseidon turned their ship to stone.

\*

*The Odyssey* is anti-family, war propaganda. It suggests that, at least for fathers, parenting is less important than waging extended wars in remote regions against people who represent no threat. Despite being a father of a young son, Odysseus leaves home for war. Nevertheless, the text communicates no criticism and expects us to celebrate when, *twenty years* later, Odysseus finally returns and, unbelievably, his son still welcomes him without a hint of resentment. In fact, his son actually risks his life fighting alongside his father against the men who made his abandoned mother feel wanted. Here is a fantasy if I ever heard of one. Yes, Homer went all the way with his lies. Homer even asked us to believe that Odysseus' son acquired fighting skills from ... from a cowherd, well, unless he acquired them from the “evil” suitors. Of course, the suitors *are* evil. Isn't anyone who would dare marry another man's wife evil, even if that man has been absent for twenty

years and sleeping around with another woman for seven of those years? The wife of a soldier is forbidden to all other men—that is some consolation and assurance for would-be soldiers, isn't it? So step right up and join the army!

\*

*The Odyssey* is imperial propaganda because *the entire plot* supports the colossal stupidity that the gravest sin imaginable is adultery. This point is driven home from the first lines, which falsely praise Odysseus for trying to save his companions and say nothing about the family he has abandoned for a decade. And, by line 25, we find Zeus contemplating the death of “stately Aigisthos,” the man who committed adultery committed with Agamemnon’s wife and was killed by her son. Judging from my short quotation, Zeus *seems* to have sympathized with Aigisthos; since Zeus was renowned for his own sexual liaisons, perhaps he always sympathized with adulterers. But Athena announces her support for a zero-tolerance policy and the death sentence for adulterers. Zeus does not contradict her. And when Odysseus finally returns home, this convenient hysteria about adultery is confirmed by the atrocity in which Odysseus hangs the twelve maidens for sleeping with the suitors. Apparently, this homicidal psychopath thought that those twelve girls were his property and were obliged to remain virgins for the entirety of his two decade absence, and potentially indefinitely. This is pure imperial propaganda, for even if it was not conceived of as such, adultery is completely meaningless to a conscience that is both aware of actual injustices and aware that some things are more important than breeding dubs.

\*

*The Odyssey* is classist propaganda Odysseus treats his servants whose lives are his absolute and expendable property. His poor, elderly swineherd, lives without a family in a miserable hut while Penelope does *nothing* in her tower of luxury, and yet Homer is not outraged.

Poor shepherds (Jesus Christ!) are identified with one-eyed monsters. Odysseus blinds the one-eyed Cyclopes with the burnt tip of a stick. This violence might be based on the historical burning or branding of cows and rebellious slaves. As late as the 16<sup>th</sup> century, aboriginal slaves as far away as Canada were blinded with an iron if they rebelled against their European masters. Thanks for glorifying aristocratic contempt for working people and for glorifying our cruel history with your epic tale, Homer.

### The Oral Thesis

Scholars argue that Homer composed his two mega-epics orally, from memory, but this thesis ignores much evidence that the blind scholars can hardly avoid tripping over. Even the ultra-conservative Homer-scholar, Professor Elizabeth Vandiver, in her Youtube series of lectures, let slip the statement that Homer’s works were “these epics take clearly the aristocratic view. They’re *written* for aristocrats. They assume that slaves and

commoners were owned..." Yes, she said they were *written*, which is a sort of Dudinkian slip, as it hints at my truth. And her claim that Homer's epics take the aristocratic viewpoint is accurate, and it agrees with the idea that they were written. If they were oral works, they would never take the aristocratic viewpoint. Writing was the medium of the poor and property-less.

Granted that they were written, new questions arise, for example, who wrote them and for what purpose? I'll argue that they were written by medieval Catholic forgers to serve as propaganda for the Church and its Crusades.

## I. A MOCKERY OF ANCIENT GREECE

Weil, Simone. *The Iliad or, The Poem of Force*, from the anthology *Politics*. New York, 1945.

This makes me that much more critical of Simone Weil's essay, which I now view as a misguided attack on courage. Most interesting, almost ironic, is her 'criticism' of *The Iliad's* use of realistic language: "No comforting fiction intervenes; no consoling prospect of immortality;" (Weil. p.164).

Woolf, Virginia. *To The Lighthouse*. Triad/Grafton Books, London England, 1987.

### The authors

We do not understand the upper class. As Chris Hedges wrote "' they are not like us.'" – understatement. How would the upper class have viewed Odysseus and his gods? I argue that if they were Greeks, they would have been offended; if they were Latin or Catholic, Homer's works would have inspired righteous contempt for everything Greek. But, since extreme racists and bigots generally lack the talent and indeed the desire to write literature, their opinions remain largely a matter of speculation and reasoning without evidence. Therefore I face an enormous challenge in persuading you that the Greek classics were written to appeal to the prejudices and bigotry of the elite.

Athena – loves Odysseus because he lies and is clever ... but she does not help him much, and causes or permits much suffering – *the Greek gods are useless and immoral*.

swords and sieges Pro-war propaganda ---

To encourage Catholic knights and soldiers to join the Crusades, the *Iliad* portrays easterners, specifically the Turks or Trojans as well as the Greeks as disorganized and unsophisticated fighters.

I don't know much about fighting, but anyone with a little common sense, and a smattering of military history, will know that Homer did not flatter Greece with a magnificent story of Grecian bravado and military strategy. On the contrary, the Achaeans, or Greeks, despite their overwhelming numbers, appear laughably

incompetent and waste an astounding nine years waging a stalemate. This is precisely the kind of shameful history you'd expect when your history is forged by the thugs who pummeled you.

One reason for the length of the war, a reason whose significance we should not underestimate, is alcohol. *The Iliad* has nearly 50 references to wine, and although Homer claims the wine was mostly for ceremonial use, we can infer why the wine was really brought to Troy, and we can certainly doubt the Greek army's ability to control its consumption. In fact, Homer raises these doubts when he reveals, in timely fashion, that just when the Greeks were on their heels on the verge of destruction, on the night before matters got even worse for them, they rested on the beach and filled their gullets with wine (7:480).

Perhaps the greatest fighter among the Greeks, the Greater Ajax, uses, get this, a boulder to defeat Hector in single combat on the open battlefield (22). Surprisingly, the combat begins with spears that are thrown, as if any reasonable fighter would throw a spear at an opponent carrying a shield and fully expecting an attack. After the spears are wasted, instead of drawing swords the fighters draw a ... excuse me, they throw stones. The one that lands on Hector nearly crushes him. Seriously, what kind of fighters are these men? Are they tribesmen? They wear gleaming helmets made of bronze, wield shields reinforced with bronze, and throw spears edged with bronze, but they do not have swords. What laughable nonsense is this? What's worse, Greek history has no history of single combat, but the Romans were, and even had the term "spoila opima" for spoils gained from an opponent defeated in single combat.

The single combat between Paris and Menelaus is equally laughable. Paris dons armour fit for a princess: "greaves of good construction fitted with ankle-clasps of silver" (3.325 approx.). Silver-studded greaves? Oh seriously! Apparently, Paris wished to look dashing, as the English say, but didn't want to dash, for silver is a somewhat heavy (and soft) metal. He also carries a "silver studded sword." So, is it any wonder that the combat ends without Paris *lifting* his sword and with him being struck on his helmeted head with his Greek opponent's sword? Well, no, and you'd think he would have died on the spot, but the sword that struck his helmet "shivered in three or four pieces." Isn't that something—a sword breaks on contact with a helmet? What was Paris wearing—ten ceramic bowls? Perhaps not. The joke is that the Greeks did not know how to forge proper swords.

But the duel between Paris and Menelaus didn't end there. Deprived of his sword, Menelaus actually curses Zeus for not granting him a swift victory—as if that would help his case—and drags the unconscious Paris away by the strap of his helmet. Not surprisingly, since he foolishly cursed the king of the gods, a lesser deity arrives and thwarts Menelaus, saving Paris. Do you think maybe someone commissioned Homer to write religious propaganda? Let's save that thought for later.

The Greek fighters are absolute cowards without any respect for military codes of honor. Even their leaders are not above prowling around at midnight, when the enemy is sleeping, and then killing them in their sleep. This is what Odysseus and Diomedes do in Chapter 10, when they kill twelve Thracian soldiers. As for Dolon, the Trojan who had informed on the sleeping men, well, instead of getting more information from him, or using him as a spy, Diomedes kills him.

And remember, *The Iliad* retells the story of a siege, so why don't the Greeks ever employ siege engines? No battering rams, crossbows, or catapults either, though they had already been in use. Why did Homer portray the Greeks as technologically challenged? Was he writing a caricature? Maybe? How else does one explain Homer's claim that the Greeks and Trojans preferred heaving large stones at their enemies than engaging them in swordfights? I suppose one could argue that Homer confused his settings and thought he was writing about the Stone Age.

Chapter 7 of *The Iliad* ends with the routed Greeks building a defensive wall and trench around their boats and camp. Let us contemplate the plausibility of this. According to Chapter 2, a large naval force comprising 1,186 ships and likely more than 100,000 men sailed to Troy for victory and loot. Did so many men really sail all the way to Troy, spend years on the battlefield, and then find the energy and resources to build defensive walls and trenches? Let us be reasonable. I know of no other example of a large, invading force that, after being routed, rather than concede defeat and sail home, decided to build defensive structures. Its entire purpose is offensive: siege, invade, pillage and loot. Defeat is rare but possible; building defensive structures is unthinkable and frankly absurd since it has not even built or used a single offensive structure like a siege tower or wheeled battering ram.

This brings me to the *Aeneid*, from which we learn about the one and only offensive structure used by the Greek force, the legendary Trojan Horse, a giant, hollow horse on wheels offered to the Trojans as a gift and used to smuggle Greek fighters into Troy. Of course, anyone who believes this is smoking fairy dust.

*The Odyssey* is just as insulting. Chapter 1 of this epic tells us that Telemachus, the son of Odysseus, the same son who feels ready to fight grown men, is led to his bedroom chamber by an old maid who, upon leaving, locks his door *from the outside!* What madness is that? Is he a prisoner in his own home? Either that or he's a child who cannot be trusted at night.

Telemachus is quite the fool. In the morning he announces an assembly, but he dresses himself as if he were going to the battlefield, or perhaps to the pasture. He takes a "bronze spear" (presumably only the tip, or point, is bronze), a sword, sandals, and "a pair of light footed dogs." What the Hell! Dogs and weapons at an assembly? If you cannot imagine how this would have inclined the others to treat the assembly—just imagine union representatives showing up with guns at contract talks with government or corporate heads.

The final battle between Odysseus and the suitors defies visualization. Somehow, in the narrow confines of an ancient hall, over a hundred defenseless suitors are killed by Odysseus. So yes, he does know how to fight—if you accept ignoble tactics and patent cowardice as knowledge of fighting. Odysseus does not even give them an opportunity to defend themselves. And he does not come with a supportive fighting force because *no one in all Ithaca wanted anything to do with scum*. Well, maybe the text doesn't say that, but what else are we supposed to conclude?

Even the Greek god of war can't fight. Ares, their god of war, is defeated by ... this is embarrassing ... a female goddess, Athena, who ... this is also embarrassing ... who injures him not with a heavenly sword or arrow but with a good old-fashioned boulder.

Beware of Greek Generosity

To discourage the Crusaders from settling among and integrating with the Greeks, the authors wrote an epic in which accepting Greek generosity leads to destruction. First, the Greek woman, Helen, falls in love with a foreigner, and for sharing her heart with him the foreigner's homeland is invaded and destroyed by vengeful Greeks. Secondly, the Greek warriors give their enemies the Trojan Horse, a huge and apparently generous gift, to win the trust of the foreigners and ultimately to secure their victory over the foreigners. In short, Greek generosity is a deceptive and dangerous thing, no Catholic knight should trust them, fall in love with their women or dare to live among them. Homer's works represent a shameless propagandistic assault on the good tradition of hosting and generosity.

## Blasphemy 1

Homer portrays the Greek gods as a mob of feuding nitwits who support opposing sides of the Trojan War and who sometimes change sides. We can make excuses and argue that this portrayal of the gods reflects how they were understood by faithful Greeks. We can imagine that faithful Greeks humbly and grudgingly accepted the idea that the gods were fickle and not always able to answer prayers. But all our excuses and assumptions will not change the fact that Homer's portrayal of the Greek gods would be about as popular among Greeks as a story that portrays Jesus, Mary and the angels feuding would be among Christians.

Let's be honest: Homer's portrait of the gods is a cruel joke. Only a monotheist (or an atheist) would dare to imply that polytheism is ridiculous because multiple gods could never agree with one another, and only an enemy of democracy would write a plot in which the gods, because they are equally divided, allow a war to continue for ten bitter years. The implication is that the uber-god, Zeus, who remained aloof from the war, should have taken a more decisive role, subdued the lesser gods and enforced his will. As such, the plot reads like an argument for tyranny, emperors and other totalitarian leaders.

The veil of naivety and respect for Homer is nearly universal. Someone at Schmoop acknowledged that for all his or her efforts, he or she continues to feel that "there remains something essentially trivial about the gods' way of life." This is something of an understatement. Hera and Athena are opposed to the Trojans because Paris said that Aphrodite was more beautiful than them, and Aphrodite supports the Trojans because she was flattered by Paris. This isn't trivial; it's ridiculous and slanderous. No devout Greek polytheist could have read such a story without being confused, upset, and possibly enraged.

A scholar writing for Sacred-Texts.com has made a different excuse. He or she recognized that Homer's gods are too "boisterous" and behave more like "irresponsible giants" than Greek gods. Moreover, he or she refers to a widespread consensus that Homer makes his gods too human to have taken them very seriously. While this goes some way to breaking the spell of our respect for Homer, the author salvaged Homer's dignity by claiming that his curious portrait of the Greek gods is a product of Homer being influenced by northern or Nordic religions.

But what if Homer was instead influenced by a Christian agenda? What if whoever he was he corrupted a formerly authentic Greek epic into a mockery of Greek polytheism? What other hypothesis could possibly explain why Zeus behaves like a tyrant "pushing

the other gods from their seats, tossing them about the hall; hurling his son by the foot over the battlements of Olympus; beating his wife and hanging her up with anvils to her feet, suggesting that she ‘would like to eat Priam [the king of Troy] raw’”? When a god treats his own family members with such violence, I think no one will pray to him.

### Achilles the Idiot

The first lines of *The Iliad* announce, in the boldest way possible, that we are not in the realm of epic poetry but in the realm of epic mockery. Just imagine, in the first lines, Homer insults the most sacred ancient Greek war mascot, Achilles. That’s right, he makes a mockery of Achilles by blaming him for bringing “countless ills” upon the Greeks. What makes this still more insulting is that Homer claims Achilles’ caused this trouble over a female captive he wanted for himself and had to give up. To grasp the enormity of this insult, imagine writing a Bible in which Jesus runs away from the cross because he’s too deeply in love with a pagan girl who worships Venus.

Homer turns Achilles into a sulking man-child, not into a stout-hearted and stoical man-god. Achilles childishly whines in Book 1: “Whenever the Achaeans sack a Trojan city, I never get as much loot as you, Agamemnon!” What a crybaby. Deprived of Briseis, his female captive, Achilles sulks, refuses to fight. While the war rages, he spends all his time with his male friend, Patroclus. Isn’t that a homosexual joke? Or what is Homer saying? That Greek kings were so greedy for women that even the gods are forced to prefer male partners?

Whatever we decided, apparently King Agamemnon should not have taken the sulking demigod’s female sex slave, but he did. And that raises the question: How dare he take anything from a Greek demigod? By claiming that Agamemnon took Achilles’ girl, Homer implies that Greek kings were not averse to taking what belonged to the gods, and worse, that the Greek god Achilles cared for nothing more than trophy girls.

Ahem, was Homer, actually a Greek?

### The Conquest of Greece

*The Iliad* is excellent imperial propaganda because it downplays the fact that the Trojan War—like any war—was primarily motivated by shameful ambitions, by greed and racism. In place of truth it gives us that old imperial lie that war was fought in defense of the insane moral law and principle that a woman may never leave her husband. Of course, no war has ever been fought over a woman; the ruling, imperial elites have always considered women expendable. The Trojan War—if it actually happened—was fought by salaried soldiers and elites who wanted gold, silver, treasures, profit and the most basic and ancient treasure of all, land.

The original Greek epic about the Trojan War—if such a work ever existed—was Greek propaganda about how ancient Greeks, or Hellenes, defended Greece from invaders, or, more likely, about how Alexander the Great expanded their empire by seizing a good deal of Asia.

The version handed down to us has few traces left of the original. Helen, the woman taken by Paris, also known as Alexander, is a symbol; Helen symbolizes ancient Greece, the land of the “Hellenes.” Abducting her symbolizes the conquest of all of Greece. And,

as if to mock Greek history, Helen is taken from Greece by Alexander, a man whose name is forever associated with the greatness of ancient Greece.

### Nestorian Christians Mocked

I don't have time to let this cat out of the bag entirely, but who is this elderly Nestor who goes to Troy, offers terrible advice to his bloody Greeks, and returns home alive? Is his character based on the ancient, early fifth century Patriarch of Constantinople, Nestorius? Nestorius created a schism in the Orthodox Church, believed that Christ had two irreconcilable natures. Is this why Homer depicts Nestor with two horses on the battlefield, presumably tied to a chariot—something not recommended, so it's ironical and lucky that Paris killed one, because you know Christ should have just one unified nature. Anyway, I guess the Roman theocrats who commissioned Homer did not approve of Nestorian Christianity, so Homer makes Nestor give awful advice. Anyone willing to research the beliefs of Nestorius and study Nestor's portrayal in Homer's epics will find still more parody.

### BLasphemy 2

Although Rome, especially its ruling classes, inherited many Hellenic gods and goddesses, I suspect that among the ruling patricians/patriarchs/theocrats, some of those gods and perhaps all of the goddesses had fallen into disrepute. This hypothesis is founded on the observation of a bias in Homer's representation of the gods and goddesses. In his works, gods associated with the sky and with political power (Zeus/Jupiter-Jove, Helios, and Apollo/Phoebus) are never powerless. In contrast, deities associated with the equestrian class and gods with no Roman equivalent accomplish very little. Gods associated with trade and sea travel (Poseidon/Neptune), war (Ares/Mars), sex (Aphrodite/Venus) metallurgy (Hephaestus/Vulcan) and various female goddesses, accomplish behave absurdly or are thwarted in their aims.

The ridiculous and powerless role played by Athena, the Greek goddess of Athens, hints at a Roman Homer. Traditionally the goddess of wisdom, her advice in *The Odyssey* is beyond stupid. Her words send young Telemachus on a wild goose-chase in search of news about his father, a man missing for two decades. Excuse me, but if his father had any friends with any news about him, wouldn't they have dispatched messengers to his wife and son? Moreover, Athena's awful advice to embark on a wild goose chase means Telemachus must leave his home and mother *undefended* while the supposed enemy is already *inside the walls of his home!*

And, one more thing about Athena: she was traditionally represented in the form of an owl. Right. But what does Homer associate her with? He has her transform into ... a cute little swallow (*The Odyssey* 22:239). A swallow? This is not quite a fearsome fowl. What did Homer mean with this peculiar choice of bird? I wonder. Should we consider that the swallow was once a traditional Greek symbol of love, renewal, rebirth, and resurrection? We could, but in vain, for Athena turns into a swallow while Odysseus is busy slaughtering the suitors. Indeed, Odysseus really would have appreciated help from Athena's traditional form as a warrior goddess. But no, she had to appear in the form of a swallow. Anyway, regarding owls and other animal representations of the gods and goddesses, I don't think Homer cared about such

peasant and rural traditions. He probably viewed any animal representations of gods as a joke;—turning Athena from an owl into a swallow merely amplifies the joke.

If parody is a major element in Homer's epics, is it ever directed at the great male sky gods, Zeus and Apollo? Apollo appears to be spared. Why did the theocratic Homer spare him? Well, Apollo was the god of prophecy, so he is most closely linked to the theocrats and their business of writing, interpreting and generally producing bullshit.

*Oh, but wait a second now!* Perhaps, I am guilty of underestimating the breadth of Homer's parody. Perhaps he actually mocks *everything*, at least everything Greek. Just consider that although Zeus was traditionally associated with order, political authority and unifying principle, Homer portrays him as divisive, reclusive and non-communicative tyrant who must tolerate his squabbling lesser gods and goddesses. In fact, Zeus has no interest in helping the Greeks. He only intervenes at the end of *The Odyssey* to stop Odysseus from killing more innocents. And, in *The Iliad*, he only acts after Poseidon complains that the Greeks have not sacrificed to him; his great thunder scares the cowardly Greek men and persuades them to “make offerings to the mighty son of Cronus” (7:481). Presumably “mighty son of Cronus” means Zeus *or* Poseidon, but it's likely the former, since Homer's Zeus is not in the habit of resolving problems for the impious Greeks.

And Homer's disparaging portraits of the gods doesn't stop with Zeus. Instead of associating the Greek gods Apollo and Helios with sunrises and sun, we have “the young Dawn showed again with rosy fingers.” Would someone explain to me “rosy fingers”? Rosy cheeks I know, but fingers? More curiously, Apollo seems to specialize in hiding Trojan soldiers under a veil of darkness! *And*, instead of portraying Apollo as a god of healing, as he is traditionally portrayed, Homer's Apollo afflicts the Achaians with a *plague* and cures *no one*. And, just one more thing, instead of associating Helios with horses, symbols of power and wealth, as per Greek tradition, Homer associates Helios with a much cheaper commodity, cattle. And Homer's Aphrodite, that much vaunted goddess of love, is married to a lame craftsman and caught committing adultery. How funny is that? But before you laugh, consider that Homer gives Poseidon a son, not glorious demi-god but a monster who lives like a common shepherd. Oh, *and* Ares, that fearsome god of war, is seduced by Aphrodite and struggles on the battlefield. That's not very flattering, is it? And who still thinks these portraits of the gods were conceived in a spirit of pious respect?

## Dressed to Die

It's a most curious fact that not once does Homer brag about the weapons used by the Greek forces. Why not? Indeed, his Greeks have terrible weapons. Agamemnon's sword breaks over Paris' helmet... hehe, hahaha, and their only siege engine is a giant hobby horse. Oh, but Homer did grant them the most splendid shields and armor. That he did. It's hard to beat Agamemnon's armor—though it makes him easier to beat. Agamemnon wears greaves (shin guards) with “clasps of silver,” and on his chest he bears a famous breastplate “with ten courses of deep blue cyanus [a pretty, blue flower], twelve of gold, and twenty of tin” (*The Iliad*, 11) Admittedly, such a splendid breastplate might be beautiful, if not gaudy certainly conspicuous, making one an easy target ... it would make good ceremonial wear, but on the battlefield, I wouldn't trust a breastplate made of two of the softest metals and possibly rows of flowers... perfect, perhaps, for a sumptuous,

stately funeral. And his shield is more suited for an art museum than a battlefield: was Homer, perhaps, commenting on the decadence and effeminate nature of an aging Greek empire?

Admittedly, Homer does grant Agamemnon a new sword. This second sword is embossed with gold “and the scabbard was of silver with a chain of gold.” Seriously, weaponry doesn’t get more impractical and ostentatious than this. Agamemnon seems to be begging someone to rob him dead.

The beauty of Agamemnon’s shield is only exceeded by the beauty of Achilles’ shield. Homer devoted about a thousand words to describing its precious materials and the pretty pictures embossed upon it. Readers can get lost in the details and not even notice the fact that, although the god Hephaestus created a shield and breastplates for Achilles’ use in the war, he—hahaha—neglected to create weapons for him! Moreover, we might note that the wonderful shield is also a joke. All its fine craftsmanship argues that it was never intended to be used in battle and that it is in fact a votive shield. Votive shields were works of art and beauty, almost always inscribed or embossed with pictures, and they served as a signature or promise between two parties.

### A Mockery of Greek Myths and Tragedies

In Sophocles’ *Philoctetes*, the whole story revolves around the notion that the Greeks cannot win the Trojan War until they have the bow of Heracles. This means that the Greeks were already familiar with the idea that great weaponry is essential to success, and that increases the likelihood that Homer intentionally made a mockery of this theme.

According to Greek myth, Achilles had one weak spot, his heel, because as a child someone held him by his foot and dipped him in icy water, or in a fire. Well, in *The Iliad*, Achilles grabs his first victim by the foot and hurls him into the river. And, in the end, Homer makes Achilles pursue Hector *on foot* around the walls of Troy. Why didn’t Achilles use his chariot—the one he uses later to drag Hector’s corpse around the battlefield? Well, that wouldn’t be funny, would it? I mean, a footrace between a handicapped demigod and a human being—that’s almost funny and almost fair. No wonders Achilles struggled to catch Hector.

More could be said, but I think I’m understood. The losers are mocked. We should consider ourselves lucky that no modern Homer has written a mockery of Third World nations, or of the world’s 99%. The tables have turned. Nowadays the best literature is written to mock the ultra-wealthy and the poor fools who admire and envy them.

### Homer’s Terrible Geography

Scholars commonly admit that Homer took liberties with geography. The stellar translator, Richmond Lattimore, has even observed that Homer’s texts include anachronisms, which means that Homer makes claims about people and geography that cannot be proven and are treated by modern historians as wrong. I agree, but I suspect the author(s) didn’t care that archaeologists somewhere might one day expose his errors. All his errors functioned to help him write propaganda.

One anachronism is the island of Phakaia, land of the Phakaians. There is no evidence that such a place ever existed. Indeed, the name is a pun on the Latin word *vacationem*, from which we have the word *vacation*. The pun is obviously intentional, since the

Phakaians appear to be enjoying a permanent vacation, much like the Roman *patrician* class...

Another anachronism is Ilium, the second or alternative name Homer uses for Troy. If the story of Troy is a Greek story, why does the city also have a Latin name (i.e. Ilium)? Well, we know that a city in Turkey was once called Troy and was later conquered and re-founded and renamed Ilium by Augustus Caesar. So, the reviser who called himself Homer called Troy "Ilium" because it gives the story more relevance to Roman readers.

### Homer's Lies and Confusion

While no one denies that "Homer" took a few liberties with geography and history, perhaps the only reason we don't suspect something worse is that we view him through the veil of honor and respect. Once we tear this off, we might notice that both of his epics are *completely* riddled or rather *corrupted* by flagrant violations of fact and plausibility. Consider the names of just a few of the princes of the Turkish/Roman city of Troy/Ilium: Hector has Greek roots and is still a common *Spanish* name; Hellenus is an absurd name for a Trojan because it refers to the Hellenic Greeks, whose ancestors are supposed to be the enemies of Troy; Deiphobus appears to be a hybrid of the Greek *deity-Phoebus* (Apollo); Gorgythion is a play on the Greek mythological monster Gorgon, although Herodotus fabricates a different explanation. In short, no effort was made to give Trojans native Turkish names; in fact, nearly all of the names attributed to Trojans are plainly Greek/Roman inventions, so that it's hard to distinguish the Greeks (Greeks) from the Trojans (Turks). This is the sort of disregard for plausibility and disrespect for readers that one expects from fraudsters who hold themselves above the law and fabricate truths with the stroke of a pen.

### The Original Odysseus

Odysseus, the supreme Greek hero, is mocked, but to see the mockery you must think like a Greek or Roman aristocrat. For example, Ody wakes up at dawn (*The Odyssey*, viii.2), and that is funny because that's how common serfs lived. He's also religiously illiterate. Before sailing home, instead of wisely trying to appease Poseidon, the god who controls the oceans, Odysseus makes the mistake of not offering Poseidon the traditional animal sacrifice. Worse yet, during his journey home the colossal fool blinds Poseidon's one-eyed son!! But, that's not all. When Ody hears Demodokos singing about his, Odysseus', life, he has a fit of self-pity and struggles to hide his tears (93). When the Phakaians offer to soothe his troubled heart with silly athletic games, he initially accuses them of mocking him (153). No kidding. When Euryalos insults him, calling him a businessman "grasping for profits" (164), he overreacts, insults the noble hosts upon whom he depends for his return home, and reverses his decision not to partake in their athletic games. But, to his credit, he throws a discus so well that the Phakaians "shrank down against the ground" – a subtle enough suggestion that the discus plate was mis-thrown *at* his hosts.

Odysseus, some will profess, is heroic for surviving in a largely uncivilized and immoral world. After all, he survived temptations his sailors did not, he deceived a one-eyed monster, and he returned home while others did not.

**Not a single argument** for Odysseus' heroism can stand. At best, Odysseus is a fool and a scoundrel, or, in the language of Hollywood, he is the world's best action hero. He fights one-eyed monsters and immoral men; he has a 7-year affair and hangs immoral women. Plus, the young girls love him, his wife and family wait 20 years for him, and a goddess escorts him. Among action heroes, you cannot beat Odysseus.

In fact, Odysseus is a disgraceful husband, a disgraceful father, a disgraceful son, a disgraceful brother (according to the cowherd) and a disgraceful leader. If you haven't read *The Odyssey* yet, you just have to, if for no other reason than to laugh at the brilliance with which one author hid all the perverse habits and desires of the ancient feudal lord in sublime hexameter. Besides, it may amuse us to recognize modern failings in *The Odyssey*. For example, while plenty of modern military families remain affected by delinquent fathers, the norm is the father who, thanks to his (and often the mother's, too!) enslavement to work, is hardly ever a father, and when he is with his children, hardly knows how to be their delightful companion. Scholars who overlook Odysseus' absolutely irresponsible behavior are themselves perpetuating a society in which irresponsible behavior is the norm.

\*

Besides, as I hinted earlier, the entire alleged cause of the Trojan War (the abduction of Queen Helen by a Trojan prince) is a joke meant to make a mockery of the Greek character and the Greek patriarchy (men rulers) by suggesting that they were inordinately passionate about women—so passionate that they would go to war over a single woman. In addition, the alleged cause of the Trojan War is a joke because it implies that Greek men were incapable of keeping their women *in their place*. The alleged cause of the war is a specifically Roman joke because, relative to the Greeks, Roman men granted their women much more freedom and made less effort to restrict their movement and visibility, a fact which suggests that Romans would have taken a kind of cruel pleasure in a story about Greeks losing control over one of their women. Furthermore—and this note is not anachronistic—just imagine how many Greek women were forcibly taken *by Romans* after the Roman Republic conquered Greece and during the years Greece spent as a tax-paying suzerainty. Of course, *that* is no joke, but for a Roman to write an epic in which Trojans, not Romans, are guilty of stealing the women of Greece ... that is *a kind* of joke.

And yet there are scholars who still have doubts that Homer indulged in parody...

### Odysseus the Effeminate Idiot and Scoundrel

It's no secret that Odysseus is a highly emotional character, though this characterization is rather odd for a land-owning, war hero. Could the author's intent have been to heap mockery on the Greek hero? Odysseus often weeps, and at one telltale moment Homer compares his sobbing to that of a woman (11). Shakespeare likewise exploited the same sexist prejudice for comical effect when he depicted the duke in *Twelfth Night* as an effeminate man. Rare is the man in any audience who would respect a male hero if the author compares him to a weeping woman.

Odysseus' cunning is also widely recognized, and the ruling class of any nation and empire is always cunning to some extent, but Odysseus' acts of cunning are exceptionally ignoble. He ....

And the Trojan horse idea.

Circe tells him he can only come home if he sails through the Strait of Gibraltar to the "Ocean Stream" – that would have been viewed as suicidal by anyone before the age of C. Columbus. Indeed, it eerily resembles Columbus' claim that he find India by sailing in the wrong direction, in a *circle* or, if you like, a *circe*. I'm not taking too much liberty with language. In Latin languages, cirque, is a circle.

Any doubt that Homer intended to present a mockery of a Greek hero could be put to rest by the episode involving the cyclops Polyhemous. Odysseus escapes from the monster's cave by hanging under a sheep, by actually clinging to the wool hanging from the bellies of sheep? Isn't this image of a battle-hardened warrior clinging to the underside of a sheep just a little hilarious? Wouldn't it be hilarious if you were a Roman noble full of pride and notions of honor, dignity, bearing, mien, comportment and Latin gravitas? Maybe it isn't hilarious in the way we easy-going latecomers to the Earth understand the word, but if you were a Roman theocrat living two millennia ago, you would probably enjoy a good smirk at the expense of the Greek *and* at the expense of military men.

Homer also made Odysseus quite an idiot. He alleges that Odysseus cut down an olive tree and turned the stump into a fixed bedpost for his bed (16:14). This is nuts. A freshly cut olive tree would continue growing shoots *even* if it were quickly covered with a roof and denied rain and sunlight. Secondly, since olive trees are capable of producing olives for hundreds of years, turning one into a bedpost shows a remarkable lack of intelligence. In fact, around 600 A.D. King Solon prohibited Greeks from cutting down olive trees because they were too valuable. They are more resilient to drought than grains—but, alas, they are less useful to empire building.

Perhaps the most bizarre decision made by Odysseus is his vow to complete a penance or mission by carrying a paddle to a place where paddles have never been seen. This reeks of the old Christian practice of doing penance by going to distant holy places on foot, and it reeks of the Christian evangelical practice of carrying the cross to people who had never seen a cross.

He falls asleep as the ship nears his home, – sleep is his favorite excuse – used when his men open the bag of wind.

## Demonize Herbal Medicines and Drugs

The episode of the Lotus eaters was intended to warn readers and listeners against the dangers of indulging in psychotropic plants. The author likely meant for his lotus flowers to allude to opium and cannabis. Certainly the state of the Lotus Eaters resembles that of heavy cannabis or opium users. Of course, Homer's negative depiction of the lotus eaters is strictly motivated by the Church's effort to eliminate any pagan religion and other source of relaxation and forgetfulness. The medieval Church, with its stake in the wine

industry and its near monopoly in the spiritual-drug industry, aggressively demonized and terrorized anyone and anything that threatened its profits.

### More Idiots

After Odysseus and Telemachus slaughter over a hundred suitors, each of whom belongs to a noble family, the natural outcome would have been irrepressible revenge. Odysseus' home would have been overrun with the friends and family of the deceased, all seeking his blood. But Homer wrote a fairy tale for us. Odysseus and Telemachus go into town and fights *everyone*, and Homer would have us believe that they would have killed *everyone* if Zeus had not expressed his displeasure and Athena finally spoken a word of wisdom and persuaded the two psychopaths to lay down their weapons and pledge peace with their enemies. Could anything be *less* plausible? Oh, I can hear the Romans laughing, oh, those Greek nobles, even an aged Odysseus, *the odious*, with his boy could kill them with impunity—just throw a peace treaty in their faces and they'll go away, forgetting that over one-hundred men were lost, ready once more to let Odysseus have his place in their primitive, feudal society, bereft of their last king, King Agamemnon.

### Scholarly Fools

Our scholars are walking blindly through their material, tripping over things they deny exist and

In his introduction to *The Odyssey*, translator Richmond Lattimore observes that *The Odyssey* borrows phrases from *The Iliad* and often does so by dropping them into unsuitable places. For example, *The Iliad* has “Sarpedon advances on the wall of the Achaians like a lion against a guarded sheepfold (XII.299-301) [...] and the same language is adapted to Odysseus' embarrassed advance on a group of frightened girls (*Odyssey* vi.130; 133-134).” Obviously the second example of a naked war vet approaching girls is comical, so it makes a mockery of the first and serious example.

The same type of secretive mockery exists elsewhere. The arrangement King Priam made for his daughters in *The Iliad* is parodied by the arrangement the swineherd makes for his pigs in *The Odyssey*. Richmond Lattimore notes that “such combinations [...] with enough good will, can be seen as parodies.” With enough good will? *Good will?* Only someone who has not seen the very serious and very imperial function of Homer's works could speak of being good to Homer.

## II. THE ROMAN PATRIARCH AND THEOCRAT

### The Power Grab

Apparently, Homer's works were rewritten as propaganda in support of the Roman patrician class, a class that controlled religious offices and pulled the strings of power in

the senate, just as the elite corporate and globalist class currently controls Congress in the U.S. The so-called patrician class mastered the art of using religion to support its unjustifiable grip on wealth and power, and it commissioned *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* to serve this function.

Consider, for example, that Homer *strongly* supports the ancient Greco-Roman religious custom of making sacrifices/payments to the “gods” in order to appease *them*—“them” being the patricians who controlled the so-called sacrifices—a euphemism for payments or tithes to religious authorities claiming to represent gods.

The concept of sacrifice is so crucial to Homer that he blames all the troubles experienced by the Greeks at Troy on their failure to offer any sacrifices to appease their gods/priests. Homer blames the troubles suffered by Menelaus on his failure to sacrifice to the gods (*The Odyssey*, 3).

The religious factor is dominant at the very start of *The Odyssey*, for it begins with an explanation that Odysseus’ struggle to return home began when his men decided to eat the cattle that belonged to the sun-god Helios. By implying that cattle can belong to a god, Homer implies that the most valuable property of ancient people really belonged to the priests who served that god, and this sets a useful precedent for the patrician theocrats who represented the will of all the gods. So, the Helios episode suggests that if mere sailors and military elites—that is, the Roman equestrian class—dared to lay hands on such cattle, they could expect severe retribution.

Nowadays mega-bankers are playing the same game of profiteering through the manipulation of the public’s ignorance. Only now, the stakes are infinitely larger. Now, instead of playing on the public’s religious fears and ignorance, *banksters*, PhD economists and the ultra-rich play on the public’s financial fears and ignorance—and claim rightful control and possession of wealth and power.

Priests profit from a people’s failure to understand that gods and heavens are the creation of their own minds; governments and bankers profit from the people’s failure to understand that their money is fabricated by fiat counterfeiting, fractional reserve deception, derivatives and other shenanigans.

\*

Homer’s epics support the priestly class because promoting the superstition that holy sacrifices (tithes and donations to the priesthood) wins the favor of the gods.

Odysseus is not of the patrician or priestly class. Being a sailor and soldier, and being identified by the Phakaians as a businessman (*The Odyssey* 8:164), Odysseus represents the Roman equestrian class, a class two grades lower than the patrician class, one class lower than the senatorial class. Because Homer’s works serve the patricians class, Odysseus must suffer for not doing what the patrician class wants all equestrians to do: sacrifice generously to the “gods” and always respect the gods. Because Odysseus doesn’t fulfill either requirement, all his troubles are justified and serve as ample warning to the young men and women who were forced to read Homer’s propaganda in academies controlled by the patricians.

Viewed as propaganda for the equestrian and senatorial classes, Homer’s epics are surprisingly transparent. Even children can see that Odysseus was a fool because, after all, he had a long sea voyage ahead of him, and despite knowing that Poseidon ruled the

seas, he enraged precisely the god he needed to appease, and blinded Poseidon's son, Cyclopes. Of course, if Homer's epics were written during the imperial Roman period, as I will argue later, young readers would have scorned Odysseus for never praying to or sacrificing to Zeus, the king of gods, or even to Apollo. This failure on Odysseus' part could even have been viewed as justification for his troubles.

Let's go back to Homer's claim that cattle were sacred to Helios. History shows that this is false. Horses were commonly associated with Helios, and besides horses, many species of domestic and other animals were "sacrificed" to "Helios". Cattle were not included. Why? Perhaps cattle were not suited to the Greek landscape and climate, I don't know; in any case, and this is rather suspicious, cattle were *not* sacrificed to any sun-god until the Romans sacrificed their cattle to Apollo, the great sun-god Romans adopted from the Greeks. Why this change? Cattle gradually became the pre-eminent source of meat in Europe, but scientists have shown that during the Roman Empire, beef consumption was rare among soldiers. They ate virtually every other type of meat, but not beef. Beef cattle, I suggest, were *too valuable* for consumption by the equestrian class and was reserved for the higher echelons.

Has anything changed in our time? No. Well, the story of meat, beef and pork in particular, continues to evolve. The global meat-eating class has ballooned, leaving in its wake incredible environmental destruction and obesity-related diseases. Nowadays, a billion people eat like the Roman patrician class.

The propaganda that Homer wrote in order to justify the patrician class' monopoly on beef is paralleled in our own time by the propaganda that justifies our continued obsession with meat consumption and continued rejection of all the scientific research that links this obsession to climate change, deforestation, animal cruelty, and heart disease.

Of course, the patrician class likely wasn't only interested in cattle for food, cattle likely continued to serve as currency, as it had before the Roman Empire. The patrician wanted to control this currency just as they controlled gold and silver coin minting. In our own time, this unjust monopoly on wealth continues most flagrantly in the way governments increase their money supply and their debts. While we don't use cattle as currency, and bartering is hardly legal, governments around the world shamelessly perpetuate the lie that land and natural resources belong almost exclusively to governments, not to individual people, most of whom own no land and natural resources. These governments sell land and resources to the super-wealthy and use the money to perpetuate a system that globally and steadily removes people from the essential wealth of this planet, creating an urban class of gadget owners.

The power structure invented in ancient Greece persists to this day. We still have a tripartite ruling class: our equestrian class is our corporate class; our senatorial class is our ... senatorial class, our House of Lords, NATO, IMF, PRC, United Nations, the ECB, and our other unelected and even elected officials; and, our patrician class consists of those shadowy "noble" families who presently control most of the world's capital and credit.

## Theocratic Archons

The first pages of *The Iliad* virtually announce the supremacy of religious power over military power. Before the war is permitted to begin, the Greek warriors are struck with a

plague by Apollo. The reason? King Agamemnon took the daughter of a priest of Apollo as his sex slave. The resulting plague endangers the Greek hope for victory, and Agamemnon must forfeit the captive girl and return her to her father, a priest of Apollo. This episode establishes that religion, or the gods, reign supreme, even over military commanders and battlefields; it *argues* that one man's failure to appease the gods, one man's failure to be pious and religious, can result in a national disaster of epic proportions. Of course, it's absurd, but like the adultery story, it's great propaganda for the theocrats that controlled the religious domain.

### The Patriarchs

According to Homer, the Trojans not only took Helen, but they also stole a statue of Athena, a Greek holy statue, and erected it Troy (in Turkey, where temples to Apollo can still be found), and the Greeks could not expect much success until they reclaimed this statue. All this nonsense emphasizes the crucial role of religion in imperial wars.

Additionally, the loss of the Athena's statue parallels the loss of Helen to the Trojans. This seems rather embarrassing for the Greeks. Homer seems to suggest that women want nothing to do with Greeks. Indeed, judging from how they treat female captives as property to be traded and used, one can hardly blame them. Of course, Homer never suggests that women should be treated better; he only identifies one cause of Greek misfortunes, and that is their neglect of the "gods." As for Athena's importance to Odysseus, remember that she only appears to him and the suitors in the form of a man. Had she appeared in her female form, Homer could not have written that anyone actually respected her. Besides, Homer actually shoved patriarchal values inside her mouth. When she speaks to young Telemachus, didn't he make her say that the young man has more status than his own mother, and didn't this transform Telemachus, so that he boldly and rudely spoke to his mother, commanded her back to her room, and told her that men alone should speak? He did! And what did Homer make the boy's mother, Penelope, do? He made her submit, obey and "return to the house in amazement" (1:360).

Moreover, Homer makes the female deities submit to discrimination by voluntarily abstaining from a serious meeting between the gods (*The Odyssey* 8.324).

Similarly, Homer's epic transforms a seafaring myth that was once common among numerous cultures, namely the myth that singing mermaids or sea creatures could seduce sailors. In Homer's extremely negative retelling, the female creatures are called the Sirens, and sailors who listen to their song are doomed. But, to cast Odysseus in a childish light, Homer has Odysseus find a way to listen to the Sirens. He stops his men's ears with wax and ties himself to his ship's mast. It's all so absurd, and childish, that it has to be a joke. But no, it's there. Odysseus is portrayed as a spoiled, easily tempted child who cannot resist a dangerous song, a song which must be sung by women, of course, otherwise it wouldn't be dangerous. So, there you have your sexist bias again. And there you also have your theocratic, aristocratic, and Roman bias against the common people's love for singing—especially women singers.

### Pay Your Priests

In one sense, Homer wants readers to think the whole trouble with the Greek war effort is the absent involvement of priests or theocrats. In Chapter 12 of *The Iliad*, we learn that

the Greek wall and trench “did not last” because “they had not offered hecatombs to the gods and built everything without consent of the gods.” Now, to get consent or blessings from the gods you obviously need a moron, I mean a priest, and to get a priest—as Homer makes clear—you need to pay a hecatomb. Now, a hecatomb is not some trifling little payment. A hecatomb is a payment of 100 quality cattle to the gods—meaning to the priests in charge of burning/offering certain parts of these cattle in religious ceremonies while the bulk of the cattle payment was consumed by the mouths of the priestly and political class. Homer even hints at the stinginess and shameful greed of the Greek warriors by mentioning, in nearly the same breath, that the Greeks possessed “rich spoils” and yet did not pay the hecatomb.

Why do you think the Greeks struggled against the Trojans even after they made “offerings” to Zeus (7:480)? Why, obviously their offerings made no difference to Zeus because they were offerings and not sacrifices. And how could the drunken Greek soldiers sacrifice anything? They had already given their cattle, slaves, hides and metals away, to pay for the bloody wine that was sold to them by their insane leaders!!!!

### Hate Foreign Cultures

*The Odyssey* is an example of religious hate literature. The one-eyed, horrible, monstrous Cyclopes is a mockery of the sacred one-eyed Egyptian god, Atum. Educated Greek and Roman readers would have noticed their similarity and realized that the blinding of the Cyclopes by Odysseus is a thinly disguised insult. In fact, the Greek one-eyed monster, the Graeae, is also based on the holy Egyptian god, Atum, so it too is a piece of religious hatred and racism disguised as myth. (How many myths were made to denigrate other ethnic groups? An idea for anthropologists.) In addition, Homer makes his Cyclopes a shepherd, someone looking after others, which nicely coincides with the Egyptian myth that Atum looked after his two offspring.

Another connection between the Cyclopes and Egypt is made when Homer explains that Poseidon, the father of Cyclopes, sat feasting with Aithiopians (*Odyssey* 1.22-26), the people at least a few anthropologists identify with ancient Egyptians.

Finally, Homer plays another variation on the insult by explaining that the son of Aigyptios was eaten by the wild Cyclops (2:15-20).

### Impoverish Your War Veterans

Homer expects us to believe that soldiers were forbidden from eating cows that “belonged” to Helios. That’s most odd. Was this episode plagiarized from some Hindu epic? All joking aside, apparently the Roman theocrats who commissioned Homer’s works wanted the military and shipping elites—the so-called equestrian class—to know that their powers did not extend over the nation’s food resources, and that such resources were the domain of the patrician class that controlled religious offices. Apparently *The Iliad’s* episode about the cattle of Helios was designed to provide historical precedence for the practice of denying wealth to war veterans. After all, *The Iliad* is set in a historical period when cattle represented money; so, prohibiting war veterans from having cattle deemed sacred is synonymous with denying them payment from the treasury.

Actually, Homer does a much greater disservice to war veterans because none of the families of the dead soldiers were compensated, and Odysseus has no intention of sharing

the treasure given to him. Worse yet, *The Odyssey* suggests that men who don't return home alive should be blamed for their own demise and therefore their families deserve nothing. After all, it is quite clear that the Greek soldiers never performed religious duties and that Odysseus' men wilfully disobeyed him and opened the windbag (Chapter )—the windbag that produced a violent windstorm that could have killed everyone. And, for listening to the Sirens, Odysseus is also guilty.

A quick survey of how U.S. war veterans are treated will reveal some interesting parallels with regards to war veterans and poverty rates. In fact, this is the fate of veterans in most countries. This cruelty isn't surprising; after all, most nations are quite capable of luring the poor into their armies by tempting them with survival wages, very few benefits and little financial security.

### Imperial Roman Propaganda

Good propaganda incites hatred of "enemies," and *The Iliad* is no exception. Its fanciful names seem designed to inflame ethnic prejudices and religious fervour. Paris, the primary villain, is named after a European city to the west of Italy and Greece, a city already known during the Roman Empire as the Lutetia of the Parisii. Did Paris symbolize the Frankish/Parissi people living north-west of Rome, people not conquered until, who was it, Julius Caesar arrived?

But, Paris could also have alluded to Persia (Parsi), a name associated with enemies to the east.

But, *Homer's* Paris is also called Alexander. This is a peculiarly Greek name. Perhaps it alludes to the tyrant Alexander of Pherae (he ruled in Thessaly from 369-358 BC). Surely it cannot allude to Alexander the Great ... not unless *The Iliad* we have was rewritten by ... gasp ... Romans.

Finally, the name of Paris' brother, Hector, also alludes to people west of Greece and Italy, for the name was rarely used outside Spain and Spanish speaking countries. But Spain, like Paris, did not interest Greece. However, Spain certainly interested the Roman Republic/Empire. So, did Hector's name, perhaps, invoke the Roman elites' contempt for the Spanish speaking "nation" living to the west of Italy, people not conquered until ... who was it, Julius Caesar, arrived?

### Skylla, Arabs, and Saved by a Fruit Tree

A highlight of Odysseus' horrible adventure is the man-eating monstrous Skylla perched on her seaside cliff. Justified charges of sexism aside, this episode deserves investigation because it is the only one obviously set in Italy, as the name was clearly derived from the seaside town of Scilla, on the southernmost tip of the Italian peninsula and just across from Sicily. Homer's place names are usually more elusive; why is this one so obvious? Well, if he did write for the Roman ruling class, Homer's portrait of Skylla echoes a classist, prejudiced view held by northern Italians about southern Italians (the northern ones tend to be paler and blonder). In fact, since Odysseus must pass between two dangers, Charybdis and Skylla, and he preferred to hug Skylla's coast, my reading suggests that even despite his racist views of southern Italians, he prefers even the most southern ones to the neighboring people of Sicily. These people are genetically partly Arab and Greek. According to a paper called "The History of the Word Arab" on

Ismaili.net, “The first actual use of the word Arab in history is to be found in an Assyrian inscription of 853 B.C., commemorating the defeat of a mutinous chieftain, called Gindibu the Aribi during the reign of King Shalmaneser III.” *Aribi* has curious echoes with *Charybdis*. Homer’s Roman racism is evident.

When Odysseus returns alone on his raft, he chooses to pass near Charybdis. A water funnel takes his raft, but he escapes by clinging to a fig tree. Why a fig tree? In the first place, fig trees do not grow on shorelines, so the claim is implausible. However, since fig trees were commonly worshipped or deemed sacred outside of Europe. The Buddha, for example, achieved enlightenment under a fig tree. By linking the salvation of Odysseus to a pagan tree, the medieval western author continued his work of secretly mocking Odysseus in a story that appears to treat him as a heroic figure.

Odysseus’ salvation by an impossible coastal fig tree is echoed in the first verses of Psalms: “He is like the tree planted by the streams of water, which yields its fruit” (1:3). Fruit trees are not planted by streams of water—at least not if the planter knows what he’s doing. Of course, this is not a case of the author lacking relevant botanical knowledge; what he lacks is respect for his readers, and what he shows is contempt for the blind trust he is used to receiving and abusing.

#### IV. CRYPTO-CATHOLICISM

Homer’s works reek of Christian propaganda, theology, practice and symbolism. The following provides a non-exhaustive sampling of the evidence.

##### The Scale of Corruption

As usual in extant Greek literature, somehow in Homer’s works the gods are not flattered and they are responsible for making the war as bloody and lengthy as it was while, despite this, the Greeks continue to offer sacrifices to the gods. Generally speaking, it’s a theocratic fantasy.

More evidence that no Greek wrote Homer’s works lies in the details. In Chapter One, Nestor says that Achilles is strong because his mother was an immortal, but that Agamemnon is stronger because he has more people under him (~380). From a religious perspective, this is absurd. If Homer respects the Greek gods *and goddesses*, he would never claim that a lot of subordinates makes a man more powerful than the support of a goddess—that’s the kind of thing you’d expect a heretic to say. So, what was Homer thinking? He wasn’t thinking—an impostor was thinking, forging and making a mockery of a Greek classic.

Then, on the same page, I find two suspicious echoes of the Bible. First Achilles says, “those that take were also those that gave” (~1:300) —strongly echoing the Bible’s refrain that God gives and God takes, a message most clearly stated in Job 1:21, “The Lord gave and the Lord has taken away.” Secondly, sullen Achilles says, “they shall seek and they shall not find” (~1:340). This verse strongly echoes the biblical refrain “they shall seek the Lord, but they shall not find him” (Hosea 5:6; Song of Solomon 5:6; James 4:3; 1 Samuel 8:18; Job 35:12; Psalm 18:41; Proverbs 15:29; Isaiah 1:15; Jeremiah 11:11; Ezekiel 8:18; Micah 3:4; Zechariah 7:13).

## A Christianized Athena

Homer portrays Athena as Odysseus' personal patron goddess. This in itself is most strange because Odysseus has no connection to Athens, and never prays or sacrifices to Athena. While this makes a mockery of Greek religion, it also reeks of Christianity. As Athena appears before Odysseus in the form of *Mentor*, a human being, so early Christians imagined that their Madonna, the Holy Virgin Mary, appeared before them in human form and gave them strength and guidance—or *mentoring*. Dead Christian saints supposedly did the same. Outside of Homer, pagan culture has only one example of a god or goddess appearing in human form to help a human being—and that example—from Virgil—was *allegedly* written just before Christ; therefore. In short, Homer's use of Athena bears the Christian fingerprint.

From this perspective, Homer's transformation of Athena into a swallow makes sense as an intentional allusion to Christian symbolism. The swallow, as a symbol of rebirth and resurrection, is perfectly suited as a symbol of Christ or the Holy Spirit, and so we are no longer in the realm of a parody but in the realm of a Catholic revision and forgery.

## A Parody of Paganism

Did anyone really believe in that witches existed before the Roman Catholic Church began its propaganda—or rather its anti-pagan-da—against pagans, especially pagan women? Well, I don't think so, but here's Homer claiming that a woman had magical powers to seduce men and turn them into pigs. This simply reeks of the time Catholic liars and inquisitors accused pagan women of being witches who seduced good Christian men and turned them into "pigs." And how does Odysseus protect himself from the witch? Not by praying but by ingesting a magical plant. At first I thought this was strange. Pagan women or witches famously used herbs and brews to cure and to curse, but in the *Odyssey* it's the man who uses a plant against the witch. Only a Catholic liar could have written such nonsense. And in case you think the author actually shared some useful herbal knowledge, forget it. The plant used by Odysseus is called selinon, which is also known as celeriac, turnip-rooted celery, knob celery and celery root. Of course, a quick study of this plant revealed that it has *no known medicinal properties, which is precisely why the lying monk whose profits depend on preventing us from understanding the power of plants mentioned selinon as a magical plant.*

## The Church of Kirke

Kirke is the witch who used food to transform men into pigs. Her name resembles the Germanic word for church, *kerk*, and Old Norse *kirkja*, and still more closely the Scottish *kirk*. Kirke's transformative magic of the berserkers, Norsemen who drank potions in order to turn into bers, or bears, and perhaps to the later Christian magic of transforming food (bread and wine) into human flesh. In either case, it's possible that pre-Christian Northern and Western Europeans already called their places of worship kerks or kirks. While it's unlikely that a Hellenic Greek author would know these details about the people far to the west and north, a Roman author might know them, especially a Roman author born after or during the age of Augustus, after the conquest of Greece, and after Julius Caesar's conquest of Germanic and English peoples. Kirke is a witch, and in that

sense the Kirke episode bears interpretation as a warning against pagan religions—and this concern with witches is distinctly Roman Catholic.

### Satanic Odysseus

Odysseus famously contacted the ghosts of his compatriots and of his parents by performing an almost Satanic ritual in which he offered the blood of a sacrificial ewe and ram (as well as barley, wine, honey and milk) to contact the dead and make them willing to speak. There's no evidence that such rituals were ever practiced by pre-Christian Greeks. And consider how Odysseus behaves towards his dead mother when her ghost appears: *he ignores her!* He's only interested in speaking to male military and political elites—*of course*. The epic tells readers that Odysseus ignored his mother because the authors considered women too far beneath them to deserve any attention.

As evidence for a Christian or Catholic thread we have the ewe and the ram, both close relatives of the lamb, the late Christian symbol of Jesus Christ. In addition, the wine and the barley nearly replicate the bread and wine symbols of the Church, and the honey and milk reproduce the Bible's imaginary land of milk and honey. Of course, since all these Christian symbols are employed in a Satanic or occult ritual suggests that the authors had no respect for Christianity.

### The Altar of Refuge

In early Christian times, churches offered sanctuary for criminals, especially repentant criminals. Christian altars were so sacred, apparently so full of the power to redeem and save, that if a criminal managed to attach himself to one, he would be deemed safe. The childishness of this custom aside, we can find evidence of it in the medieval legend whose title presently escapes me as well as in—surprise, surprise—*The Iliad*. In Chapter 22, after witnessing a bloodbath, Phemios the singer considers fleeing to “the altar of almighty Zeus of the court, and crouch at the structure” (334-35). Even when Phemios and Medon are both spared, they worry for their lives and “sat down both together at the altar of almighty Zeus” (379). To my knowledge, there's no pagan precedent for the custom of providing people refuge at an altar.

### The Ransom of Christ

Homer's ransoming of Chryseis finds a close parallel in Christian salvation theology, in which Christ redeems or *ransoms* humankind from sin. “For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many” (Mark 10:45). The concept that Christ was a ransom is so central to Christianity that it probably has roots dating back at least as far as the first century and beyond.

For Christians the Father and the Son are different and yet they are one and effectively identical; in Homer's epic, this is reflected in the fact that Chryseis' name is almost identical to her father's.

Who is Chryseis? Well, she is like Helen, except she is a virgin captive presumably taken against her will, and certainly taken against the will of Apollo, which contrasts sharply with Helen, who was not taken against her will and about whose decision to leave her old husband the gods say nothing. Indeed, the gods are more concerned about

monsters (Cyclopes), a wayward man (Odysseus), the cattle of Helios and the murder of Agamemnon. A mere woman—that is, a woman who isn't a virgin and isn't dedicated to a god—is of no concern to the Greek gods, although she seems the entire concern of Greek men.

Anyway, instead of beginning his war story with a retelling of how Paris seduced Helen, Homer begins with a tale about a different illicit couple, namely Agamemnon and Chryseis. She is the virgin daughter of the priest Chryses. Of course, Homer is not concerned with the fact that King Agamemnon, who captured her, is raping this virgin captive and committing adultery. *That* would be asking too much. Instead, Homer focuses our attention on the outrage felt by the girl's father, Chryses. Chryses attempts to ransom his daughter, fails, and appeals to Apollo for vengeance, and Apollo provides it by striking the Greek camp with a nine-day plague. Ultimately, Achilles ransoms the daughter, albeit against his will, by giving Agamemnon his sex slave, Briseis.

### Hector as Christ

A second, lesser example of the ransom theme concerns the body of Hector, which his father ransomed from Achilles. The ransom of Hector hints at the ransom of Christ, though these are quite different, for in the first Hector's "noble body" is ransomed, and in the second Christ's body is the ransom. Nevertheless, Homer has hinted at an equivalency: Hector is equated with a "lamb" and Achilles says he'd like to "cut your flesh into pieces and eat it raw," and after Hector dies, Greeks pierce him with their spears, just as the Roman soldier pierced Christ's crucified body. Also, Achilles, not content with the despoiling of Hector's body, "pierced the sinews at the back of his feet" with a rope and ties him to a chariot, just as Christ's feet were pierced and affixed to a cross.

Hector's last words also bear a Christian fingerprint. Hector warns Achilles that he will have revenge "when Paris and Phoebus Apollo shall slay you at the Scaean Gates." Paris is Hector's younger brother ... Hector sounds like a Christ warning his enemies that he will return on Judgement Day.

Hector's mother, like the mother of Jesus, does not witness the death of her son,

### The Odyssean Messiah

The story of Odysseus, his twenty year absence from home, and the battle that occurs when he does return home, is ripe for a Christian reading. Odysseus' return and victory is the coming of the Messiah on the Day of Judgement! It's the story of delayed revenge, or delayed justice.

Well, we should have expected that. After all, like the crucified Christ, wasn't Odysseus tied, hand and foot, to a wooden beam? (12:50)

### Rhesus and the Traitors

Of course, Christians typically consider Christ to have had 12 disciples, since the 13<sup>th</sup>, Judas Iscariot, betrayed him to the Romans, and that resulted in him being mocked as the King of the Jews and crucified. *The Iliad* has an unusual but obvious variation on this story. In Chapter 10, Dolon, a Trojan, is captured and betrays King *Rhesus* to Diomedes

and Odysseus. This curiously named *Rhesus*, like Jesus, is somehow more-than-human, for Dolon claims his armour is “too splendid for any mortal man.” And when the Greeks see the horses that belonged to Rhesus, they compare them to sunbeams and state that a god must have given them to Odysseus and Diomedes. *Moreover*, this Rhesus appears to have exactly 12 companions, for that is how many of his men are killed, along with Rhesus, in their sleep. Finally, both Judas and Dolon end up dead soon after they betrayed Christ.

*The Odyssey* has a weaker parallel. Odysseus kills the one male servant who betrayed him, Melanthius. Before that, he asks Euryclea if any of his female slaves have betrayed him, and she betrays 12 women who are then hung “between the domed room and the wall of the outer court” (22:177). But why a domed room? Telemachus actually hangs the twelve women from a pillar supporting the domed roof—a very odd decision, not only because this alludes to a crucifixion, for crucifixions usually required a single post. The son’s decision is also odd because the domed roof would have covered an important room, hardly a room fit for mass hangings, *Moreover*, Odysseus stipulated that he wanted the women pierced, presumably with a sword. Considering that historically Greek churches have domes, while domed roofs were rare in ancient times, and not used in Greece until the 300 B.C., and later quite common in Roman villas and palaces, and still later in churches.

Are these coincidences? Of course, all my evidence is coincidence. This whole book is full of coincidences and misinterpretations.

### The Blood of Christ

In Book 11, Odysseus pours the blood of lamb on the ground, and immediately a mass of souls—dead people—come to drink it, and Persephone acts as a priestess. The event clearly mimics the Catholic Eucharist ceremony in which the blood of Christ, the Lamb of God, is symbolized by red wine, which a priest offers to his congregation. And just as Odysseus forces the dead to drink one at a time, so Catholics are usually given a sip of wine from one common goblet, so they are also served one at a time.

### The Monogamy Hysteria and Excuse

Homer’s obsession with adultery, epitomized by Odysseus’ raging against the suitors for daring to win his wife’s hand in marriage, bears the Catholic fingerprint, or perhaps this view of marriage had already been developed by the uptight, private property hysterics of the imperial Roman ruling class. For them, as for the “immortal” kings who commanded their wives and servants to join them in the grave, no wife was permitted to remarry, not even if her husband was missing for 20 years. You do understand the cruelty and the falsehood in this? No evidence exists that ancient Hellenic Greece was *that* uptight about marriage. All the evidence suggests that the more ancient the cultures, the more lenient it is about marriage. The most intelligent cultures treated spouses as they treated their land, as a living thing to be treated with respect and never to be treated as anyone’s exclusive property.

When the greediest imperialists wanted to engage in expansionist wars, the empire needed a moral excuse to go to war, and it drummed up moral outrage against the marital traditions of “uncivilized” peoples. African, Arab and European peoples who did not

practice strict monogamy were already viewed with contempt; the tale of a foreigner (Paris) stealing a king's wife (Helen) plays into the monogamy hysteria.

Of course, the ruling class always allowed itself access to prostitutes or, as one naïve translator called the female captives in the Greek camp, "concubines." Even they could not abide by their own rules, and as Chris Hedges observed, war and prostitution are expressions of the same disease.

Nowadays politicians divert public attention with homosexuality and make up hypocritical humanitarian excuses for invading foreign countries.

### Odysseus and Jesus Hate Parties

Odysseus condemned the maids to death when he returned to his manor, many years after leaving. Jesus similarly warned the virgins that he would condemn them if they did not keep their candles lit until the unknown day of his return.

Why candles? This is no metaphor. Pagan Rome's Vestal Virgins had to keep a sacred fire burning, and the tradition was continued by the Church, which assigned virgins, or nuns, the task of keeping its sacred candles burning. In both the Gospels and *The Odyssey*, the working women have no right to stop serving their absent masters.

Another parallel concerns a common prejudice against partying. If we're to believe the narrator, Odysseus' manor hosted a great deal of reckless partying while the host was gone, and when he returned, it was dooms day for them. Coincidentally, in the Gospels we read, "People were eating, drinking, marrying and being given in marriage up to the day Noah entered the ark. Then the flood came and destroyed them all" (Luke 17:27). The common underlying message is unmistakably imperial: "If you dare to cease working, and if you dare find joy in the company of ordinary people and in art and food, then you consume what belongs to God and his Empire, then you deserve to die!"

### Hell and the Afterlife

According to Odysseus, he saw sees Heracles punished in Hell --- hungry but can't eat the fruit of the tree he's hung in. it's forbidden fruit. Odysseus is terrified and flees – why? Homer hints that Ody's conscience recognized his own life of sin and future in Hell. Homer ...

### The Anti-Hedonism Doctrine and the Apocalypse

Many of the troubles recorded in *The Odyssey* seem to warn against hedonistic pleasures involving alcohol (at Ismaros), drugs (with the Lotus Eaters), feasting (at Hypereia and at Helios' island), singing and music (the Sirens) and extramarital fucking (with Kirke and Calypso). Is all this really a fair representation of the ancient Greek culture? My dear Homer, I don't think so. Prior to the rise of Christianity, pagan Greeks and Romans celebrated sexuality and fertility, had no prohibitions on drugs or alcohol, considered feasting good manners, sang obsessively, and did not take extramarital sex very seriously, in part because there was little need for extramarital sex. This might seem hard to imagine in our world, but it is corroborated by the fact that primitive people had little need for drugs and alcohol before their lives were ruined by conquerors and their repressive imperial demands.

In other words, Homer's anti-hedonistic doctrine does not express the spirit of the typical, ancient Greek. Much more plausible is the interpretation that this doctrine expresses the hypocritical values of a ruling, imperial class like the Roman Catholic clergy.

However, the Calypso episode challenges the above interpretation. In a sense, Odysseus deserves to be there alone, without his men, because he was not responsible for causing the storm that brought him there. From this perspective, Odysseus' virtuous behavior earned him seven years of pleasure with the nymph, Calypso. Finally, these seven years symbolize a stay in Heaven. This reading agrees with my earlier claim that Odysseus is a prototype of Christ the Messiah. His only stop before returning to the world of human beings, is a visit to Skheria, land of the Phakaians, the only friendly humans he has met on his journey home. Moreover, the Phakaians have wondrous fruit trees, feast sumptuously, have their own singing bard, Demodokos, and the men enjoy competitive sports amongst themselves. Everything suggests that Skheria represents a very aristocratic, sexist, and repressed idea of Heaven.

One more question must be addressed: How do we interpret Odysseus' rejection of Calypso's tempting offer of immortality? This rejection seems to accurately reflect the beliefs of the ancient Greeks. After all, they did not believe in a pleasant afterlife. Perhaps their instincts told them that it would be too dangerous to do so, since it might cause them to sacrifice this life and all its potential for happiness in the pursuit of a potentially imaginary one. This, at least, appears to be Odysseus' reasoning as he declines Calypso's offer and speaks of a yearning to return home.

Of course, Odysseus' seven years represents a long time before his ultimate realization that he wants to return home. Why does he need so much time before coming to his oddly and frankly unchristian realization? What Christian would sacrifice Heaven for a few years on Earth? Odysseus' realization is shocking, beyond an epiphany. It hints at an apocalypse—this Greek word, after all, means a lifting of the veil, or a realization. I mention this because, wouldn't you know it, Calypso's name was likely based on "apocalypse."

How did this unchristian message slip past the Roman Catholic overseers and editors? They likely dismissed Odysseus' rejection of Calypso's offer as a noble rejection of a sensual, pagan concept of Heaven. And they might never have noticed that the world of the Phakaians closely approximates Christian notions of Heaven and that this was also abandoned by Odysseus.

## V. DICTATION AND REBELLION???

### The Rebel

Well, wherever a talented author is forced to pen imperial bullshit, he or she will attempt to undermine the imperial message with undercurrents that contradict the imperial message.

For example, in *The Iliad's* the Trojans seems far better human beings than the Greeks. We do not even hear them voice ugly wishes for revenge, no night attacks, no dirty tricks, and much less stone throwing. And, Trojan grief is more genuine. Also,

judging from Helen's own contentment in Troy, and judging from how the Greeks speak of women captives, the Trojans were culturally and morally superior.

In *The Odyssey*, the suitors cannot be half as deserving of death as Odysseus believes. After all, the suitors are patient with Penelope, and since she is no longer a young woman, their three years of waiting for her decision on remarriage is exceedingly flattering. As for the suitors' alleged crime of consuming the estate's wealth, since they have been consuming it for three years, apparently they are only consuming as much meat and wine as the estate is capable of producing. Of course, they're still a useless lot of parasites who did none of the work on Odysseus' estate, and only consumed what they did not produce, so they surely deserved to die. But—by this logic, *Odysseus deserves the same fate*.

Oh, and what about the fact that the suitors tried to ambush and kill Telemachus on the sea? It's simply not a plausible story. They could easily have overpowered the boy on land and done so whenever they wished. Bah! So much nonsense defies explanation. Whatever the original Greek epics were, they are not Homer's.

### A Plea of Innocence

Finally, our imperial Homer, whoever he was, pleads innocence in his own epics. Traditionally considered a blind poet, Homer is represented in his *Iliad* by the blind Phakiaian singer Demodokos. Poor Demodokos sings about Odysseus in return for food and drink—in return for life. That was Homer's life, too. What would have happened to Demodokos/Homer if he refused to sing and impress his masters? Death and starvation.

*The Odyssey* makes Homer's plea of innocence even clearer as Telemachus pleads for the lives of Phemios, the court singer, and Medon, the court herald. Homer tells us that Phemios had sung for the suitors "under compulsion," and Phemios is quoted as saying he served the suitors against his will—which is precisely the story of every genius who has ever been forced to "sing" the values of imperialism. As for Medon, the court herald, he only escaped death by disguising himself as an ox—a rather implausible claim that makes perfect sense as a metaphor for someone who only survives by appearing to be what the powerful wish him to be.

And you and I, shall we exonerate and spare Homer? Perhaps we should; but we should not spare his works.

### The Dictators

The last question in literature, though perhaps it should be the first, is why? Why was it written? What function could these forged, adulterated epics have served? Perhaps, initially they were pure Greek epics, but they were later rewritten to serve as material for indoctrinating the Roman upper class. They may even have been rewritten again, to serve as material for indoctrinating the Roman Catholic upper class.

What was the upper class? Before the empire's conversion to Christianity, the upper class consisted of the equestrian, senatorial and patrician sub-classes; however, after the conversion to Christianity, all traces of a republican government disappeared, the senatorial class vanished, and its role was assumed by Christian clergy who functioned as a holy puppet oligarchy. As for the patrician class, its composition may have changed, but its role as a conspiring, secretly controlling class of puppet-masters remained.

Centuries before bishops won the right to elect their popes, popes and other positions in the Church hierarchy were filled by the Pope, who was almost always a representative of the old patrician class. This Christianized patrician class controlled the Church much as their predecessors controlled the senate and the Acropolis, it likely owned nearly all the rent-earning land in the empire's cities, and it continued to control the state religion. This class commissioned Homer's epics as well as numerous other "Greek" and Roman classics, and designed them to function as material useful for indoctrinating upper class youth into the values that would profit it and especially the elite of the elite, the patrician class.

I don't consider this theory of purpose any more far-fetched than the *fact* that textbooks in modern nations do not express regrets about any wars, do not warn students against greed and materialism, avoid telling all the shameful horrors committed by their nation's pioneers and founders, promote scientific theories and practices that perpetuate imperialism, encourage students to whitewash the Bible and Shakespeare, and—finally—encourage students to focus on the clever symbols and themes of modern literature instead of teaching them to hear and feel the relevance of its anti-imperial outcry.

#### FOUR CONCLUSIONS

1. Homer's works reflect imperial values and were meant as propaganda.
2. Homer's works are Roman forgeries dating to the end of the Roman Republic, after Rome had pillaged Greece and destroyed or looted its cultural heritage; in fact, very little of the literature that we consider works of Greek antiquity are authentic.
3. Homer's works reflect a religious or theocratic bias, apparently a Roman theocratic bias. This is suggested by evidence that early Judeo-Christian notions are mocked by Homer, and by evidence that the texts value theocratic power over aristocratic power.
4. Everything in Homer is marked by Roman Catholic contempt for both Greek pagan and Greek Christian culture. This contempt was expressed in the true imperial spirit, utterly lacking in expressive freedom, full of slyness and secrecy born of cowardice that few readers have ever detected it.

#### SAPPHO AND PINDARUS

I have perused the lyric poets. I have sniffed their hors d'oeuvres. Well, sadly I detect nothing suspicious in them. Regarding the words attributed to the Greek lyric poet Sappho, so few verses have survived that the criminals effectively erased him. But Pindarus is quite another story. Whether he actually existed or not, the verses attributed to him are so mangled as to be meaningless. In effect, both Sappho and Pindarus do not exist.

## EPISTOLARIA

History can be quite mysterious. According to the ‘surviving’ Greek texts, the Greeks wrote their literary ‘masterpieces’ between as early as 800 BC and 200 BC, ending with the first conquest of Greece by the Romans. This is understandable, since Rome would not have allowed Greeks to produce writings on the most significant aspect of their lives, their subjugation to Rome. After their defeat, Greeks seem to have written no literature: not plays, poems or epics, but a few Greek historians wrote books flattering their Roman conquerors, and Arrian wrote a very unflattering portrait of the ancient Greek conqueror, Alexander the Great. Besides this, the fallen Greeks only wrote treatises on medicine and mathematics while they turned philosophy into the cold, pro-imperial doctrine we call Stoicism. Is this plausible? Did the rage at being repeatedly violated and humiliated by Rome inspire not one literate Greek to express his outrage in poetry, drama, or any other genre? Of course it’s not plausible, and everything ‘Greek’ is either a Roman forgery or a pathetic capitulation to Roman power.

But then, oh then—hoorah!—quite magically, a few literate Greeks began writing cold, calculating, passionless *Christian* trash! Read them and you’ll find no passion in the early Greek ‘fathers’ of the Christian Church. And this is shocking, since at the time Christians were violently persecuted—again, by Rome.

Let us examine a passage by Athenagoras, a possible Neoplatonist and a definite Christian apologist who lived, allegedly, from 133-190 AD. The following passage comes from his letter pleading for Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus to show tolerance towards Christians. However, the letter is a forgery crammed with slanderous lies about Greece.

In your empire, greatest of sovereigns, different nations have different customs and laws; and no one is hindered by law or fear of punishment from following his ancestral traditions, however ridiculous these may be. A citizen of Ilium [ancient Greece] calls Hector a god, and pays divine honours to Helen, taking her for Adrasteia. The Lacedaemonian [Greece] venerates Agamemnon as Zeus, and Phylonoe the daughter of Tyndarus ... The Athenian sacrifices to Erechtheus as Poseidon. The Athenians also perform religious rites and celebrate mysteries in honour of Agraulus and Pandrosus, women who were deemed guilty of impiety for opening the box. In short, among every nation and people, men offer whatever sacrifices and celebrate whatever mysteries they please.

None of this is true. No archeological evidence can be found to support these charges. The author has employed all his imagination in inventing shameful religions and then made the false claim that they were practiced in Greece. As for Rome’s legendary tolerance towards foreign religions, this is likely true, because pre-Christian Rome was not ruled by a gang of religious zealots.

In Athenagoras’ silly little defense of resurrection, he does not fail to shame the Greeks by speaking of some of horrible myths alleged to be theirs, but he fails to remember that Euripides had written a play in which Heracles resurrects the dead. Well, isn’t that a strange oversight? Sometimes liars have to be selective about their lies.

Much more could be written about the Christian Greeks, but someone else can have the glory.

## MEDICINE

### THE HIPPOCRATIC HOAX: THE CORRUPT ORIGINS OF WESTERN MEDICINE

Now, as we are in the midst of [the greatest medical hoax](#) ever [perpetrated on humanity](#), perhaps it's time to look at the origins of western, allopathic medicine and its dependence on Knife (saw, scalpel, laser), Fire (to cauterize or irradiate) and Poison (alchemy, pharmaceuticals, chemo, etc.).

Now that fatal medical errors—aka medical malpractice—officially cost hundreds of thousands of lives annually in the U.S., perhaps the time has come to look at the origins of modern, western medicine.

Now that the wondrous tree of modern civilization produces millions of cancer and other chronic disease patients annually, *perhaps* we should examine just one of the roots of the world's dominant medical system: western medicine.

As we presently live in the Corona-Drama, I really should examine germ theory, the foundation of the present 'drama,' but the unscientific basis of germ theory has already been exposed by Dr. Stefan Lanka, [Dr Zach Bush](#), [Dr. Andrew Kaufman](#), Arthur Firstenberg and, doubtlessly, others. They analyzed the history and 'evidence' for germ theory, especially as it applies to viruses, and they poured over the data, medical journals and letters of the people involved in establishing, promoting and criticizing germ theory. So, that work is done. Germ theory and Louis Pasteur are frauds.

What about the books attributed to the founding father of modern western medicine: Hippocrates? Are they, perhaps, also frauds? Wouldn't that be funny—and appropriate? Aren't [the unhealthy hypocrites](#) who call themselves doctors and [don't take their own medicine](#) *hypocrites*? but who generally only know how to suppress symptoms, who still can't make healthy patients, and who are still blindly prescribing non-cures for cancer, diabetes, autism and diverse other diseases and disorders—imagine if those medical hypocrites were simply following in the footsteps of the greatest hypocrite of all, the man bearing the name of their own hypocritical condition, Hippocrates?

Ironically, the Hippocratic oath, sworn by all modern doctors in the West, was *allegedly* named after Hippocrates. This is ironic for the same reason that Americans believe their wealthy, [elitist founding fathers endorsed democracy](#). Yes, it is ironic because Hippocrates had no interest in promoting human health.

How dare I make such an outrageous claim? Hippocrates was an ancient Greek whose genius has been verified repeatedly, over the centuries, by numerous certified experts and scholars! Actually, proving that Hippocrates existed is possibly more futile than trying to determine the historical facts about that other legendary healer, Jesus. Hippocrates' body is gone. No tomb even claims to hold his remains. But approximately 70 texts are attributed to him. So, he surely existed, right? Actually, scholars have already determined that the 70 odd texts bearing his name are *forgeries*—well, that's my word choice, not

theirs; still, they do state that those texts were written by possibly [19 different authors](#). This seems like good evidence for treating Hippocrates as a myth, but don't tell our scholars that. They continue to believe that Hippocrates was a Greek who lived 2400 years ago and that he was a revolutionary in his field.

Plato and Aristotle are the only pre-Christian authors I know who referred to Hippocrates, but their origins are dubious, too, as I've demonstrated in my still unfinished *Counterfeit Classics I*. Plato, Aristotle and Hippocrates are pseudonyms for state-sponsored propagandists. If this seems outlandish, please consider that our own media is highly compromised and corrupted, and our [“Mockingbird” media is controlled by the CIA](#).

As is true of most classical and medical texts, the name *Hippocrates* was concocted as a pseudonym, but why would the creators choose a name that so closely resembles the word *hypocrisy*? Were the real authors cynical mockers of the masses? For that matter, the western symbol of medicine, the [Caduceus](#), seems equally cynical and sneering, as snakes are generally not sources of healing, and many species of snakes inject poison into their victims. And just in case you think this evidence of cynical mockery in the origins of western medicine proves that we have since then evolved into honest and kind people, consider that the data analysis company [Ipsos Mori](#) bears a Latin name that translates into English as *They Die*.

But, enough of this preamble. Let's *analyze* the writings attributed to Hippocrates.

### Against Ancient Medicine

If the works of Hippocrates are well over two thousand years old, why do they never recommend the most common cures of the time: herbal cures? In fact, in his work *On Ancient Medicine*, Hippocrates explicitly *dismisses* the healthfulness of traditional herbal medicines and raw foods. In their place he recommends “gentler” foods—namely wheat and barley. Really, *gentler*? This bizarre and *unhealthy* bias for grains is not unique to Hippocrates; it was already identified in the Bible, a Catholic forgery.

In *On Ancient Medicine*, Hippocrates exhibits his bias by dismissing, in one sweeping generalization, all the medicinal knowledge of our ancestors. How? He draws a distinction between the superstition-based false medicines of the past, and the knowledge-based effective medicines that he recommends. While superstition plays a major role in the ‘remedies’ of early imperial medical practices—as is evident in traditional Chinese and medieval European medicine, the remedies of indigenous folk are always tried and tested over generations, which means their remedies were tried and tested through an informal and yet scientific method.

So, when Hippocrates dismisses all medicines of the past, he rejects knowledge and claims to represent knowledge, though, in fact, he does not conduct any trials to prove the efficacy of his recommended medicines.

The third paragraph of *On Ancient Medicine* introduces the *absurd hypothesis* that human illnesses first arose because the earliest human diet consisted of raw organic food. This diet he calls a “strong and brutish diet,” and—he argues—it caused our illnesses, and in response we humans had to create a new and milder diet, a diet that, judging from *his* words, consists of wheat and barley. To my knowledge, these two grains have not provided humanity with superior health; on the contrary, they've provided inferior health.

But, don't wait for the media to admit this; they will not risk losing the support of Big Ag.

Why did Hippocrates promote foods that must be cooked and that humans are not evolved to digest? Why—because grains form the foundation of almost every empire. They deliver calories to workers, but they slowly degrade their health by providing too [little nutrition, too many toxins](#) and excessive labor. Grain-based cultures, like Christian holy-bread culture, always spell death for forests and for their indigenous peoples. Grain-based agriculture, especially in temperate regions, [is not even sustainable](#).

### Against Gardens

Incredibly, Hippocrates associates gardens with illness. He informs us that the man “who lived in Dealce's Garden” (*Of Epidemics*) suffered an illness that ended in “a perfect crisis,” a vague phrase that might mean the patient died. The same man's wife died after an illness lasting 21 days. Since, to my knowledge, this is the only time a garden is mentioned in all of Hippo's writings, I suspect *he intentionally associated gardens with illness to help promote pro-imperial, pro-open-field and grain-based agriculture*.

Hippocrates effectively claims that imperialism is the source of our health and that bread is medicine. Modern bread and pasta marketers will agree, but science has begun to sound the alarm about the environmental, social and [physiological dangers of grain-based diets](#).

Furthermore, to persuade us that strong foods like fruit, vegetables, herbs and raw foods cause illness, Hippocrates claims that weak foods are healthier, and that soup, which consists of vegetables weakened by boiling, is better for sick people because soup is easily digested. It is certainly more easily digested, but that proves nothing. Walking is easier when done downhill, but that does not prove it's healthier. And yet, the father of western medicine claims that all “strong” foods are bad for human beings—even if we are healthy!

What motivation did Hippocrates have for his pro-grain, anti-garden bias? Money and power? I can grow enough zucchinis, squash and potatoes to feed myself, but no man can or would want to grow and process enough grains to provide for the bulk of his calories. Growing and processing grains into bread is such an energy intensive practice that it virtually necessitates slavery, plantation-style farming using ‘volunteers’—as had been practiced by the Catholic Church, or mechanization. In other words, grain products can only be produced in a hierarchical world where some have much and many are poor. This phenomenon bears comparison to what has happened to cannabis. This easily grown medicinal plant was made illegal because it was too cheap, so capitalists promoted their expensive laboratory-made medicines instead.

Hippocrates, like a good imperialist stooge, dismisses indigenous cultures and promotes dependency on imperial agriculture and non-sustainability. Paragraph seven in *On Epidemics* continues to push his agenda by claiming that an ancient physician “found out and prepared for all mankind that kind of food which we all now use, in place of the former savage and brutish mode of living.” What “ancient physician”? Why not provide a name? Why this mystical nonsense? No physician “prepared for all mankind” any kind of food to keep mankind healthy; but Hippocrates' bizarre claim echoes the bizarre

Christian superstition that Jesus is a sort of physician whose “holy” bread is medicine for the soul, if not for the body, too. And the claim that “we all now use” the same kind of food is suspicious. Hippocrates contrasts this food “we all now use” to foods humans cannot digest, so his magic food is probably grain-based breads. This would explain why he used the word *now*—for that suggests his magic food is relatively new, and that also agrees with my interpretation, since for many ancient Greeks, grain-based breads would have been a new kind of food.

Paragraph eight adds another food group to Hippocrates’ list of healthful foods: meat. “Bread and flesh” are considered “Articles which prove beneficial to healthy persons,” and he argues that whatever is good for healthy persons is medicine for sick persons; only the quantity must be adjusted. Again, science is starting to reveal the environmental, sociological and [physiological](#) dangers of meat consumption.

In paragraph eight, Hippocrates warns that unskilled physicians are frauds for whom “punishment is not far off.” Isn’t that reminiscent of how, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Rockefeller funded American Medical Association discredited and made illegal traditional medicines?

## The Good Empire

[On the Sacred Disease](#) is Hippocrates’ treatise on mental diseases. It explicitly rejects the belief that the Greek gods are responsible for mental diseases and insists that such diseases are hereditary and may be caused by excessive humidity and “cold, sun, and wind.” Isn’t it nice to blame Mother Nature? And, isn’t this shockingly *modern*? Aren’t we, too, in the habit of blaming heredity, or genetics, and not Nature’s climate but her animals like swine, birds, bats, mad cows and monkeys *for our diseases*?

The patient’s living conditions and lifestyle, which are often created for the masses by the ruling class, are never blamed. Like Sigmund *Fraud*, Hippocrates ignored the fact that mental diseases are commonly triggered by the economic and political factors that cause domestic abuse. Of course, the good imperialist doctor must ignore these causes of madness, for his job was to whitewash civilization.

Hippocrates’ definition of a healthy brain is also revealing. Apparently, a healthy brain is a brain that is “at rest.” Well, isn’t that what your rulers want you to think?

As long as the brain is at rest, the man enjoys his reason, but the depravement of the brain arises from phlegm and bile, either of which you may recognize in this manner: Those who are mad from phlegm are quiet, and do not cry out nor make a noise; but those from bile are vociferous, malignant, and will not be quiet, but are always doing something improper. If the madness be constant, these are the causes thereof. But if terrors and fears assail, they are connected with derangement of the brain, and derangement is owing to its being heated.

Can anyone honestly respect this blatantly unscientific, unproveable *bullshit*? Isn’t it obvious that this was written to make people mad, that is, ignorant?

Lastly, the sixth paragraph implies the entire text was written after the Renaissance, *after* European physicians launched the madness of vivisection and mapped all the internal organs and tissues of the human body. Since vivisection was not part of Greek

culture, and no evidence exists for it outside of dubious texts, the works of Hippocrates likely date to the Christian Era.

### Wine Is Medicine

Hippocrates is a quack. He constantly prescribes wine as a cure for everything. Wine is his panacea. But *why* wine? Is this preference more evidence of a Christian bias—since wine, for Christians, not only represents the blood of Christ but, [for the Church, wine was a source of income?](#)

In *On Ulcers*, Hippocrates writes in his first sentence, “We must avoid wetting all sorts of ulcers except with wine”. In modern times, the wine industry has worked hard to muddle the science around alcohol; however, in the final analysis, [alcohol remains deadly to cells.](#)

In *Aphoristic Sentences*, Hippocrates offers a prescription for women trying to fix their uterus: “bathe in hot wine.” A whole bath full of hot wine? This sounds like a prescription to spend and party excessively. Yet, this was prescribed by the father of modern medicine?

Hippocrates’ other favorite medicines included salt, honey, minerals such as alum and verdigris as well as expensive, imported *foreign* herbs and spices. This is a *profitable* list. None of his preferred substances were available to the common Greek. Like wine, they had to be purchased—but that, of course, was the whole point.

### Water Is Poisonous

One of the more glaringly insane claims posited by the good Hippocrates is that water—especially precipitated water, or rain—is not healthy for us. According to him, the healthiest part of water remains up in the Heavens, perhaps in vapor form, while the heavy and unhealthy part forms rain, snow, hail, and everything in between. As for drinking fresh water from running rivers, or river-fed lakes, this he maintains causes *men* to suffer from stones and “diseases of the kidneys, strangury, sciatica” (*On Airs, Waters and Places*).

Why did Hippocrates make such blatantly absurd and erroneous assertions? Was he simply doing the best he could while science was still in its infancy? But why would he warn against using a resource that humans and other animals have evolved to consume? Why blame diseases on water instead of on the diet humans were not evolved to eat?

Money? Impossible? Even 500 years ago, clean water was easily accessible and free, so no one could profit from its sale. Did Hippocrates recommend something more expensive than water for health? He recommended [wine](#). Why wine? The Catholic Church and wealthy landowners profited from the wine market.

Now, our wines are not only alcoholic, and therefore cytotoxic, but they are contaminated with pesticides and herbicides—but that does not stop the wine industry for promoting the imagined health benefits of wine consumption. And, alcoholic beverage producers, like GMO producers, are [exempt from disclosing their ingredients](#) on their labels. But, I’m sure if he were alive today, Hippocrates would still claim that that wine is medicine.

As for water, so much of the Earth's surface water has been [polluted](#) by people that clean water is mostly only available from springs and wells, so most people are paying for public tap or corporate bottled water. It's a capitalists' dream come true.

### Misogynist and Sadist

Hippocrates' misogyny is another Catholic echo. The misogynistic *disease* is evident from Hippocrates' habit of prescribing horrid medicines and treatments for women. In *On Ulcers*, he recommends that women bathe not in warm wine but in "hot" wine, but just how hot he conveniently avoids saying.

Was Hippocrates a misogynistic sadist? The above prescription was made as a curative for a descended or prolapsed uterus. Such a uterus is exposed and extremely sensitive to any heat, so a bath in hot wine sounds like a prescription for torture.

Elsewhere, while dismissing the medicinal properties of garlic and onions, he recommends a trick in which garlic be used to determine if "pregnancy [or birth?] has taken place." To make this trick work, a "boiled clove of garlic" must be placed "in the vagina for an hour." Again, garlic is a very strong and pungent herb, especially if not boiled long enough, so placing it inside a sensitive part could be highly unpleasant, if not for the woman then for her lover.

In his tract on [hemorrhoids](#), Hippocrates recommends cauterizing or burning the extended tissue off the anus and he seems to think it's normal for hemorrhoidal tissue to spurt blood "when the anus is forced out." *Forced* out? What kind of force does he recommend? Another method for curing hemorrhoids with fire and heat is to shove a reed into the anus and then shove a "red hot iron" down it.

In the last paragraph, Hippocrates addresses woman's hemorrhoids, as if they were qualitatively different from a man's hemorrhoids. The cure he recommends for women appears designed to either fail or poison the patient: he recommends a suppository made of strong herbs (he doesn't identify them. Thanks, Hippocrates), litharge (good for lead poisoning), tamarisk powder (has no medicinal properties), galls (very rare and of dubious usefulness), white wine (of course), and oil and goose grease for lubricant.

So, he generously prescribes putting herbs in vaginas and anuses instead of in our mouths. What, precisely, was his agenda?

### Against Masturbation

In *On Airs, Waters, and Places*, Hippocrates claims that one reason women suffer from fewer kidney and ureteral stones is that they "do not rub their genitals with their hands" (para. 9). So there you have it: if you masturbate, you will go blind—I mean *suffer from stones*. Coincidentally, the Bible speaks against masturbation and claims, without proof, that [masturbation upsets God](#), especially if you use your right hand. Like the Hippocratic corpus, the Bible does not promote *love*-making for its mental and physical health benefits. Neither corpus is interested in health or—for that matter—happiness.

## North-South and West-East Biases

Incredibly, our iconic physician also suffered from the North-South bias, the same bias that still dominates the global economy. Even the north wind is better than the south wind: the north wind “is the most wholesome of the winds, but the effects of the south are the very reverse” (*On the Sacred Disease*). Also, somehow, springs that face south are the worst springs of all (*On Airs, Waters, and Places*, 7).

Heat, ever associated with the south, is blamed for many ailments. Hippocrates has no qualms making such absurd meteorological-medical claims as this, “If the summer and the autumn be rainy and southerly, the winter will be unhealthy.” Somehow, he didn’t understand the many dangers of northerly living: pneumonia (cold-related), vitamin D deficiency (lack of sunlight in winter), and scurvy (short growing season leads to lack of fresh fruit and vegetables in winter).

However, instead of recommending a life in the south or tropics, Hippocrates speaks well of cities that “lie to the rising sun” because their inhabitants are “well colored and blooming,” and their “women are very prolific, and have easy deliveries” (*On Airs, Waters... 5*). That is an odd recommendation. Was he, perhaps, giving the nod to the African slave trade?

Hippocrates’ bias against the south is so strong that he even begins *Of the Epidemics* by blaming the south, or southerly winds, for plagues. Well, centuries later, and we are still playing the blame game. Viruses are commonly blamed on southern as well as eastern peoples and their animals. Remember the ‘Spanish’ flu, Mexico’s swine flu, Africa’s Ebola, and now—allegedly—China’s coronavirus? Yes, the East is also evil.

Hippocrates’ western bias is on display in *On Airs, Waters and Places*. There, without scientific basis—no basis except prejudice—he, [echoing Aristotle](#), argues that because Asia, or the parts of interest to him—is warmer, its people must be “less active and more effeminate.” A little later he adds that Asians “possess neither vigor nor courage, and are less suited for war than Europeans.” Why is our good doctor interested in war and why do his writings seem to encourage western men to think they can walk over Asia? At the very least, Hippocrates has betrayed his physician’s duty to protect health and life.

Hippocrates’ mental disease—that of racism—is on full display in the same text. There, he absurdly claims that Europeans have bigger brains because they have longer heads. He even asks us to believe—again without scientific or even textual evidence—he argues that Europeans have longer heads because their ancestors squeezed the heads of their children. Well, I am a long-headed man, but I reap no benefit from it and suspect it is partly [a consequence of eating over-cooked and processed foods](#) during my youth. But that’s just a wild guess.

## Final Diagnosis and Prescription

In *On the Creation of Man* and elsewhere, Hippocrates boldly displays his anti-Greek-gods bias. First, he argues that the Greek gods are not responsible for causing diseases. This sounds scientific *if we assume that real Greeks echoed Homer and actually blamed their gods for causing diseases and, like Homer, saw no reason to credit them with healing powers*. But this blasphemous attitude is highly unlikely in any historical population.

Another reason we should question Hippocrates' authenticity is that he never credits or invokes Apollo, the god of medicine. Only his one-page Hippocratic Oath invokes Apollo; nothing else. That makes me wonder, was the author Greek?

In *Of Epidemics* (3<sup>rd</sup> sec.; 3<sup>rd</sup> year), Hippocrates suggests that the Greek gods do not heal or are guilty of causing diseases. He casually notes that a man who lived near the temple of Hercules died of a disease. A few pages later he mentions that Melidia suffered from an excruciating disease and "lived by the temple of Juno." Isn't that curious? Why didn't Hercules and Juno help their believers? Half a page later, we learn that someone suffered from an abominable disease while "he lived by the temple of the Earth." In case we did not understand, a few pages later, we learn that a temple was filled with the victims of a plague—not a word about them being cured. Next, we learn that Parion, "who lived above the temple of Diana," was ill for 120 days before perishing. Sounds to me like these pagan or heathen temples are accursed—and that's precisely how it was *supposed* to sound. The writings of Hippocrates were not written to discredit the Greek religion and the vast body of indigenous medicinal knowledge. Why? Was the author, perhaps, interested in promoting Jesus, the legendary healer of Christianity, or in preventing Christians from seeking medical wisdom in ancient traditions?

Presently, I am a prophet gibbering in the wilderness. More decorated experts have not diagnosed the Hippocratic corpus as *medical propaganda* written centuries after Hippocrates allegedly lived. Their failure to make this diagnosis is understandable. They would rather not admit they spent years believing in lies.

In conclusion, the diagnosis is clear: Hippocrates, or rather the writings attributed to him, are fraudulent, racist, sexist, dangerous, probably Catholic, certainly cynical and malevolent. But this shouldn't surprise us. The [modern medical research](#) field is rife with fraud; thus, we harvest the fruit of the Hippocratic root.

My prescription? Avoid propaganda and immerse yourself in truth, humor and beauty.

## CONCLUSIONS

Cassandra, the prophetess who dared to speak out, should have her own religion; she doesn't because ancient Greece had no market for truth. Socrates should have examined the crimes of the empire he lived in, but he didn't, for he was a sheep. Jesus should have denounced the crimes of the Roman Empire, but he didn't, but more on that later. In our time, people are more likely to blow the whistle, but often enough they are still assassinated, framed, jailed or fired. But why bother dreaming of change? What did Nietzsche say about cities? Did he say, "Get your picket signs, nooses, boycotts, hunger strikes and guillotines and have yourselves a merry revolution? No, I believe he said something more along the lines of "Where one can no longer love one should—*have an exit strategy*" (*Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Of Passing By).

The Greek classics are medieval forgeries designed to brainwash young nobles who went to Rome and to the Church's many cathedral schools and monasteries for their education.

*The works of Hesiod* serve to promote the imperial values of war and violence but also serve to reduce the Greek gods to a brutish gang of thugs with no interest in humanity, and whose leader, Zeus, persecuted the one hero (Prometheus), who wished to help humanity. In addition, his *Works and Days* promotes the agrarian lifestyle on which the Church had founded its empire. In short, Hesiod's works are designed to promote the Church's interests.

*The Oedipus trilogy* consistently and strongly argues that the authority of the gods and their priests and prophets overrules the authority of kings. The entire trilogy appears designed to promote the primacy of religious authority over secular, monarchic authority. Such literature could not have been created or staged in ancient Greece, where religion and government largely worked in harmony and playwrights would not have dared to portray kings as such cruel and craven people while portraying Tiresias the prophet as an brave and utterly infallible servant of the gods. However, in medieval Europe, the conditions for writing such biased trash did exist. There religious and secular authorities were in conflict, as Rome was in conflict with nearly every secular ruler and was desperate to maintain its authority over them.

*Homer's works* are crypto-Christian allegories stuffed full of Christian, theocratic biases. Like the Oedipus trilogy, they present kings as bickering and reckless leaders, they present the Greek gods as a bunch of unreliable and juvenile oafs, and yet they construct a world in which the gods and their priests and holy laws are more powerful and have more authority than kings and warriors. The Vatican must have loved it.

*Plato's works* turn philosophy into pseudo-religious, metaphysical nonsense well-suited to keeping impressionable young minds agreeable to a religious elite. His ideal world is ruled by so-called philosopher kings—although they would really be priest-kings.

*Hippocrates' works* turn traditional Greek medicine and physiology into something designed to degrade the Greek religion while profiting the Catholic Church and its partners—the wealthy merchants who controlled the spice trade and the landed gentry who controlled the mining industry. His frequent recommendation of grain-based diets and his frequent prescriptions of wine and vinegar were obviously designed to profit the Church. And, his frequent recommendations to use rare spices and minerals are designed to profit merchants and aristocratic land owners—two the categories of the rich who essentially funded the Church and without whom the medieval Church could not have existed.

*Aristotle's works*, like's Plato's, consistently promote the values of the ruling elite, and unlike Plato's works, the Aristotelean works help turn science into a ridiculous hodgepodge of metaphysical absurdities. By turning science into metaphysics, the Church hoped to protect its monopoly on 'truth.'

*Euripides and Aristophanes' works* make a mockery of Greek religion and philosophy, and so are perfectly designed to shepherd European students away from the ancient Greek and Roman cultures—cultures that remained popular among Europe's elites well into the Middle Ages.

\*

How convenient and wonderful—for the Roman Catholic Church—that the Greek classics *never* portray Greek gods doing anything except acts of evil and acts that demonstrate support for imperialism. Armed with this library of fraud, the Church’s teachers could say to their impressionable students, “Now, isn’t it wonderful that today we have the love and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, instead of raping and plaguing the innocent, healed them, fed them, and bravely sacrificed his life for them?”

Secondly, armed with this library of fraud, the Church’s teachers could defend its own support for slavery, classism, sexism, expansionist wars, and so on, by saying to its students, “Look, even the Greek philosophers and poets, those icons of wisdom, support us, so why do you question us?”

\*

Another damning bit of evidence that we are dealing with a gigantic conspiracy masterminded by priests: not one of the classics portrays a single male priest or male prophet in a negative light. Instead, the wrath of the ‘Greek’ dramatists is always and entirely directed towards women, the Greek gods and royalty; *they* are repeatedly and consistently portrayed as violent, fallible, corrupt, impious and egotistical monsters. Why this discriminatory view? Are we to believe that Greek women, gods and rulers had a monopoly on evil, and that the Greek priests were innocent? That is impossible. Greek priests most certainly worked hand in hand with their rulers and fabricated oracles for them—oracles that always supported their policies and decisions. That is the universal pattern in every empire, the Greek included.

\*

A good reader might ask, if the original or *authentic* Platonic and Neoplatonic texts existed, why would a Christian zealot like Justinian I ban them in the 6<sup>th</sup> century? Since the texts we do know are harmless, boring and un-revolutionary, we must ask, were the authentic texts revolutionary and dangerous for Christian rulers? Were entire libraries of authentic Greek texts works that praised and promoted the gods, the rites and rituals and the military and political leaders of ancient Greece? Very likely they did and so they had to be destroyed by the representatives of a new, more powerful empire. Or, perhaps the Romans considered them harmless, and --- they were forgotten until an age of Christian intolerance forced Christian authorities to prevent those

defiled, corrupted and transformed in secret scriptoria?

If Justinian commissioned a massive revising and shortening of Roman law books, did he do the same to Greek literature or did the crime happen much later, or slowly, over centuries?

\*

Regardless of who and when the crime was committed, in any good court case, to prove guilt the prosecution should prove that the accused party had a profitable cause for committing the crime. So, if medieval Roman Catholics revised the stolen Greek classics, how would that profit them? If the ancient Greek religion no longer posed a threat to the dominance of Christianity, why would the Church of Rome seek to destroy and revise those classics to better reflect Christian teachings?

Well, perhaps the Greek and Roman pagan religions did compete with Christianity by Justinian's time, but there's another, more plausible motivation for creating a whole library of fraud. We know that during the Middle Ages Greek texts continued to dominate medieval education in Europe, but what if Greece, and specifically Constantinople, *forbade the sharing of its texts (textbooks) so that it monopolized education, forcing Western nobles to travel to Greece and pay for a kind of boarding-school education? Then Rome's inexorable greed for power and money would have motivated it to destroy the heart of Greece's education industry and to quickly revise the stolen texts to better reflect Catholic teaching and ensure that young nobles grow up to be faithful and paying Catholics?* Money talks, and money also kills, burns, and corrupts.

\*

Although I've exposed only a few Greek classics, we shouldn't be surprised at the implication that all the Greek classics, along with Constantinople's libraries, were destroyed. We shouldn't be surprised because today libraries are again being 'burned' and disappeared for money. The West tried to silence the teachings of Karl Marx and his fellow communists.

Recently Canada's government has begun closing scientific libraries and silencing scientists *because this government wants to continue exploiting the toxic Tar Sands for profit.* And Canadian media outlets are as silent about the BIS banking racket as the American media is about the financial cartel that calls itself the FED. In whatever country one goes to, the same crimes are the norm: truth is constantly being silenced and twisted for profit.

## Before and After

What is the difference between Roman imperial expansion and American corporate expansion? In the first place, fewer civilians were killed in Roman wars, not only because in antiquity armies fought in open combat, but because swords are more accurate than American bombs. American wars are also made worse by a military-industrial complex that profits enormously whenever someone explodes their non-reusable bombs (swords are very durable, so there was little money to be made in their production.). These are some differences.

Both the Roman and American empires were admired by foreigners living in worse conditions than those offered by those empires. As America does today, Rome was admired because it represented superiority in weaponry, architecture, agriculture, road building, entertainment, literature and legislation. Plus, thanks to Rome's control over Mediterranean trade, it beguiled other parts of Europe because it represented access to foreign material luxuries. Additionally, Rome had a reputation for providing a more democratic form of government, and, more importantly, higher living standards and more upward economic mobility, both points that—however illusory—made Rome extremely enticing and seductive. In short, the Roman Republic and Empire would have been viewed by naïve foreign peasants as the U.S. was during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries: as a beacon of liberty, opportunity and prosperity.

In conclusion, it's a mistake to think foreign peasants unanimously hated Rome and resisted the expansionist campaigns of Julius Caesar and others like him. For the most part, only wealthy foreign kings and feudal lords would have resisted Rome, since they would have feared becoming redundant. Rome's appeal to the masses would have continued *despite* the fact that some ethnic groups (some Slavic populations) were exploited and enslaved by the empire, and *despite* the fact that the empire ruined traditional lifestyles and traditional agriculture, and *despite* the fact that the Roman elite regularly defrauded its own people and committed atrocities abroad. But this should not surprise us, for the same madness continues today with respect to the U.S. and other beacons of "civilization."

However, despite all the parallels I have drawn, modern beacons of "civilization" are extremely unlike classical Roman "civilization". Today's elite and today's well off are more human and more humane. They are still greedy and ruthless, but they are more likely to hide the truth from themselves. Raping, pillaging and brutality are no longer honorable in war; we no longer plant rows of crucified corpses along roads to deter slaves and serfs from seeking liberty; we no longer cut the hands off petty thieves to deter them; instead, we put our sins away, out of sight, as far as possible, in prisons, and hope they change. Likewise, we do not exploit madmen in circuses; instead, we try to help them. Nor do we exploit the physically peculiar in circuses; instead, we try to integrate them

into society. These are signs of progress. But progress isn't linear. Sometimes society takes a step backwards; sometimes the elite sink even by their own standards, and retrogrades rise to power. You can hear them, these Blankfeins and Presidents, making claims we have not heard since Roman emperors deified themselves, claims otherwise only made by antique popes and other vestiges of the medieval elite, claims that reflect their belief that they are God's elect prophets and saviors *of the empire*.

How should we deal with the psychopaths who seek profit by trampling nature, dividing families and turning minds into ruins? Shall we put them in a circus? Shall we resurrect the guillotine? No, *we* are not retrogrades. I recommend we stop aiding and abetting the psychopaths, boycott their money-making schemes, emerge from the cloud of naïve dreams, occupy the Earth and let the one percent know that *this* belongs to everyone—except to the ones who destroy it.

