

The Ancient Socratic Tyrant,
And Our Modern Ideological
Version

Table of Contents:

THE ANCIENT SOCRATIC TYRANT, AND OUR MODERN IDEOLOGICAL VERSION ...	1
The Hierarchical Values (Loves) and Their Respective Lovers.....	3
The Spiritual Battle (Raging within Us All, Individually and Collectively) between Rationality and Emotionalism	8
Citizens are like their City-States, Societies, Rulers and Governments(and vice-versa).	11
The five Descending Dispositions, Mentalities or Spirits (and hence Kingdoms or States) of Men: Monarchy/Aristocracy, Timocracy, Oligarchy, Democracy and Tyranny	17
Timocracy: the Rule of Honor, Reputation, Popularity	22
Oligarchy: the Rule of Money, Property, Wealth, Greed.....	24
Democracy: the Rule of Pleasure, Hedonism, Sensuality, License, Equality and the Mob or Majority (of Sensualist Swine)	30
The (Socratic and Democratic) Genesis of the Tyrant.....	31
Tyranny: the Rule of Injustice, Coercion, Terror	36
The Tyrant's Rise as the Public's "Protector"	45
On the Public's "Protector" (from e.g. "Tyranny" or "Terror)	47
The Public Misery Which the Tyrant Brings.....	49
On the Tyrannical, "Communist" "jewish" State of Gentile/Public Misery.....	58
The Spiritual Genesis of the Tyrant: The (Socratic) Psychology of the Tyrant: an Abject Slave of his Tyrannical Desires, and hence the most Unhappy Man	60
The Ideological Tyrant: the Tyranny of the "Virtuous" Tyrant (who would perforce make us all "Virtuous" also); and Max's Spiritual, Mental or Intellectual History	74
Distinguishing the Ancient from the Modern Ideologue, the Socratic Philosopher-King from the Modern Tyrant	88
The Current World-Wide "Democratic" Tyranny of the Imperious and Peremptory "Liberator(s)"	90
The Great Amerikan "Liberation" Pretension.....	95
Surviving the Great(est?) god Man, Mankind or Humanity.....	100
Socratic Relevance to the Subversive, Satanic, anti-Christ or "jewish" "Protocols of Zion"	105
The Stages of "jewish" "Revolution"	106
Covert "jewish" Agents of (Gentile) Public Corruption	106
"Secret" "jewish" FreeMasonry.....	108
From Gentile (Political, Racial, Social) Unity to "jewish" Disunity, Decomposition, Fragmentation, Destabilization, Chaos, "Revolution" or Conquest.....	111
Mob Freedom or "Liberation" becomes Chaos, Violence, Revolution, Tyranny	113
The True Meaning or Definition of "jewish" "Freedom" or "Liberation" and "Equality"	121
"Jewish" Mass Murder, Extermination, Genocide or "Holocaust" of the "best of the Gentiles," or the Gentile "Aristocracy"	124

The Hierarchical Values (Loves) and Their Respective Lovers

For Socrates, the Athenian “philosopher” or “lover of wisdom” (470-399 B.C.), the highest things are thoughtful, spiritual or heavenly things—like truth, wisdom and virtue, and the lowest things are material, worldly, sensual—like sex and wine.

For Socrates, there are three classes of men: lovers of wisdom; lovers of victory and public acclaim (and hence of public office); and lovers of gain, property, money, (and of all the worldly and sensual things money can buy). And what can’t money buy? Happiness and fulfillment perhaps? Perhaps, but lack of money can certainly buy misery.

* * *

Socrates judged and arranged the loves, values, goods, rewards or pleasures of men in a natural hierarchy from highest to lowest—each with its corresponding type of man, life, people and government.

The better men (and hence kingdoms or states) love and hence seek the higher values, and the lower the lower.

The Socratic loves or values in descending order are: Truth (and hence the freedom to seek it and speak it); Honor (reputation or popularity); Money (property); and Sensuality or bodily Pleasure.

Truth, the best or highest value, is most beloved by the highest, most virtuous or best (“aristos”) man, by definition and etymology the “aristocrat.” Truth therefore best corresponds with this best man and his government of himself and of others, which is also the most happy, being based upon truth rather than falsehoods, lies, delusions or fantasies—(such as equality, sameness or interchangeability of individuals, races or nations). This state, kingdom or government of the “best” is monarchy/“aristo”cracy.

Then comes “timocracy”: the rule of honor, repute, reputation, popularity. This is the highest value here. The most popular man rules in such a state.

Then follows “oligarchy”: the “reign or rule of the [richest] few.” It is also called “plutocracy,” the “reign of money.” Money is the highest value or thing in such a state, and hence all the things and forms of sensuality (or sin) which money can buy.

Which state of affairs naturally degenerates into “democracy,” the “reign or rule of the people.” The highest value or thing in a “democracy” is the “demos,” the people. Their will is law. Their voice is god’s. “Vox populi, [=] vox Dei.” (And therefore let us pray.)

Which state of affairs further degenerates into the worst and most miserable possible form of government: “tyranny,” the reign of the tyrant.

* * *

But again, which of these four lovers (of truth, honor, money or sensuality) is happiest, or lives the most fulfilled or satisfying life?

(For is our personal happiness not our constant motivation and (selfish) criterion for everything we do or don’t do?—or for whatever we choose to do, or choose not to? Do we seek our beloved objects for their own sakes, or for ours? Isn’t all religion, philosophy, politics, or what-have-you based exclusively upon this selfish pursuit of happiness, satisfaction or paradise?—or, in other words, on the avoidance of unhappiness, misery, hell or Tartarus?)

From The Republic of Socrates (as recorded by his pupil, Plato, and as translated by B. Jowett), “book” 9, p. 580-82:

SOCRATES: Come then, I said, and as the general umpire in theatrical contests proclaims the result [“like the final judge in musical contests; you can give the deciding vote”—Rouse], do you also **decide who** in your opinion **is first in the scale of happiness, and who second, and in what order the others follow: there are five of**

them in all—they are the royal, timocratical, oligarchical, democratical, tyrannical.

GLAUCON: The decision will be easily given, he replied; they shall be choruses coming on the stage, and **I must judge them in the order** in which they enter [“come on the stage, like choruses,”—Rouse], by the criterion of virtue and vice, **happiness and misery.**

Need we hire a herald, or shall I announce, that the son of Ariston [the best] has decided that **the best and justest is also the happiest, and that this is he who is the most royal man and** [“who reigns”—Rouse] **king over himself; and that the worst and most unjust man is also the most miserable, and that this is he who being the greatest tyrant of himself is also the greatest tyrant of his State?**

[“Let’s hire a herald then,’ said I, ‘or I’ll do it myself. Oyez ! Mr. Bestmanson has judged as **Happiest** : the best and justest man, and that same **is the most wholly royal man who reigns king over himself.** And he has judged as **Most Miserable: the most wicked and unjust man,** and that same is he who, **most tyrannical** in himself, is most completely tyrant **over himself and over the city.**”—Rouse]

Make the proclamation yourself, he said.

And shall I add, “whether seen or unseen by gods men” [“**This holds good whether all earth and heaven know them to be such, or whether they do not?**”—Rouse]?

[This is Socrates’ answer to Callicles’ contention that to be popularly-perceived as just, is much more personally profitable and rewarding than to actually be just. To counter this argument, our philosopher needed to clarify the necessarily-inescapable and spiritual punishments of the unjust man, however popularly-perceived. Socrates needed to show that not all rewards and punishments are visible, extrinsic, political, social, but that some are invisible, intrinsic, psychological or spiritual. (See Gorgias)—Ed.]

GLAUCON: Let the words be added.

Then this, I said, will be our first proof [that the just man is more blessed, happy, fulfilled, rewarded, fortunate than the unjust—Ed.]; and there is another, which may also have some weight.

What is that?

The second proof is derived from the nature of the soul: seeing that **the individual soul, like the State, has been divided by us into three principles** [“parts”—Rouse; (reason, emotion or spirit, and sensuality)—Ed.], the division may, I think, furnish a new demonstration.

[“**Since just as the city,**’ said I, **has been divided into three classes** [of lovers: lovers of wisdom; of honor (fame, power); and of (sensual) pleasure, and hence of money—(which, by the way, can also purchase all power, authority, offices and thrones up for sale or public auction)—Ed.], **and thus also the soul of each person is divided into three parts, it seems to me the soul will provide a way for a second proof** [that the most just man is also the happiest, and vice-versa—Ed.].”—Rouse]

Of what nature?

It seems to me that **to these three principles three pleasures correspond; also three desires and governing powers.**

How do you mean? he said.

There is one principle with which, as we were saying, **a man learns, another with which he is angry; the third, having many forms, has no special name, but is denoted by the general term appetitive, from the extraordinary strength and vehemence of the desires of eating and drinking** [“and love making”—Rouse; (sex—Ed.)] **and the other sensual appetites which are the main elements of it; also money-loving, because such desires are generally satisfied** [“mostly through money.”—Rouse] **by the help of money.**

That is true, he said.

If we were to say that the loves and pleasures of this third part were concerned with gain, we should then be able to fall back on a single notion; and might truly and intelligibly describe this part of the soul as loving gain or money [“calling it the money-loving and gain-loving part?”—Rouse].

I agree with you.

Again, is not **the passionate element** [“the high-spirited part”—Rouse] **wholly set on ruling and conquering and getting fame?**

True.

Suppose we **call it the contentious or ambitious** [“victory-loving and honour-loving”—Rouse]—would the term be suitable?

Extremely suitable.

On the other hand, every one sees that **the principle of knowledge is wholly directed to the truth** [“the part we learn with...is always bent on knowing what the truth is in everything;”—Rouse], **and cares less than either of the others for gain or fame.**

Far less.

“Lover of wisdom” [“philosopher”—Ed.], **“lover of knowledge”** [“learning-loving and wisdom-loving”—Rouse], **are titles which we may fitly apply to that part of the soul?**

Certainly.

One principle prevails in the souls of one class of men, another in others, as may happen? [“Now,’ I went on, ‘sometimes one and sometimes another rules in the souls of men, just as it happens.’—Rouse]

Yes.

Then we may begin by assuming that **there are three classes of men—lovers of wisdom, lovers of honour** [“victory-loving”—Rouse], **lovers of gain?**

Exactly.

And **there are three kinds of pleasure, which are their several objects?** [“And so pleasures are also of three kinds, one belonging to each of these?”—Rouse]

Very true.

Now, if you examine the three classes of men, and ask of them in turn which of their lives is pleasantest, each will be found praising his own and depreciating that of others: the money-maker will contrast the vanity of honour or of learning if they bring no money with the solid advantages of gold and silver [“the money-maker, at any rate, will say that, compared with getting gain, the pleasure of honour or of learning is worth nothing at all, unless perhaps there is a bit of money in them.”—Rouse]?

True, he said.

And the lover of honour—what will be his opinion? Will he not think that the pleasure of riches is vulgar, while the pleasure of learning, if it brings no distinction, is all smoke and nonsense to him?

Very true.

And are we to suppose, I said, that the philosopher sets any value on other pleasures in comparison with the pleasure of knowing the truth [“as it is”—Rouse], **and in that pursuit abiding, ever learning, not so far indeed from the heaven of pleasure** [“from true pleasure”—Rouse]? **Does he not call the other pleasures [of money and honor—Ed.] necessary [(sic)—unnecessary (?)—Ed.], under the idea that if there were no necessity for them, he would rather not have them?**

There can be no doubt of that, he replied.

Since, then, the pleasures of each class and the life of each are in dispute, and the question is not which life is more or less honourable, or better or also

worse, but which is the more pleasant or painless—how shall we know who speaks truly?

[“Since there is dispute, then,’ I said, ‘about the pleasures of each class, and the life of each class, not only which leads to the most beautiful or ugly existence, or the better or worse, but which, indeed, is more pleasant and free from pain, how could we know which of them speaks truly?’—Rouse]

I cannot myself tell, he said.

Well, but **what ought to be the criterion? Is any better than experience and wisdom and reason?**

[“Well look at it this way. What must we judge by if we are to judge properly? Surely experience and intelligence and reason! Could one find a better standard than those?”—Rouse]

There cannot be a better, he said.

Then, I said, reflect. **Of the three individuals, which has the greatest experience of all the pleasures** which we enumerated? Has the lover of gain, in learning the nature of essential truth, greater experience of the pleasure of knowledge than the philosopher has of the pleasure of gain?

The philosopher, he replied, has greatly the advantage; for he has of necessity always known the taste of the other pleasures from his childhood upwards:... [The Republic 9, p. 580-82]

* * * * *

Now, for the long-dead Socrates (as for the recently-dead Frank Sinatra), “love” is not half-hearted, but rather whole-hearted and fanatical. For thus swanky Franky (inspired by the sensual Muse) once melodically professed (and confessed):

All or nothing at all./ **Half a (of) love never appealed to me./**

So if your heart never could yield to me,/ then I’d rather, rather have nothing at all./

I said all, or nothing at all./ **If it’s love, there’s just no in-between./**

Why begin, then cry, for something that might have been?/

No I’d rather, rather have nothing at all./

* * *

Thus real, deed, genuine love and desire (whether for sex, wine, honor or truth) is not half- but whole-hearted, passionate, all-consuming, fanatical. From The Republic 5, p. 474-75,

SOCRATES: ...I need not remind you that **a lover, if he is worthy of the name,** ought to show his love, not to some one part of that which he loves, but to the whole.

.... And what do you say of **lovers of wine?** Do you not see them doing the same [as your flattersome cravers after sex—Ed.]? **They are glad of any pretext of drinking any wine.**

GLAUCON: Very good.

And the same is true of ambitious men; if they the lover cannot command an army, they are willing to command a file; and if they cannot be honoured by really great and important persons, they are glad to be honoured by lesser and meaner people,—but honour of some kind they must have.

[The lover greedily takes of his beloved as much as he can possibly get of her/it.—Ed.]

Exactly.

Once more let me ask: **Does he who desires any class of goods, desire the whole class or a part only?**

The whole.

And may we not say of the philosopher that he is a lover, not of a part of wisdom only, but of the whole?

Yes, of the whole.

And he who dislikes learning...such an one we maintain not to be a philosopher or a lover of knowledge, just as he who refuses his food is not hungry, and may be said to have a bad appetite and not a good one?

Very true, he said.

Whereas he who has a taste for every sort of knowledge and who is curious to learn and is never satisfied, may be justly termed a philosopher? Am I not right?

[The Republic 5, p. 474-75]

But again for Socrates, and unlike Sin(atra), the highest, most lovable and love-worthy things are not sensual but intellectual, mental, thoughtful, spiritual or heavenly things: like truth, wisdom and virtue. And the lowest (and thus least love-worthy) things are material, worldly, sensual and unnecessary—such as sex or wine.

* * * * *

Again, Socrates judged and arranged the loves, values, goods, rewards or pleasures of men in a natural hierarchy from the highest, most divine or most sublime to the lowest, the pettiest, the meanest (and the most miserable)—and each with its corresponding type of life and government.

At the very bottom of the hierarchy of worldly loves is the sensual, addictive, and “tyrannical” love of all the varied pleasures of the five senses—including the love for food, wine and especially of sex and orgasm. (This base sensuality is most common, general, popular and hence “democratic.”)

“True” Socratic love is a love for true and eternal and spiritual objects—and therefore not for “false,” temporal and sensual objects—like wine or mammaries, etc.

But for Socrates “true love” is not sensual nor sexual, but is rather intellectual or spiritual. (And hence “true” lovers are not only best, but rarest. They are the “aristocrats,” among whom are to be found the “philosopher-kings.”)

Above this common or “democratic” love of sensuality is the “oligarchial” love of money—for which much (if not all) of the sensual pleasures are obtainable.

The next love above sensuality and money is the “timocratic” love of honor or reputation—and hence the love, the desire and the chasing after honors, offices, powers or authorities which naturally gravitate to or come calling upon those souls most generally and publicly reputed to be most honorable, and hence most deserving of them.

“Timocratic” or “timocracy” is from “**time**”—(“honor” or “worth”) and again refers to the exterior, general and public regard or estimation of someone, rather than one’s own personal, private, individual, interior self-concept or self-worth.

SOCRATES: Parents and tutors are always telling their sons and their wards that they are to be just; but why? not for the sake of justice, but **for the sake of character and reputation; in the hope of obtaining for him who is reputed just some of those offices, marriages, and the like** which Glaucon has enumerated among the **advantages accruing to the unjust from the reputation of justice.** [The Republic 2, p. 362-63]

And finally above all the worldly loves is the spiritual, intellectual, unworldly and “philosophical” love of truth or wisdom. This Socratic lover is by far the best lover of them all. For his passion is the most rewarding of all passions, and his object the most worthy of his love—being more than, for example, merely time-souring milk or time-sagging breasts, but being eternal and changeless being—the eternal and unchanging “essence” of truth. What could be greater than this?—and hence more worthy of our love, pursuit, acquisition, possession? Perhaps (the existence or “essence” of) eternal spirit or mind—rather than merely

eternal truth or thought? For without the former creator, the latter creation could never exist—neither temporally nor eternally.

This supreme Socratic lover is also the “philosopher-king.” For he arranges the outside world with the same spiritual order which reigns within him.

* * * * *

The Spiritual Battle (Raging within Us All, Individually and Collectively) between Rationality and Emotionalism

The three Socratic “principles” or elements within the soul of man are: reason, passion (emotion) and desire.

And of course the former should ideally rule over the latter two. And when the majority of citizens are rationally self-ruled, they constitute a rational, orderly state; and when not, not.

For Socrates, pure reason or emotionlessness is strong, manly, virtuous, profitable and correct. And so the antithesis and absence of reason, emotion, is weak and womanly, childish, cowardly, irrational, useless, pointless, wasteful, misleading, meritless and unprofitable.

The individual should rationally conquer and rule himself. To give oneself over to emotion is bad, harmful, ruinous. And what is true of the individual, is also true of the group.

A man, populace or citizenry governed by emotion or desire is like a city without walls.

He that (hath) no rule over his own spirit (is like) a city (that is) broken down, (and) without wall. [Proverbs 25:28]

(He that is) slow to anger (is) better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit [“is better”—Ed.] than he that taketh a city. [Proverbs, 16:32]

Pure Socratic reason is the way to self-betterment and success—both individually and collectively. And its emotional antithesis is the road to ruin. From The Republic 10, p. 604,

SOCRATES: There is a principle of law and reason in him [man—Ed.] which bids him resist [indulging his sorrows—Ed.], as well as a feeling of his misfortune which is forcing him to indulge his sorrow?

GLAUCON: True.

But **when a man is drawn in two opposite directions, to and from the same object** [in this case, sorrow, grief, emotion—Ed.], **this**, as we affirm, **necessarily implies two distinct principles in him?**

Certainly.

One [principle—Ed.] of them is ready to follow the guidance of the [ideal, rational, emotionless, philosophical—Ed.] law?

How do you mean?

The law would say that **to be patient under suffering is best**, and that **we should not give way to impatience, as there is no knowing whether such things are good or evil; and nothing is gained by impatience; also, because** no human thing is of serious importance [?], and **grief stands in the way of that which at the moment is most required.**

What is most required? he asked.

That **we should take counsel about what has happened, and** when the dice have been thrown **order our affairs in the way which reason deems best; not, like children who have had a fall, keeping hold of the part struck and wasting time in setting up a howl, but always accustoming the soul forthwith to apply a remedy, raising up that which is sickly and fallen, banishing the cry of sorrow by the healing art.**

Yes, he said, **that is the true way of meeting the attacks of fortune.**

Yes, I said; and **the higher principle is** ready to follow this suggestion of **reason?** Clearly.

And the other principle, which inclines us to recollection of our troubles and to lamentation, and can never have enough of them, **we may call irrational,** useless, and cowardly?

Indeed, we may.

And does not **the latter—I mean the rebellious** [irrational, emotional—Ed.] **principle—**furnish a great variety of materials for imitation? **Whereas the wise and calm temperament, being always nearly equable, is not easy to imitate or to appreciate when imitated, especially at a public festival when a promiscuous crowd is assembled in a** [emotionalistic, Dionysian—Ed.] **theatre. For the** [wise, calm, equitable—Ed.] **feeling represented is one to which they are strangers.**

Certainly.

[The Republic 10, p. 604]

* * * * *

From The Republic, 4, p. 440-441,

SOCRATES: ...**when a man's desires violently prevail over his reason, he reviles himself, and is angry at the violence within him, and that in this struggle, which is like the struggle of factions in a State, his spirit** [passion—Ed.] **is on the side of his reason;—but for the passionate or spirited element to take part with the desires when reason decides that she should not be opposed,...**

SOCRATES: **His noble spirit will not be quelled** until he either slays or is slain; or **until he hears the voice of the shepherd, that is, reason, bidding his dog** [of anger, emotion, spirit, passion—Ed.] **bark no more.**

GLAUCON: **The illustration** ["comparison"—Rouse] **is perfect, he replied; and in our State, as we were saying, the auxiliaries were to be dogs, and to hear the voice of the rulers, who are their shepherds....**

SOCRATES: But a further question arises: **Is passion different from reason also, or only a kind of reason; in which latter case, instead of three principles in the soul** [i.e. reason, passion/emotion and desire—Ed.], **there will only be two, the rational and the concupiscent** ["the reasoning and the desiring?"—Rouse]; **or rather, as the State was composed of three classes, traders, auxiliaries, counsellors,** ["the moneymakers, the state-assistants, and the counsellors"—Rouse; (the subjects, the soldiers, and their "philosopher-king")—Ed.] **so may there not be in the individual soul a third element which is passion or spirit, and when not corrupted by bad education is the natural auxiliary of reason?....**

[I.E. passion, spirit, emotion or feeling need not be irrational or anti-rational.—Ed.]

SOCRATES: **the same principles which exist in the State exist also in the individual, and that they are three in number.**

GLAUCON: Exactly.

Must we not then infer that the individual is wise in the same way, and in virtue of the same quality which makes the State wise?

["Another thing must follow of necessity, that as and whereby the city was wise, so and thereby a particular man is wise [if and when ruled or dominated by the reasoning part of his soul over the emoting and desiring parts—Ed.]."—Rouse]

Certainly.

Also that the same quality which constitutes courage in the State constitutes courage in the individual, and that both the State and the individual bear the same relation to all the other virtues?

Assuredly.

And the individual will be acknowledged by us to be just in the same way in which the State is just?

That follows, of course.

We cannot but remember that the justice of the State consisted in each of the three classes doing the work of its own class [“the city was just by reason that each single man in its three classes did his own business [as justly decided, chosen, assigned and arranged by their Socratic philosopher-king?–Ed.]”–Rouse]

GLAUCON: **We are not very likely to have forgotten, he said.**

We must recollect that the individual in whom the several qualities of his nature do their own work will be just, and will do his own work?

[“We must remember then that each one of us will be doing his own business, and will be just, when each part of him will be doing its own business in him.”–Rouse]

GLAUCON: Yes, he said, we must remember that too.

[“Then it is proper for the reasoning part to rule, because it is wise and has to use forethought for the whole soul;”–Rouse] **And ought not the rational principle, which is wise, and has the care of the whole soul, to rule, and the passionate or spirited principle to be the subject and ally?**

GLAUCON: Certainly.

[Republic, 4, p. 440-441]

* * * * *

From The Republic 4, p. 442-44,

SOCRATES: **And him we call wise who has in him that little [rational–Ed.] part which rules, and which proclaims these commands; that part too being supposed to have a knowledge of what is for the interest of each of the three parts and of the whole?**

GLAUCON: Assuredly.

And would you not say that **he is temperate** who has these same elements in friendly harmony, **in whom the one ruling principle of reason, and the two subject ones of spirit and desire are equally agreed that reason ought to rule, and do not rebel?**

Certainly, he said, **that is the true account of temperance whether in the State or individual.**

And surely, I said, we have explained again and again how and by virtue of what quality a man will be just.

That is very certain.

And is justice dimmer in the individual, and is her form different, or is she the same which we found her to be in the State?

There is no difference in my opinion, he said.

SOCRATES: **And the reason is that each part of him [whether reason, passion/spirit/emotion or desire–Ed.] is doing its own business, whether in ruling or being ruled?**

[“the [Socratic–Ed.] **State** was **composed of three classes, traders, auxiliaries, counsellors**, [“the moneymakers, the state-assistants, and the counsellors”–Rouse; (the subjects, the soldiers, and their “philosopher-king”)”–(Rep. 4:440 or 41, from above)–Ed.]

Exactly so.

Are you satisfied then that **the quality which makes such men and such states is justice**, or do you hope to discover some other?

Not I, indeed.

Then our dream has been realized; and the suspicion which we entertained at the beginning of our work of construction [of an ideal (Socratic) state—Ed.], that some divine power must have conducted us to a primary form of justice, has now been verified? [So speaks Socrates, the divinely-inspired. (And I for one don't doubt it.)—Ed.]

Yes, certainly.

And the division of labour which required the carpenter and the shoemaker and the rest of the citizens to be doing each his own business, and not another's, was a shadow of justice, and for that reason it was of use?

Clearly.

.... **Must not injustice be a strife which arises among the three principles—a meddlesomeness, and interference, and rising up of a part of the soul against the whole, an assertion of unlawful authority, which is made by a rebellious subject against a true prince, of whom he is the natural vassal,—what is all this confusion and delusion but injustice, and intemperance and cowardice and ignorance, and every form of vice?**

Exactly so.

[Republic 4, p. 442-44]

This Socratic injustice is when, where and in whom passion and/or desire rebel against their just and proper lord, reason; or else when the Socratic citizens and/or the Socratic soldiers rebel against their most rational and just lord, the Socratic “philosopher-king.”

* * * * *

Citizens are like their City-States, Societies, Rulers and Governments— (and vice-versa).

Each Socratic Kind of love (truth, honor, money or sensuality) becoming popular or general, yields a corresponding kind of society.

And each society tends to choose or get one of their own kind (spirit, disposition, character) to be their ruler. That is, States and governments are like their subjects. States and gov'ts are similar to those who institute, elect, tolerate or suffer these forms and officials to rule over them.

It has been said that people get the government they deserve, if not choose. (See below.)

As the fruit is of its tree, so is politics of its body politic, the state of its populace, or the gov't of its citizens/subjects.

SOCRATES: Do you know, I said, that **governments vary as the dispositions of men vary, and that there must be as many of the one as there are of the other? For we cannot suppose that States are made of “oak and rock,” and not out of the human natures which are in them**, and which in a figure turn the scale and draw other things after them?

GLAUCON: Yes, he said, the **States are as the men are; they grow out of human characters.**

Then if the constitutions of States are five, the dispositions of individual minds will also be five?

Certainly.

[The Republic 8, p. 544]

(The five State constitutions or Socratic forms of gov't are (in descending order): Aristocracy, Timocracy, Oligarchy, Democracy and Tyranny.)

SOCRATES: **And must not the tyrannical man** [i.e. a citizen or subject of a tyrannical state—Ed.] **be like the tyrannical State, and the democratical man like the democratical State; and the same of** [or for—Ed.] **the others** [i.e. the oligarchic, timocratic and aristocratic/monarchial man—Ed.]?

[“Then surely,” said I, “the tyrannical man would be in one likeness with the city under a tyrant, and the democratical man with the city under democracy, and so with all the others.”—Rouse.]

GLAUCON: Certainly.

[The Republic 9, p. 576]

Again, the State is like the citizenry and the citizenry is like the state. The government is like their subjects and their subjects are like their government.

And the ruler (or government) in his turn influences his subjects to become like him.

SOCRATES: “...for **as the government is, such will be the man.**” [The Republic 8, p. 557]

SOCRATES: “...**there appear to be as many forms of the soul as there are distinct forms of the State.**”—[The Republic 4, p. 445]

But which is the chicken and which the egg, which the horse and which the cart, which the political master and which servant? For government or officialdom has a nasty way or habit of starting out as a servant but gradually, stealthily, usurpatiously becoming tyrannical—and especially in times of war or other public crisis.

In other words, once you create an office, authority, thrown or crown (above yourself), then how do you peaceably uncreate or dissolve it? Or can't you? And there's your political self-entombment.

SOCRATES: Must we not acknowledge, I said, that **in each of us there are the same principles and habits which there are in the State; and that from the individual they pass into the State?—how else can they come there?** Take the quality of passion or spirit;—**it would be ridiculous to imagine that this quality, when found in States, is not derived from the individuals who are supposed to possess it**, e.g. the Thracians, Scythians, and in general the northern nations; and the same may be said of the love of knowledge, which is the special characteristic of our [Hellenic or Grecian—Ed.] part of the world, or of the love of money, which may, with equal truth, be attributed to the Phoenicians and Egyptians.

[The Republic 4, p. 435-36]

And from Max Stirner (1845),

In society the human demand at most can be satisfied, while the egoistic must always come short.

Because it can hardly escape anybody that the present shows no such living interest in any question as in the “social,” one has to direct his gaze especially to society.

Nay, if the interest felt in it were less passionate and dazzled, **people** would not so much, **in looking at society, lose sight of the individuals in it**, and would **recognize that a society cannot become new so long as those who form and constitute it remain the old ones. If, for example, there was to arise in the Jewish people a society which should spread a new faith over the earth, these apostles could in no case remain Pharisees.**

As you are, so you present yourself, so you behave toward men: a hypocrite as a hypocrite, a Christian as a Christian. **Therefore the character of a society is determined by the character of its members: they are its creators. So much at least one must perceive** even if one were not willing to put to the test the concept “society” itself. [Max, p. 210]

Citizens are like their state. And states are like their citizens.

SOCRATES: **Let me ask you not to forget the parallel of the individual and the State; bearing this in mind, and glancing in turn from one to the other of them, will you tell me their respective conditions?** [The Republic 9, p. 578]

* * * * *

As in a well-ordered individual, the better, rational part rules over the remainder, or his virtues reign over his vices, so in a group or society the best had better rule over the rest—and not vice-versa. And that political arrangement is best for all group members, not just the best. If there must be ruler(s), and we must be ruled, far better that the best should rule over the rest (of the group or society), than the worst or the mediocre. Aristocracy (“the government of the best”) is by definition the best form of government.

From The Republic 4, p. 430-32,

SOCRATES: Two virtues remain to be discovered in the State [after wisdom and courage—Ed.]—first temperance [or self-control—Ed.], and then justice which is the end of our search.

GLAUCON: Very true.

Now, **can we find justice without** troubling ourselves about **temperance?**

I do not know how that can be accomplished, he said, nor do I desire that justice should be brought to light and temperance lost sight of; and therefore I wish that you would do me the favour of considering temperance first.

Certainly, I replied, I should not be justified in refusing your request.

Then consider, he said.

Yes, I replied; I will; and as far as I can at present see, the virtue of temperance has more of the nature of harmony and symphony than the preceding [two virtues: wisdom and courage—Ed.]

How so? he asked.

Temperance, I replied, **is the ordering or controlling of certain pleasures and desires;** this is curiously enough implied in **the saying of “a man being his own master”;** and other traces of the same notion may be found in language.

No doubt, he said.

There is something ridiculous in the expression “master of himself”; for the **master is also the servant and the servant the master; and in all these modes of speaking the same person is denoted.**

Certainly.

The meaning is, I believe, that in the human soul there is a better and also a worse principle; and when the better has the worse under control, then a man is said to be master of himself; and this is a term of praise: but when, owing to evil education or association, the better principle, which is also the smaller, is

overwhelmed by the greater mass of the worse—in this case he is blamed and is called the slave of self and unprincipled.

Yes, there is reason in that.

And now, I said, look at **our newly** [theoretically or philosophically designed or – Ed.] **created State**, and there you will find one of these two conditions realised; for **the** [Socratic–Ed.] **State, as you will acknowledge, may be justly called master of itself, if the words “temperance” and “self-mastery” truly express the rule of the better part over the worse.**

Yes, he said, I see that what you say is true.

Let me further note that the manifold and complex pleasures and desires and pains are generally found in children and women and servants, and in the freemen so called who are of the lowest and more numerous class.

Certainly, he said.

Whereas the simple and moderate desires which follow reason, and are under the guidance of mind and true opinion, are to be found only in a few, and those the best born and best educated.

Very true.

These two [“mind and true opinion”–Ed.], **as you may perceive, have a place in our State; and the meaner desires of the many are held down by the virtuous desires and wisdom of the few.**

That I perceive, he said.

Then **if there be any city which may be described as master of its own pleasures and desires, and master of itself, ours may claim such a designation?**

Certainly, he replied.

It may also be called temperate, and for the same reasons?

Yes.

And if there be any State in which rulers and subjects will be agreed as to the question who are to rule [And there’s the eternal political rub!–Ed.], **that again will be our State?**

Undoubtedly.

And the citizens being thus agreed among themselves, in which class will temperance be found—in the rulers or in the subjects?

In both, as **I should imagine**, he replied.

Do you observe that we were not far wrong in our guess that **temperance was a sort of harmony?**

Why so?

Why, because **temperance is unlike courage and wisdom, each of which resides in a part only, the one making the State wise and the other valiant; not so temperance, which extends to the whole, and runs through all the notes of the scale, and produces a harmony of the weaker and the stronger and the middle class**, whether you suppose them to be stronger or weaker in wisdom or power or numbers or wealth, or anything else. Most truly then may **we deem temperance to be the agreement of the naturally superior and inferior, as to the right to rule of either, both in states and individuals.**

I entirely agree with you.

And so, I said, we may consider **three out of the four virtues to have been discovered in our State.** [I.E., wisdom, courage and temperance–Ed.] **The last of those qualities which make a state virtuous must be justice, if we only knew what that was.**

The inference is obvious.

[The Republic 4, p. 430-32]

The philosopher, when politically empowered or enthroned, becomes the philosopher-king—the enlightened autocrat or benevolent dictator whose just and blessed reign is most beneficial to all his blessed subjects.

(But again how do you peaceably remove an autocrat or dictator who's not quite so enlightened or benevolent? And there's the insufferably vile political rub, and inevitably violent political rub-out!)

* * * * *

But, on the other Socratic hand, and totally removed from and contrasted with the rational, just, self-ordered man, society and state is the tyrannical man (whether despot or mere citizen), society and state.

On the other hand, the piggish slave of his tyrannical senses, once enthroned, becomes a tyrant whose unjust, oppressive, violent reign is a political curse to all those citizens unfortunately subjected under his most coercive and predatory power, fist and heel.

(But do tyrannized citizens deserve to be tyrannized? Do they deserve their tyrant? And they spiritually like their tyrant? Are tyrants and their subjects reflections of one another? See below.)

From The Republic 9, p. 578,

SOCRATES: Let me ask you not to forget the parallel of the individual and the State [**“the likeness between city and man”**–Rouse]; bearing this in mind, and glancing in turn from one to the other of them, will you tell me their respective conditions?

ADEIMANTUS: What do you mean? he asked.

Beginning with the State, I replied, would you say that a city which is governed by a tyrant is free or enslaved?

No city, he said, can be more completely enslaved.

And yet, as you see, there are freemen as well as [Ed.]—slave-]masters in such a State?

Yes, he said, I see that there are a few [freemen–Ed.]; but the people, speaking generally, and the best of them are miserably degraded and enslaved.

Then if the man is like the State, I said, must not the same rule prevail? his [tyrannically sensual–Ed.] soul is full of meanness and vulgarity [“slavery and ungenerousness”–Rouse]—**the best elements in him are enslaved; and there is a small ruling part, which is also the worst and maddest** [“most mad and abominable”–Rouse].

Inevitably.

And would you say that the soul of such an one is the soul of a freeman, or of a slave?

He has the soul of a slave, in my opinion.

And the State [i.e. the people, the “demos”–Ed.] **which is enslaved under a tyrant is utterly incapable of acting voluntarily** [independently, unilaterally, spontaneously–Ed.]?

[**“The city which is a slave under a tyrant least of all does what it wishes?”**–Rouse]

GLAUCON: Utterly incapable.

And also the soul which is under a tyrant [“a monstrous winged drone”–desire, craving, passion–Ed.] (I am speaking of the soul taken as a whole) **is least capable of doing what she** [rationally–Ed.] **desires; there is a** [passionate/emotional and/or desirous/addictive/obsessive/compulsive–Ed.] **gadfly which goads her** [“drives it violently about, and it is full of confusion and repentance.”–Rouse], **and she is full of trouble and remorse?**

Certainly.

And is the city which is under a tyrant rich or poor?

Poor.

And the tyrannical soul must be always poor and insatiable [“poverty-stricken and even unsatisfied.”—Rouse]?

True.

And must not such a State and such a man be always full of fear?

Yes, indeed.

Is there any State in which you will find more of lamentation and sorrow and groaning and pain?

Certainly not.

And is there any man in whom you will find more of this sort of misery than in the tyrannical man, who is in a fury of passions and desires [“one maddened by desires and passions, this man of tyranny?”—Rouse]?

Impossible.

Reflecting upon these and similar evils, **you held the tyrannical State to be the most miserable of States?**

And I was right, he said.

Certainly, I said. **And when you see the same evils in the tyrannical man** [the private citizen-slave of his own passions/emotions/fears and sensual desires/cravings/addictions, regardless of his class, social status, or political position—Ed.], **what do you say of him?**

I say that he is by far the most miserable of all men.

There, I said, I think that you are beginning to go wrong. [Socrates is just being cute here. You’ll see.—Ed.]

What do you mean?

I do not think that he has as yet reached the utmost extreme of misery.

[“You have not yet found the most miserable of all,” I said.—Rouse]

GLAUCON: **Then who is more miserable?**

One of whom I am about to speak.

[“Here is someone perhaps that you will consider more miserable still.”—Rouse]

GLAUCON: Who is that?

He who is of a tyrannical nature [a devoted slave of sensuality or sin—Ed.], **and instead of leading a private life has been cursed with the further misfortune of being a public tyrant.**

From what has been said, I gather that you are right.

[The Republic 9, p. 578]

* * * * *

But this notion that city-states are like their citizens, and vice-versa—that rulers are like their subjects, leaders like their followers (and vice-versa), or that each group somehow deserves its leaders is less plainly, clearly and demonstrably true than that parents e.g. “deserve” their own children (and vice-versa)—(being their own particular seed or fruit), or that an individual “deserves” his own success or failure—(being primarily based upon himself and his deeds—his commissions and omissions).

For mediocre or even the very worst citizens have historically been known to take or seize power (and hence rule) over their betters. (See e.g. oligarchy, democracy or tyranny.)

Or is do oppressed citizens and tyrannized subjects deserve their political fate? Do citizens of oppressive states, societies or constitutions deserve their oppression, tyranny and tyrants due to their personal weaknesses and inability to overthrow them? Is a democratic or tyrannical state or society a decadent (and hence deserving) society? If we suffer under tyrants, is it our collective or democratic fault? It is because the quality of the people or demos is so poor, so anti-aristo?

If so, then such is a cause and argument for freedom of mutual association or choice—which of course means or entails the rejection of unacceptable or unchosen (would-be) members or citizens.

A state, group or society in which anyone and everyone can be a member is a dreg society, a bottom of the barrel society, a “democratic” society, an inevitably tyrannized and despicable society.

* * *

One again from Max Stirner. (Nero (37-68 A.D.) was a tyrannical Roman emperor who persecuted (and perhaps scapegoated) Christians.)

A Nero is a “bad” man only in the eyes of the “good”; in mine he is nothing but a **possessed** man [an owned man, a weak man, a mental slave—Ed.], as are the good too. The good see in him an arch-villain, and relegate him to hell. **Why did nothing hinder him in his arbitrary course? Why did people put up with so much? Do you suppose the tame Romans, who let all their will be bound by such a tyrant, were a hair the better? In old Rome they would have put him to death instantly, would never have been his slaves.** But the contemporary “good” among the Romans opposed to him only moral [or lawful—Ed.] demands, not their **will**; they sighed that their emperor did not do homage to morality, like them; they themselves remained “moral [or lawful, dutiful, obedient—Ed.] subjects,” till at last one found courage to give up “moral, obedient subjection.” **And then the same “good Romans” who, as “obedient subjects,” had borne all the ignominy of having no will, hurrahed over the nefarious, immoral** [or illegal—Ed.] **act of the rebel.** Where then in the “good” was the courage for the **revolution**, that courage which they now praised, after another [who was therefore not moral or lawful—Ed.] had mustered it up? The good [or lawful—Ed.] could not have this courage, for a revolution (and an insurrection into the bargain), is always something “immoral” [or unlawful—Ed.], which one can resolve upon only when one ceases to be “good” [lawful—Ed.] and becomes either “bad” [criminal—Ed.] or—neither of the two. **Nero was no viler than his time** [nor his subjects?—Ed.], in which one could only be one of the two, good or bad. The judgment of his time on him had to be that he was bad, and this in the highest degree: not a milksop, but an arch-scoundrel. All moral people can pronounce only this judgment on him.

Rascals such as he was are still living here and there to-day...in the midst of the moral. It is not convenient to live among them [tyrants—Ed.] certainly, as one is not sure of his life for a moment; but can you say that it is more convenient to live among the moral [law-abiding—Ed.]? One is just as little sure of his life there, only that one is hanged “in the way of “justice” [i.e. “Law”—Ed.] but least of all is one sure of his honor [friends—Ed.], and the national cockade is gone before you can say “Jack Robinson”: The hard fist of morality [or legality—Ed.] treats the noble nature of egoism altogether without compassion. [Max, p. 54-55]

* * * * *

The five Descending Dispositions, Mentalities or Spirits (and hence Kingdoms or States) of Men:

Monarchy/Aristocracy, Timocracy, Oligarchy, Democracy and Tyranny

SOCRATES: "...**there appear to be as many forms of the soul as there are distinct forms of the State.**"—[The Republic 4, p. 445]

* * * * *

"he who is ill-governed in his own person—the tyrannical man"—(Rep. 9:579)

And so, in this Socratic vein, let us proceed upward to...

He who is ruled by the people or "demos"—the democratic man.

He who is ruled by money—the oligarchic man.

He who is ruled by his public reputation, honor or popularity—the timocratic man.

And he who is ruled by a king or an aristocracy—the monarchial or aristocratic man.

* * * * *

The social/political fruit is of its tree. Virtue is of the virtuous and vice of the vicious. And the tree is of its seed, parentage, heredity.

Socratic virtue or godness is basically genetic. It is Godliness and hence love of truth, wisdom and justice. Socratic justice is a just arrangement of things, a placing of things in their proper places and proper order—as directed by the Socratic "aristo," the philosopher-king, the "best" or most proper man in the kingdom. Only he who has order within himself can possibly arrange, create or impose order outside of himself. For the political fruit is of its tree. Thus only the philosopher-king can best order or arrange a just kingdom or state. For above all others and by definition he has virtue or godness within him.

But who is he? How is he to be found or chosen? And would the people, the "demos" ever choose or desire this best or most virtuous man to rule over them? No? Then there's the democratic rub!

And virtue is a thing of spirit—though again virtue is genetic, being based, grounded and dependent upon one's superior, godly and virtuous seed. (See Moses. His mythology is entirely genetic, hereditary, racial or "racist.") Virtue from a base or vicious seed is impossible. (Matt. 7:17-20 & 12:33) And yet vice from a virtuous seed is indeed possible. (See The Republic 6, p. 491-92)

And the more one values (loves) the things of this world, the less one values the good or godlike things of the spirit, and hence virtue, truth, temperance, justice, and so on. The love of the world and the love of virtue are mutual exclusives, opposites: the more of one the less of the other. Truly one can neither love nor serve both God and Mammon (riches, money, property). [Matthew 6:24 & Luke 14: 10-13]

SOCRATES: ...**the more they** [the citizenry—Ed.] **think of making a fortune the less they think of virtue; for when riches and virtue are placed together in the scales of the balance, the one always rises as the other falls** ["the more they value money the less they value virtue; in truth, we may imagine riches and virtue as always balanced in scales against each other."—Rouse]. [The Republic 8, p. 550]

* * * * *

First of all, in the Socratic system (and outside his ideal state or kingdom, in which he would feign divine authority and auguries), authority is not necessarily godlike, divine, sacred.

(This contrasts with the "divinely-appointed" authority in the politically ruinous mythology of Peter and Paul, (see 1 Peter 2:13-15, :17-18 & Romans 13:1-4), whose followers were "prophetically" commanded to dutifully obey all worldly authority as divinely-appointed. (Surely the Roman emperor would have no quarrel with that, having divinely-appointed

himself.) Assuming Peter and Paul's sincerity, presuming they really and truly meant what they said—(because maybe they were just trying to avoid Roman persecution or “prosecution” of Christians for disloyalty or treason toward Rome of the emperor)—Socrates differed from Peter and Paul in publicly doubting the divinity of all other authority but his own, and in privately denying that also. (See “Socrates on His own Priestcraft, gods, Myths and Holy Lies as “Sacred” Means to His own Desired Social/Political Ends,” within On the gods I: Priestcraft—(not yet finished nor available.)

For Socrates of course knew that authority is merely sanctimonious power and coercion, that Law is merely someone's “sacred” order or command, and that Evil can have power or authority too.

And when evil people are in power, they oppress, prey upon, rob and ruin the good, Godly, virtuous and prosperous people within their predatory grasp or power, or under their tyrannical authority. (For no two things can occupy the same space.)

SOCRATES: ...in a city when the evil are permitted to have authority and the good are put out of the way,...

[“in a city, **when putting bad men in power one hands over the city to them and ruins the finer people.**”–Rouse]

[The Republic 10, p. 605]

* * * * *

The character of a king's subjects determine his kingdom even more than he does, or ever can.

And as one cannot build a marble city or cathedral out of mud bricks, nor make fine jewelry from base metals, nor a “silk purse out of a pig's ear,” nor direct those who cannot act, sing nor dance to tragic, comic or choral heights, so the seed, spirit and character of citizens or subjects limits not only what they can do, but what can be done with them, or made of them—should they even care to sit still for any authoritarian or coercive transformation into becoming the best that they could possibly be.

(“Be all that you can be” in “Uncle” Satan's army?) Possibly not.

* * *

From The Republic 4, p. 445—5, p. 449:

SOCRATES: Still, as we are near the spot at which we may see the truth in the clearest manner with our own eyes, let us not faint by the way.

GLAUCON: Certainly not, he replied.

Come up hither, I said, and **behold the various forms of vice**, those of them, I mean, which are worth looking at.

I am following you, he replied: proceed. [Cf. Apo./Rev. 4:1-11]

I said, The argument seems to have reached a height from which, as from some tower of speculation, a man may look down and see that **virtue is one, but that the forms of vice are innumerable; there being four special ones which are deserving of note.**

What do you mean? he said.

I mean, I replied, that **there appear to be as many forms of the soul as there are distinct forms of the State.**

How many?

There are five of the State, and five of the soul, I said.

What are they?

The first, I said, is that which we have been describing, and which may be said to have two names, monarchy and aristocracy, accordingly as rule is exercised by one distinguished man or by many.

True, he replied.

But **I regard the two names as describing one form only; for whether the government is in the hands of one or many**, if the governors have been trained in the manner which we have supposed, the fundamental laws of the State will be maintained.

That is true, he replied.

Such is the good and true City or State, and the good and true man is of the same pattern; and if this is right every other is wrong; and **the evil is one which affects not only the ordering of the State, but also the regulation of the individual soul, and is exhibited in four forms.**

What are they? he said.

I was proceeding to tell the order in which the four evil forms appeared to me to succeed one another, when Polemarchus [interrupted—Ed.]....

[The Republic 4, p. 445—5, p. 449]

* * * * *

From The Republic 8, p. 543-46,

SOCRATES: True, I said; and now that this division of our task is concluded, let us find the point at which we digressed, that we may return into the old path.

GLAUCON: There is no difficulty in returning; you implied, then as now, that **you had finished the description of the State** [of the ideal Socratic philosopher-king—(a description far beyond our modest present scope and intention. See Socrates.)—Ed.]: **you said that such a State was good, and that the man was good who answered to it**, although, as now appears, you had more excellent things to relate both of State and man. **And you said further, that if this was the true form, then the others were false; and of the false forms, you said**, as I remember, that **there were four principal ones, and that their defects, and the defects of the individuals corresponding to them, were worth examining. When we had seen all the individuals, and finally agreed as to who was the best and who was the worst of them, we were to consider whether the best was not also the happiest, and the worst the most miserable. I asked you what were the four forms of government of which you spoke**, and then Polemarchus and Adeimantus put in their word; and you began again, and have found your way to the point at which we have now arrived.

Your recollection, I said, is most exact.

Then, like a wrestler, he replied, you must put yourself again in the same position; and let me ask the same questions, and do you give me the same answer which you were about to give me then.

Yes, if I can, I will, I said.

GLAUCON: I shall particularly wish to hear **what were the four** [non-, ideal, non-Socratic ideal “false” and “evil”—Ed.] **constitutions of which you were speaking.**

That question, I said, is easily answered: **the four governments of which I spoke, so far as they have distinct names, are, first, those** [timocracies—Ed.] **of Crete and Sparta**, which are generally applauded; **what is termed oligarchy comes next; this is not equally approved, and is a form of government which teems with evils; thirdly, democracy, which naturally follows oligarchy, although very different; and lastly comes tyranny, great and famous, which differs from them all, and is the fourth and worst disorder of a State.** I do not know, do you? of any other constitution which can be said to have a distinct character. There are lordships and principalities which are bought and sold [this sounds like “oligarchy” (“the reign of the [richest] few”) or “plutocracy” or the reign of money to me—Ed.], and some other intermediate forms of government. But these are nondescripts and may be found equally among Hellenes [Greeks—Ed.] and among barbarians [i.e. everyone else—Ed.].

Yes, he replied, we certainly hear of many curious forms of government which exist among them.

Do you know, I said, that **governments vary as the dispositions of men vary, and that there must be as many of the one as there are of the other? For we cannot suppose that States are made of ‘oak and rock,’ and not out of the human natures which are in them,** and which in a figure turn the scale and draw other things after them?

Yes, he said, the **States are as the men are; they grow out of human characters.**

Then if the constitutions of States are five, the dispositions of individual minds will also be five?

Certainly.

Him who answers to aristocracy, and whom we rightly call just and good, we have already described.

We have.

Then let us now proceed to describe the inferior sort of natures, being the contentious and ambitious, who answer to the [“timocratic”—Ed.] Spartan polity; also the oligarchical, democratical, and tyrannical. Let us place the most just by the side of the most unjust, and when we see them we shall be able to compare the relative happiness or unhappiness of him who leads a life of pure justice or pure injustice. The enquiry will then be completed. And we shall know whether we ought to pursue injustice, as Thrasymachus advises, or in accordance with the conclusions of the argument to prefer justice.

Certainly, he replied, we must do as you say.

Shall we follow our old plan, which we adopted with a view to clearness, of taking the State first and then proceeding to the individual, and begin with **the government [“power or rule”—Rouse] of honour?—I know of no name for such a government other than timocracy, or perhaps timarchy. We will compare with this the like character in the individual; and, after that, consider oligarchical man; and then again we will turn our attention to democracy and the democratical man; and lastly, we will go and view the city of tyranny, and once more take a look into the tyrant’s soul,** and try to arrive at a satisfactory decision.

That way of viewing and judging of the matter will be very suitable.

First, then, I said, **let us enquire how timocracy (the government of honour) arises out of aristocracy (the government of the best). Clearly, all political changes originate in divisions of the actual governing power; a government which is united, however small [(?) or large—Ed.], cannot be moved.**

Very true, he said.

In what way, then, will our [aristocratic—Ed.] city be moved [divided, fragmented, dissolved—Ed.], and in what manner will the two classes of auxiliaries and rulers disagree among themselves or with one another? Shall we, after the manner of Homer, pray the Muses to tell us “how discord first arose”? Shall we imagine them in solemn mockery, to play and jest with us as if we were children, and to address us in a lofty tragic vein, making believe to be in earnest?

How would they address us?

After this manner:—A city which is thus constituted [according to Socratic design and instruction—Ed.] can hardly be shaken; but, seeing that everything which has a beginning has also an end, **even a constitution such as yours [i.e. Socrates and Glaucon’s—Ed.] will not last for ever, but will in time be dissolved. And this is the dissolution:...**

[The Republic 8, p. 543-46]

The “dissolution” of the ideal Socratic state is genetic or physical (and therefore spiritual and political) degeneracy—the genetic mixture of the best with lesser seeds, resulting in a degenerated, lesser, vain, ambitious, honor-seeking, “timocratic” and warlike leadership.

Timocracy: the Rule of Honor, Reputation, Popularity

From The Republic 8, p. 547-49:

SOCRATES: **And the new government which thus arises will be of a form intermediate between oligarchy and aristocracy?**

GLAUCON: Very true.

Such will be the change, and after the [degenerate-Ed.] change has been made, how will they proceed? Clearly, the new State, being in a mean between oligarchy and the perfect [ideal, Socratic-Ed.] State, will partly follow one and partly the other, and will also have some peculiarities.

True, he said.

In the honour given to rulers, in the abstinence of **the warrior class** from agriculture, handicrafts, and trade in general, in the institution of common meals, and in the attention paid to gymnastics and military training—in all these respects this State will resemble the former.

True.

But **in the fear of admitting philosophers to power, because they [the warrior or auxiliary class-Ed.] are no longer to be had simple and earnest, but are made up of mixed elements; and in turning from them [from (enthroning) philosophers-Ed.] to passionate and less complex characters, who are by nature fitted for war rather than peace; and in the value set by them upon military stratagems and contrivances, and in the waging of everlasting wars—this State** will be for the most part peculiar.

Yes.

Yes, I said; and **men of this stamp will be covetous of money, like those who live in oligarchies; they will have a fierce secret longing after gold and silver, which they will hoard in dark places**, having magazines and treasuries of their own for the deposit and concealment of them; also castles which are just nests for their eggs, and in which they will spend large sums on their wives, or on any others whom they please.

That is most true, he said.

And they are miserly because they have no means of openly acquiring the money which they prize; they will spend that which is another man's on the gratification of their desires, stealing their pleasures and running away like children from the law, their father: they have been schooled not by gentle influence but by force, for they [the educators (and hence their Spartan students)-Ed.] have neglected her who is the true Muse, the companion of reason and philosophy, and have honoured gymnastic more than music.

Undoubtedly, he said, **the form of government which you describe is a mixture of good and evil.**

Why, **there is a mixture**, I said; **but one thing, and one thing only, is predominantly seen,—the spirit of contention and ambition; and these are due to the prevalence of the passionate or spirited element.**

Assuredly, he said.

Such is the origin and such the character of this State, which has been described in outline only; the more perfect execution was not required, for a sketch is enough to show the type of the most perfectly just and most perfectly unjust; and to go

through all the States and all the characters of men, omitting none of them, would be an interminable labour.

Very true, he replied.

Now what man answers to this form of government—how did he come into being, and what is he like?

ADEIMANTUS: I think, said Adeimantus, that in **the spirit of contention which characterises him**, he is not unlike our friend Glaucon.

Perhaps, I said, he may be like him in that one point; but there are other respects in which he is very different.

ADEIMANTUS: In what respects?

SOCRATES: He [the timocratic man—Ed.] should have **more of self-assertion and be less cultivated**, and yet a friend of culture; and he should be a good listener, but no speaker. Such a person is **apt to be rough with slaves**, unlike the educated man, who is too proud [?] for that; and he will also be courteous to freemen, and **remarkably obedient to authority; he is a lover of power and a lover of honour; claiming to be a ruler, not because he is eloquent, or on any ground of that sort, but because he is a soldier and has performed feats of arms; he is also a lover of gymnastic exercises and of the chase** [the hunt—Ed.].

Yes, that is the type of character which answers to timocracy.

Such an one will despise riches only when he is young; but as he gets older he will be more and more attracted to them, because he has a piece of the avaricious nature in him, and is not singleminded towards virtue, having lost his best guardian.

Who was that? said Adeimantus.

Philosophy, I said, **tempered with music, who comes and takes her abode in a man, and is the only saviour of his virtue throughout life.**

Good, he said.

Such, I said, **is the timocratical youth, and he is like the timocratical State.** Exactly.

His origin is as follows:—He is often the young son of a brave father, who dwells in an ill-governed city, of which he declines the honours and offices, and will not go to law, or exert himself in any way, but is ready to waive his rights in order that he may escape trouble.

ADEIMANTUS: And how does the son come into being?

SOCRATES: **The character of the son begins to develop when he hears his mother complaining that her husband has no place in the government, of which the consequence is that she has no precedence among other women. Further, when she sees her husband not very eager about money, and instead of battling and railing in the law courts or assembly, taking whatever happens to him quietly; and when she observes that his thoughts always centre in himself, while he treats her with very considerable indifference, she is annoyed, and says to her son that his father is only half a man and far too easy-going:** adding all the other complaints about her own ill-treatment which women are so fond of rehearsing.

Yes, said Adeimantus, they give us plenty of them, and their complaints are so like themselves.

And you know, I said, that **the old servants also**, who are supposed to be attached [or loyal—Ed.] to the [head of—Ed.] family, from time to time talk privately in the same strain to the son; and if they see any one who owes money to his father, or is wronging him in any way, and he fails to prosecute them, they **tell the youth that when he grows up he must retaliate upon people of this sort, and be more of a man than his father.** He has only to walk abroad and he hears and sees the same sort of thing: those who do their own business in the city are called simpletons, and held in no esteem, while the busy-bodies are honoured and applauded. **The result is that the**

young man, hearing and seeing all these things—hearing, too, the words of his father, and having a nearer view of his way of life, and making comparisons of him and others—**is drawn opposite ways: while his father is watering and nourishing the rational principle in his soul, the others are encouraging the passionate and appetitive** [principles or elements in his soul—Ed.]; **and he being not originally of a bad nature, but having kept bad company, is at last brought by their joint influence to a middle point, and gives up the kingdom** [of heavenly reason—Ed.] **which is within him to the middle principle of contentiousness and passion, and becomes arrogant and ambitious.**

ADEIMANTUS: You seem to me to have described his origin perfectly.

SOCRATES: **Then we have now, I said, the second form of government and the second type of character?** [“Timocracy”—the rule of honor—Ed.]

We have.

[The Republic 8, p. 547-50]

* * * * *

Oligarchy: the Rule of Money, Property, Wealth, Greed

From The Republic 8, p. 550-57]

SOCRATES:**I believe that oligarchy follows next in order.**

ADEIMANTUS: **And what manner of government do you term oligarchy?**

A government resting on a valuation of property, in which the rich have power and the poor man is deprived of it.

[“A constitution,” I said, ‘according to property, in which the rich govern and the poor man has no share in the government.’”—Rouse]

I understand, he replied.

Ought I not to **begin by describing how the change from timocracy to oligarchy arises?**

Yes.

Well, I said, no eyes are required in order to see how the one passes into the other.

How?

The accumulation of gold in the treasury of private individuals is the ruin of timocracy; they invent illegal modes of expenditure; for what do they or their wives care about the law?

Yes, indeed.

And then one, seeing another grow rich, seeks to rival him, and thus the great mass of the citizens become lovers of money.

Likely enough.

And so they grow richer and richer, **and the more they think of making a fortune the less they think of virtue; for when riches and virtue are placed together in the scales of the balance, the one always rises as the other falls** [“the more they value money the less they value virtue; in truth, we may imagine riches and virtue as always balanced [?] in scales against each other.”—Rouse].

True.

And in proportion as riches and rich men are honoured in the State, virtue and the virtuous are dishonoured [“less honored than the rich.”—Rouse].

Clearly.

And what is honoured is cultivated [“practised”–Rouse], **and that which has no honour is neglected.**

That is obvious.

And so at last, instead of loving contention and glory, men become lovers of trade and money [“Thus in the end they have become lovers of money and moneymaking and no longer aim at honour and ambition;”–Rouse]; **they honour and look up to the rich man, and make a ruler of him, and dishonour the poor man.**

They do so.

They next proceed to make a law which fixes a sum of money as the qualification of citizenship; the sum is higher in one place and lower in another, as the oligarchy is more or less exclusive; and they allow no one whose property falls below the amount fixed to have any share in the government. These changes in the constitution they effect by force of arms, if intimidation has not already done their work.

Very true.

And this, speaking generally, is the way in which oligarchy is established.

Yes, he said; but **what are the characteristics of this form of government, and what are the defects** of which we were speaking?

First of all, I said, **consider the nature of the** [property or money–Ed.] **qualification. Just think what would happen if** [ship navigators or–Ed.] **pilots were to be chosen according to their property, and a poor man were refused permission to steer, even though he were a better pilot?**

You mean that they would shipwreck?

Yes....

....SOCRATES: This, then, will be the first great defect of oligarchy [the poor are disqualified from entering government–Ed.]?

Clearly.

And here is another defect which is quite as bad.

What defect?

The inevitable division: such a State is not one, but two States, the one of poor, the other of rich men; and they are living on the same spot and always conspiring against one another.

That, surely, is at least as bad.

Another discreditable feature is, that, for a like reason, they are incapable of carrying on any war [with foreign powers or city-states–Ed.]. **Either they arm the** [poor–Ed.] **multitude, and then they are more afraid of them than of the enemy; or, if they do not call them out in the hour of battle, they are oligarchs indeed, few to fight as they are few to rule. And at the same time their fondness for money makes them unwilling to pay taxes.**

How discreditable!

And, as we said before, under such a constitution the same persons have too many callings—they are husbandmen, tradesmen, warriors, all in one. [Jacks of many trades, but masters of none.–Ed.] Does that look well?

Anything but well.

There is another evil which is, perhaps, the greatest of all, and to which this State first begins to be liable.

What evil?

A man may sell all that he has, and another may acquire his property; yet after the sale he may dwell in the [oligarchial–Ed.] city of which he is no longer a [political–Ed.] part, being neither trader, nor artisan, nor horseman, nor hoplite [a Greek foot-soldier–Ed.], but only a poor, helpless creature.

Yes, that is an evil which also first begins in this State.

The evil is certainly not prevented there; for **oligarchies have both the extremes of great wealth and utter poverty.**

True.

But think again: In his wealthy days, while he was spending [squandering, wasting—Ed.] his money, **was a man of this sort a whit more [political, civic—Ed.] good to the State for the purposes of citizenship? Or did he only seem to be a member of the ruling body, although in truth he was neither ruler nor subject, but just a spendthrift [wastrel, prodigal—Ed.]?**

[The point is, money does not necessarily make one a good citizen, nor, I suppose, does the lack of it necessarily make one a bad citizen. Good citizenship and riches are two different things. You may have one without the other. And so to politically or oligarchially reject and discard a man for lack of money/property is to throw away many a good citizen. And that's not good for the state.—Ed.]

As you say, he seemed to be a ruler, but was only a spendthrift.

May we not say that this is the drone in the [state—Ed.] house who is like the drone in the honeycomb and that the one is the plague of the city as the other is of the hive?

[Note: A drone is “a male bee, as the male honeybee, which serves only in a reproductive capacity, has no sting, and does no work; **2.** an idle person who lives by the work of others; parasite; loafer”—Ed.]

Just so, Socrates.

And God has made the flying drones, Adeimantus, all without stings, whereas of the walking drones he has made some without stings but others have dreadful stings; of the stingless class are those who in their old age end as paupers; of the stingers come all the criminal class, as they are termed.

Most true, he said.

Clearly then, whenever you see paupers in a State, somewhere in that neighborhood there are hidden away thieves, and cutpurses and robbers of temples, and all sorts of malefactors.

Clearly.

Well, I said, and **in oligarchical States do you not find paupers?**

Yes, he said; **nearly everybody is a pauper who is not a ruler.**

And may we be so bold as to affirm that **there are also many criminals to be found in them [among the pauper drones—Ed.], rogues who have stings, and whom the authorities are careful to restrain by force?**

Certainly, we may be so bold.

The existence of such persons is to be attributed to want of education, ill-training, and an evil constitution of the State?

True.

Such, then, is the form and such are the evils of oligarchy; and there may be many other evils.

Very likely.

Then **oligarchy, or the form of government in which the rulers are elected for their wealth,** may now be dismissed. **Let us next proceed to consider the nature and origin of the individual who answers to this State.**

By all means.

Does not the timocratical man change into the oligarchical on this wise?

How?

A time arrives when the representative of timocracy [the timocratic man—Ed.] has a son: at first he [the timocratic son—Ed.] begins by emulating his father and walking in his footsteps, but presently he sees him of a sudden foundering against the State as upon a sunken reef, and he and all that he has is lost; he may have been a general or some other high officer who is [unjustly—Ed.] brought to trial

under a prejudice raised by informers, and either put to death, or exiled, or deprived of the privileges of a citizen, and all his property taken from him.

Nothing more likely.

And the son has seen and known all this—he is a ruined man, and his fear has taught him to knock [timocratic, office-seeking—Ed.] ambition and passion foremost from his bosom’s throne; humbled by poverty he takes to money-making and by mean and miserly savings and hard work gets a fortune together. Is not such an one likely to seat the concupiscent [sensual/sexual—Ed.] and covetous element on the vacant throne and to suffer it to play the great king within him, girt with tiara and chain and scimitar?

Most true, he replied.

And when he has made reason and spirit sit down on the ground obediently on either side of their sovereign, and taught them to know their place, he compels the one [reason—Ed.] to think only of how lesser sums may be turned into larger ones, and will not allow the other [spirit, passion, enthusiasm, emotion—Ed.] to worship and admire anything but riches and rich men, or to be ambitious of anything so much as the acquisition of wealth and the means of acquiring it.

Of all changes, he said, there is none so speedy or so sure as the conversion of the ambitious youth into the avaricious one [“as from love of honour to love of money for the young man.”—Rouse].

And the avaricious, I said, is the oligarchical youth?

Yes, he said; at any rate the individual out of whom he came is like the State out of which oligarchy came.

Let us then consider whether there is any likeness between them.

Very good.

First, then, they resemble one another in the value which they set upon wealth?

Certainly.

Also in their penurious [cheap, stingy, miserly—Ed.], laborious character; the individual only satisfies his necessary appetites, and confines his expenditure to them; his other desires he subdues, under the idea that they are unprofitable.

True.

He is a shabby fellow, who saves something out of everything and makes a purse for himself; and this is the sort of man whom the vulgar applaud. Is he not a true image of the State which he represents?

He appears to me to be so; at any rate money is highly valued by him as well as by the State.

You see that he is not a man of [spiritual, philosophical, musical—Ed.] cultivation, I said.

I imagine not, he said; had he been [properly—Ed.] educated he would never have made a blind [irrational, sensual, desirous covetous—Ed.] god director of his chorus, or given him chief honour.

Excellent! I said. Yet consider: Must we not further admit that owing to this want of cultivation there will be found in him dronelike desires as of pauper and rogue, which are forcibly kept down by his general habit of life?

True.

Do you know where you will have to look if you want to discover his rogueries?

Where must I look? [at him when he is certain no one is watching—Ed.]

You should see him where he has some great opportunity of acting dishonestly, as in the guardianship of an orphan.

Aye.

It will be clear enough then that in his ordinary dealings which give him a reputation for honesty he coerces his bad passions by an enforced virtue; not making

them [other people–Ed.] see that they are wrong, or taming them [his worldly, sensual desires–Ed.] by reason, but by necessity and fear constraining them, and because he trembles for his possessions.

To be sure.

Yes, indeed, my dear friend, but **you will find that the natural** [sensual or sinful–Ed.] **desires of the drone commonly exist in him all the same** whenever he has to spend what is not his own [e.g. his ward's money–Ed.].

Yes, and they will be strong in him too.

The man, then, will be at war with himself; he will be two men, and not one; but, in general, his better [rational, spiritual–Ed.] desires will be found to prevail over his inferior [sensual, worldly–Ed.] ones.

True.

For these reasons such an one will be more respectable than most people; yet **the true virtue of a unanimous and harmonious soul will flee far away and never come near him.**

I should expect so.

And surely, the miser individually will be an ignoble competitor in a State for any prize of victory, or other object of honourable ambition; **he will not spend his money in the contest for glory**; so afraid is he of awakening his expensive appetites and inviting them to help and join in the struggle; in true oligarchical fashion he fights with a small part only of meanness in a contest; **he saves his money and loses the** [glorious, timocratic–Ed.] **prize.**

Very true.

Can we any longer doubt, then, that **the miser and money-maker answers to the oligarchical State?**

There can be no doubt.

Next comes democracy; of this the origin and nature have still to be considered by us; and then we will enquire into the ways of the democratic man, and bring him up for judgment.

That, he said, is our method.

Well, I said, **and how does the change from oligarchy into democracy arise? Is it not on this wise?—The good at which such a State aims is to become as rich as possible, a desire which is insatiable?**

What then?

The rulers, being aware that their power rests upon their wealth, refuse to curtail by law the extravagance of the spendthrift youth because they gain by their ruin; they take interest from them and buy up their estates and thus increase their own wealth and importance?

To be sure.

[See e.g. the incessant devil of “jew”-temptation into sensual indulgence (sin) via “jew”-advertising, television, print, etc., and the “jew”-money-lending, “credit-cards,” etc. to satisfy the insatiable sensual cravings thus excited or aroused by the “jew” within the “jew”-corrupted and ruined Gentile society.–Ed.]

There can be no doubt that the love of wealth and the spirit of moderation [or temperance–Ed.] **cannot exist together in citizens of the same State to any considerable extent; one or the other will be disregarded.**

That is tolerably clear.

And in oligarchical States, from the general spread of carelessness and extravagance, men of good family have often been reduced to beggary?

Yes, often.

And still they remain in the city; there they are, ready to sting and fully armed, and some of them owe money, some have [oligarchially–Ed.] **forfeited their citizenship; a third class are in both predicaments** [i.e. with neither property nor

citizenship–Ed.]; **and they hate and conspire against those who have got their property, and against everybody else, and are eager for revolution.**

That is true.

On the other hand, the [usurious–Ed.] **men of business**, stooping as they walk, and **pretending not even to see those whom they have already ruined, insert their sting—that is, their money—into some one else who is not on his guard against them, and** [via their “compounding” “jewish” “interest”–Ed.] **recover the parent sum** [the original “principal” loan–Ed.] **many times over** multiplied into a family of children: **and so they make drone and pauper to abound in the State.**

Yes, he said, there are plenty of them—that is certain.

The evil blazes up like a fire; and they [the oligarchial authorities or usurious ruling class–Ed.] will not extinguish it, either by restricting a man’s use [wastefulness, profligacy–Ed.] of his own property, or by another remedy:

What other?

One which is the next best, and has the advantage of compelling the citizens to look to their characters:—**Let there be a general rule** [against usurious “loan-sharking”–Ed.] **that every one shall enter into voluntary contracts at his own risk** [thus no longer also binding any “co-signers” to these loans?–Ed.], **and there will be less of this scandalous money-making, and the evils of which we were speaking will be greatly lessened in the State.**

Yes, they will be greatly lessened.

At present the [oligarchial–Ed.] governors, induced by the [profit-making, usurious, predatory –Ed.] motives which I have named, treat their subjects badly; while they and their adherents, especially **the young men** [drones–Ed.] **of the governing class, are habituated to lead a life of luxury and idleness both of body and mind; they do nothing, and are incapable of resisting either pleasure or pain.**

Very true.

They themselves care only for making money, and are as indifferent as the pauper to the cultivation of virtue.

Yes, quite as indifferent.

Such is the state of affairs which prevails among them. And often rulers and their subjects may come in one another’s way, whether on a pilgrimage or a march, as fellow-soldiers or fellow-sailors; aye and they may observe the behaviour of each other in the very moment of danger—for where danger is, there is no fear that the poor will be despised by the rich—and very likely the wiry sunburnt poor man may be placed in battle at the side of a wealthy one who has never spoilt his complexion and has plenty of superfluous flesh—when he sees such an one puffing and at his wit’s end, **how can he avoid drawing the conclusion that men like him are only rich because no one has the courage to despoil them?** And when they meet in private will not people be saying to one another “Our warriors [both rich and poor?–Ed.] are not good for much”?

Yes, he said, I am quite aware that this is their way of talking.

SOCRATES: And, as in a body which is diseased the addition of a touch [germ–Ed.] from without may bring on illness, and sometimes even when there is no external provocation a commotion may arise within—in the same way wherever there is weakness in the State there is also likely to be illness, of which the occasions may be very slight, **the one** [ruling–Ed.] **party introducing from without their oligarchical, the other their democratical allies, and then the State falls sick, and is at war with herself;** and may be at times distracted, even when there is no external cause.

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, surely.

[The Republic, 8, p. 550-57]

Democracy: the Rule of Pleasure, Hedonism, Sensuality, License, Equality and the Mob or Majority (of Sensualist Swine)

The gods of “democracy” (the “rule of the people”) are (first and foremost) the People themselves—(self-deified as “majority Will”; “vox populi, [=] vox Dei”); then come the gods of Liberty (from virtuous self-restraint); and of Equality (of the very worst with the very best “aristos”); and so on. (See Shakespeare’s Coriolanus.)

For the best (“aristos”) naturally decline to worship the worst: the democratic dregs, the mad mob, their demagogues and their tyrants. And the worst naturally envy and hate the best for being better.

And for every deity (or personified ideal) there exists a devil, an anti-deity, an antithesis. Therefore Athena (the goddess of Wisdom), and the gods of Truth and Philosophy, as well as all Socratic philosophers, are all characteristically banished from democracies for their unpopular, undemocratic and unflattering “crimes” of wisdom, truth, reason, temperance, orderliness, and so on. How dare they hold the unflattering mirror of truth up to the face of the People, the “Demos,” this pompous ass within its lion’s skin?

* * * * *

From The Republic 8, p. 557-58,

SOCRATES: And then democracy comes into being after the poor have conquered their opponents, slaughtering some and banishing some, while to the remainder they give an equal share of freedom and power; and this is the form of government in which the magistrates are commonly elected by lot.

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, that is the nature of democracy, whether the revolution has been effected by arms, or whether fear has caused the opposite party to withdraw.

And now what is their manner of life, and what sort of a government have they? **for as the government is, such will be the man.**

Clearly, he said.

In the first place, are they not free; and is not the city [supposedly, allegedly—Ed.] full of freedom and frankness—a man may say and do what he likes?

’Tis said so, he replied.

And where freedom is, the individual is clearly able to order for himself his own life as he pleases?

Clearly.

Then in this kind of State there will be the greatest variety [or “jewish,” Marxist, Babylonian “diversity”—Ed.] of human natures?

There will.

This, then, seems likely to be the fairest of States, being like an embroidered robe which is spangled with every sort of flower. And just as women and children think a variety of colours [or a “gorgeous mosaic”—Ed.] to be of all things most charming, so there are many men to whom this State, which is spangled with the [“multi-cultural”—Ed.] manners and characters of mankind, will appear to be the fairest of States.

Yes....

SOCRATES: ... **And there being no necessity, I said, for you to govern in this State, even if you have the capacity, or to be governed, unless you like, or go to war when the rest go to war, or to be at peace when others are at peace, unless you are so disposed**—there being no necessity also, because some law forbids you to hold office or be a dicast [a judge—Ed.], that you should not hold office or be a dicast, if you have a fancy—**is not this a way of life which for the moment is supremely delightful?**

For the moment, yes.

And is not their [i.e. the democratic judges' (tolerance and forbearance of the guilty)—Ed.] humanity to the condemned in some cases quite charming? Have you not observed how, in a democracy, many persons, although they have been sentenced to death or exile, just stay where they are and walk about the world—the gentleman parades like a hero, and nobody sees or cares?

Yes, he replied, many and many a one.

See too, I said, the forgiving spirit of democracy, and the “don't care” about trifles, and **the disregard which she shows of all the fine principles which we solemnly laid down at the foundation of the city**—as when we said that, except in the case of some rarely gifted nature, there never will be a good man who has not from his childhood been used to play amid things of beauty and make of them a joy and a study—**how grandly does she trample all these fine notions of ours under her feet, never giving a thought to the pursuits which make a statesman, and promoting to honour any one who professes to be the people's friend.**

Yes, she is of a noble spirit.

SOCRATES: These and other kindred characteristics are proper to **democracy**, which **is a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike.**

ADEIMANTUS: We know her well.

[The Republic 8, p. 557-58]

* * * * *

The (Socratic and Democratic) Genesis of the Tyrant

“**he who is ill-governed in his own person—the tyrannical man**”—(Rep. 9:579)

The Republic 8, p. 558-62,

SOCRATES: **Consider now**, I said, what manner of man **the** [democratic—Ed.] **individual** is, or rather consider, as in the case of the [democratic—Ed.] State, how he comes into being.

ADEIMANTUS: Very good, he said.

Is not this the way—**he is the son of the miserly and oligarchical father who has trained him in his own habits?**

Exactly

And, like his father, he keeps under by force the [sensually indulgent—Ed.] **pleasures which are of the spending and not of the getting sort** [“not moneymaking”—Rouse; (not productive)—Ed.], **being those which are called unnecessary?**

Obviously.

Would you like, for the sake of clearness, to **distinguish which are the necessary and which are the unnecessary pleasures?**

I should.

Are not necessary pleasures those of which we cannot get rid, and of which the satisfaction is a benefit to us? And they are rightly so, because we are framed by nature to desire both what is beneficial and what is necessary, and cannot help it.

True.

We are not wrong therefore in calling them necessary?

We are not.

And the desires of which a man may get rid, if he takes pains from his youth upwards—of which the presence, moreover, does no good, and in some cases the reverse of good [lust, alcoholism, gluttony, etc.—Ed.]—shall we not be right in saying that all these are unnecessary?

Yes, certainly.

Suppose we select an example of either kind, in order that we may have a general notion of them?

Very good.

Will not the desire of eating, that is, of simple food and condiments [“relish” (of meat or fish, eaten with bread)—Rouse], in so far as they are required for health and strength, be of the necessary class?

That is what I should suppose.

The pleasure of eating is necessary in two ways; it does us good and it is essential to the continuance of life?

[“The desire for bread is necessary on both counts, both because bread is beneficial and because a living man cannot suppress the desire for it.”—Rouse]

Yes.

But the condiments are only necessary in so far as they are good for health?

[“And the desire for meat, if it provides any help towards vigour [is likewise necessary—Ed.].”—Rouse]

Certainly.

And the desire which goes beyond this, of more delicate food, or other luxuries, which might generally be got rid of, if controlled and trained in youth, and is hurtful to the body, and hurtful to the soul in the pursuit of wisdom and virtue, may be rightly called unnecessary?

[“Very well. And we might fairly name any further desire unnecessary, a desire for other viands [viddles, fixins, morsels—Ed.] than those we have mentioned, one that can be corrected and trained from youth and can be got rid of by most people, **which does harm to the body and harm to the soul as regards wisdom and temperance.**”—Rouse]

Very true.

May we not say that these [unnecessary—Ed.] desires spend, and that the others make money because they conduce to production?

Certainly.

And of the pleasures of love [sex—Ed.], and all other pleasures, the same holds good?

True.

And the drone of whom we spoke was he who was surfeited in [“laden with”—Rouse] pleasures and desires of this sort, and was the slave of [“ruled by”—Rouse] the unnecessary desires, whereas he who was subject to the necessary only was miserly [“thrifty”—Rouse] and oligarchical?

Very true.

Again, let us see how the democratical man grows out of the oligarchical: the following, as I suspect, is commonly the process.

[“Now we must go back,’ I said, ‘and explain how the democratical man is produced. Here, it seems to me, is the usual way.”—Rouse]

What is the process?

When a young man who has been brought up as we were just now describing, **in a vulgar and miserly way** [“in parsimony [thrift, stinginess—Ed.] and ignorance”—Rouse], **has tasted drones’ honey and has come to associate with fierce and crafty natures** [“gets a taste of the drones’ honey, and finds himself among wild beasts fiery and dangerous,”—Rouse] **who are able to provide for him all sorts of refinements and varieties of pleasure—then**, as you may imagine, **the change will begin of the oligarchical** [honor-loving—Ed.] **principle within him into the democratical** [pleasure-loving—Ed.]? [“...there you must see the beginning of his inward change from the oligarchic to the democratic.”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Inevitably.

SOCRATES: And as in the city like was helping like, and the change [from oligarchy to democracy—Ed.] was effected by an alliance from without assisting one division of the citizens, **so too the young man is changed by a** [sensual—Ed.] **class of desires coming from without to assist** [and exacerbate—Ed.] **the desires within him**, that which is akin and alike again helping that which is akin and alike?

[Sinful birds of a feather flock to sin together.—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Certainly.

And if there be any ally which aids the oligarchical [money —getting, property-loving and productive—Ed.] principle within **him**, whether the influence of a father or of kindred, advising or rebuking him, **then there arises in his soul a faction and an opposite faction, and he goes to war with himself.**

It must be so.

And **there are times when the democratical** [pleasure-loving—Ed.] **principle gives way to** [“retreats before”—Rouse] **the oligarchical** [money-making—Ed.], **and some of his** [sensual—Ed.] **desires die, and others are banished; a spirit of reverence** [“shame”—Ed.] **enters into the young man’s soul and order is restored.**

Yes, he said, that sometimes happens. [Rep. 8:560]

[Thus all spiritual (and hence political) change and movement within a man is not necessarily decadent, downward or for the worst. If so, there would be no hope at all for the improvement or upward ascension of men’s worldly and sensual souls. So neither the individual (nor the society?) need always spiritually or culturally decline into self-destruction and oblivion.—Ed.]

SOCRATES: **And then, again, after the old** [sensual or “democratic”—Ed.] **desires have been driven out, fresh ones spring up, which are akin to them, and because he, their father, does not know how to educate** [and conquer, master, subordinate, tame—Ed.] **them, wax fierce and numerous.**

Yes, he said, that is apt to be the way.

They [his new unnecessary, bad or harmful desires—Ed.] **draw him to his old associates** [desires—Ed.], **and holding secret intercourse with them, breed and multiply in him.**

Very true.

SOCRATES: **At length they** [both his old and new sensual, unnecessary and harmful desires—Ed.] **seize upon the citadel of the young man’s soul, which they perceive to be void of all accomplishments and fair pursuits and true words, which make their abode in the minds of men who are dear to the gods, and are their best guardians and sentinels.**

[“So in the end, I think, they storm the fortress of the young’s man’s soul, and they find it empty of learning and beautiful practices and without words of truth,

which are indeed **the best sentinels and guardians on the minds of men whom the gods love.**—Rouse] [Rep. 8:560]

* * *

[See Matt. 12:43-45 (also Luke 11:24-26),

When an unclean spirit [or desire—Ed.] **is gone out of a man**, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none. Then **he saith, I will return unto my house from whence I came out; and when he cometh, he findith (it) empty, swept and garnished** [“put in order”—By.]. **Then goeth he, and** [invites in—Ed.] **taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the last (state) of that** [demonically or desirously possessed, unpossessed and seven times repossessed—Ed.] **man is worst than the first.**

(Also see 2 Peter 2:20-22)—Ed.]

* * *

ADEIMANTUS (responding): None better.

SOCRATES: **False and boastful conceits and phrases mount upwards and take their place.**

[“Now liars and impostors, I suppose, false words and opinions, charge up and occupy the place of the others in such a man.”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: They are certain to do so.

And so the young man returns [to his bad old desires, friends and ways—Ed.] into the country of the [forgetful, careless, lazy, sedated, dreamy—Ed.] lotus-eaters [*Odyssey* 9:83—Ed.], and [“openly”—Rouse] takes up his dwelling there in the face of all men; and if any help be sent by his friends to the oligarchical [“thrifty”—Rouse] part of him, the aforesaid vain conceits shut the gate of the king’s fastness [“of the royal castle in him”—Rouse]; and they [the bad desires and opinions—Ed.] will neither allow the embassy itself to enter, nor if private advisers offer the fatherly counsel of the aged will they listen to them or receive them. **There is a battle and they** [the bad desires and opinions—Ed.] **gain the day, and then modesty** [“Shame”—Ed.], **which they call silliness, is ignominiously thrust into exile by them, and temperance, which they nickname unmanliness** [“dub Cowardice”—Rouse], **is trampled in the mire and cast forth; they persuade men** [“the man”—Rouse] **that moderation and orderly expenditure are vulgarity and meanness** [“clownishness”—Rouse], **and so, by the help of a rabble of evil appetites, they drive them** [modesty and temperance—Ed.] **beyond the border** [of the self-deceived soul of the wanton sensualist, self-possessed by (his own) vain opinions and (his own) harmful desires, habits, addictions, lusts—Ed.].

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, with a will. [“Indeed they do!”—Rouse]

And when they have emptied and swept clean the soul of him who is now in their power and who is being initiated by them in great [sensual and sinful—Ed.] **mysteries, the next thing is to bring back to their house insolence and anarchy and waste and impudence** [“Violence and Anarchy and Licentiousness and Immodesty with a long train of attendants,”—Rouse] **in bright array having garlands on their heads, and a great company with them, hymning their praises and calling** [“glorify[ing]”—Rouse] **them by sweet names; insolence they term breeding** [“Violence is now good breeding,”—Rouse], **and anarchy liberty, and waste magnificence, and impudence** [“Immodesty”—Rouse] **courage. And so the young man passes out of his original nature, which was trained in the school of necessity, into the freedom and libertinism** [“emancipation and release”—Rouse] **of useless** [“unprofitable”—Rouse] **and unnecessary pleasures.**

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, the change in him is visible enough. [Rep. 8:561]

[Thus the once cleanly-swept figurative house of the young man’s mind has since been invaded and is now occupied by unnecessary, unprofitable, undesirable and even harmful guests, desires, opinions, attitudes.]

Or again (metaphorically-speaking) the young man's spirit-castle has become possessed and soiled by foul and dirty "demon"-guests who/which had best be immediately (self-) exorcised from this young man's mind or soul, self-possessed by his own stubborn, willful errors, and by his own sensually-immoderate and harmful ways.

(For "The Devil made me do it," has always been far more palatable explanation to the decadent, self-abandoned and self-discarded soul (and to others besides) than, "I have made myself a demon. I have damned myself indeed. I have sent myself to live in hell, by my own dark hand, mind, thoughts and needs.")—Ed.]

SOCRATES: After this he lives on, spending his money and labour and time ["pains and study"—Rouse] on unnecessary pleasures quite as much as on necessary ones; **but if he be fortunate, and is not too much disordered in his wits** ["dissolute"—Rouse], **when years have elapsed, and the heyday of passion is over—supposing that he then re-admits into the city** [-state of his mind or spirit—Ed.] **some part of the exiled virtues, and does not wholly give himself up** [cf. Jude :7 & Ephesians 4:19—Ed.] **to their successors** ["the intruders"—Rouse]—**in that case he balances his pleasures and lives in a sort of equilibrium**, putting the government of himself into the hands of the one [craving, desire or impulse—Ed.] which comes first and wins the turn ["by lot"—Rouse]; and when he has had enough of that [one ruler—Ed.], then into the hands of another; he despises none of them but encourages them all equally.

Very true, he said.

Neither does he receive or let pass into the fortress any true word of advice ["he will not even let it into the guardhouse."—Rouse]; if any one says to him that **some pleasures are the satisfactions of good and noble desires, and others of evil desires**, and that **he ought to use and honour some and chastise and master** ["enslave"—Rouse] **the others**—whenever this is repeated to him he shakes his head and says that they are all alike ["equal, and to be respected equally."—Rouse], and that one is as good as another.

Yes, he said; that is the way with him.

Yes, I said, **he lives from day to day indulging the appetite of the hour**; and sometimes he is lapped in drink and strains of the flute; then he becomes a water-drinker, and tries to get thin; then he takes a turn at gymnastics; sometimes idling and neglecting everything, then once more living the life of a philosopher ["sometimes he makes a show of studying philosophy."—Rouse]; often he is busy with politics, **and starts to his feet and says and does whatever comes into his head**; and, if he is emulous of any one who is a warrior, off he is in that direction ["Perhaps the fame of a military man makes him envious, and he tries that; or a lord of finance—there he is again."—Rouse], or of men of business, once more in that. **His life has neither law nor order** ["no discipline or necessity"—Rouse]; **and this distracted existence he terms joy and bliss and freedom**; and so he goes on.

Yes, he replied, **he** [the democrat—Ed.] **is all liberty and equality**.

Yes, I said; his life is motley and manifold ["variegated"—Rouse; (and "legion"?)—Ed.] and an epitome of the lives of many;—**he answers to the State which we described as fair and spangled** ["beautiful, many-colored"—Rouse]. **And many a man and many a woman will take him for their pattern, and many a constitution and many an example of manners is contained in him.**

[O say, have you seen that so proudly hailed, star-spangled banner?—Ed.]

Just so.

SOCRATES: **Let him then be set over against democracy; he may truly be called the democratic man.**

ADEIMANTUS: **Let that be his place, he said.**

[The Republic 8, p. 559-62]

Tyranny: the Rule of Injustice, Coercion, Terror

From *The Republic* 8, p. 562-69:

SOCRATES: **Last of all comes the most beautiful** [Socrates is mocking the self-flattery (and even self-adulation) of the democrat or mobster, of his mindless mob, and of his tyrant—Ed.] **of all, man and State alike, tyranny and the tyrant;** these we have now to consider.

ADEIMANTUS: Quite true, he said.

Say then, my friend, **in what manner does tyranny arise?—that it has a democratic origin is evident.**

[“Of course democracy changes into this [tyranny—Ed.], so much is clear enough.”—Rouse]

Clearly.

And does not tyranny spring from democracy in the same manner as democracy from oligarchy—I mean, after a sort?

How?

The good which oligarchy proposed to itself and the means by which it was maintained was excess of wealth [“riches”—Rouse]—am I not right?

Yes.

And the insatiable desire of wealth and the neglect [“disregard”—Rouse] **of all other things for the sake of money-getting was also the ruin of oligarchy?**

True.

SOCRATES: **And democracy has her own good, of which the insatiable desire brings her to dissolution?**

[“**Then is democracy also dissolved by insatiate desire for that which it defines as good?**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: **What good?**

SOCRATES: **Freedom** [“**Liberty**”—Rouse], I replied; **which, as they tell you in a democracy, is the glory** [“most beautiful”—Rouse] **of the State—and that therefore in a democracy alone will the freeman of nature deign to dwell** [“and therefore this is the only city where a man of free nature thinks life worth living.—Rouse]?

Yes; the saying is in everybody’s mouth.

I was going to observe, that **the insatiable desire of this and the neglect of other things introduces the change in democracy, which occasions a demand for tyranny.**

How so?

When a democracy which is thirsting for freedom has evil [demagogic, freeloading, robbing—Ed.] **cupbearers presiding over the feast** [“worthless butlers presiding over its wine,”—Rouse], **and has drunk too deeply of the strong wine of freedom, then, unless her rulers are very amenable and give a plentiful draught** [and sufficient bread and circuses—Ed.], **she** [democracy—Ed.] **calls them to account and punishes them, and says that they are cursed oligarchs.**

Yes, he replied, a very common occurrence.

Yes, I said; and **loyal citizens are insultingly termed by her** [to be—Ed.] **slaves who hug their chains and men of naught; she would have** [demagogic—Ed.] **subjects who are like rulers, and** [submissive, mob-courting, pandering—Ed.] **rulers who are like subjects: these are men after her own heart, whom she praises and honours both in private and public. Now, in such a State, can liberty have any limit?**

Certainly not.

By degrees the anarchy [of democratic liberty and equality—Ed.] **finds a way into private houses, and ends by getting among the** [democratic—Ed.] **animals and infecting them.**

[“And it must go creeping, my friend,’ said I, ‘into private houses too, and the end is, their anarchy [reigning within every family, wherein children usurp parental authority and parents abdicate—Ed.] even gets into the animals!”—Rouse]

How do you mean?

I mean that **the father grows accustomed to descend to the level of his sons and to fear them, and the son is on a level with his father, he having no respect or reverence** [“honor or fear”—Rouse] for either of his parents; **and this is his freedom** [“**‘must have liberty’ he says**”—Rouse], **and the metic** [“settler”—Rouse] **is equal with the citizen and the citizen with the metic, and the stranger** [“the foreigner”—Ed.] **is quite as good as either** [the citizen or the settler—Ed.].

Yes, he said, that is the way.

And these are not the only evils, I said—there are several lesser ones: **In such a** [democratic, “liberated,” equalized—Ed.] **state of society** [“Teacher fears pupil”—Rouse] **the master fears and flatters his scholars, and the scholars despise their masters and tutors; young and old are all alike; and the young man is on a level with the old, and is ready to compete with him in word or deed; and old men** condescend to [“give way to”—Rouse] the young and are full of pleasantry and gaiety [“complaisance and wriggling”—Rouse]; they are loth to be thought morose and authoritative [“disagreeable or dictatorial”—Rouse], and therefore they **adopt the manners of the young.**

Quite true, he said.

[“And behold the topmost pinnacle!’ said I. ‘Mob liberty can go no further in such a city, when...’—Rouse] **The last extreme of popular liberty is when the slave bought with money, whether male or female, is just as free as his or her purchaser; nor must I forget to tell of the liberty and equality of the two sexes in relation to each other.**

[Have you ever heard that one before, dear reader? (Me too.)—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Why not, as Aeschylus says, utter the word which rises to our lips?

[“Shall we not say what cometh to our lips,’ he rejoined, ‘as Aeschelus put it?’” (In one of his lost plays.)—Rouse]

[Alas, this ancient word of the poet/playwright Aeschylus is (forever?) lost to us moderns, and hence unutterable—Ed.]

SOCRATES: That is what I am doing, I replied; and I must add that no one who does not know would believe, how much greater is the liberty which the animals [the dregs, the worst of men—Ed.] who are under the dominion of man have in a democracy than in any other State: for truly, the she-dogs, as the proverb says, are as good as their she-mistresses [“the bitches become just like their mistresses”—Rouse; (And vice-versa?)—Ed.], and the horses and asses have a way of marching along with [“the greatest freedom and haughtiness,”—Rouse] all the rights and dignities of freemen [Even democratic monkeys parade therein as men. (“Are we not men”? Chorus: “We are Devo.”)—Ed.]; **and they will run at anybody who comes in their way if he does not leave the road clear for them: and all things are just ready to burst with liberty** [“and all the other animals likewise are filled full of liberty.”—Rouse].

When I take a country walk, he said, I often experience what you describe. You and I have dreamed the same thing.

And above all, I said, **and as the result of all, see how sensitive** [“touchy”—Rouse] **the citizens become; they chafe impatiently at the least touch of authority** [“hint of servitude, and won’t have it;”—Rouse] **and at length,** as you know, **they cease to care even for the laws, written or unwritten; they will have no one over them** [“that no one may be their master in anything.”—Rouse].

Yes, he said, I know it too well.

Such, my friend, I said, **is the fair and glorious** [democratic, egalitarian and libertarian–Ed.] **beginning out of which springs** [“grows”–Rouse] **tyranny.**

Glorious indeed, he said. But **what is the next step?**

The ruin of oligarchy [money-seeking–Ed.] **is the ruin of democracy** [freedom-seeking–Ed.]; **the same disease magnified and intensified by liberty overmasters democracy—the truth being that the excessive increase of anything often causes a reaction in the opposite direction** [“To do anything too much tends to take you to the opposite extreme,”–Rouse; (E.G., Mohammed’s sexual prudery (his “sacred” command for women to be completely covered or veiled at all times) was a (popular) reaction to a long period of Meccan and Arabian whoredom wherein women were sexually free, loose, provocative and hence sexually-dominant over men, thus eventually and inevitably provoking the opposite extreme, still in effect to this day.)–Ed.]; **and this is the case** not only in the seasons and in vegetable and animal life, but **above all in forms of government.**

True.

The excess of liberty [riot, chaos–Ed.], **whether in States or individuals, seems only to pass into excess of slavery** [imposed order and restraint–Ed.].

[“For too great liberty seems to change into nothing else that too great slavery, both in man and in city.”–Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, the natural order. [Rep. 8:564]

[When an individual or group without temperance, the virtue of self-control, is or becomes free to go sensually (socially and/or politically) out of control—(such as a would-be prodigal son suddenly freed from his father’s constraints—or a child set loose in a candy store, or an alcohol or heroin addict freed from jail)—they (if lacking Socratic “philosophy and music”) will sometimes do just that: pig out, go hog wild and/or run riot, until (like a crazy or violent drunk, mad dog, mad bull or mad mob) they have to be (and hence are) forcibly restrained by officialdom, government or tyranny.

And so precisely via their general freedom or popular license to run riot are the public’s formerly “sacred” rights to eventually annulled altogether or trampled underhoof by some accursed, officious, fascistic “tyrant” or other. And so with the general public’s sacred, constitutional right to “freak out” (or whatever) goes yours and mine, dear reader. (Bummer.)–Ed.]

SOCRATES (continuing): **And so tyranny naturally arises out of democracy, and the most aggravated form of tyranny and slavery out of the most extreme form of liberty?**

[“Then **it is likely**,’ said I, **that democracy is precisely the constitution out of which tyranny comes; from extreme liberty, it seems, comes a slavery most complete and most cruel.**”–Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: As we might expect. [Rep. 8:564]

* * * * *

Note also the Socratic irony that while excess of liberty (whether individual or general) leads to tyranny, and hence to official or political loss of liberty, it was precisely this official deprivation or lack of political liberty which killed (or rather murdered) Socrates.

But the former is a bodily or sensual freedom (to become a sensual swine or addict (of sex, wine, tobacco, drugs, food, pork, ham, or what-have-you?). And the latter is a mental or spiritual, philosophical or “scientific” freedom (to seek, find, speak or publish the truth).

* * *

A hopeless drunk, e.g., habitually surrenders himself and his liberty to his sensuality, his bodily desire or pleasure. And if he makes himself too much of an intolerable bother or pain to his fellows, they “intervene” or seize him (take his liberty from him), and they banish him from them (their town, city, state or county), or they cast him into a prison or “hospital” of

some sort, wherein the imprisoned drunk is (temporarily) unfree, constrained or prevented from indulging his intemperate sensual desire(s), from surrendering himself or “giv[ing] himself up” (Rep. 8:561) or over to his beloved sensual object(s).

And so (if I read Socrates rightly) a group of intemperate swine or sensualist satyrs likewise “give up” their liberty (and hence power) to their beloved objects of sensual desire or bodily pleasure. And they gradually become too undisciplined, too unruly and too weakened (in mind and body) to resist conquest by would-be-tyrants (foreign or domestic), who (like drunks ever looking for excuses or occasions to drink) are always seeking excuses or occasions to tyrannize, i.e. to seize more and more official or authoritative power for themselves; to take the people’s rights (along with their properties) to themselves; to transform individual, “public” or popular liberties into their own private powers or official “authorities”; in short, to tyrannize over the people, the public, the citizenry, and hence over their properties, both individual and common, private and “public.”

For the more liberties the public thus officially lose, the more powers or “authorities” “their” “public servants” (“public” officials or “authorities”) thereby gain. Think of a “see-saw”: the higher the “public” official(s), the lower the citizen or the public, and vice-versa. And if you know what’s good for you and yours, you **don’t** want to get too far underneath (the almighty, officious, imperious power of) “your” “public servant(s).”

The public freedom or choice (to become a society of intemperate and unruly sensualist swine) is thus the official cause, seized excuse or “emergency” occasion for the tyrant’s’ initially popular reaction or “solution” to the social/political problem—wherein (in or under the popular name of “law and order”) popular liberty is “legally” or officially “suspended,” suppressed, outlawed and/or taken away from **all** citizens—(both swine, satyrs, goats, jackasses **and** men—from both the worst and the best (“aristos”) citizens alike). And (like political poker winnings or the spoils of civil war) this popular liberty/power is thus officially transferred or given to, or assumed or taken by the conquering tyrant(s). For again and again the public’s loss is the “public official’s” gain.

* * *

All the more reason, therefore, to live separate or “segregated” from the intemperate satyr, the unruly jackass or the violent Negro. And all the more reason, therefore, for the Satanic “jew” to wish or desire, to order, command or “legislate,” and to coerce or “enforce” your “racial/national integration” with his intemperate, troublesome, parasitic, predatory and violent pet Negro—and hence to “enforce” your racial/national disintegration from your own chosen (and hopefully stable and orderly) genetic kindred. (Something which, if you notice, the “jew: never, ever does to himself, but only to you and me, fellow Gentile.) For in this evil way the evil, harmful, malevolent and predatory “jew” indirectly (and yet self-righteously) attacks you and yours by siccing his intemperate, unruly and violent attack dogs (or rather apes) upon you, your loved ones and your properties. And that’s not very nice or neighborly of him, is it?

And then the wily, “jew”-bastard son of Satan (John 8:44) cites (not his intemperate, unruly, violent and unleashed pet Negroes but) an intemperate, unruly or violent “public” or “citizenry” as his tyrannical excuse or “emergency” occasion to “legislatively” annul, outlaw or take away your popular, traditional (even constitutional) rights, freedoms or liberties, and thus to cast both you **and** his violent, intemperate and unruly Negro into his totalitarian state-prison system—into his Marxist, communist, fascist police state—wherein and whereby this criminal-prone or “terrible” citizenry can be more easily watched...by tyrannical “jewish” (and Negro) gov’t or state officials...and by “national [concentration camp] guards(men).” For again your would-be tyrants, these Marxist or Satanic “jews,” want to use (and indeed have used) their intemperate, unruly and violent pet Negroes as their excuse and occasion to enslave you and yours.

Far better, therefore, to live without certain individual people or races (i.e. “jews” and Negroes) than by their presence to be thus cast into political (Marxist, communist or “jewish”) hell on earth. (See e.g. “jewish”-Amerika.) For the Devil’s kingdom or heaven is our hell. So let’s not go there. Or let’s get the hell out of here/there.

* * *

And when the public is continually fed on or exposed 24/7/365 to “jewish” “entertainment” (T.V. or cinema), they are continually being tempted to sin, to fornicate, to get drunk, to overeat or otherwise pig out. And so the weakest minds succumb most of all to these ceaseless sensual promptings or sinful temptations emanating from this tireless, continuous, electronic tempter in a (T.V.) box. Just look how incredibly fat Americans have become! And the imperious “jews” want to spread this sinful satyr or swine “culture” of theirs worldwide?—this sensuous or “consumerist” culture?—this poisonous, “jewish”-Amerikan apple? (Indeed, haven’t they already done so?) (Let’s just say “No”!)

Socrates tells us democracy coincides with sensuality, that the democrat is a seeker after bodily pleasures, and therefore not a mentally strong and stoic character but a weak and needy man. And we see that the “jew” (through his media monopoly) ceaselessly tempts the Gentile with physical, bodily, sensual pleasures. And the “jew” panders, feeds off and profits from those artificial needs which he deliberately promotes, encourages, incites and fosters within the Gentiles, and then ceaselessly excites, exacerbates and exploits at will. And he will.

And furthermore, the “jew” is a Marxist or “communist” “revolutionary”—i.e. a would-be tyrant (over the Gentiles). And Socrates teaches us that democracy naturally leads to or degenerates into tyranny. So, is this an accident, fluke or mere coincidence that the “jew” makes his intended Gentile prey weak with sensuality, addiction or sinfulness? and thus prepares him/them for Marxist, “jewish,” “communist” conquest, usurpation, enslavement, tyranny? (The correct answer is, “Hell no!”) In other words, the “jew’s” ceaseless promotion of “consumerism,” sensuality or sin is “pro-revolutionary.”

And “consumerism’s” abstinent antithesis, sensual minimalism or sinlessness, is therefore “counter-revolutionary” because it coincides with Gentile strength, mental and physical. A nation of physical addicts or mental weaklings is far easier (for the Satanic “jew”) to overcome, dominate, manipulate, control, capture or conquer, don’t you think?

And so here again we see how and why the “capitalist” “jew” prepares the way (and the Gentile prey) for the “communist” “jew”—who again (like the “communist” and the zionist) is really one and the same Satanic “jew.” Can you see that, dear reader? It’s rather important for you and yours, your country and your countrymen that you do.

* * *

This (individual or collective) freedom or power to become an intemperate slave of sensuality (or sin)—and hence a mental (and physical, political, and military) weakling—is yet a freedom or power, but one which doesn’t last if used or exercised. It’s like wasting, squandering, losing or giving away all your money or property. Then what? When you lose, waste, squander or give away the farm, you simply starve, beg or rob.

The rich man is indeed free to become poor, and the free man to become a slave. But it’s much harder to gain riches or freedoms than to lose them. And yet the choice to give up choice is still a choice. The freedom or choice to become a slave is the freedom or choice to have neither (freedom nor choice). (But where in earthly hell is that?) The freedom to give up, surrender or cast away freedom is yet a freedom—but a freedom which doesn’t last or which goes away, if indeed you chose to give it away, or are weak enough to have your liberties (constitutional or otherwise) taken from you and yours. For again liberty (like money or property) is far easier to lose than to gain—to give away or squander than to take to oneself. Or freedoms, once surrendered, given away or lost, are much harder to be regained or taken back. (And it almost always involves violence and bloodshed. And that’s no fun.)

It’s much easier to sin than to abstain or refrain from sin, to be undisciplined than self-disciplined. It’s a lot easier to pig-out than to fast, and to gain weight than to lose it. It’s much easier to come down a hill or mountain than to climb up it.

And because freedom, self-control, self-discipline and/or nobility is much easier lost than won, or decreased than increased, it’s far easier to slide or fall down Socrates’ constitutional mountain (from monarchy/aristocracy to timocracy to oligarchy to democracy to tyranny—Rep. 8:568) than to ascend it.

And furthermore, one is necessarily and unavoidably dependent upon one's fellow citizens as to how high their common city or acropolis can possibly stand upon Soc's hill. All the more reason, therefore, not to make every single satyr a citizen. And here is the convincing argument and the vital need for the political freedom of association. It matters, dear fellow-citizen, whom your fellow citizens are...and aren't. For you can't "make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." And you can't construct a marble cathedral out of mud bricks. And you can't have a free city-state with too many drones, satyrs, swine, pigs, democrats or would-be tyrants therein. And if the latter are to enter or remain, your hill city must fall. And there's the political rub!—and the democratic, "liberal," libertine, humanist or Babylonian collapse into historical dust! Can you dig it?

* * * * *

SOCRATES (continuing): That, however, was not, as I believe, your question—you rather desired to know **what is that disorder which is generated alike in oligarchy and democracy, and is the ruin of both?** ["...you asked what kind of disease it was which grows up the same both in oligarchy and in democracy, and enslaves democracy."—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Just so, he replied.

Well, I said, I meant to refer to **the class of idle spendthrifts** ["of idle and extravagant men."—Rouse], **of whom the more courageous are the leaders and the more timid the followers, the same whom we were comparing to drones, some stingless, and others having stings.**

A very just comparison.

These two classes [good-for-nothing citizen-drones and their good-for-nothing leaders—Ed.] **are the plagues of every city in which they are generated** [or foolishly admitted—Ed.], **being what phlegm and bile are to the body. And the good physician and lawgiver of the State ought, like the wise bee-master, to keep them at a distance and prevent, if possible, their ever coming in; and if they have anyhow found a way in, then he should have them and their cells cut out as speedily as possible.**

["**These two**, then,' said I, '**make a mess of every constitution they get into**, like [poison—Ed.] hot phlegm and cold gall in the body; **the good physician must beware of them both in good time** [before they do irreparable damage, or become too many or too powerful for medicinal political expulsion—Ed.], **and so must the good lawgiver in the city, no less than the skilful beemaster. It is best not to let them in at all; but if they so, cut them out, honeycombs and all.**"—Rouse]

[Should the philosopher-king, as did Doctor Adolf—(who, by the way, indeed agreed with Socrates that communism (tyranny) is necessarily preceded by democracy)—bother with the formality of first revoking citizenship of the "drones" before exorcising or expelling them out of his body politic, and driving them out of his kingdom or state to plague some other unfortunate state foolish enough to welcome them, or weak enough to be unable to keep them out? (Madagascar, perhaps?)—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: **Yes, by all means**, he said.

["**The very thing**,' said he, '**the whole lot of them.**"—Rouse]

SOCRATES: Then, in order that we may see clearly what we are doing, **let us imagine democracy to be divided, as indeed it is, into three classes** [i.e. the useless drone class; the orderly, wealthy class; and the people or everyone else—Ed.]; **for in the first place freedom creates rather more drones** [useless parasites or predators, non-producing consumers, "welfare" or "dole" cases—Ed.] **in the democratic than there were in the oligarchical State.**

["Let us assume that a democratic city is made up of three parts, as it really is. One, a [useless, harmful, drone—Ed.] class, such as we have described, grows here because of democratic license [tolerance, permissiveness, doles—Ed.], no less than in the oligarchic city."—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: That is true.

SOCRATES: **And in the democracy they are certainly more intensified.**

ADEIMANTUS: How so?

SOCRATES: **Because in the oligarchical State they** [the drones—Ed.] **are disqualified** [after squandering their money or property—Ed.] **and driven from office, and therefore they cannot train or gather strength; whereas in a democracy they** [the demagogues of the useless class of parasitic drones—Ed.] **are almost the entire ruling power, and while the keener sort speak and act, the rest keep buzzing about the bema** [podium, forum, stage, platform—Ed.] **and do not suffer a word to be said on the other side** [See Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf on combating this (Marxist) mob censorship.—Ed.]; **hence in democracies almost everything is managed by the drones.**

[“There they get no [military—Ed.] training and gather no strength, because they are excluded from the government as being [propertyless and—Ed.] held in no honour; **but in democracy this is the dominant class**, all but a few. **The fiercest part of them talk and act while the others swarm round the platform and buzz; they never tolerate anyone who speaks on the other side** [as Socrates, Jesus and Adolf well know—Ed.], **so that all business of state is managed by this class, with a few exceptions.**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Very true, he said.

Then there is another class which is **always** being **severed from the mass.**

What is that?

SOCRATES: They are **the orderly class**, which in a nation of traders is **sure to be the richest.**

[“When all are busy making money, the most orderly by nature, I suppose, generally become richest.”—Rouse]

[This productive and industrious class is the Marxist “jew” hated, slandered and targeted “Bourgeois” class—but only the Gentiles among them, of course.—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Naturally so.

They are **the most squeezable** [taxable, bleedable, robable—Ed.] **persons** and **yield the largest amount of honey to the drones.**

[“From them, I think, comes the most honey for the drones, and they are most easy to squeeze.”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Why, he said, **there is little to be squeezed out of people who have little.**

[Is this why the “communist,” Marxist, “jewish” Soviet Union “fell”? Or rather why the red-“jew” tyranny and police (“K.G.B.”) took private and personal possession of formerly “public,” government or state property?—(although their official control of all “public” property was always 9/10ths of personal ownership anyway—as “possession is 9/10ths of the law”). Did the “Soviet Union” of the Marxist or “communist” “jews” fall simply because these officious and predatory or parasitic “jewish” drones or vampires or had simply preyed or sucked the Slavic Gentile body politic completely bloodless, lifeless, listless, non-active, and hence non-productive? Was it because there was simply nothing left for these predatory and parasitic “jews” to rob or steal from the once-productive Gentiles? And so did these drone-like, communistic or “oligarchic” “jews” then steal (or rather “buy”—for pennies on the “ruble”) the “public’s” the “people’s” or the “commune’s” property (which was nearly all property) from the “people’s” state or government, and simply declare a “capitalist” state? Is that what really and truly happened to (or rather in) the “Soviet Union”? (See the “Russian [i.e. “jewish”—Ed.] oligarchs.”)—Ed.]

SOCRATES: And this is called **the wealthy class** [“drones’ fodder”—Rouse; (a.k.a. the “bourgeoisie” class—Ed.)], and **the drones feed upon them.**

That is pretty much the case, he said.

SOCRATES: [Besides the “orderly, wealthy” class and the useless, predatory and would-be tyrannical “drones,”–Ed.] **The people are a third class, consisting of those who work with their own hands; they are not politicians** [“outside politics, without much property of their own.”–Rouse], **and have not much to live upon. This, when assembled, is the largest and most powerful** [“sovereign”–Rouse] **class in a democracy** [“when it combines”–Rouse].

ADEIMANTUS: True, he said; but then **the multitude is seldom willing to congregate unless they get a little honey.**

[“So it is,’ he said, ‘but **it** [the Marxist, “jew”-led, propertyless or “proletarian” mob–Ed.] **does not often care to combine unless it can get a bit of the honey.**”–Rouse]

SOCRATES: [“**Well it does get a bit from time to time,**’ I said, ‘**depending on the ability of the presidents, in taking the property away from those** [“bourgeois”–Ed.] **who have it and distributing it among the people, to keep most of it themselves.**”–Rouse]

And do they not share? I said. **Do not their** [Marxist, demagogic, “jewish” or “Gentile-front”–Ed.] **leaders deprive the rich of their estates and** [in exchange for the mob’s “democratic” votes–Ed.] **distribute them among the people; at the same time taking care to reserve the larger part for themselves?**

ADEIMANTUS: Why, **yes**, he said, **to that extent the people do share** [in the drone-plundered, taxed, confiscated or “nationalized” ex-property of the “bourgeois” or propertied class.–Ed.].

[“Yes, it gets a share to that extent.”–Rouse] [Rep. 8:565]

* * * * *

“So demagogic, Marxist, communist or ‘proletarian’ drone-Jews rob ‘bourgeois’ drone-Jews?”

No, the former, demagogic or “communist” “jews” are in fact financed and directed or controlled by the latter “bourgeois” or “capitalist” “jews,” who “take measures to protect ...[their] own” property when they (via their agents) unleash their hateful, envious, Marxist mobs to attack and “loot” the Gentile (not the “jewish”) “bourgeois” classes. (See Satanic plan of attack #3 “From the Protocols of Zion” below, along with Monetary/Economic Appendix #I: “Jewish” Communism verses a True and Genuine “Labor,” “Populist” or “People’s” State)

* * *

It has been insightfully observed that democracies (states ruled by the “demos,” the people, the majority of voters or “majority will”) do not and cannot last for long, simply because the propertyless majority immediately or eventually vote to rob (dispossess, spoil, tax-rob or “nationalize”) the rich, and to distribute or share this “bourgeois” booty among themselves. Indeed, “democratic” demagogues, tyrants and “jews” have historically and characteristically exploited the hatred, jealousies and envies of the poor for the rich and their properties.

“Democratic” demagogues promise their “democratic” mobs a share (or rather “their rightful share”) in these rich properties in exchange for their votes or political support. And yet (as Socrates duly noted above) these demagogues usually keep most of this rich loot, spoil or booty for themselves. (See “jewish” “communism.”) Should that surprise anyone?—that democratic demagogues (or demagogic democrats) only pretend or **say** they’re in it for the “demos,” the people, and hence **not** for themselves, their personal advantage, advancement and enrichment?

And naturally the greatest supporters of these would-be tyrants are (not productive citizens but) fellow drones like themselves: unproductive, envious and predatory: those who produce nothing of value, and hence have nothing of value (to trade), and so who live by robbing others—if only indirectly through their demagogues. (See “democratic constituents.”)

And once the estates of the rich are robbed (or tax-robbed) and consumed by these unproductive drones or locusts, and all storerooms, pantries and cupboards are empty or

bare, and further production is discouraged by high taxation or outright confiscation (or “nationalization”), the drones or locusts have no more fields to consume, and so fly off to find some.

(Note how, before and after their Berlin wall came down, countless predatory, Marxist, communist-“jew” drones flew off as “refugees” from their “Soviet Union” to the United States, to therein devour Gentile American tax-moneys (via their special “jewish” “refugee status,” legislated specifically for them by their drone-like, capitalist-“jew” Amerikan brothers). And never forget that their “Soviet Union” was born in, financed and launched from “jewish”-Amerika, specifically from their Jew York City. And so it’s only natural that the anti-Christ or “jewish” drones should at last return home to their Satanic Amerikan hive.)

* * *

A group which everyone can join is a group with its very best members or “aristos” citizens on the bottom, outvoted and overwhelmed by the rest—like an inverted or upside-down pyramid. And nowadays, since the imperious Amerikans have “made the world safe for [their] democracy,” the vote is generally granted to everyone: i.e. to women, to the poor or propertyless, and even to Negroes. (See “universal suffrage.”)

And so the poor simply outvote the rich, or vote to rob the rich. And this democratic eventuality of the poor outvoting and robbing the rich, or voting to tax-rob or dispossess the propertied, is precisely why democracies don’t last, or turn into tyrannies. (See e.g. “post-colonial” (i.e. ex-European) Africa.)

And this is precisely why foresightful states presciently grant(ed) the vote only to property owners of sufficient size or minimum amount. For the understanding was (is) that voters simply vote their personal interests, or desires. The poor generally desire to rob (the properties of) the rich, and they don’t think or care much about the consequences...until they’re far too obvious to continue to ignore or deny.

And so many a democratic mob (or swarm or human drones or locusts) have later come (in times of famine or tyrant-enslavement) to regret and lament their earlier mob-rush to folly, and to perceive at last, but alas too late, that their true interests were neither served nor further by devouring the rich (at their demagogues’ urging)—but merely their momentary and impulsive desires, now long repented. (“Act in haste, repent at leisure.”)

For the demagogic Devil and Its Marxist, “communist” “jewish” demons promise heaven, but they deliver quite the opposite—with themselves on the throne, and with most of the loot by their sides—as Socrates correctly observed of demagogues above.

Demagogues, Marxist/“jewish” tyrants or “communist” officials (along with “legal” monopolists and/or “jewish” “central” banksters): Now there’s a species of the rich who truly deserve to be robbed by the poor, because their riches have been robbed **from** the poor (along with everyone else)!

* * *

So what demagogues promise (heaven) and what they deliver (hell) are opposites. Just take a look at ex-colonial or ex-European Africa: a dark collection of brutal, violent, starving black tyrannies or dictatorships. Is this not so?

(“Don’t it always seem to go, you don’t know what you’ve got ’till it’s gone.”—Joni Mitchell)

The European farmers have now all but lost all their African farms to the African Negroes. But why haven’t the Oppenheimer “jews” lost their African (diamond or gold) mines, etc. to these same natives?

Is this not why?: From Satanic “jewish” protocol #3,

These [“jew”-inspired, Marxist, communist or democratic–Ed.] **mobs will rush delightedly to shed the blood of those whom**, in the simplicity of their ignorance [of these manipulative and malevolent “jews”–Ed.], **they have envied from their cradles, and whose property they will then be able to loot.**

Ours they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us [“jews” who signal, command and control this lowest “class” attack, or rather (“jewish”) “class war”—Ed] **and we shall take measures to protect our own.** [pr. #3]

Is that not precisely what happened to Africa, Russia and elsewhere?
But let us return to the Socratic dialogue precisely where we left it, (i.e. Rep. 8:565).

* * * * *

The Tyrant’s Rise as the Public’s “Protector”

ADEIMANTUS: Why, yes, he said, to that extent the people do share.

SOCRATES: **And the persons whose property is taken from them are compelled to defend themselves before the people as they best can?**

[“So those whom they plunder have to defend themselves, I suppose, by speaking before the people and taking action in what way they can.”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: What else can they do?

SOCRATES: **And then, although they may have no desire of change, the others charge them with plotting against the people and being friends of** [“counter-revolutionary,” “reactionary,” Gentile or “bourgeois” —Ed.] **oligarchy?**

[“**And so they are accused** by the other party [the drone, Marxist, revolting, democratic, “revolutionary” or “peoples” party—Ed.] **of plotting against the people, even if they have no wish to revolt, and they are said to be reactionary oligarchs.**”—Rouse]

[Note again, dear reader, how the demagogic “jew” (via his deceived, manipulated, Marxist or democratic mob) never, ever condemns, attacks, dispossesses nor beheads his own “jewish” bourgeois oligarchy—his “revolutionary” funders and masters—(indeed, his own conspiratorial, “revolutionary,” SuperNational “banking” (i.e. debt-token monopoly-money) cabal or cartel)—by which **all** classes of **all** Gentile nations are gradually dispossessed and eventually debt-enslaved, or else suddenly conquered and enslaved via these very “communist revolutions.”

(Can we Gentiles, along with Moses, say “jubilee” (debt-forgiveness or repudiation) and “reparations.” Let’s hope so. Our world, our freedoms and futures depend upon it. (See The Monetary/Economic Appendix VII on usury)—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: True.

SOCRATES: **And the end is that when they see the** [misled—Ed.] **people, not of their own accord, but through ignorance, and because they are deceived** by informers [“jews” and “jewishpapers”—Ed.], **seeking to do them wrong, then at last they are forced to become** [“reactionary”—Ed.] **oligarchs in reality; they do not wish to be, but the sting of the** [Marxist “jew”—Ed.] **drones torments them and breeds** [“counter”—Ed.] **revolution in them.**

[“**In the end, when they see the people, ignorant and completely deceived by the false accusers** [or slanderers—Ed.], **trying recklessly to do them wrong, then at last willy-nilly they become truly oligarchic, not willingly, but this evil thing also is put in them by that** [demagogic, democratic, Marxist, communist “jewish”—Ed.] **drone stinging them.**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: **That is exactly the truth.**

SOCRATES: **Then come impeachments and judgments and** [propagandistic, “jewish” show—Ed.] **trials of one another.**

[Socrates himself would later come to most intimately experience this demagogic “impeachment,” this “public” “trial” (indictment, false accusation, judgment or “conviction”) method of legalized murder or political assassination.

And note this type of slanderous, propagandistic “show-trials” were a characteristic feature of the so-called “French” and “Russian” revolutions and states—(or rather of the bloody-red, Marxist, “jewish” capture, terror, mass-murder and (upper-class) decapitation, extermination, genocide or “holocaust” of those Gentile nations).—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: True.

SOCRATES: **The people** [the “demos”—Ed.] **have always some champion** [“special protector”—Rouse] **whom they set over them and nurse into greatness.**

Yes, that is their way.

SOCRATES: **This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears above ground he is a protector.**

[“One thing is clear then,’ I said, ‘that **when a tyrant appears, he grows simply and solely from a protectorship** as the root.’”—Rouse]

Yes, that is quite clear.

SOCRATES: **How then does a protector begin to change into a tyrant?** Clearly when he does what the man is said to do in the tale [“fable”—Rouse] of the Arcadian temple of Lycaean Zeus.

What tale?

The tale is that **he who has tasted the entrails of a single human victim** minced up with the entrails of other victims **is destined to become a wolf** [a wolf-man, man-eater, cannibal, political predator, tyrant—Ed.]. Did you never hear it?

Oh, yes.

And the protector of the people is like him; having a mob entirely at his disposal, he is not restrained from shedding the blood of kinsmen; by the favourite method of false accusation [slander, defamation, “la infamy”—Ed.] **he brings them into court and** [after the slanderous, propagandistic “show-trial” is over, (see e.g. Socrates at Athens, Jesus-God at Jerusalem, and the Germans at Nuremberg), and the fatal foregone conclusion has been pronounced upon the “guilty” heads of the falsely accused and falsely “convicted,” he then—Ed.] **murders them, making the life of man to disappear** [“and incurs bloodguilt by destroying the life of a [innocent—Ed.] man;”—Rouse], **and with unholy tongue and lips tasting the blood of his fellow citizen; some he kills and others he banishes, at the same time hinting at the abolition of debts and partition of lands** [“estates”—Rouse]: **and after this, what will be his destiny? Must he not either perish at the hands of his** [Gentile and “bourgeois”—Ed.] **enemies** [or by his treacherous “jew”—backers, funders, managers, handlers, wire-pullers, puppeteers and eventual back-stabbers—Ed.], **or from being a man become a wolf—that is, a tyrant?**

[“...**he must either perish at the hands of his enemies or become a tyrant, and be a wolf instead of a man?**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Inevitably.

This, I said, is he who begins to make a [Marxist, “jewish” political—Ed.] **party against the rich** [Gentiles—Ed.]?

[“**That is the man** then,’ said I, **who comes to lead a party against those who possess property.**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: The same.

After a while he is driven out, but comes back, in spite of his [“reactionary,” “bourgeois,” “counter-revolutionary”—Ed.] **enemies, a tyrant full grown.**

[“He may be banished then, and return in despite of his enemies a tyrant finished and complete?”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: That is clear.

And if they [the tyrant's "bourgeois" "reactionaries"—Ed.] **are unable to expel him, or to get him condemned to death by a public accusation** ["or to accomplish his death by setting the mind of the city against him,"—Rouse], **they conspire to assassinate him.**

Yes, he said, that is their usual way.

Then comes the famous request for a bodyguard, which is the device of all those who have got thus far in their tyrannical career—"Let not the people's friend," as they say, "be lost to them."

["...if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews:"—John 18:36]

Exactly.

The people readily assent; all their fears are for him—they have none for themselves.

["So the [unsuspecting—Ed.] people grant the bodyguard; fearing for him, I suppose, but quite easy about themselves."—Rouse]

Very true.

["And when a man sees this [private bodyguard/army of the tyrant—Ed.] who has money and with his money the repute of being a people-hater,"—Rouse]

And when a man who is wealthy and is also accused of being an enemy of the people sees this [private bodyguard/army of the tyrant—Ed.], **then,** my friend, as the oracle said to Croesus,

By pebbly Hermus' shore **he flees** and rests not and is not ashamed to be a coward. [Heroditus 1, 55—Ed.]

And quite right too, said he, for if he were, he would never be ashamed again.

But if he [whom the tyrant would dispossess and/or behead in the holy name of "the people"—Ed.] is caught he dies.

Of course.

And he, the protector of whom we spoke, **is** to be seen, not "larding the plain" with his bulk, but himself **the overthrower of many, standing up in the chariot of State with the reins in his hand, no longer protector, but tyrant absolute.**

["**Meanwhile your Protector** himself does not lie low, grand in his grandeur, at all; no, he **knocks down crowds of others and stands towering** [titanic, supreme—Ed.] **in the coach of state, Protector no longer but Tyrant finished and complete.**"—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: No doubt, he said. [Rep. 8:566]

Thus does the demagogue inevitably and intimately betray the (authoritative) power foolishly, naively, trustingly placed by the public within his all-too-eager grasp.

* * * * *

On the Public's "Protector" (from e.g. "Tyranny" or "Terror")

For the tyrant comes not to serve the public but to be publicly served, and not to give but to take from the public. But he doesn't dare publicly **say** that, nor plainly act that predatory desire out, until he feels he safely can—(not without false official "explanations" or "cover-stories" to conceal his tyrannical acts and intentions—as e.g. merely being official acts for the "protection of the public" against invasion, crime, "terrorism," etc.).

Until the would-be tyrant (his bodyguard, his soldiers and/or his police) is sufficiently armed, and his would-be subjects (the public) are sufficiently disarmed, he doesn't dare

publicly reveal himself. For only then, with absolute or irresistible power within his grasp, does the democratic “protector” of the foolishly trusting democratic mob at last remove his protective mask, thus revealing his true tyrannical face. Only then is the “public’s shepherd” self-revealed as the public’s wolf, devourer, dispossessor, enslaver. Only then, when it’s too late for the public to save themselves, is the public’s White Knight “protector” against the Dragon (of Tyranny or international “Terror” e.g.) self-revealed as the terrible Dragon Itself. (Burnt!)

So beware whenever anyone in “public” office tries to disarm you or restrict your armament, to coerce you (in the name of a law, what else?) to “register” or “permit” your weapons, etc. For such is clearly a would-be tyrant. And once you are tyrannically disarmed, you and yours are entirely at his (or her) tyrannical or “protective” “mercy.” And you don’t want to go there, dear readers. For such is a police-state, a terror-state, a state of tyranny. (See e.g. “jewish”-Amerika.)

* * *

The “tyrant” is the false friend and pseudo-protector, guardian or champion of the people, who uses their “holy” or “sacred” name to cover his multitude of sins—precisely as a high priest likewise employs, exploits and desecrates his god. As long as the tyrant can hide beneath the holy mask and cloak of these popular gods—and no god is more holy nor popular among the people than the (god of) the people themselves—the tyrannical religious/political champion of the god(s) meets with little to no resistance among the faithful. For he is not yet perceived as a “tyrant” and public enemy acting against the “sovereign” will and “sacred” interests of the people—which two deities or sanctities do not always coincide, and are never so far apart as when the tyrant or public enemy “represents,” “champions” and dictates the “public interest or good.” And nothing is more “good” or “better” for the public than that the tyrant should be their permanent “protector” (from all forms of Evil).

The tyrant often emerges as the guardian of public order or protector of public safety, thrown into riot or chaos by a “democratic” culture of sensualist license, or of the political “equality” of true unequals, or of the social/governmental toleration of the arrogance and aggressions of intolerable lowlifes: “democratic” bastards born of the popular worship of those contradictory goddesses, Liberty and Equality. (For the more we all are free to run our fastest and jump our highest, the more obvious our natural inequality becomes, even to the willingly or obstinately deaf, dumb and blind: the most fervent devotees of the goddess Equality, whether individually or racially “equal.”)

The tyrant plays upon the resentment and greed of the poor for the rich and their properties, and presents himself as their champion and protector against this “oppressive,” “heartless” and “exploitative” class. But once he is empowered with an army, he is then free to cast off his populist mask and have his (hitherto concealed) will and way with all classes, properties and liberties within the (or his) kingdom.

* * * * *

From The Republic 8, p. 564-65,

SOCRATES: [Besides the “orderly, wealthy” class and the useless, predatory and would-be tyrannical “drones,”—Ed.] **The people are a third class, consisting of those who work with their own hands; they are not politicians** [“outside politics, without much property of their own.”—Rouse], **and have not much to live upon. This, when assembled, is the largest and most powerful** [“sovereign”—Rouse] **class in a democracy** [“when it combines”—Rouse].

ADEIMANTUS: True, he said; but then **the multitude is seldom willing to congregate unless they get a little honey.**

[“So it is,” he said, ‘but **it** [the Marxist, “jew”-led, propertyless or “proletarian” mob—Ed.] **does not often care to combine unless it can get a bit of the honey.**’”—Rouse]

SOCRATES: [“**Well it does get a bit from time to time,**’ I said, **‘depending on the ability of the** [demagogic or democratic–Ed.] **presidents, in taking the property away from those** [“bourgeois”–Ed.] **who have it and distributing it among the people, to keep most of it themselves.**”–Rouse]

And do they not share? I said. **Do not their** [Marxist, demagogic, “jewish” or “Gentile-front”–Ed.] **leaders deprive the rich of their estates and** [in exchange for the mob’s “democratic” votes–Ed.] **distribute them among the people; at the same time taking care to reserve the larger part for themselves?**

ADEIMANTUS: Why, **yes**, he said, **to that extent the people do share** [in the drone-plundered, taxed, confiscated or “nationalized” ex-property of the “bourgeois” or propertied class.–Ed.].

[“Yes, it gets a share to that extent.”–Rouse]

[Republic 8, p. 564-65]

* * * * *

So demagogues profess and pretend to be Robin Hoods talking from the rich to give to the poor. But once enthroned they give mostly to themselves, their friends, allies, supporters and servants.

For power has power to enforce its “sacred” will or “law.” And power is known by its works, if not by its words. For Evil power or tyranny (malevolent and harmful coercion) is least of all known by its (false) words, and hence known far better by its actual deeds.

It has been suggested that, “Power corrupts; and absolute power corrupts absolutely.”

I don’t personally know too much about that, having had little to no experience in “absolute power.” But I’m willing to give it a try if you are, dear readers and/or fellow-citizens.

And on rare occasions I have indeed been willing to issue commands, pronounce decrees, give orders. But the trouble is, I’ve yet to find anyone willing to **take** them from me. (Don’t you just hate when that happens! Or there’s the political rub!)

Heck, I’m still trying to get my kitten to come to me when I call her—much less to stop being so insufferably aloof, and so apparently deaf, yes, even to my most “sacred” orders, commands, decrees or pronouncements.

* * * * *

The Public Misery Which the Tyrant Brings

SOCRATES (continuing from 8:566 above): And now **let us consider** the happiness of the man, and also of **the State** [“city”–Rouse] **in which a creature like him is generated.**

Yes, he said, let us consider that.

At first, in the early days of his power, he is full of smiles, and he salutes every one whom he meets [“says he is no tyrant,”–Rouse];—**he to be called a tyrant, who is making promises in public and also in private! liberating debtors, and distributing land to the people and his followers, and wanting to be so kind and good to every one** [“pretends to be gracious and friendly to all the world.”–Rouse]!

Of course, he said.

SOCRATES: **But when he has disposed of foreign enemies by conquest or treaty, and there is nothing to fear from them, then he is always stirring up some war or other, in order that the people may require a leader.** [Rep. 8, p. 567]

* * * * *

For the tyrannical Dragon needs, requires or invents a dragon (foreign or domestic—real or imagined) against which he/it/they might play the gallant White Knight, selflessly

protecting his lady, his public, his terrified subjects against that big, bad, fire-breathing dragon lurking somewhere **out there**—hence nowhere **in here**. (You see?) This protective White Knight is a very popular role indeed—one which masks, disguises and excuses a multitude of public tyrannies, predations and offenses (perpetrated by tyrannical “public” officials). In this way the real and true tyrannical public enemy within is self-transformed into a publicly protective and popularly supported leader crusading against some allegedly or imaginary terrible enemy without. (See e.g. “Al Qaeda” or “world-wide Islamic terrorism,” whereas the real and genuine world-wide terrorism remains, as always, “jewish”-Amerikan (or anti-Christ-Amerikan) and “Israel.”)

In other words, Satan the Dragon and “Devil” is a “slanderer” of Its Godly opponents, as are the Slanderer’s demonic children, devotees and servants or mercenaries. (Apo./Rev. 20:2, 13:1-10 & John 8:44)

And so the greatest Evil and most evil Tyrant of all needs, requires and invents an external and eternal Evil to **pretend** to oppose, and a most “terrible” enemy (such as e.g. “stateless international terrorism”) to allegedly wage a ceaseless, permanent and most “terrible” war against Its people, from which this tyrannical “White Knight,” “Good Shepherd” or “Uncle” Satan must therefore perpetually “protect” them. For this terrible pretension and imposture enables Evil and/or Its tyrant to “protectively” reign indefinitely, and to strike at this “terror(ism)” wherever It claims to “see,” it, “find” it, or “suspect” it to be lurking—both within and without Its tyrannical kingdom or terror-state—which is therefore always on “terror-alert,” or permanently languishing within the perpetual deceit, darkness and war-like tension of Evil’s perpetual terror-state, or state of terror.

After all, was this not the Satanic spirit and terrible pretension of the “jewish” “Soviet Union”—ceaselessly looking for “reactionary” enemies without and “counter revolutionaries” within to torture into irrefragable “confessions”? (See George Orwell’s 1984.) And is this not the Satanic spirit and terrible pretension of “Israel” and of the anti-Christ or “jewish”-Amerikan empire?—that the great and terrible Evil lurks somewhere **outside**, and therefore not inside the Satanic ruling party and government?

And there **is** of course just such an eternal Evil, and a Satanic earthly enemy waging just such an eternal and terrible war against Gentile humanity. (See “jewish” “zionism,” Marxism or “communism” and John 8:44.) But this “jewish”-Amerikan Evil, Tyranny and Terror is on **their** side, not **against** them, and therefore against us Gentiles everywhere. So beware and be armed.

And therefore is Evil, the Devil or the Slanderer (and Its terrible, mass-murderous and demonic spawn) not yet once again, here and now, in “Israel” and Amerika, as within Its former “Soviet Union,” characteristically and slanderously “projecting” Itself upon Its good or Godly opponents?

* * *

And these endless foreign wars are also tyranny’s (or the tyrant’s) grand distraction from itself, its public failures, its broken promises, its deceitful words and predatory deeds—in short, from all that’s really wrong and menacing within its tyrannical state.

See e.g. the Amerikan presidents since Woodrow Wilson ceaselessly and imperiously waging wars and world wars to “liberate” the Gentile world from both non-democratic governments (like the Kaiser’s) **and** democratic or popularly-elected governments (like Hitler’s).

The Amerikans call this “making the world safe for democracy” and/or their “liberation” of the (Gentile) world from tyranny. For they’ve never once “liberated” the “jews” and imposed their puppet-government over them. Why not? Why “liberate” the world and yet not the “jews”? Because it’s not really liberation, but “jewish”-Amerikan imperialism?

Methinks the arrogant and imperious Americans should liberate themselves first. Or first they should at least come to know what liberty is. And then perhaps they could see well enough to presume to “liberate” all the world besides themselves. Don’t you think? (Luke 6:41-42 & Matt. 7:1-5)

(And who's gonna make the world safe from Amerika? That's what I wanna know. "Israel" perhaps? Perhaps not.)

* * *

And note also that while president Roosevelt was "crusading" (at Casablanca, Yalta and elsewhere) to "liberate" Europe from the Europeans, what was he doing to the Americans at home if not installing a tyrannical, totalitarian, "jewish" or Soviet style government with a thousand-and-one official arms reaching into and controlling every aspect of American civil or domestic life? Is this not so?

And so from his ancient grave Socrates instructs us moderns yet again.

* * *

And it also seems no matter which non-American leaders are chosen by non-Americans, nor what form of gov'ts the Gentile nations choose for themselves, the imperious Americans are not satisfied until they've chosen both the governmental forms **and** the (puppet) leaders thereof.

But the irony is that these imperial Amerikan presidents were (are) puppets also. Yes, the presidential Amerikan tyrants since Wilson (and his anti-Christ masters' "central" bank of 1913) were actually tyrannical puppets of their tyrannical puppet-masters: corporately concealed, "legally" irresponsible on "unliable," supernational or imperial, "jewish," and hence anti-God and anti-Gentile (or anti-humanity).

(And although president Lincoln (1861-65) was indeed a tyrant, he was his own tyrant, his own man, and hence not some purchased presidential prostitute and traitorous puppet of some foreign power: evil, malevolent, supernational or imperial, "messianic" or Satanic, anti-Christian, anti-Gentile, "jewish," zionist or "communist.")

And so though the tyrannical Amerikan presidents since Wilson have ceaselessly "crusaded" against the liberty and independence of Gentile nations and individuals everywhere around the globe (under the very disguise of "liberating" the Gentile world from (what else?) Evil, Tyranny, Dictatorship, etc.), they in fact were (and remain) the official puppets, the political whores and the treasonous agents of supernational or imperial tyrants, corporately masked and anonymous tyrants, "unliable" and irresponsible "jewish"-bankster tyrants. Amerikan presidents since Wilson were (and remain) puppet-tyrants or tyrannical puppets of their corporately and "centrally" concealed SuperNazi "jewish" masters who secretly pull(ed) their tyrannical presidential strings, and covertly command(ed), control(led) and dictate(d) their tyrannical presidential policies—both foreign and domestic, international and intra-national.

For he who creates or makes the "money" calls the tune. And he who accepts or who takes the "money" plays, sings and/or dances to the ("jewish" "central" bankster's) tune.

* * *

And so this latest phase of "jewish"-Amerikan imperialism or SuperNazism, this current and permanent "war on terror," is to be permanently waged against all Gentiles everywhere, including, as before, all those within "jewish"-Amerika. For along with charity, terror evidently also "begins at home." See "Uncle" Satan's tyrannical, anti-constitutional, presidential and congressional acts of "patriotism" or "Patriot Act(s)."

Thus does the imperial Amerikan nuclear "beast," dragon (or Godzilla) two times over (i.e. Hiroshima and Nagasaki) not only terrify or petrify all the Gentile world internationally with fears of yet more "jewish"-Amerikan nuclear holocausts. It likewise terrifies its own populace or citizenry intra-nationally. And so we see "Uncle" Satan, the very inventor, perpetrator and disseminator of the atomic and/or nuclear bomb, shoving little Gentile American school-children under gov't-school desks in mock protection against some terrible nuclear dragon somewhere **outside** the "jewish" Amerikan empire or government.

Are you beginning to understand the deceptive nature, character and practices of genuine Evil, Tyranny and Terror? It never truly tells you what it is. And so if you're ever going to see It for what It is, you have to perceive It through Its "holy" pretenses, lies, masks and disguises, and perhaps also through Its slanders or self-"projections."

* * * * *

ADEIMANTUS [responding to Socrates as if your Editor hadn't thoughtlessly interrupted their dialogue—Ed.]: To be sure.

SOCRATES: **Has he** [the tyrant—Ed.] **not also another object, which is that they may be impoverished by payment of taxes, and thus compelled to devote themselves to their daily wants and therefore less likely to conspire against him?** [See below.—Ed.]

Clearly.

SOCRATES: **And if any of them are suspected by him of having notions of freedom** [“of harboring a free spirit”—Rouse], **and of resistance to his authority, he will have a good pretext for destroying them by placing them at the mercy of the enemy** [“he wants [needs, seeks—Ed.] an excuse to destroy them by exposing them to the enemy.”—Rouse]; **and for all these reasons the tyrant must be always getting up a war.**

[See the story of the Mosite or Hebrew king David and Uriah the Hittite, the husband of Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, whom David had impregnated. David placed Uriah in the front lines of battle to be killed by the enemy, thus freeing the king to openly take the dead man's wife to his bed...and bath. (2 Sam. 11:2-27)—Ed.]

He must.

SOCRATES: **Now he begins to grow unpopular.**

[“Then by doing this he becomes more and more detestable to the citizens.”—Rouse]

A necessary result.

SOCRATES: **Then some of those who joined in setting him up, and who are in power, speak their minds to him and to one another, and the more courageous of them cast in his teeth what is being done**

[“You may expect that some of those who helped to set him up, the bravest of them, being now in power themselves, will speak freely before him and among themselves, and reproach him for what is happening.”—Rouse]

Yes, that may be expected.

SOCRATES: **And the tyrant, if he means to rule, must get rid of them; he cannot stop while he has a friend or an enemy who is good for anything.**

[“**So he must quietly get rid of all these if he is to rule, until not a single one is left, either friend or foe, who is of any use** [for or against him—Ed.].”—Rouse]

[For every tyrant knows that all superior, virtuous, courageous and Godly souls will never willingly suffer inferiors, predators or other villains (such as tyrants) to reign over (and thus prey upon) themselves and their loved ones.—Ed.]

He cannot.

SOCRATES: And therefore **he must look about him and see who is valiant, who is high-minded** [“magnanimous”—Rouse], **who is wise, who is wealthy;** happy man [more Socratic irony—Ed.], **he is the enemy of them all** [“whether he likes it or not”—Rouse], **and must seek occasion against them whether he will or no, until he has made a purgation of the State** [of all virtuous souls—Ed.].

Yes, he said, and a rare purgation.

SOCRATES: Yes, I said, **not the sort of purgation which the physicians make of the body** [“the opposite of what doctors do for the body”—Rouse]; **for they take away the worse and leave the better** [“best” (aristo)—Rouse] **part, but he does the reverse.**

[Evil, vice, tyranny and “jewish” “revolution” murders the very **best** members of society, humanity—their **aristocrats**, their genuine leaders. The Satanic “jewish” bible called “Talmud,” e.g., tells its demon-devotees to “Kill the best of the Gentiles”—All the better to terrorize, dominate, rob and enslave the rest of the Gentiles.)—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: **If he is to rule** [“to remain ruler”—Rouse], **I suppose that he cannot help himself.**

SOCRATES: **What a blessed** [i.e. cursed or hellish—Ed.] **alternative, I said:—to be compelled to dwell only with** [“worthless creatures”—Rouse] **the many bad, and to be by them hated, or not to live at all!**

Yes, that is the alternative.

SOCRATES: **And the more detestable his actions are to the citizens the more satellites** [“bodyguards”—Rouse] **and the greater devotion in them will he require?**

Certainly.

SOCRATES: **And who are the devoted band** [“his trusty guards”—Rouse], **and where will he procure them?**

ADEIMANTUS: **They will flock to him, he said, of their own accord, if he pays them.**

[“They will come of themselves,” he said, ‘plenty of them, on wings of the wind, if he pays their wages.’—Rouse]

SOCRATES: **By the dog! I said, here are more drones, of every sort and from every land** [“mercenaries from anywhere.”—Rouse].

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, there are. [Rep. 8, p. 567]

* * * * *

Note if you will how much the tyrannical “jew” is like Odysseus, the Greek “waster of cities.” For this uninvited and unwanted “jew” first sneaks into the Gentile home, city-state, kingdom or nation. And then he dares presume to play the host, and (in the holy names of “humanity,” “multi-culturalism,” “multi-racialism” [i.e. Babylonism] anti-“racism” and/or “diversity”) this predatory “jew” invites his drone-like, locust-like, Marxist, “communist” allies world-wide to also come enter the home, city-state, kingdom or nation of his unwilling Gentile hosts, to likewise prey upon or devour them.

And so “of their own accord” and “on wings of the wind” these foreign drones “flock” to this “jewish” tyrant because “he pays them” with the property, largess and “refugee” or “welfare benefits” of their unwilling Gentile host nation and prey.

And so these allied Marxist predators, locusts or drones invade their poor, unwilling Gentile hosts to prey upon them. And these “jew” led “proletarian” drones outvote, dispossess, and devour their common “bourgeois” targets. (And that’s why democracies don’t last, but become (“communist”) tyrannies.) These “communist” drones or Marxist locusts “liberate,” appropriate or confiscate their hosts’ property—often indirectly through the agency of (tyrannical “jewish”) government or “public” officials. They feed off the racial or national carcass of their unwilling Gentile hosts, which they devour at their predatory leisure.

And so the tyrannical “jew” invites in his fellow-drones, but he will always take the loin’s share of the prostrate national Gentile carcass, host and prey. And after his digestion or consolidation of this national Gentile corpse and prey, the treacherous “jew” will eventually and characteristically turn upon his erstwhile Marxist-Gentile allies, co-predators, co-drones and co-locusts. Sooner or later the “jew” will betray and devour his Marxist allies also. It’s who he is and what he does. The Satanic “jew” can’t help being himself, being who and what he is.

* * *

Recall the parable of the frog and the compulsive stinging scorpion which could not help but be itself, and act out its offensive nature and treacherous character. It simply must sting whenever, wherever and whomsoever it possible can, and hence every body with whom it comes in contact (except itself).

This is what happens to all those unfortunates who come in contact with (or are touched by) the Satanic “jew,” and hence all those Gentiles who ally with or serve this bastard spawn of God’s eternal Enemy, the Devil. (John 8:44)

And by the way, all those Gentiles who use (or are forced to use) this Satanic “jew’s” “money” are indeed touched (and hence stung) by this most predatory, harmful and noxious demon. And whether they even know it or not, aside from why, Gentiles also need to know **how** they are thus stung. (And therefore, dear readers. Educate yourselves about the frauds,

tricks and traps of the supernational or SuperNazi “jewish” “central” banksters and their “debt-token, monopoly-money” within the Monetary/Economic Problem.)

* * * * *

SOCRATES: **But will he not desire to get them** [these imported foreign “drones, of every sort and from every land”–Ed.] **on the spot?**

[“What!” I asked, ‘no recruits from home’ Won’t he want...”–Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: How do you mean? [“Whom?”–Rouse]

SOCRATES: [“...**the slaves: he will take them from the citizens, and set them free, and add them to the bodyguard about his person.**”–Rouse]

He will rob the citizens of their slaves; he will then set them free and enrol them in his body-guard. [Rep. 8, p. 567]

[See, read and hear the “emancipation proclamation” of the Amerikan “unionist” (i.e. imperialist, anti-state, anti-states’ rights, anti-secessionist, anti-self-determination) “president,” Abraham Lincoln—(1861-65, that “great emancipator” of four score and more years ago). Note that Lincoln did not liberate or emancipate the African Negro slaves of his own “federally” captive states, but only those of those secessionist states who would dare escape his northern, imperial super-state tyranny. These southern slaves were presidentially, “federally” or imperially emancipated (“upon military necessity” and “as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion,”) to thus darkly aid the Washingtonian dictator of the Potomac in his imperial war of aggression to (re)conquer and (re)enslave the sovereign, united or confederated southern states. And so many “federally” freed southern Negroes joined this northern tyrant’s army against their former European masters, and Lincoln’s sovereign southern quarry, the “federally” intended imperial slave-states of Washington D.C.

And therefore beware any political “union” wherein your (ex-)sovereignty becomes your enslavement, and any unilateral disunion or succession on your part would be viewed or condemned by your master, owner or emperor as a “rebellion” against his empire or “union,” and as a prelude to his conquistadorial invasion, conquest and re-enslavement of you and yours. In short, dear reader, you can’t ever marry the Devil (or a Tyrant) and later be graciously granted a divorce. Or you can’t ever surrender to the Devil (or a Tyrant) and later be graciously “emancipated.”–Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS (responding): To be sure, he said; and **he will be able to trust them** [his emancipated slaves–Ed.] **best of all.** [yet more irony–Ed.]

SOCRATES: What a blessed creature, I said, must **this tyrant** be; **he has put to death the** [very “best” (aristos)–Ed.] **others and has these** [most inferior creatures–Ed.] **for his trusted friends.**

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said; they are quite of his sort.

SOCRATES: Yes, I said, **and these** [freed slaves–Ed.] **are the new citizens whom he has called into existence** [via the 13th or 14th (or whatever) “amendment” to the constitution of the Amerikan “republic” or “democracy” (or whatever) (“Cause this is **my** united states of whatever.”)–Ed.], **who admire him** [this “great emancipator”–Ed.] **and are his companions, while the good** [Southerners–Ed.] **hate and avoid him.**

ADEIMANTUS: Of course.

* * *

SOCRATES: Verily, then, tragedy is a wise thing and Euripides a great tragedian. [More Socratic irony or sarcasm.–Ed.]

Why so?

Why, because he is the author of the pregnant saying, “Tyrants are wise by living with the wise,” and he clearly meant to say that they are the wise whom the tyrant makes his companions. [?]

Yes, he said, and he also praises tyranny as godlike [“as a ruler like God in heaven,”—Rouse; Euripides’ *Troades*, line 1169]; and many other things of the same kind are said by him and by the other poets.

And therefore, I said, **the tragic poets being wise men will forgive us** and any others who live after our manner [“politics”—Rouse] **if we do not receive them** [“as singing the praises of tyranny.”—Rouse] **into our State, because they are the eulogists of tyranny.**

Yes, he said, those who have the wit will doubtless forgive us.

But they will continue to go [“all round”—Rouse] **to other cities and attract mobs, and hire voices fair and loud and persuasive, and draw** [“drag”—Rouse] **the cities over to tyrannies and democracies.** [See and hear, e.g., the imperial democratic propaganda of “jewish”—Amerika.—Ed.]

Very true.

SOCRATES: Moreover, **they** [tragic poets/“eulogists of tyranny”—Ed.] **are paid for this and receive honour** the greatest honour, as might be expected, **from tyrants, and the next greatest from democracies; but the higher they ascend our constitution hill** [upwards to oligarchy, timocracy, aristocracy or monarchy and philosophy or truth—Ed.], **the more their reputation fails, and seems unable from shortness of breath to proceed further.**

[“**but the higher they ascend the steps of Mount Constitution, the more their honour fails, as if they could go no further for want of breath.**”—Rouse] [Rep. 8, p. 568]

* * * * *

Thus we see the metaphoric “constitution hill” of Socrates with its steps or gradations ascending upwards towards (political) truth, justice, peace, prosperity, fulfillment and happiness, and likewise descending therefrom down to popularity, money, sensuality, democracy and tyranny. But there rises “Mount Constitution” above the earthly and barbarian plain toward the Socratic heaven, the ideal polis, the philosophic state or kingdom of truth, justice, peace, prosperity and happiness on earth.

(“Can you dig it?”)

(“No, you have to ascend it.”)

So we see that the well-meaning Socrates was trying to discover and point out the political or “constitutional” steps upward to a better racial, social, political place or “state or condition of [our] standing together” (“constitution”). He was attempting to theoretically or philosophically construct a “shining city on a hill,” which would thus bless its all inhabitants and shed its light upon all the world, and thus show all men the way to what philosophically-enlightened men can accomplish, if only they have first discovered the truths, principles, or laws of mental/spiritual and politically ascension and descention, and if only they have successfully applied the former laws (like political medicine) and avoided the latter (like the racial/social/spiritual/political plague).

Via discovery, knowledge and adoption of these political principles, the Socratic intention and hope was that those who were capable could rise up to the heights of this metaphorical “constitutional” mountain of philosophical blessedness or divinity—which rises racially, socially and politically upwards from earth, tyranny and democracy towards truth, justice, God and heaven.

And via ignorance, rejection or abandonment of these racial/social/political principles of ascension and descention, the people or “demos” must fall, either gradually sliding or suddenly tumbling down this divine metaphoric mountain of Socrates to a lesser, darker, dimmer or less-enlightened city, city-state or “constitution.”

A city (kingdom, state) built upon ascendant or Socratic principles naturally rises upward toward the heavens as an exemplary city of light. But a good (or even superior, “aristo” or best) seed, once degenerated, must fall—indeed has already fallen. And a city founded upon

(or reconstituted or rededicated to) degenerate or descendant principles must naturally fall by a gravity both natural and divine, spiritual or philosophical. For the natural laws are the laws of the Creator-God. And so by natural laws of the creator-God those genetically degenerated or fallen seeds or cities are eventually overthrown and trampled underfoot by opponents genetically, spiritually and physically stronger, and/or cities better “constituted”:

Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour [“strength”—By.], wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. [Matt. 5:13]

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill [“mountaintop”—By.] cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men,... [Matt. 5:14-16]

The religious/political prescription or “constitution” of Moses (likewise derived from a metaphorical “mountain of God” toward which men were to politically ascend) condescended down Sinai with much Mosaic fanfare as divine instructions for (Mosaic) men to construct their (Mosaic) city and tower toward a blessed, political heaven on earth.

But the constitutional mount of Moses was unstepped or ungraduated. It was all or nothing—either all light or all darkness—either all divine/Mosaic blessings or all divine/Mosaic curses—with no “constitutional” gradations, shades of gray, or steps in between. But Socrates was much more specific in his spiritual prescription, instruction and explanation of the divine/natural laws of individual and racial/social/political ascension (and descention).

(And the relative truthfulness of the political prescriptions of these two “prophets” is another matter and inquiry altogether.) Sufficeth here to note that both ancient “constitutionalists” were decidedly and entirely genetic, hereditary, racial or “racist.” They both knew (as do we too?) that the seed makes (or unmakes) the man, the family, the tribe, the city, the race and the nation.

So let us now return.

* * * * *

ADEIMANTUS (responding): True.

SOCRATES: But we are wandering from the subject: **Let us** therefore return and **enquire how the tyrant will maintain that** fair and **numerous and various and ever-changing** [drone, mercenary and/or “emancipated” slave—Ed.] **army of his** [besides his tyrannical army of public praisers, poetic flatterers and dramatic sycophants (whom Socrates would exclude from his ideal city-state)—Ed.].

ADEIMANTUS: **If**, he said, **there are sacred** [“temple”—Rouse] **treasures in the city, he will confiscate and spend them** [“and the goods of his [officially or “legally” robbed or dispossessed—Ed.] **victims as far as they will go;**”—Rouse]; **and in so far as the fortunes of attainted** [i.e. politically-denounced, demonized, “show-tried,” “convicted,” condemned, “executed,” excommunicated or banished—Ed.] **persons may suffice, he will be able to diminish the taxes which he would otherwise have to impose upon the people.**

SOCRATES: **And when these fail?**

ADEIMANTUS: Why, clearly, he said, then he and his boon companions [“and his [sexual—Ed.] boy friends and girl friends.”—Rouse], whether male or female, will be maintained out of his father’s estate.

SOCRATES: You mean to say that [his parents—Ed.] the people, from whom he has derived his being, will maintain him and his companions?

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said; they [tyrannical personalities—Ed.] cannot help themselves.

[“That is plain necessity,” said he.”—Rouse]

SOCRATES: But what if the people fly into a passion, and aver that a grown-up son ought not to be supported by his father, but that the father should be supported by the son? The father did not bring him into being, or settle him in life, in order that when his son became a man he should himself be the servant of his own [son's–Ed.] servants and should support him and his rabble of slaves and companions [“foreigners.”–Rouse]; but that his son should protect him, and **that** by his [son's' democratic or tyrannical–Ed.] help **he might be emancipated from the government of the rich** [“oligarchic”–Ed.] **and aristocratic** [“gentlemen”–Rouse], **as they are termed.** And so he bids him and his companions depart [“out of the city”–Rouse], just as any other father might drive out of the house a riotous son and his undesirable associates.

Here lies the difference between self-liberation and emancipation (manumission, setting free). Those who to-day “stand in the opposition” are thirsting and screaming to be “set free.” The princes are to “declare their peoples of age,” that is, emancipate them! Behave as if you were of age, and you are so without any declaration of majority; if you do not behave accordingly, you are not worthy of it, and would never be of age even by a declaration of majority. **When the Greeks were of age, they drove out their tyrants, and, when the son is of age, he makes himself independent of his father. If the Greeks had waited till their tyrants graciously allowed them their majority, they might have waited long. A sensible father throws out a son who will not come of age, and keeps the house to himself; it serves the** [immature, drone-like, parasitic, democratic or tyrannical–Ed.] **noodle right.** [Max, p. 167-68]

ADEIMANTUS [responding to Socrates, and apparently unaware of Max's apt and relevant interruption–Ed.]: By heaven, he said, **then the parent will discover what a monster he has been fostering in his bosom** [as shall that foolish, trusting, “democratic” mob who installed the tyrant-monster as their public champion and protector against “the government of the rich [‘oligarchic’–Ed.] and aristocratic [‘gentlemen’–Rouse]”—i.e. against the “exploitation” of the Gentile (but never the “jewish”) “bourgeois” or moneyed class–Ed.]; **and, when he wants to drive him out, he will find that he is weak and his son strong.**

[“Ah, **then the people will find out**, by God.’ said he, ‘just what they are, and **what a monster they have** bred, and nursed in their bosom, and **raised to greatness; and they, weaker, are now talking of throwing out the stronger!**”–Rouse]

[Sic, Rouse translates “the people” what Jowett renders “the parent.” Go figure if you wish, but it's Greek to me.–Ed.]

SOCRATES: **Why, you do not mean to say that the tyrant will use violence? What! beat his father if he opposes him?**

[“What's that you say?’ I exclaimed. ‘Will the tyrant dare to use violence against his own father [or people, “demos,” subjects–Ed.], and thrash him if he won't obey?’–Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: **Yes, he will, having first disarmed him** [or them–Ed.].

[“**Yes,**’ said he, ‘**after taking away his arms.**”–Rouse]

SOCRATES: **Then** he is a parricide, and a cruel guardian of an aged parent; and **this is real tyranny**, about which there can be no longer a mistake: as the saying is, the people who would escape the smoke which is the slavery of [or under–Ed.] freemen, has fallen into the fire which is the tyranny of [or under–Ed.] slaves. **Thus liberty, getting out of all order and reason, passes into the harshest and bitterest form of slavery.**

[“...we have tyranny here unconcealed, **the people will run from the smoke into the fire**, as the proverb goes, **from slavery under free men into despotism under slaves.** [“Out of the [democratic] frying pan and into the [tyrannical] fire.”–Ed.] **That**

perfect and unseasonable [sic] liberty has been exchanged for a new dress, the most cruel and most bitter slavery under slaves.—Rouse]

[If one cannot be master of oneself, then better to be subject to a better than a worse man. And best to be subject to the best man of all, the philosopher-king, and worst to the worst man, or tyrant. The former is master of his body, mind, thoughts and desires, and the latter a slave.—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: True, he said.

SOCRATES: Very well; and **may we not rightly say that we have sufficiently discussed the [social, political and economic –Ed.] nature of tyranny, and the manner of the transition from democracy to tyranny?**

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, quite enough, he said.

[The Republic 8, p. 562-69]

What think you, dear reader? Has Socrates drawn for us a clear and accurate portrait of the tyrant and his kingdom, state or “government”?

* * * * *

On the Tyrannical, “Communist” “jewish” State of Gentile/Public Misery

“Communism” is the slave-state or tyrant-kingdom of materialistic “jewish” philistines or swine. (See George Orwell’s Animal Farm.) The (Gentile) nation’s landowners and producers are robbed of their land, property, liberty, labor and even their lives (or the rest of their lives) to perpetually serve these philistine swine.

As Soc’s tyrant above disarmed his parents prior to robbing them of their property (and liberty), so it is of course a “crime” to own, “keep and bear arms” (guns or weaponry) within all tyrannical or “communist” states—(such as the communist, Marxist, “jewish” city-state of New York City)—much less to ever **use** such “arms” in self-defense against these tyrannical “communist” pigs.

Furthermore, the Marxist or communist “jews” even make it a “crime” to ever criticize them, to tell the truth about them and/or to expose their countless “crimes against [Gentile] humanity.” They call this the “crime” of “anti-Semitism.” And this “crime” was one of their very first laws within their mass-murderous, “jewish,” Marxist, communist slave-state called “Soviet Union.” And it was a “capital crime” “punishable” by death. I.E. the “jew”-“Soviets” would “legally” or “judiciously” murder their Gentile critics.

Just like their Father Satan they say, “If you have something unflattering or undesirable to say about us, something we don’t want to hear, or don’t want the Gentiles to hear—however true—then you’d better say nothing, or we’ll kill you.” (John 8:44) This is what the Satanic “jews” call (Gentile) “freedom of speech.”

And of course the “jews” themselves are always free to spread their lies, poisons, hatreds and slanders against Gentile humanity. (See/hear their media monopoly and their “holocaust,” e.g.) And of course the “jews” make no crime of their anti-Gentilism and hatred of humanity, much less do they ever punish themselves for it. For “hate speech” can only be a Gentile “crime”—(not because “jews” cannot hate, indeed they wrote the book (see their Talmud)—but because “jews” are the only accusers, “prosecutors” judges and punishers (of the Gentiles they hate and want to harm, hurt, silence, persecute). And so we see it very much matters who the lawgivers or “legislators,” law-enforcers and judges are. For laws are merely their “sacred” orders or commands.

But what do you do, dear reader, when the laws are crimes and the law-enforcers are criminals, thugs, predators or monsters with badges, tanks and bazookas? Do you not then “criminally” “own and bear arms,” or else acquire them?

* * * * *

The Socratic values in descending order are Truth (and thus the freedom to seek it and speak it); Honor (public repute or popularity); Money (property); and Sensuality or bodily Pleasure.

And the highest three Socratic values are totally (i.e. totalitarly or tyrannically) controlled, owned and dictated by “jews”—either by “jewish”-“capitalist” pigs, or by “jewish”-“communist” pigs within (or rather atop) their “animal farm.”

For consider: Their mass-media or communication monopoly controls (indeed dictates) both “Truth” and the public reputation of all Gentile citizens or subjects both alive and dead, and even all non-citizens, both alive and dead. Can you see that, dear reader? (And have you noticed, e.g., what they’ve done to the public honor, repute or popularity of Adolf Hitler and his “nazi” friends and associates?) Again, this is called slander or defamation. And Satanic “jews,” the demonic spawn of the Slanderer or false Accuser, wrote the book on slander. (John 8:44) And they make their slanders stick and get their lies believed by monopolizing and controlling all mass-media, so that few to no contradictions, disproofs or truths are hardly ever seen, heard or read by the Gentile masses.

And how about money? Do “jews” control money? What’s the difference between “capitalist” and “communist” money? (The former is **loaned** into existence/circulation, and the latter is not. So the former is a **debt**-money and the latter is not.) And are both moneys not “jewish”? Is “communist” money not as “jewish” as “communism”? And what is a “central bank”? Where did it/they come from? Exactly who invented and perpetrated “central” banks upon Gentile humanity: the French, the Germans, the Kelts, or the “jews”? And precisely who are the “central” banksters: the Christians, the Mohammedans, the Buddhists, or the “jews”?

And so by controlling all mass-media (communication) the “jews” control (indeed dictate) all mental, spiritual, psychological, philosophical or cultural activity (and hence all physical or political activity) within Gentile nations or states, peoples or publics.

And by controlling (indeed creating, printing and lending) all the “capitalist” money the “jewish” “central” banksters control all economic and hence all political activity—and not for the benefit of Gentiles, but for their complete and total destruction, dispossession and enslavement. And by sending their imperial armies or murderous mercenaries against those Gentile gov’ts and governmental forms of which they disapprove and desire to control or impose, their supernational reach and tyranny has become worldwide. (See their world wars I and II, etc.)

* * * * *

And so all “truth” (and “falsehood”) within these total(tarian) “jewish” states is by “jews” dictated; all public “honors” by “jews” bestowed, withheld, (and even withdrawn); and all property, labor and money (and therefore all Gentiles) are therein owned and controlled exclusively by “jews.” Such is the “jewish” state—whether “capitalist” or “communist.”

(And the former “jewish” state, by the way, leads directly to the latter. See Appendix #I of the Monetary/Economic Problem entitled, “Jewish” Communism verses a True and Genuine “Labor,” “Populist” or “People’s” State)

And so all else besides these “jew”-dictated “truths” and “falsehoods” (i.e. all freedom to think and speak the truth—much less to act upon it) is by definition “crime” within the tyrannical “jewish” state. And so “jewish” lies and slanders (the “holocaust” e.g.) become “sacred” slanders, lies or “truths” within the tyrannical “jewish” state. And so truth, the highest Socratic value, is therein persecuted as “lies” (“false news”) and “slanders”—and truth’s speakers, writers and publishers are persecuted (“prosecuted”) as “liars” or “slanderers.”

(See Evil accuse, “try,” “convict,” “sentence” and crucify the Truth. See Evil hang the word-painter for painting an accurate picture. And see Hideousness accuse, “try,” “convict” and hang the mirror for daring to reflect Itself back into Its face.)

For how else can a kingdom or state based upon lies and coercion exist, stand or persist but by the expulsion or absence of all truth and all freedom? How else can the state of total

Darkness exist but by the total extinction and banishment of all Light? And how else can the “jewish” state of total Lies and Falsehood exist but by the total banishment of all Truth, and all freedom to seek it and speak it?

* * * * *

And therefore is “communism,” Marxism or the “jewish” state not the very definition, example, incarnation and epitome of Socrates’ most evil and miserable tyranny?

This total-tyranny, this “communism” is the ever-longed and prepared-for “utopian” or “messianic” “jewish” state. This is what the tyrant and the “jew” ever longs and aims for—to own or control everything and everybody else. This to a “communist” pig is “heaven.” This is “paradise” for the “messianic” or Satanic swine, and a miserable hell-on-earth for each and every truly human being. (See e.g. their “Soviet Union” and/or their “Israel.”)

All freedom to think, to speak, to act, to produce, to sell, to buy and to own is a “crime” within this complete or total (and hence tyrannical) “jewish” state. (For all (political) fruit, whether good, bad or mediocre, is and must ever be of its genetic or creative tree. Would Socrates not with that statement agree?) But the real and true crime, of course, is this “communist” or “jewish” state itself, and the fact that Gentiles tolerate its existence.

For Satan (and Its “jew”-demons) to forever reign, Jesus-God (and His faithful) must forever hang. But is God forever Willing?—as He evidently once was (for whatever reason(s)? And can God always, everywhere and forever be thus compelled by Satan the Devil, Its demonic “jews” and their “beastly” empire, “messianic” “sinagog” and/or SuperNazi “comintern” to suffer their Satanic wills? (Apo./Rev. 2:9, 3:9 & 13:1-10) Let’s hope and pray not, and hence (hope and pray) for deliverance from (Satanic “jewish”) Evil. Amen?

* * * * *

The Spiritual Genesis of the Tyrant: The (Socratic) Psychology of the Tyrant: an Abject Slave of his Tyrannical Desires, and hence the most Unhappy Man

But again what think you, dear reader? Has Socrates drawn for us a clear and accurate portrait of the tyrant and his kingdom, state or “government”? Can we all now see tyranny as it really is, from whence it comes, and to where it must go?

Then let’s continue in our philosopher’s vein, to follow his thoughtful train wherever it leads—here toward an interior, mental, spiritual or psychological depiction of the tyrant—as an abject slave to the imperious tyranny of his own bodily desires, sensuous cravings, physical addictions.

And there is no Socratic harm nor danger for us in this inquiry—on the contrary. And perhaps there is even no danger for the tyrant—maybe even now still yet ranting against our “bourgeois,” “elitist” or “racist” philosopher and his “reactionary” and even “counter-revolutionary” philosophy. For we need only follow our philosopher in thought, and not necessarily in deed—unless indeed we deem it needful—(i.e. “politically-correct” for ourselves, our loved ones or our dependents)—to thus abide in, act out or even enforce our Socratic truths against our tyrants, oppressors or enemies.

So let’s now return to Socrates exactly where we left him above.

The Socratic tyrant is a total slave to his “unnecessary” physical needs, his uncontrolled bodily cravings, his “unlawful” sensuous appetites. In a word, he is a pig, a swine, a glutton.

* * * * *

From The Republic 9, p. 571-80,

SOCRATES: [“What is left now to examine,”—Rouse]

Last of all comes the tyrannical man; about whom we have once more to ask, how is he formed out of the democratical? [“and what his character is,”—Rouse] and how does he live, in happiness, or in misery?

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, he is the only one remaining.

SOCRATES: There is, however, I said, a previous question which remains unanswered.

ADEIMANTUS: What question?

SOCRATES: **I do not think that we have adequately determined the nature and number of the [worldly, sensual, addictive, tyrannical—Ed.] appetites, and until this is accomplished the enquiry will always be confused.**

[“**The desires: what are they, and how many. I don’t think we have defined them properly; our enquiry will not be clear enough if we leave that unfinished.**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Well, he said, it is not too late to supply the omission.

SOCRATES: Very true, I said; and observe the point which I want to understand: **Certain of the unnecessary pleasures and appetites I conceive to be unlawful [“lawless; they are born in everyone, it is true,”—Rouse]; every one appears to have them, but in some persons they are controlled [“chastised”—Rouse] by the laws and by reason, and the better desires prevail over them—either they are wholly banished or they become few and weak; while in the case of others they are stronger, and there are more of them.**

ADEIMANTUS: **Which appetites do you mean?**

SOCRATES: **I mean those which are awake when the reasoning and human and ruling power is asleep; then the wild beast within us, gorged with meat or drink, starts up and having shaken off sleep, goes forth to satisfy his desires; and there is no conceivable folly or crime—not excepting incest or any other unnatural [sexual—Ed.] union, or parricide, or the eating of forbidden food—which at such a time, when he has parted company with all shame and sense, a man may not be ready to commit.**

[“**Those which are aroused in sleep,**’ said I, **whenever the rest of the soul, all the reasonable, gentle and ruling part, is asleep, but the bestial and savage, replete with food or wine, skips about [like some frolicsome, fierce and metaphorical goat-man—Ed.] and throwing off sleep, tries to go and fulfil its own instincts.** You know **there is nothing it will not dare to do, thus freed and rid of all shame and reason;** it shrinks not from attempting in fancy to lie with a mother, or with any other man or god or beast, shrinks from no bloodshed, refrains from no food—in a word **leaves no folly or shamelessness untried.**”—Rouse]

[“The sleep of reason breeds monsters.”

[I can well imagine that drunken dreams may be more irrational, foolish, wonton, lustful, shameless, but full-bellied dreams?—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Most true, he said.

SOCRATES: But when a man’s pulse is healthy and temperate, and when before going to sleep he has awakened his rational powers, and fed them on noble thoughts and enquiries, collecting himself in meditation; after **having first indulged his appetites neither too much nor too little, but just enough to lay them to sleep, and prevent them and their enjoyments and pains from interfering with the higher principle** [of reason—Ed.]

[“whenever he does that, he allows the best part to remain pure and self-contained, to ponder and to reach after something, to perceive something which he did not know, past or present or future.”—Rouse]

—which [“higher principle”—Ed.] he leaves in the solitude of pure abstraction, free to contemplate and aspire to the knowledge of the unknown, whether in past, present,

or future: when again he has allayed ["tames"—Rouse] the passionate element, if he has a quarrel against any one—I say, when, **after pacifying** ["quieting"—Rouse] **the two irrational principles** [of (sensual) desire, and of "spirit" (passion, emotion)—Ed.], **he rouses up the third, which is reason, before he takes his rest, then, as you know, he attains** ["touches"—Rouse] **truth most nearly, and is least likely to be the sport of fantastic and lawless visions** ["and the visions of his dreams are least likely to be lawless."—Rouse].

ADEIMANTUS: I quite agree.

SOCRATES: In saying this I have been running into a digression; but the point which I desire to note is that **in all of us, even in good men, there is a lawless wildbeast nature, which peers out in sleep** ["**what a dreadful, savage, lawless brood of desires is in everyone**, even in some of us who are thought decent people; and these, it appears, are shown clearly in sleep."—Rouse]. Pray, consider whether I am right, and you agree with me.

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, I agree.

SOCRATES: And **now remember the character which we attributed to the democratic man. He was supposed from his youth upwards to have been trained under a miserly parent, who encouraged the saving appetites in him, but discountenanced the unnecessary, which aim only at amusement and ornament?**

[“He was produced, you remember, as the son of a thrifty father, and brought up from his youth by him, a father who honoured the [oligarchic—Ed.] moneymaking desires alone, and despised the unnecessary ones,”—Rouse]

True.

SOCRATES: **And then he got into the company of a more refined, licentious sort of people** ["full of the desires we have just described, he rushed into riot of all kinds and behaviour after their style, through hatred of his father's parsimony;"—Rouse], **and taking to all their wanton ways rushed into the opposite extreme from an abhorrence of his father's meanness** [thrift, restraint—Ed.]. At last, **being a better man than his corruptors, he was drawn in both directions until he halted midway and led a life, not of vulgar and slavish passion, but of what he deemed moderate indulgence in various pleasures. After this manner the democrat was generated out of the oligarch?** ["So the oligarchic becomes democratic."—Rouse]

[So the oligarch loves money and the democrat loves bodily or sensual pleasure. The former loves money to save it or keep it, and the latter to spend it (on bodily pleasures).—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said; that was our view of him, and is so still.

SOCRATES: And now, I said, years will have passed away, and you must **conceive this man, such as he is, to have a son, who is brought up in his father's principles.**

ADEIMANTUS: I can imagine him.

SOCRATES: Then you must **further imagine the same thing to happen to the son which has already happened to the father:—he is drawn into a perfectly lawless** ["wanton" or unrestrained—Ed.] **life, which by his seducers is termed perfect liberty; and his father and friends take part with his moderate desires, and the opposite** ["licentious" and "lawless"—Ed.] **party assist the opposite** [immoderate, extreme—Ed.] **ones. As soon as these dire** ["terrible"—Rouse] **magicians and tyrantmakers find that they are losing their hold on him, they contrive to implant in him a master passion, to be lord** ["protector"—Rouse] **over his idle and spendthrift** [wasteful, prodigal—Ed.] **lusts—a sort of monstrous winged drone—that is the only image which will adequately describe him** ["what else is the ruling passion in such men?"—Rouse].

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, that is the only adequate image of him.

SOCRATES: [“Now the other desires come buzzing around the huge drone”–Rouse] **And when his other lusts**, amid clouds of incense and perfumes and garlands **and wines, and all the pleasures of a dissolute life, now let loose, come buzzing around him** [“magnifying and nursing him [the “monstrous winged drone” the “lord...[of] lusts”–Ed.] **to the uttermost, and they implant in him a sting of unsatisfied craving;**”–Rouse], **nourishing to the utmost the sting of desire which they implant in his drone-like nature, then at last this lord** [“protector”–Rouse] **of the soul, having Madness for the captain of his guard, breaks out into a frenzy; and if he finds in himself any good** [“honest”–Rouse] **opinions or** [“modest”–Rouse] **appetites in process of formation, and there is in him any sense of shame remaining,** [“he slays them and casts them out of himself,”–Rouse] **to these better principles he puts an end, and casts them forth until he has purged away temperance and brought in madness** [“foreign frenzy”–Rouse] **to the full.**

[He is “in denial” of the truth and at war with his better, higher, more rational and truthful self.–Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: **Yes**, he said, **that is the way in which the tyrannical man is generated.**

SOCRATES: **And is not this the reason why of old love** [sexual desire, lust–Ed.] **has been called a tyrant?**

[Is this “love” not the “monstrous winged drone”? Or is there a greater desire in you, in me?–Ed.]

I should not wonder.

SOCRATES: **Further, I said, has not a drunken man also the spirit of a tyrant?**

He has.

SOCRATES: And you know that **a man who is deranged and not right in his mind, will fancy that he is able to rule, not only over men, but also over the gods** [“and does his best in that direction?”–Rouse]?

[He believes what he is pleased and self-flattered to believe, instead of the truth.–Ed.]

That he will. [“Undoubtedly,”–Rouse.]

SOCRATES: **And the tyrannical man in the true sense of the word comes into being when, either under the influence of nature, or habit, or both, he becomes drunken, lustful, passionate** [emotional, irrational–Ed.]? O my friend, is not that so?

[“Then here’s a surprise for you, my friend: **a man becomes tyrannical** in the exact sense, **when he is drunken and lustful and insane**, whether **by nature or habit or both.**”–Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Assuredly.

* * *

SOCRATES: **Such is the** [tyrannical–Ed.] **man** [“his character”–Rouse] **and such is his origin. And next, how does he live?**

ADEIMANTUS: Suppose, as people facetiously say, you were to tell me.

SOCRATES: I imagine, I said, **at the next step in his progress, that there will be feasts and carousals and revellings and courtezans** [“pretty girls”–Rouse], **and all that sort of thing** [“wherever love the tyrant makes his home within and steers the soul according to his will!”–Rouse; (Aha! Socrates also id’s the “monstrous winged drone” thus!)–Ed.]; **Love** [sexual lust–Ed.] **is the lord of the house within him, and orders all the concerns of his soul.**

ADEIMANTUS: **That is certain.**

SOCRATES: [“How **many dire desires** do **sprout up beside the Tyrant Love** every day and every night! How many things they want!”–Rouse]

Yes; and every day and every night desires grow up many and formidable, and their demands are many.

ADEIMANTUS: They are indeed, he said.

SOCRATES: His revenues, if he has any, are soon spent.

True.

SOCRATES: Then comes debt and the cutting down of his property [“borrowings and levying off the estate [of his father–Ed.]”–Rouse].

Of course.

SOCRATES: When he has nothing left, **must not his desires, crowding in the nest like young ravens, be crying aloud for food; and he, goaded on by them, and especially by love himself, who is in a manner the captain of them** [“and specially by Love itself, the leader, as it were, of all the others as bodyguards, run wild, and hunt for someone to rob of something by deceit or violence!”–Rouse], is in a frenzy, and would fain discover whom he can defraud or despoil of his property, **in order that he may gratify them** [his importunate, insatiable tyrannical cravings, his ravenous “young ravens”–Ed.]?

Yes, that is sure to be the case.

[Compare with the Christian’s parable of the wayward, wasteful and prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32)—except that this prodigal son never repents, never changes, never returns home in humility (but the contrary), and just gets worse and worse and worse until something or other puts him out of his misery.–Ed.]

SOCRATES: **He must have money, no matter how, if he is to escape horrid pains and pangs.**

[“Then they [the tyrannical desires–Ed.] must lift spoil from anywhere and everywhere, or else [like alcohol or heroin addicts without their “medicine”–Ed.] be afflicted with great travails and pains.”–Rouse]

He must.

SOCRATES: [“He will do as the pleasures did. The pleasures sprang up in him and got the better of the old ones and robbed them of what they had;”–Rouse] And as in himself there was a succession of pleasures, and the new got the better of the old and took away their rights, so **he** being younger **will claim to have more** [property rights–Ed.] **than his father and his mother, and if he has spent his own share of the property, he will take a slice of theirs.**

No doubt he will.

SOCRATES: **And if his parents will not give way, then he will try first of all to cheat** [“steal”–Rouse] **and deceive them.**

Very true.

SOCRATES: **And if he fails, then** [“he would proceed to rob with violence?”–Rouse] **he will use force and plunder them.**

Yes, probably.

SOCRATES: **And if the old man and woman fight for their own, what then, my friend? [“what scruples will he have? Will he spare to do anything a tyrant would do?”–Rouse] Will the creature feel any compunction at tyrannizing over them?** [Would he hesitate to do to his parents what a tyrant would do to his subjects, his people, his “demos”?–Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Nay, he said, I should not feel at all comfortable about [or unafraid for–Ed.] his parents.

[“I don’t feel quite happy,” he said, ‘about the patterns of such a man.’”–Rouse]

SOCRATES: But, O heavens! Adeimantus, **on account of some newfangled love of a harlot, who is anything but a necessary connection**, can you believe that he would strike the mother who is his ancient friend and [once–Ed.] necessary to his very existence, and would place her under the authority of the [harlot–Ed.] other, when she is brought under the same roof with her; or that, under like circumstances, he would do the same to his withered old father, first and most indispensable of friends, for the sake of some newly found blooming [homosexual–Ed.] youth who is the reverse of indispensable?

["Would he make them [his parents—Ed.] both slaves and subject them to these others, bringing these into the same house?"—Rouse]

Yes, indeed, he said; I believe that he would.

SOCRATES: Truly, then, I said, a tyrannical son is a blessing [i.e. curse—Ed.] to his father and mother.

He is indeed, he replied.

SOCRATES: He first takes their property, and **when** that fails, and **pleasures are beginning to swarm in the hive of his soul**, then he breaks into a house, or steals the garments of some nightly wayfarer [?]; next he proceeds to clear a temple.

["Surely he will first get in touch with some house-wall, or the cloak of someone walking about late at night, and then sweep clean a temple or so!"—Rouse]

[Is Socrates colorfully saying that the penniless, prodigal would-be tyrant, urged on by his tyrannical cravings, will somehow stealthily appropriate himself again—via burglary, theft, or disguised theft (under another's cloak) of valuable temple objects?—Ed.]

SOCRATES (continuing): **Meanwhile the old opinions** ["beliefs"—Rouse] **which he had when a child**, and which gave judgment about good and evil ["beautiful and ugly."—Rouse], **are overthrown by those others** [his denials, excuses or rationalizations for his immoderate sensual desires, cravings or addictions—Ed.] **which have just been emancipated** ["from slavery,"—Rouse; (from self-restraint, self-control, self-mastery or self-suppression—Ed.); "aided by the ruling passion whose bodyguard they are"—Rouse], **and are now the bodyguard of love** ["the tyrant," lust—Ed.] and share his empire. **These in his democratic days**, when he was still subject to the laws and to his father, **were** [formerly—Ed.] **only let loose in the dreams of sleep. But now** ["under the tyranny of the ruling passion,"—Rouse] **that he is under the dominion of love** ["the tyrant," lust—Ed.], **he becomes always and in waking reality what he was then very rarely and in a dream only; he will commit the foulest murder**, or eat forbidden food, **or be guilty of any other horrid act.**

SOCRATES (continuing): **Love** [sexual lust—Ed.] **is his tyrant, and lives lordly in him and lawlessly, and being himself a king, leads him on, as a tyrant leads a State, to the performance of any reckless deed by which he can maintain himself and the rabble of his associates** [the companion desires of lust the tyrant—Ed.], whether those whom evil communications [company, associates—Ed.] have brought in from without, or those whom he himself has allowed to break loose within him by reason of a similar evil nature in himself.

["**That passion lives in him as a tyrant, sole sovereign, alone with no government or law to restrain it; and so it will lead the man, whom it occupies like a conquered city, into every audacity by which it can support both itself and the racket of desires around it**, partly introduced from without from evil company, and partly let loose at liberty from within by similar habits and by the tyrant passion ["love"—Ed.] itself."—Rouse]

SOCRATES (continuing): **Have we not here a picture of his way of life?**

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, indeed, he said. [Republic 9:573-75]

* * *

"he who is ill-governed in his own person—the tyrannical man"—(Rep. 9:579)

Thus we see the tyrant is the slave of those "unnecessary," "unlawful," uncontrolled, importunate, persistent, unrelenting, wolfish, ravenous and tyrannical sensual cravings growling within him, to which he has surrendered himself or "given himself over" as their abject slave, their sensuous devotee. And he needs money or property to feed all these all-demanding tyrannical cravings. And so he takes property. He steals, robs or "taxes" others, his

political prey, his “bourgeois class.” And so the tyrant makes many defensive, “bourgeois” or “reactionary” enemies.

* * *

SOCRATES (continuing): And if there are only a **few** of them [“drones,” slaves of sensuality or tyrannical personalities—Ed.] in the State, [and therefore—Ed.] the rest of the people are well disposed, they [the drones—Ed.] go away and become the bodyguard or mercenary soldiers of some **other** tyrant who may probably want them for a war; and if there is no war, they stay at home [in that “other tyrant’s” city or their own home city?—Ed.] and do many little pieces of mischief in the city.

[“And if there are only a few such in the city,” I said, ‘and the rest of the people are temperate, out they go [by popular demand?—Ed.] and bodyguard some **other** tyrant, or serve as his mercenaries if a war is going on somewhere; but if they appear when there is peace abroad and quiet at home, they stay there in the city and do no end of evil in little things.’”—Rouse] [Rep. 9, p. 575]

[These menacing mercenaries (in war or peace time) remind me of the “standing,” or permanent army (British, American or whatever) so rationally and rightfully feared by the American rebels. For power has power to do its will—whatsoever it wills. And there’s the political rub—and the standing menace to freedom, and the permanent threat against the independence of the public thus so powerfully and officially “protected”—and especially if (like the poor Socratic parents above) they’ve been coercively disarmed by their tyrannical “protector(s)”—as is the present case within much of (tyrannical) “jewish”-Amerika.

But aside from being thrown out by the “well disposed” or “temperate” citizenry, why would home-grown (as distinct from foreign and roving) drones, sensualists or mercenaries willingly leave their reigning and rewarding home-town tyrant and protector, and their safe nests beside him, to join up with “some **other** tyrant” and venture into dangers elsewhere for payment or booty comparable to what they so “peacefully” enjoy at home? Perhaps to search for even greater “kicks” (better rewards, plunders, predations, enjoyments or depravities) than those available at home?

But another possibility is suggested below: Perhaps the home-grown, home-town sociopaths (drones, thugs, potential bodyguards and mercenaries of a tyrant) have yet to choose (elect) and enthrone their **own** chosen home-town leader, one from their own ranks, as (tyrant) king. And perhaps that is presumed in the passage above, even though it speaks of “some **other** tyrant.”

(I am also reminded of those old motorcycle flicks wherein some biker gang takes over some dusty, western town and terrorizes the townsfolk.)—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS (responding): What sort of mischief?

SOCRATES: For example, they are the thieves, burglars, cutpurses, footpads, robbers of temples, man-stealers of the community [“they strip travelers, they rob temples, they kidnap;”—Rouse]; or if they are able to speak [“able speakers”—Rouse] they turn informers, and bear false witness, and take bribes [or orate, rhapsodize or act for those “tragic poets/eulogists of tyranny” mentioned above?—Ed.].

ADEIMANTUS: A small catalogue of evils, even if the perpetrators of them are few in number.

SOCRATES: Yes, I said; but small and great are comparative terms, and all these things, in the misery and evil which they inflict upon a State, do not come within a thousand miles of the [much greater evils inflicted by a—Ed.] tyrant; **when this noxious class** [of drones, parasites or predators—Ed.] **and their followers grow numerous and become conscious of their strength, assisted by the infatuation** [“folly”—Rouse] **of the people, they choose from among themselves the one who has most of the tyrant in his own soul** [“most mighty and prevailing”—Rouse], **and him they create their tyrant.**

ADEIMANTUS: **Yes**, he said, and **he will be the most** [“tyrannical.”–Rouse] **fit to be a tyrant.**

SOCRATES: **If the people yield, well and good; but if they resist him, as he began by beating his own father and mother, so now, if he has the power, he beats them**, and will keep his dear old fatherland or motherland, as the Cretans say, in subjection to his young retainers [mercenaries–Ed.] whom he has introduced to be their rulers and masters. **This is the end of his passions and desires.**

[“**Then if the people are willing to yield, well and good; but if not, he will treat the city as the man did mother and father** [no doubt after first disarming the people too–Ed.]: **he will import new** [drone-like, tyrannical, mercenary–Ed.] **comrades and chastise it** [the city, the people–Ed.] **if he can; he will keep and maintain his fatherland** and once dear motherland, as the Cretans call it, **in slavery under these foreigners. So this would be the final consummation of such a man’s desire.**”–Rouse]

[I.E. to own everything and everyone, or to enslave everyone except his tyrannical “police” or “law-enforcement officers.”–Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Exactly. [Rep. 9, p. 575]

In other words, the tyrant takes all the people’s property to and for himself. Is this not the precise picture or description of “jewish” Marxism or “communism”? Is this not “the end of his [the tyrannical “jew’s”–Ed.] passions and desires”—to own everything that is the Gentile’s’, and even the Gentile himself/themselves? Is this not the very Satanic meaning, aim, intention, purpose, beginning, middle and end of “jewishism,” “communism,” Marxism or zionism?

The tyrant’s’ final goal or ultimate desire is absolute tyranny, absolute power, complete control, total ownership of everything and everyone—(as within the Satanic “jew’s” “communism” or “Soviet Union”).

Racially foreign or alien mercenaries (with little to no love or sympathy, and perhaps even hatred for the tyrant’s intended victims, his targeted subjects, tribes, races, nations) are “imported” and “retained” by the tyrant to heartlessly enforce his harmful dictates, his malevolent edicts, his terrible tyranny. Again see the history of the “jewish” empire called “Soviet Union,” and note the heartless and cynical use of racially foreign or alien Soviet soldiers or mercenaries with no love nor empathy for those races and nations which they were employed, paid or rewarded to oppress, “relocate” or mass-murder for their malevolent, tyrannical and mass-murderous “jewish” masters. (The 1930’s starvation of the Ukraine bread-basket comes to mind.) And the same goes for countless numbers of hateful psychopathic/sociopathic prisoners whom the “Soviets,” “Bolsheviks” or “jews” released from jail after 1917 to help them terrorize, massacre, mass-murder, genocide, “holocaust” or “kill the best of the Gentiles” (Talmud).

The Satanic “jews” (whether “communists” or “zionists”) are scientific oppressors, destroyers, enslavers, mass-murderers. Their ultimate aim is to place you and yours “in slavery under these foreigners.” I would also recommend the novel, The Turner Diaries (by Andrew Macdonald/William Pierce, 1978) for a fictional account of how “jews” will again (as after their “civil” war) employ Negroes to willingly, heartlessly and hatefully do their dirty work in imposing and maintaining their racist “communist” tyranny against Europeans and all other races (but the “jews” themselves, of course).

And also beware their Jewnighted Nations. For they will likewise employ soldiers of tribes, races or nations with no love for yours to oppress you and yours.

And now Socrates goes on to further describe the dark character and personality traits of the would-be tyrant, dictator or “authoritarian personality.”

* * *

SOCRATES (continuing): **When such men are only private individuals and before they get power, this is their character; they associate entirely with their own flatterers or ready tools; or if they want anything from anybody, they in their**

turn are equally ready to bow down before them: they profess every sort of affection for them; but when they have gained their point they know them no more.

[“Well then,’ said I, ‘**what is the private character of such men, as they show it even before they are rulers? Whom do they mix with? Either with flatterers who are ready to do anything for them; or, if they want something, they themselves grovel and condescend to any grimaces** [or pretensions—Ed.] **of friendship—but when they have got what they want, they don’t know you!**”—Rouse.]

[So pretty girls or beautiful women had better beware this tyrannical character. And every one had better beware this “authoritarian personality” who insincerely grovels before or under his official or political superiors, but who haughtily tyrannizes over his official subordinates or political subjects. He is truly power-mad and friend to no one.—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, truly.

SOCRATES: **They are always either the masters or servants and never the friends of anybody; the tyrant never tastes of true freedom or friendship.**

[“**So all their lives they are absolutely friendless, either slavemasters or slaves of someone; the tyrannic nature has never a taste of true freedom or friendship.**”—Rouse]

[For to have a friend, one must first be a friend. And to truly be free, one must first become master of oneself. One must first enslave one’s natural and rampant sensuality.—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Certainly not.

SOCRATES: **And may we not rightly call such men treacherous** [“faithless”—Rouse; (untrustworthy, disloyal, backstabbers)—Ed.]?

No question.

SOCRATES: **Also they are** utterly unjust [“**as unjust as unjust can be,**”—Rouse], if we were right in our notion of justice?

Yes, he said, and we were perfectly right.

SOCRATES: Let us then sum up in a word, I said, **the character of the worst man: he is the waking reality of what we dreamed.**

[“Then let us sum up **the most evil character,**’ I said. ‘He is, I take it, the man who would be living in broad daylight such as that man [of 9:571-2—Ed.] was in dreams.”—Rouse]

[Such is the complete sensualist, the total slave of his fleshy desires, the hog-wild pig-man, the drunken, lustful satyr, goat-dude or braying ass without any self-restraint whatsoever—as we may sometimes find ourselves behaving in our wildest dreams, or most sinful nightmares. (Can I get a witness?)—Ed.]

ADEIMANTUS: Most true.

SOCRATES: And this is he who being by nature most of a tyrant bears rule, **and the longer he lives the more of a tyrant he becomes.**

[“Then this is what the man becomes, who is most tyrannic naturally and gains sole power, **and the longer he lives as a tyrant the more like that** [i.e. a tyrant—Ed.] **he becomes.**”—Rouse]

[See the sad history, decline and final demise of Elvis Presley—the tyrant “king” [“tyrannosaurus-rex”] of Rock & Roll, who lived and died a satyr’s life, a piggish slave to his gluttonous sensuality, and to his limpid little donkey. Note also the lamentable Jimbo Mo Jo Risin’: (“I am the lizard king./ I can do anything.”)—Ed.]

GLAUCON: That is certain, said Glaucon, taking his turn to answer [“taking up the argument”—Rouse]. [9:576]

[For such was how the Socratic, philosophical and “dialectical” game of (Socratic) question and answer was played—whereby our philosopher-teacher carefully, logically and deliberately led his student-disciples step by step, question by question, answer by

answer, and premise by premise to arrive at his pre-conceived (Socratic) conclusions (truths, principles, essences).

Yes, of course preconceived, pre-deliberated, pre-thought-out or pre-concluded: For “only fools rush in.” And he who walks in the dark (or upon strange, new paths) stumbles. There’s no way Socrates was making all this up as he went along. He had pre-thought through all the logical steps necessary to take his students or conversants from where they mentally were, step by logical step to his Socratic conclusions.—Ed.]

* * *

SOCRATES (continuing): **And will not he who has been shown to be the wickedest, be also the most miserable? and he who has tyrannized longest and most, most continually and truly miserable** [“And whoever is tyrant longest and most fully will be most and longest miserable in truth?”—Rouse; (“It may all end [for me—Ed.] tomorrow./ Or it could go on forever./ In which case I’m doomed!/ It could go on forever./ In which case I’m doomed!”—Morrissey’s “Picadilly Palare”)—Ed.]; **although this may not be the opinion of men in general?**

[This again is because sensual over-indulgence or piggishness is naturally and unavoidably unsatisfying, unfulfilling, even emptying and saddening. For we are spirits or minds. And so our happiness or fulfillment must likewise be spiritual, mental, immaterial, ethereal. And sensuality, its antithesis, is most decidedly not, and most distanced or divorced therefrom. And so precisely he who is most and longest the tyrannized slave and indulger of his very own tyrannical sensual desires, must also be the most miserable mind, spirit or soul of all, because you can’t get the (spiritual or mental) “high” of happiness from the material bottle or can of sensuality. And so a lifetime of sin is a natural downer, an unavoidable bummer, a (“bona”) drag. (Again see and hear that poor, sensualist, tyrant-king called “Elvis the Pelvis.” (“A-hun-ha!/ A-hun-ha!”)—Ed.)]

GLAUCON: Yes, he said, inevitably.

SOCRATES: And **must not the tyrannical man be like the tyrannical State, and the democratical man like the democratical State; and the same of the others** [oligarchic, timocratic and aristocratic/monarchic—Ed.]?

[“Then surely,” said I, “the tyrannical man would be in one likeness with the city under a tyrant, and the democratical man with the city under democracy, and so with all the others.”—Rouse.]

GLAUCON: Certainly. [“Why, what else.”—Rouse]

SOCRATES: And **as State is to State in virtue and happiness, so is man in relation to man?**

[I.E. a virtuous man, people and city-state is happy. And a vicious, sensualist or sinful man, people and city-state is miserable.—Ed.]

To be sure.

SOCRATES: **Then comparing our original city, which was under a** [Ed.]—truth-seeking and -finding philosopher—] **king, and the city which is under a tyrant, how do they stand as to virtue?**

They are the opposite extremes, he said, for **one is the very best and the other is the very worst.**

SOCRATES: There can be no mistake, I said, as to which is which, and therefore I will at once **enquire** whether you would arrive at a similar decision **about their relative happiness and misery.** And here we must not allow ourselves to be panic-stricken at the apparition of the tyrant, who is only [“that one man,”—Rouse] a unit and may perhaps have a few retainers [drones or mercenaries—Ed.] about him; but let us go as we ought into every corner of the city [“and see it as a whole,”—Rouse] and look all about, and then we will give our opinion.

A fair invitation, he replied; and **I see, as every one must, that a tyranny is the wretchedest form of government, and the rule of a** [Socratic philosopher—Ed.] **king the happiest.**

SOCRATES: And in estimating the [tyrannical and philosophical—Ed.] men too, may I not fairly make a like request, that I **should have a judge whose mind can enter into and see through human nature? He must not be like a child who looks at the outside and is dazzled at the pompous aspect which the tyrannical nature assumes to the beholder, but let him be one who has a clear insight.**

[“...the judge should be one who can dive deep into human nature and understand it in his mind; he **must not be, like a boy, dismayed by the sight of the tyrannical façade, by the pomp which they display outside, but he must see through that and property understand.**”—Rouse] [Rep. 9, p. 577]

When one looks to the bottom of anything, searches out its essence, one often discovers something quite other than what it seems to be [See e.g. Dorothy’s dog, Toto, discovering or demasking the actual, real and true “wizard” of Oz—thus at last finally stripped of his godlike pretensions. Also read and finally see Moses’ self-unmasking in his Deuteronomy 29:1-6—Ed.]; **honeyed speech and a lying heart, pompous words and beggarly thoughts, and so on. By bringing the essence into prominence one degrades the hitherto misapprehended appearance to a bare semblance, a deception.** [Can you see the Sinai “wizard” yet, dear reader?—Ed.] The essence of the world, so attractive and splendid, is for him who looks to the bottom of it—emptiness; emptiness is = world’s essence (world’s doings). **Now, he who is religious does not occupy himself with the deceitful semblance, with the empty appearances, but looks upon the essence, and in the essence has—the truth.** [Max, p. 40]

[And so a truly “religious” soul sees, knows and says that Moses and his mountain god were one and the same (“prophet,” “wizard” or “god”). And a falsely religious soul does not.—Ed.]

SOCRATES (continuing): May I suppose that the judgment is given in the hearing of us all by one who is able to judge, and has dwelt in the same place [“under one roof”—Rouse] with him [the tyrant—Ed.], and been present [“by his side”—Rouse] at his daily life and known him in his family relations, where he may be seen stripped of his tragedy attire [“stage costume”—Rouse], and again in the hour of public danger—**he** [the judge—Ed.] **shall tell us about the happiness and misery of the tyrant when compared with other men?** [“Could we fairly call on one such who had seen all this and bid him declare how the tyrant compares with others in happiness and misery?”—Rouse]

That again, he said, is a very fair proposal.

Shall I assume that **we ourselves are able and experienced judges and have before now met with such a** [tyrannical—Ed.] **person** [“mingled with such men”—Rouse]? We shall then have some one [i.e. ourselves—Ed.] who will answer our enquiries. By all means.

Let me ask you not to forget the parallel of the individual [citizen (tyrannical, democratic, oligarchic, timocratic and/or aristocratic/monarchic)—Ed.] **and the State** [“the likeness between city and man”—Rouse]; bearing this in mind, and glancing in turn from one to the other of them, will you tell me their respective conditions?

What do you mean? he asked.

Beginning with the State, I replied, **would you say that a city which is governed by a tyrant is free or enslaved?**

No city, he said, **can be more completely enslaved.**

And yet, as you see, **there are freemen as well as** [Ed.]—slave] **masters in such a State?**

Yes, he said, I see that there are a few [freemen—Ed.]; **but the people, speaking generally, and the best of them are miserably degraded and enslaved** [“but in that

city the whole in general is in slavery, and the most decent part of it is in dishonour and misery.”—Rouse].

Then if the man is like the State, I said, must not the same rule prevail? his [tyrannically sensual—Ed.] soul is full of meanness and vulgarity [“slavery and ungenerousness”—Rouse]—the best elements in him are enslaved; and there is a small ruling part [i.e. the desirous part, element or “principle of the soul”—Ed.], which is also the worst and maddest [“most mad and abominable”—Rouse].

Inevitably.

And would you say that **the soul of such an one is the soul of a freeman, or of a slave?**

He has **the soul of a slave**, in my opinion.

SOCRATES: And **the State** [i.e. the people, the “demos”—Ed.] which is **enslaved under a tyrant is utterly incapable of acting voluntarily** [independently, unilaterally, spontaneously—Ed.]?

[“**The city which is a slave under a tyrant least of all does what it wishes?**”—Rouse]

GLAUCON: Utterly incapable.

SOCRATES: **And also the soul which is under a tyrant** [“a monstrous winged drone”—desire, craving, addiction—Ed.] (I am speaking of the soul taken as a whole) **is least capable of doing what she [rationally—Ed.] desires; there is a [passionate/emotional and/or desirous/addictive/obsessive/compulsive—Ed.] gadfly which goads her** [“drives it violently about, and it is full of confusion and repentance.”—Rouse], **and she is full of trouble and remorse?**

Certainly.

SOCRATES: **And is the city which is under a tyrant rich or poor?**

Poor.

SOCRATES: And **the tyrannical soul must be always poor and insatiable** [“poverty-stricken and even unsatisfied.”—Rouse]?

True.

SOCRATES: **And must not such a State and such a man be always full of fear?**

Yes, indeed.

SOCRATES: **Is there any State in which you will find more of lamentation and sorrow and groaning and pain?**

Certainly not.

SOCRATES: **And is there any man in whom you will find more of this sort of misery than in the tyrannical man, who is in a fury of passions and desires** [“one maddened by desires and passions, this man of tyranny?”—Rouse]?

Impossible.

SOCRATES: Reflecting upon these and similar evils, **you held the tyrannical State to be the most miserable of States?**

And I was right, he said.

SOCRATES: Certainly, I said. **And when you see the same evils in the tyrannical man** [the private citizen-slave of his own passions/emotions/fears and sensual desires/cravings/addictions, regardless of his class, social status, or political position—Ed.], **what do you say of him?**

I say that he is by far the most miserable of all men.

SOCRATES: There, I said, I think that you are beginning to go wrong. [Socrates is just being cute here. You’ll see.—Ed.]

What do you mean?

SOCRATES: I do not think that he has as yet reached the utmost extreme of misery.

[“You have not yet found the most miserable of all,” I said.—Rouse]

Then who is more miserable?

SOCRATES: One of whom I am about to speak. [the enthroned or “public” tyrant—Ed.]

[“Here is someone perhaps that you will consider more miserable still.”—Rouse]
Who is that?

SOCRATES: **He who is of a tyrannical nature** [a devoted slave of sensuality or sin—Ed.], **and instead of leading a private life has been cursed with the further misfortune of being a public tyrant.**

From what has been said, I gather that you are right.

SOCRATES: Yes, I replied, **but in this high argument you should be a little more certain, and should not conjecture only; for of all questions, this respecting good and evil is the greatest.**

[“Yes,’ I said; ‘but such things ought nor to be a matter of opinion; we must thoroughly examine them by continuing our reasoning. For **this is in truth the supreme question, the good and the evil life.**”—Rouse]

Very true, he said.

SOCRATES: **Let me then offer you an illustration, which may, I think, throw a light upon this subject.** [“...I think we ought to get some notion about the man [this most desirous, sensuous, miserable and political, official or “public” tyrant—Ed.] from examining certain persons.”—Rouse]

What is your illustration?

SOCRATES: **The case of rich individuals in cities who possess many slaves: from them you may form an idea of the tyrant’s condition,** [“For these [slave-owners—Ed.] are like tyrants in having many to rule;”—Rouse] **for they both have slaves; the only difference is that he** [the tyrant—Ed.] **has more slaves.**

Yes, that is the difference.

SOCRATES: You know that they [slave owners—Ed.] live securely and have nothing to apprehend [“fear”—Rouse] from their servants?

What should they fear?

Nothing. But do you observe the reason of this?

GLAUCON: Yes; the reason is, that the whole city [of citizens or freemen—Ed.] is leagued together for the protection of each [free—Ed.] individual [“is ready to help each one of the private persons.”—Rouse].

SOCRATES: Very true, I said. But imagine one of these owners, the master say of some fifty slaves, together with his family and property and slaves, carried off by a god into the wilderness [“a desert”—Rouse], **where there are no freemen to help him** [the big slave-owner/tyrant—Ed.]—**will he not be in an agony of fear lest he and his wife and children should be put to death by his slaves?**

Yes, he said, **he will be in the utmost fear.**

SOCRATES: **The time has arrived when he will be compelled** [“to wheedle some”—Rouse] **to flatter divers of his slaves, and make many promises to them of freedom and other things, much against his will—he will have to cajole his own servants.**

Yes, he said, **that will be the only way of saving himself.**

SOCRATES: **And suppose** the same god, who carried him away, **to surround him with neighbours who will not suffer the one man to** [“claim to”—Rouse] **be the master of another, and who, if they** [“caught one trying to do that”—Rouse] **could catch the offender, would take his life?**

GLAUCON: **His case will be still worse, if you suppose him to be everywhere surrounded and watched by enemies** [of slavery or of tyranny—Ed.].

SOCRATES: **And is not this the sort of prison in which the tyrant will be bound** [“lies in chains?”—Rouse]—**he who being by nature such as we have described, is full of all sorts of fears and lusts** [“terrors and passions;”—Rouse]? **His soul is dainty and greedy, and yet alone,** of all men in the city, he is never allowed to go on

journey, or to see the things which other freemen desire to see, but **he lives in his hole like a woman hidden in the house**, and is jealous of any other citizen who goes into foreign parts and sees anything of interest.

Very true, he said.

SOCRATES: **And amid evils such as these will not he who is ill-governed in his own person—the tyrannical man** [“Is not, then, the harvest of evil much greater for that man to reap **who has an evil constitution in himself**,”—Rouse], I mean—whom you just now decided to **be the most miserable of all—will not he be yet more miserable when, instead of leading a private life, he is constrained by fortune to be a public tyrant? He has to be master of others** [“tries to master others”—Rouse] **when he is not master of himself: he is like a diseased or paralytic man who is compelled to pass his life, not in retirement, but fighting and combating with other men.**

[An addict is like a boxer with one arm tied behind his back.—Ed.]

Yes, he said, the similitude is most exact.

SOCRATES: Is not his case utterly miserable? and does not the actual [political or “public”—Ed.] tyrant lead a worse life than he [the “private” tyrant—the mental slave of his own sensuality—Ed.] whose life you determined to be the worst [“judged most wretched?”—Rouse]?

Certainly.

SOCRATES: **He who is the real tyrant, whatever men may think, is the real slave, and is obliged to practise the greatest adulation and servility, and to be the flatterer of the vilest** [“the most worthless”—Rouse] **of mankind.** [Recall 9:576-77 above.—Ed.]

[For who else but the very worst, most treacherous, venal, mercenary or ignorant souls would serve the evil tyrant?—would be bribable, purchasable or deceivable by him?—Ed.]

SOCRATES (continuing): **He has desires which he is utterly unable to satisfy** [“never can satisfy his own desires in the least:”—Rouse; (‘Cause you simply can’t cure a thirst with salt water, nor put out a fire with gasoline; you can only make it worse.)—Ed.], **and has more wants than any one, and is truly poor** [“a pauper”—Rouse], **if you know how to inspect** [“estimate”—Rouse] **the whole soul of him** [See Apo./Rev. 2:23 & 3:15-17—Ed.]: **all his life long he is beset with fear and is full of convulsions, and distractions, even as the State which he resembles: and surely the resemblance holds** [“all his life laden with fear he is full of spasms and pains, if **his condition** indeed **is like the city he rules—and he is like it**, isn’t he?”—Rouse]?

GLAUCON: Very true, he said.

SOCRATES: Moreover, as we were saying before, **he grows worse from having power: he becomes** and is of necessity **more jealous, more faithless, more unjust, more friendless, more impious** [“wicked”—Rouse], **than he was at first; he is the purveyor and cherisher of every sort of vice** [“the universal innkeeper and foster-father of all the vices.”—Rouse], **and the consequence is that he is supremely miserable, and that he makes everybody else** [“those about him”—Rouse] **as miserable as himself.**

GLAUCON: No man of any sense will dispute your words.

[The Republic 9, p. 571-80]

* * * * *

And so the greatest sensualist (the spiritually or metaphorically biggest, fattest pig) is also the greatest would-be tyrant, and for two reasons: 1.) So he can possess and devour (without ever producing) all the property/slop he can possibly ever devour—(and then some, with which to pay his fellow robbing swine); 2.) And so he can protect himself from the wrath of all those whom he robs, steals, “taxes” or “liberates” this property from.

And so the tyrant's greed for unearned, undeserved or other people's wealth is also his greed for power: the power to rob or steal this wealth in the first place; and the power to protect this robber-tyrant from justice (exposure, truth, punishment or retaliation) in the second place.

So the ancient tyrant was the greatest sensualist? But is the modern tyrant the greatest idealist (or pretended idealist)?

* * * * *

The Ideological Tyrant: the Tyranny of the "Virtuous" Tyrant (who would perforce make us all "Virtuous" also); and Max's Spiritual, Mental or Intellectual History

SOCRATES: Then you must **further imagine the same thing to happen to the son which has already happened to the father:—he is drawn into a perfectly lawless life, which by his seducers is termed perfect liberty; and his father and friends take part with his moderate desires, and the opposite** ["licentious, lawless"—Ed.] **party assist the opposite** [immoderate, extreme—Ed.] **ones. As soon as these dire magicians and tyrantmakers find that they are losing their hold on him, they contrive to implant in him a master passion, to be lord** ["protector"—Rouse] **over his idle and spendthrift** [wasteful, prodigal—Ed.] **lusts—a sort of monstrous winged drone—that is the only image which will adequately describe him** ["what else is the ruling passion in such men?"—Rouse]. [Rep. 9:572-73]

* * * * *

The (potential for the) Socratic tyrant shall always remain with us so long as men have bodies or bodily senses to abuse, or so long as certain men insist on being satyrs, beasts or pigs, or on spiritually and metaphorically transforming themselves (Circe-like) into sensuous swine.

But since Socrates (and his creation of thought-gods or invention of ideals) we moderns have a new kind or species of tyrannosaurus rex to contend with: the ideological tyrant: the man who insists on conquering and subjecting others to "bless" or "save" them, to force or coerce them to become as "virtuous" or "blessed," "holy" or "human" as he himself claims or pretends to be; and/or those tyrants who insist on subjecting or conquering others in the "holy" name or under the "sacred" banner of some "holy" principle or "sacred" cause or other (e.g. "freedom," "democracy," "equality," "humanity," "church," "state," "empire" or what-have-you?). For these too claim to be "blessing" or "saving" their conquered subjects—as the Roman Catholics did those Christian martyrs whom they tortured to death upon their "holy" racks, etc.

In the former category of ideological or spiritual tyrant belong the Roman pope, certain pseudo-Christians, the Mohammedans and humanists (esp. psychiatrists and psychologists). (For the divine commission is to "Go forth and teach ["make disciples"—By; (i.e. inform, persuade or convince)—Ed.] all nations" (Matt. 28:19-20), and therefore not to torture or otherwise coerce non-Christians into spiritual or political submission.) And in the latter category belong those imperial or imperious "jewish"-Amerikans who "crusade" around the

Gentile world to impose their “democracy,” “freedom” and/or “equality” upon all those whom they imperiously invade, conquer, occupy, control (and hence “bless”). (See the next chapter.)

And we should further distinguish between the ideological or spiritual tyrant who sincerely or actually believes he’s blessing or saving those unfortunates upon his rack or under his sword, cannon, nuclear missiles or “weapons of mass-destruction,” and that ideological or spiritual tyrant who damn-well knows he’s merely (sanctimoniously) lying or pretending to be the savior of his subjects.

And which is the worse tyrannical liar: The (perhaps crazy) liar who believes his lies, the tyrannical liar who lies to everyone? Or the tyrannical liar who lies to everyone but himself (and perhaps a few tyrannical subordinates or fellow “con-artists”)? Or which tyrant would you rather be tyrannized by? Good question, no?

* * * * *

As the ancients revered or worshipped earthly or material things as gods, so the modern revere or worship mental things or thoughts (as gods).

(“Like what?”)

(Like the gods (or goddesses) of Liberty, Equality, Humanity, Law, Constitution, “mother” Church, “papa” State, etc., etc., etc.)

Now, here is the post-Socratic argument: As ancient men were (tyrannized and tyrannical) slaves of their physical bodies and senses, their earthly desires or sensual lusts, so modern men (after Socrates) were similarly (tyrannized and tyrannical) slaves of their minds or intellects, their unearthly thoughts or “heavenly” ideals, and their desires to convert or subject others, even all others, to them.

If we like, let’s hope this isn’t/wasn’t the case. But let’s be rational, realistic, truthful or philosophic (or as folks say nowadays, “scientific”) about this.

* * * * *

The life or history of man(kind) may be(and indeed has been) compared to the life and history of **a** man. Tell me if you think the comparison is apt and holds up. And tell me if you recognize yourself.

Just compare a man with a youth, and see if he will not appear to you harder, less magnanimous, more selfish. Is he therefore worse? “No,” you say; “he has only become more definite,” or, as you also call it, more “practical.” But the main point is this, that he makes **himself** more the centre than does the youth, who is infatuated about other things, for example, God, fatherland, and so on.

Therefore the man shows [or finds—Ed.] a **second** self-discovery. **The youth found himself as spirit** [or mind—Ed.] **and lost himself again in the general spirit**, the complete, holy spirit, Man, mankind—in short, all ideals; **the man finds himself as embodied spirit.**

Boys had only *unintellectual* interests (those interests devoid of thoughts and ideas), youths only *intellectual* ones; the man has bodily, personal, egoistic interests.

If the child has not an *object* that it can occupy itself with, it feels *ennui* [boredom—Ed.]; **for it does not yet know how to occupy itself with *itself*. The youth, on the contrary, throws the object aside, because for him *thoughts* arose out of the object; he occupies himself with his *thoughts*, his dreams, occupies himself intellectually, or “his mind is occupied.”**

The young man includes everything not intellectual under the contemptuous name of “externalities.” If he nevertheless sticks to the most trivial externalities (such as the customs of students’ clubs and other formalities), it is because, and when, he discovers mind in them, when they are **symbols** [i.e. ideas—Ed.] to him.

As I find myself back of [or above—Ed.] things, and that as mind, so I later find myself also back of [or above—Ed.] thoughts—to wit, as their [thinker—Ed.] creator and owner. In the time of spirits thoughts grew till they overtopped my head,

whose offspring they yet were; they hovered about me and convulsed me like fever-phantasies—an awful power. The thoughts had [seemingly or imaginably—Ed.] become corporeal on their own account, were ghosts, such as God, Emperor, Pope, Fatherland, etc. If I destroy their [apparent—Ed.] corporeity, then I take them back into [me or—Ed.] mine, and say: “I alone am corporeal.” And now I take the world as what it is to me, as mine, as my property; I refer all to myself.

If as spirit [or mind—Ed.] I had thrust away the world in the deepest contempt, so as owner [or thinker—Ed.] I thrust spirits or ideas away into their “vanity.” They have no longer any power over me, as no “earthly might” has power over the spirit.

The child was realistic, taken up with the things of this world, till little by little he succeeded in getting at what was back of [or above—Ed.] these very things; the youth was idealistic, inspired by thoughts, till he worked his way up to where he became the man, the egoistic man, who deals with things and thoughts according to his heart’s pleasure, and sets his personal interest above everything. Finally, the old man? When I become one, there will still be time enough to speak of that. [Max, p. 13-14]

Such is History. Can you dig It, modern man? But don’t even bother trying ’cause He ain’t dead. (Thank God somebody thoughtfully saved His brain! (“Meanwhile I’m still thinking.”—T. Rex)

And so Socrates was the first idealist, the first “youth.” His gods were not earth or sky or material gods but thought-gods like “the good,” “the right,” philosophical “truth” and “justice.” Socrates was therefore “executed” as a heretic by religiously offended Athenian “children.” And since he himself drank the poison-hemlock which they had prepared for him, and could have escaped and saved himself, he was perhaps the first victim of the ideals he had created or invented, or, as he and his pupil Plato might rather say, “discovered”).

Even 400 years later, Pilate, that Roman tool of the Satanic “jews” against Jesus-God, could not comprehend the idea of unearthly or philosophical “truth.” (John 18:37-38) It was mentally, intellectually or philosophically beyond him, as beyond ancient man in general. The Roman governor is depicted in the movies or “passion” photo-plays as responding to God sarcastically, because modern man well understands what Jesus-God meant by (philosophical or unworldly) “truth,” but is unaware that ancient man did not. This again is the progression of History.

(“The blue bus is calling us./ The blue bus is calling us./ Driver, where You taking us?”—Jim Morrison)

Besides Max Stirner (1806-56) or assuming his divine inSpiration, we are still Historically awaiting the advent or arrival of the very first “man.” Are we not? He (that “atheist”) who fears and worships no thought-gods, no ideals, no mental, philosophical or intellectual divinities, “principles” or “sanctities.”

(You go “Max”! You climb! You ascend! You rock!)

When comes the shaping man,/ a [Max(imum), Socratic, philosophical, theoretical, ideal kingdom, state or ?—Ed.] nation in his eyes,/ striped with blood and emblazed tattoo [the “sacred heart”?—Ed./ streaking [ascending?—Ed.] cathedral spires?/

They say, “He has no brain.”/ They say, “He has no room.” [to spiritually ascend any higher up those “cathedral spires”?—Ed.]/ They say, “He was born again.”/ They say, “Look at him climb.”/ They say, “Jump!”/

They say, “He was two [?] gods.”/ They say, “He has no fear.” [of his “two gods”?—Ed.]/ They say, “He has no eyes.”/ They say, “he has no mouth.”/

They say, “Hey that’s really something./ Maybe he should get some [TV/radio?—Ed.] time.”/

I say, "He should watch his ass."/ My friend, don't listen to the crowd./ They say, "Jump!"/

Watch out!/ Watch out! [my friend-Ed.]/
[the crowd]: "Got to believe somebody!"/ They say, "Jump!/ Got to believe somebody!"/ They say, "Jump!/ Got to believe!"/—(David Bowie)

The modern crowd "got to believe." And they demand all must take that leap of faith with them—not necessarily toward their particular sacred truth(s), but toward **some** sacred truth or other. Woe to he who will not take that leap of faith with them. Woe to he who has no thought-gods. Woe to the non-ideologue. He had better watch his back.

And so what ancient man could not even conceive of, i.e. heavenly, philosophical or worldless truth, modern man cannot live without—or so he thinks, believes, insists, because mentally, spiritually, psychologically he "got to believe."

Can you dig it, modern man? And can you dig that crazy beat? What do you say?

The first "youth," Socrates, was killed for the religious "crime" of believing in ideals. And the first "man" had better watch his back for the spiritual "crime" of not doing so. Is that ironical, Historical, or both?

* * * * *

But I am ahead of myself and have not yet shown or demonstrated (much less proven) that thought-gods or ideals nowadays reign supreme which weren't even imaginable (much less extant) in Socrates' day. And I won't. (I'll just let Max take care of my small stuff.)

From p. 93-97—(with all insertions indented, marked and noted),

The **imperturbable** spirit of "the [Grecian, Hellenic or Athenian-Ed.] wise man" (with which the old world worked to prepare its end), now underwent an **inner perturbation** against which no ataraxia ["ataxia" (?)—intransigence, immobility or unmovedness-Ed.], no Stoic courage, was able to protect it. The spirit [or mind-Ed.], secured against all influence of the world, insensible to its shocks and **exalted** above its attacks, admiring nothing, not to be disconcerted by any downfall of the world—foamed over irrepressibly again, because gases (spirits) were evolved in its own interior, and, after the **mechanical shock** that comes from without had become ineffective, **chemical tensions**, that agitate within, began their wonderful play.

In fact, ancient history ends with this—that I have struggled till I won my ownership of the world. "All things have been delivered to me by my Father." (Matt. 11:27) [also Matt. 28:28 (And did I mention Max Stirner was divinely inspired?)—Ed.] **It has ceased to be overpowering, unapproachable, sacred, divine, for me; it is undeified, and now I treat it so entirely as I please** that, if I cared, I could exert on it all miracle-working power, that is, power of mind—remove mountains, command mulberry trees to tear themselves up and transplant themselves into the sea (Luke 17:6) [also Mark 11:23, Matt. 17:20 & 21:21-Ed.], and do everything possible, **thinkable**: "All things are possible to him who believes." [Mark 9:23] **I am the lord of the world, mine is the "glory"** [lordliness or lordship-Ed.]. **The world has become prosaic** [dull or commonplace-Ed.], **for the divine has vanished from it: it is my property, which I dispose of as I (to wit, the mind) choose.**

When I had exalted myself to be the owner of the world, egoism had won its first complete victory, had vanquished the world, had become worldless, and put the acquisitions of a long age under lock and key.

The first property, the first "glory," has been acquired!

But the lord of the world is not yet lord of his thoughts, his feelings, his will: he is not lord and owner of the spirit, for the spirit is still sacred, the "Holy Spirit," and the "worldless" Christian is not able to become "godless." If the ancient struggle was a struggle against the world, the medieval (Christian) struggle is a struggle against self, the mind; the former against the outer world, the latter

against the inner world. The medieval man is the man “whose gaze is turned inward,” the thinking, meditative man.

All wisdom of the ancients is *the science of the world*, all wisdom of the moderns is *the science of God*.

The heathen (Jews included) got through with the *world*; but now the thing was to get through with self, the spirit, too; to become spiritless or godless.

So antiquity gets through with the *world of things*, the order of the world, the world as a whole; but to the order of the world, or the things of this world, belong not only nature, but all relations in which man sees himself placed by nature, as in the family, the community—in short, the so-called “natural bonds.” [Matt. 10:34-37]—Ed.] **With the world of the spirit Christianity then begins. The man who still faces the world armed is the ancient, the—heathen (to which class the Jew, too, as non-Christian, belongs); the man who has come to be led by nothing but his “heart’s pleasure,” the interest he takes, his fellow-feeling, his—spirit [or mind—Ed.], is the modern, the—Christian.**

As the ancients worked toward the *conquest of the world* and strove to release man from the heavy trammels of connection with *other things*, at last they came also to the dissolution of the State and [to—Ed.] giving preference to everything private. Of course community, family, and so forth, as natural relations, are burdensome hindrances which diminish my spiritual freedom.

B.—THE MODERNS

“If any man be in Christ, he is a *new creature* ; the old is passed away, behold, all is become *new*.” [2 Cor. 5:17]

As it was said above, “To the ancients the world was a truth,” we must say here, “To the moderns the spirit was a truth”; but here, as there, we must not omit the supplement, “a truth whose untruth they tried to get back of [or to rise above—Ed.], and at last they really do.”

[Yes, but this is prophecy, not History; or future, not past. (Can you dig it, dear modern? Or must you wait ’till it happens, and hence is past?)—Ed.]

A course similar to that which antiquity took may be demonstrated in Christianity also,... [Max, p. 24-25]

For almost two thousand years we have been working at subjecting the Holy Spirit [the holy, sacred or divine idea—Ed.] to ourselves, and little by little we have torn off and trodden under foot many bits of sacredness [Matt. 7:6]—Ed.; but the gigantic opponent is constantly rising anew under a changed form and name. The spirit has not yet lost its divinity, its holiness, its sacredness. To be sure, it has long ceased to flutter over our heads as a dove [John 1:32, Matt. 3:16-17, Mark 1:10-12 & Luke 3:22 —Ed.]; to be sure, it no longer gladdens its saints alone, but lets itself be caught by the laity too; but as spirit [“sacred” idea, “holy” concept or “divine” thought—Ed.] of humanity, as spirit of Man, it remains still an *alien* spirit to me or you, still far from becoming our unrestricted *property*, which we dispose of at our pleasure. However, one thing certainly happened, and visibly guided the progress of post-Christian history: this one thing was the endeavor to make the Holy Spirit *more human*, and bring it nearer to men, or men to it. Through this it came about that at last it could be conceived as the “spirit of humanity,” and, under different expressions like “idea of humanity, mankind, humaneness, general philanthropy,” appeared more attractive, more familiar, and more accessible.

Would not one think that now everybody could possess the Holy Spirit, take up into himself the *idea* of humanity, bring mankind to form and existence in himself?

No, the spirit [the “sacred” ideal—Ed.] **is not stripped of its holiness and robbed of its unapproachableness, is not accessible to us, not our property;** for the spirit of humanity is not *my* spirit. My *ideal* it may be, and as a thought I call it mine; the *thought* of humanity is my property, and I prove this sufficiently by propounding it quite according to my views, and shaping it to-day so, to-morrow otherwise; we represent it to ourselves in the most manifold ways. But it is at the same time an entail, which I cannot alienate nor get rid of.

Among many transformations, the Holy Spirit became in time the “absolute idea,” which again in manifold refractions split into the different ideas of philanthropy, reasonableness, civic virtue, and so on.

Right “in and for itself.” Without relation to me, therefore! “Absolute right.” Separated from me, therefore! A thing that exists in and for itself! An absolute! An eternal right, like an eternal truth!

According to the liberal way of thinking, right is to be obligatory for me because it is thus established by *human reason*, against which *my* reason is “unreason.” Formerly people inveighed [argued—Ed.] in the name of divine reason against weak human reason; now, in the name of strong human reason, against egoistic reason, which is rejected as “unreason.” And yet none is real but this very “unreason.” Neither divine nor human reason, but only your and my reason existing at any given time, is real, as and because you and I are real.

The thought of right is originally my thought; or, it has its origin in me. But, when it has sprung [or escaped—Ed.] from me, when the “Word” is out, then it has “become flesh” [John 1:1-3 & :14—Ed.], it is a *fixed idea*. Now I no longer get rid of the thought; however I turn, it stands before me. **Thus men have not become masters again of the thought “right,” which they themselves created; their creature is running away with them. This is absolute right, that which is absolved or unfastened from me. We, revering it as absolute, cannot devour it again, and it takes from us the creative power: the creature is more than the creator** [Romans 1:21-25—Ed.], it is “in and for itself.”

Once you no longer let right run around free, once you draw it back into its origin, into you, it is *your* right; and that is right which suits you. [Max, p. 205-06]

With absolute right, right itself passes away; the dominion of the “concept of right” is canceled at the same time. For it is not to be forgotten that hitherto concepts, ideas, or principles ruled us, and that among these rulers the concept of right, or of justice, played one of the most important parts.

Entitled or unentitled—that does not concern me, if I am only *powerful*, I am of myself *empowered*, and need no other empowering or entitling.

Right—is a wheel [delusion, mirage, phantasm—Ed.] in the head, put there by a spook [ghost, chimera—Ed.]; power—that am I myself, I am the powerful one and owner of power. **Right is above me, is absolute, and exists in one higher, as whose grace it flows to me: right is a gift of grace from the judge; power and might exist only in me the powerful and mighty.** [Max, p. 209-10]

But can I call the idea my property if it is the idea of humanity, **and can I consider the Spirit as vanquished if I am to serve it, “sacrifice myself” to it?** Antiquity, at its close, had gained its ownership of the world only when it had broken the world’s overpoweringness and “divinity,” recognized the world’s powerlessness and “vanity.”

The case with regard to the *spirit* [thinking or thought–Ed.] corresponds. When I have degraded it to a spook and its control over me to a cranky notion, then it is to be looked upon as having lost its sacredness, its holiness, its divinity, and then I use it, as one uses nature [or mere things–Ed.] at pleasure without scruple.

The “nature of the case,” the “concept of the relationship,” is to guide me in dealing with the case or in contracting the relation. As if a concept of the case existed on its own account, and was not rather the concept that one forms of the case! As if a relation which we enter into was not, (by the uniqueness of those who enter into it), itself unique! As if it depended on how others stamp it! But, as people separated the “essence [idea or ideal–Ed.] of Man” from the real man, and judged the latter by the former, so they also separate his action from him, and appraise it by “human value.” **Concepts are to decide everywhere, concepts to regulate life, concepts to rule.** This is the religious world, to which Hegel gave a systematic expression, bringing method into the nonsense and completing the conceptual precepts into a rounded, firmly-based dogmatic. **Everything is sung according to concepts, and the real man, I, am compelled to live according to these conceptual laws. Can there be a more grievous dominion of law,** and did not Christianity confess at the very beginning that it meant only to draw Judaism’s dominion of law tighter? (“Not a letter of the law shall be lost!”) [Matt. 5:17-18–Ed.]

When the worldly egoist had shaken off a higher power (such as the Old Testament law, the Roman pope), then at once a seven times higher one was over him again, such as faith in the place of the law, the transformation of all laymen into divines in place of the limited body of clergy, and so on. His experience was like that of the possessed man into whom seven devils passed when he thought he had freed himself from one. [Max, p. 79]

Liberalism simply brought other concepts on the carpet; human instead of divine, political instead of ecclesiastical, “scientific” instead of doctrinal, or, more generally, real concepts and eternal laws instead of “crude dogmas” and precepts.

But what I do unconsciously I half-do, and therefore **after every victory over a faith I become again the *prisoner* (possessed) of another faith which then takes my whole self anew into its *service*, and makes me an enthusiast for reason after I have ceased to be enthusiastic for the Bible, or an enthusiast for the idea of humanity after I have fought long enough for that of Christianity.** [Max, p. 358]

To this day the revolutionary principle has gone no farther than to assail only ***one or another*** particular establishment, to be ***reformatory***. Much as may be ***improved***, strongly as “discreet progress” may be adhered to, **always there is only a *new master* [idea(l)–Ed.] set in the old one’s place, and the overturning is a—building up** [to higher and higher ideas, thoughts, ideals–Ed.]. [Max, p. 110-11]

And so we go on with the sacred, grade after grade, from the “holy” to the “holy of holies.” [Max, p. 73-74]

Now nothing but *mind* [spirit, ideas, concepts, ideals–Ed.] rules in the world. An innumerable multitude of concepts buzz about in people’s heads, and what are those doing who endeavor to get further? They are negating these concepts to put new ones in their place! They are saying:

“You form a false concept of right, of the State, of man, of liberty, of truth, of marriage; the concept of right, etc., is rather that one which we now set up.” Thus the confusion of concepts moves forward.

The history of the world has dealt cruelly with us, and the spirit [the “holy” idea(l) or thought, the “sacred” concept—Ed.] **has obtained an almighty power.**

....But around the altar rise the arches of a church, and its walls keep moving further and further out. What they enclose is **sacred**. You can no longer get to it, no longer touch it. Shrieking with the hunger that devours you, you wander round about these walls in search of the little that is profane, and the circles of your course keep growing more and more extended. Soon that church will embrace the whole world, and you [shall—Ed.] be driven out to the extreme edge; another step, and the **world of the sacred** has conquered: you sink into the abyss. Therefore take courage while it is yet time, wander about no longer in the profane where now it is dry [or scanty—Ed.] feeding, dare the leap, and rush in through the gates into the sanctuary itself. If you **devour the sacred**, you have made it your **own!** Digest the sacramental wafer, and you are rid of it! [Max, p. 93-97]

And what is sacred or the sacred? The sacred is whatever you think or believe it is. If something, then something, and if nothing, nothing.

Before the sacred, people lose all sense of power and all confidence; they occupy a **powerless** and **humble** attitude toward it. And **yet no thing is sacred of itself, but by my declaring it sacred, by my declaration, my judgment, my bending the knee; in short, by my—conscience.** [Max, p. 72]

What some folks think, believe or find sacred, others find profane. What is the most sacred thing to the Roman Catholic, e.g.? Is it not his (or rather his “holy father’s”) wafer-god? And yet to most everyone else this is merely a flat, condensed and round piece of wheat or whatever.

* * * * *

Now the “tyrant,” as always, is the father of tyranny, as surely as (“unconstitutional”) government is the creation or perpetration of the (“unconstitutional”) governor, or as poisonous political fruit is and must be of its politically poisonous tree.

The Socratic “tyrant” was (is) the slave of sensuality, of his worldly desires, physical cravings, bodily addictions, “unnecessary” biological needs. He is a profane tyrant.

But the modern tyrant is a sacred tyrant. He is a tyrant of the mental, the spiritual, the ideal.

The ancient Socratic tyrant was a sensual slave of his physical body and of his all-important and almighty lusts. And the modern tyrant is a mental or intellectual slave of his mind and of his all-important and almighty thoughts, ideas or ideals?

* * *

(“How dare you compare your filthy lusts with my heavenly thoughts, principles, ideals?”)

“My thoughts (are) not your thoughts; as the heaven is higher than the earth, so are my thoughts higher than your thoughts,” saith the Lord.—(Isaiah 55:8) (See also Romans 8:4-5 & John 3:31, 8:23, :26, :37-38 & :42-47)

(Yes, what was I thinking of? I must have had one beer too many!)

* * *

But what does it matter to us, the tyrannized, if the idols of our tyrants be sensual or ideological?

“Because in the latter case at least we get to conform to his (or her) sense, idea or concept of virtue?”

I must admit it's a very attractive prospect, but...let us rather seek to (spiritually, mentally or intellectually) conquer both false gods or idols within ourselves, and to beware like the plague their abject slaves or tyrannical devotees dwelling among us—whether sensual or ideological—piggy or priestly—sensual or clerical.

* * * * *

The wheels [gods or idols—Ed.] in the head have a number of other formal aspects, some of which it may be useful to indicate here.

Thus *self-renunciation* is common to the holy with [or and—Ed.] the unholy, to the pure and the impure. The impure [or whorey or tyrannical—Ed.] man renounces all “better feelings,” all shame, even natural timidity, and follows only the appetite that rules him. The pure man renounces his natural relation to the world (“renounces the world”) and follows only the [spiritual, heavenly, ideal or intellectual—Ed.] “desire” which rules him. Driven by the thirst for money, the avaricious [or oligarchic—Ed.] man renounces all admonitions of conscience, all feeling of honor, all gentleness and all compassion; he puts all considerations out of sight; the appetite drags him along. The holy man behaves similarly. He makes himself the “laughing-stock of the world,” is hard-hearted and “strictly just”; for the desire [to be “holy”—Ed.] drags him along.

As the unholy man renounces *himself* before Mammon, so the holy man renounces *himself* before God and the divine laws. We are now living in a time when the shamelessness of the holy is every day more and more felt and uncovered, whereby it is at the same time compelled to unveil itself, and lay itself bare, more and more every day. Have not the shamelessness and stupidity of the reasons with which men antagonize the “progress of the age” [toward the first godless or idealess “man”—Ed.] long surpassed all measure and all expectation? But it must be so. The self-renouncers must, as holy men, take the same course that they do so as unholy men; as the latter [whoremongers—Ed.] little by little sink to the fullest measure of self-renouncing vulgarity and *lowness*, so the former must ascend to the most dishonorable *exaltation*. The mammon of the earth and the God of heaven both demand exactly the same degree of—self-renunciation. The low man, like the exalted one, reaches out for a “good”—the former for the material good, the latter for the ideal, the so-called “supreme good”; and at last both complete each other again too, as the “materially-minded” man sacrifices everything to an ideal phantasm, his *vanity*, and the “spiritually-minded” man to a material gratification, the *life of enjoyment*.

The [alien—Ed.] object makes us into possessed men in its sacred form just as in its profane; as a supersensuous object, just as it does as a sensuous one. The appetite or mania refers to both, and avarice and longing for heaven stand on a level. [Max, p. 337]

Those who exhort men to “unselfishness” [literally “un-self-benefitingness”—Ed.] think they are saying an uncommon deal. What do they understand by it? Probably something like what they understand by “self-renunciation.” But who is this self that is to be renounced and to have no benefit? It seems that *you* yourself are supposed to be it. And for whose benefit is unselfish self-renunciation recommended to you? Again for *your* benefit and behoof, only that through unselfishness you are procuring your “true benefit.”

You are to benefit *yourself*, and yet you are not to seek your benefit. [Max, p. 59-60]

* * * * *

The Socratic tyrant was (is) a vicious tyrant. But the modern tyrant is a virtuous tyrant—or so he at least claims or pretends to be. He is a defender, upholder, spreader or imposer of the sacred, the virtuous, the unworldly, the spiritual, the intellectual, the ideal.

Who could dare object to that? Who would dare object to virtue, to the sacred or the ideal? Or who would dare publicly question, doubt or refuse to worship the popular idols or gods? Therefore the most a critic could safely do would be to suggest or show how the modern tyrant was not really and truly virtuous, idealistic, sacred, Godlike, humanistic, or what-(sanctity, virtue or ideal)-have-you.

As an ancient tyrant may not truly have loved and served Athena, Apollo or Zeus or Jupiter, so a modern tyrant may not truly love and further Liberty, Democracy, Equality or Humanity.

Because the modern time is the time of thought-gods or ideals, therefore all modern tyrants must reign in the name and in the service of these thought-gods (Liberty, Equality, Democracy, etc.), or else they simply would have no legitimacy, authority or sanctity in the eyes of the idolatrous devotees of these thought-gods or ideals.

But because ideals or ideology, the gods of thought or the thought-gods, historically began with Socrates, being created or invented by him, the father of ideology, Socrates himself (as far as I know) neither conceived nor anticipated the “philosopher-tyrant,” the ideological tyrant.

I mean the tyrannical imposer (if not abject slave) of some “virtue” or other, some “holy” or “sacred” “right,” some transcendent “truth,” some “absolute good,” in short, some ideal (thought-god) or other. I mean the (real or apparent) fanatical devotee and tyrannical imposer or enforcer of some ideal “good” or other, some “sacred” truth, some “virtue,” some “absolute idea of the good.” This is the “virtuous” tyrant. This is the defender, upholder, spreader and imposer of “absolute goodness,” of the false spiritual gods or intellectual idols, of the “divine” thoughts or “sacred” ideals of e.g. Church, State, Love or Brotherhood, Freedom or Liberty, Equality (individual, national and/or racial), Truth, Justice, Law, Constitution, Humanity or Humanism, Democracy, Socialism, Communism, anti-Terrorism, National Security, etc., etc., etc.

So let’s enter the modern pantheon and pray...or else laugh...but pray not too loudly—not for fear of the lifeless gods, the mindless idols or the unthinking ideals themselves, but of their mad and murderous devotees. Shhhhh!

Every one who has “sublimar feelings” is able to vent his humor on the pettinesses of men; but to let it play with all “great thoughts, sublime feelings, noble inspiration, and sacred faith” presupposes that I am the owner of all. [Max, p. 358]

* * * * *

But can and do we, dear reader, imagine, perceive and apprehend such monstrous modern creatures?—such tyrannical slaves of ideology (if not cynical liars and sanctimonious pretenders) who count it their great virtue and/or sacred duty to subject us all to their immaterial or imaginary gods, their sacred truths, their holy principals, their intellectual idols, their ideals? Let us pray God for deliverance from such “virtuous” tyrannical monsters as these.

(Consider again the great gods Church, State, Liberty, Equality, Law (Liberty’s Nemesis), Constitution, Man, Humanity, and so on. Have there not historically been, and are there not now countless priests and politicians badgering, menacing or lording over us who would (without qualm, compunction, guilt, shame or regret) cast us alive into their “sacred” ideological fires? and/or bleed us to death upon their “holy” altars of “absolute truth”? i.e. Democracy, Humanity, “National Security,” “Public Safety,” anti-“Terrorism,” etc., etc., etc.?)

Let us then beware ideological tyrants in priests’ or politicians’ robes bearing gifts of “absolute truths” for us all to coercively accept and be grateful for, or being paragons or personifications of “absolute virtues” for us all to coercively imitate, emulate and strive for.

(See e.g. the Roman “pope” or “Soviet premier.”) And let us pray to the real McCoy for deliverance from these most “virtuous,” “principled,” “religious” and ideological of tyrants.

* * * * *

As it was said above, **“To the ancients the world was a truth,”** we must say here, **“To the moderns the spirit was a truth”;** but here, as there, we must not omit the supplement, **“a truth whose untruth they tried to get back of [or to rise above—Ed.], and at last they really do.”** [Max, p. 24]

OK, but how?

And yet **the truth is only a—*thought* ; but it is not merely “a” thought, but the thought that is above all thoughts,** the irrefragable thought; it is *the* thought itself, which gives the first hallowing to all others; **it is the consecration of thoughts, the “absolute,” the “sacred” thought. The truth wears longer than all the gods; for it is only in the truth’s service, and for love of it, that people have overthrown the gods and at last God himself. “The truth” outlasts the downfall of the world of gods, for it is the immortal soul of this transitory world of gods, it is Deity itself.** [Max, p. 352]

As long as you believe in the truth, you do not believe in yourself, and you are a—*servant, a—religious man.* You alone are the truth, or rather, you are more than the truth, which is nothing at all before you [the thinker of the thought, the creator of the truth—Ed.]. You too do assuredly ask about the truth, you too do assuredly “criticize,” but you do not ask about a “higher truth”—to wit, one that should be higher than you—nor criticize according to the criterion of such a truth. [Max, p. 353]

The following is from Max, p. 354-57, with a indented and noted insertion.

As reality or worldliness is “vain and a thing of naught” for Christians, so is the truth for me. It exists, exactly as much as the things of this world go on existing although the Christian has proved their nothingness; but it is vain, because it has its value not *in itself* but *in me.* Of itself it is *valueless.* The truth is a—*creature* [my creature, my thought—Ed.].

As you produce innumerable things by your activity, yes, shape the earth’s surface anew and set up works of men everywhere, so too you may still ascertain numberless truths by your thinking, and we will gladly take delight in them. Nevertheless, **as I do not please to hand myself over to serve your newly discovered machines** mechanically, but only help to set them running for my benefit, **so too I will only use your truths, without letting myself be used for their demands.**

All truths *beneath* me are to my liking; a truth *above* me, a truth that I should have to *direct* myself by, I am not acquainted with [or I don’t know—Ed.]. **For me there is no truth, for nothing is more than I. Not even my essence, not even the essence of man, is more than I! than I, this “drop in the bucket,” this “insignificant man”!**

[As the creator is more than his creation, and the artist more than his art, so is the thinker more than his thought, his “truth,” even if it be the highest, greatest or truest thought ever thought, or the highest, greatest, truest “truth” of all. As the creator who worships his creation (or the artist his art) is a crazy fool, so is the thinker who worships his thought or “truth” (or someone else’s, for that matter). Does that make sense to you, dear modern?—Ed.]

You believe that you have done the utmost when you boldly assert that, because every time has its own truth, there is no “absolute truth.” Why, with this you nevertheless still leave to each time its truth, and thus you quite genuinely create an

“absolute truth,” a truth that no time lacks, because every time, however its truth may be, still has a “truth.”

Is it meant only that people have been thinking in every time, and so have had thoughts or truths, and that in the subsequent time these were other than they were in the earlier? No, the word is to be that **every time had its “truth of faith”; and in fact none has yet appeared in which a “higher truth” has not been recognized, a truth that people believed they must subject themselves to as “highness and majesty.” Every truth of a time is its fixed idea, and, if people later found another truth, this always happened only because they sought for another; they only reformed the folly and put a modern dress on it. For they did want—who would dare doubt their justification for this?—they wanted to be “inspired by an idea.” They wanted to be dominated—possessed, by a *thought!* The most modern ruler of this kind is “our essence,” or “man.”**

[modern-Ed.] **Man, your head is haunted;** you have wheels [ghosts, spooks, illusions, delusions, obsessions-Ed.] in your head! **You imagine great things, and depict to yourself a whole world of gods that has an existence for you, a spirit-realm to which you suppose yourself to be called, an ideal that beckons to you.** You have a fixed idea!

Do not think that I am jesting or speaking figuratively when **I regard those persons who cling to the Higher** [idea-Ed.], **and (because the vast majority belongs under this head) almost the whole world of men, as veritable fools, fools in a madhouse.** What is it, then, that is called a “fixed idea”? **An idea that has subjected the man to itself. When you recognize, with regard to such a fixed idea, that it is a folly, you shut its slave up in an asylum.** And is the truth of the faith, say, which we are not to doubt; the majesty of the people, which we are not to strike at (he who does is guilty of—lese-majesty); virtue, against which the censor is not to let a word pass, that morality may be kept pure;—are these not “fixed ideas”? **Is not all the stupid chatter of most of our newspapers the babble of fools who** suffer from the fixed idea of morality, legality, Christianity, and so forth, **and only seem to go about free because the madhouse in which they walk takes in so broad a space? Touch the fixed idea of such a fool, and you will at once have to guard your back against the lunatic’s stealthy malice. For these great lunatics are like the little so-called lunatics in this point too—that they assail by stealth him who touches their fixed idea. They first steal his weapon, steal free speech from him, and then they fall upon him with their nails. Every day now lays bare the cowardice and vindictiveness of these maniacs, and the stupid populace hurrahs for their crazy measures. One must read the journals of this period, and must hear the Philistines talk, to get the horrible conviction that one is shut up in a house with fools.** [Max, p. 43-44]

For all free criticism [modern thinking, ideology or philosophy-Ed.] **a thought was the criterion; for own** [or my-Ed.] **criticism I am,** I the unspeakable, and so not the merely thought of; for what is merely thought of is always speakable, because word and thought coincide. That is true which is mine, untrue: that whose own I am; true, as in the union; untrue, the State and society. **“Free and true” criticism takes care for the consistent dominion of a thought, an idea** [ideal or ideology-Ed.], a spirit; “own” criticism, for nothing but my *self-enjoyment*. But in this the latter is in fact—and we will not spare it this “ignominy”!—like the bestial criticism of instinct. I, like the criticizing beast, am concerned only for **myself**, not “for the cause.” I am the criterion of truth, but I am not an idea, but more than idea, that is, unutterable. My *criticism* [or

my thinking—Ed.] is not a “free” criticism, not free from me, and not “servile,” not in the service of an idea, but an *own* criticism [in my service—Ed.].

True or human criticism makes out only whether something is *suitable* to man, to the true man; but by own criticism you ascertain whether it is suitable to you.

Free criticism busies itself with *ideas*, and therefore is always theoretical. However it may rage against ideas, it still does not get clear of them. It pitches into the ghosts, but it can do this only as it holds them to be ghosts. The ideas it has to do with do not fully disappear; the morning breeze of a new day does not scare them away.

The critic may indeed come to ataraxia [“ataxia” (?)—intransigence, immobility, unmovedness or petrification—Ed.] before ideas, but he never gets *rid* of them; he **will never comprehend that above the *bodily man* there does not exist** [an idea(l)—Ed.] **something higher**—to wit, liberty, his humanity, etc. He always has a “calling” of man still left, “humanity.” And this **idea** of humanity remains unrealized, just because it is an “idea” and is to remain such.

If, on the other hand, I grasp the idea as *my* idea, then it is already realized, because I am its reality; its reality consists in the fact that I, the bodily, have it.

They say, the idea of liberty realizes itself in the history of the world. The reverse is the case; this idea is real as a man thinks it, and it is real in the measure in which it is idea, that is, in which I think it or *have* it. **It is not the idea of liberty that develops itself, but men develop themselves, and, of course, in this self-development develop their thinking too.**

In short, **the critic** [or modern thinker—Ed.] **is not yet *owner*, because he still fights with ideas as with powerful aliens—as the Christian is not owner of his “bad desires” so long as he has to combat them; for him who contends against vice, vice exists.**

Criticism remains stuck fast in the “freedom of knowing,” the freedom of the spirit, and the spirit gains its proper freedom when it fills itself with the pure, true idea; this is the freedom of thinking, which cannot be without thoughts.

Criticism smites one idea only by another, such as that of privilege by that of manhood [or citizenship—Ed.], **or that of egoism by that of unselfishness.**

In general, the beginning of Christianity comes on the stage again in its critical end, egoism being combated here as there. I am not to make myself (the individual) count, but the idea, the general.

Why, warfare of the priesthood with *egoism*, of the spiritually-minded with the worldly-minded, constitutes the substance of all Christian history. In the newest criticism this war only becomes all-embracing, fanaticism complete. Indeed, neither can it pass away till it passes thus, after it has had its life and its rage out. [Max, p. 354-57]

* * * * *

So the ancient tyrant was (and remains) a sensuous, vicious, extortive or coercive despot, but the modern tyrant may also be an ideological, principled or “virtuous” despot.

As Heaven and Hell could not exist in the minds and creeds of men until they could conceive of spirit, of life outside of the body, or life without flesh, so the ideological tyrant could not Historically arrive nor begin to tyrannize until men could conceive of ideals, or could understand what the tyrant was talking about, and professing or pretending to champion, advance, uphold, defend, enforce.

“What is truth?” asked Pilate of God, simply because he didn’t know. And only until men generally came to know the answer to that question could they be tyrannized in its “holy” name or “sacred” cause.

As we moderns would laugh in the face of he who wanted to enslave us in the “holy” name or “sacred” cause of the sun-god or the moon-goddess, so ancient man would laugh in the face of any would-be champion of “Truth,” or “Justice,” “Right,” “Equality,” “Law” or what-(modern thought-gods or ideals)-have-you?

The ancient Socratic tyrant merely wanted to make a pig of himself and slaves of others (to help feed his insatiable appetites). But the modern tyrant may also want (or at least pretend) to enslave us to serve or further his “holy” ideals or “sacred” causes. The modern tyrant may also desire (or at least pretend) to make us “virtuous,” to make “Christians” or “Mohammedans” of us, to make us “men” or “humans” or “free,” or “democrats” or “communists” or something equally “blessed,” “virtuous,” “sacred” “divine” or “human.”

The ancient tyrant wanted to make us his personal slaves. But the modern tyrant may also want (or at least pretend) to make us slaves of his gods (ideals, “principles,” “truths”) as well as of himself. For he who would presume to make us all “virtuous” thereby presumes to be most virtuous of all. (See “pope,” e.g.)

The ancient tyrant merely wanted to enslave or possess our bodies, but the modern tyrant also demands our minds. It is not enough for him that we serve him bodily, for we must now serve him body and soul (mind, spirit, psyche). It is not enough for the modern Roman emperor that we serve him, further him, worship and make public sacrifices to him as a god. For we must now actually believe it. We must believe in the tyrant’s (presidential) divinity or sanctity, or we are guilty of (mental, spiritual or psychological) treason, disloyalty or blasphemy. It is no longer enough that we physically obey the tyrant, that we do whatsoever he commands, for we must now believe whatsoever he commands. Modern tyranny or despotism has gone far beyond the ancient boundaries of our bodies; for it has long since penetrated our minds, spirits, psyches. We modern subjects of tyranny or despotism are not merely physically possessed, but also mentally, spiritually, psychologically.

So which tyrant or tyranny is worse, dear moderns—whether ye be mods, rockers or mockers: the sensuous or the ideological tyrant, the ancient or the modern despot?

* * * * *

Or what does it matter to us, the tyrannized, if our tyrants be slaves of sensuality or of ideology?—of their bodies or of their minds?—of their worldly or their unworldly loves or values?—of their sensuous or their ideological gods, idols —i.e. their ideas, ideals, principles, “truths” or “sanctities”?

Are ideological tyrants not much more demanding or tyrannizing?

What do we care whether the idols or gods of our tyrants (to which they would unctuously bleed us to death—(and perhaps even themselves as well—if their devotion be sincere and pure, not merely a cynical pretense and lure)—be of flesh, stone, ideology or pure fancy?

Again, do ideological tyrants not demand much more blood or “self-sacrifice” of us?

Do (Max’s modern) ideological tyrants render or leave us any less tyrannized than (Soc’s ancient) sensual ones?

Indeed, is there not even more potential tyranny in ideology?

Again, look at the ideological tyrannies of nationalism, humanism, communism? And aside from “our” “sacrosanct” “public officials or the Devil’s “chosen people,” their official prerogatives and their untouchable properties, what is too good **not** to be sacrificed to the almighty and all-demanding deities or sanctities of “National Security,” the “World War on Terrorism,” the Majority or Humanity or the “Greatest Good for the Greatest Number [of people],” etc.?

* * *

Don’t “nationalism,” “democracy,” “communism” or “humanism” present themselves (or rather don’t their ideologues or priests present themselves) as virtuous spiritual/political crusaders against self-seeking individualism or the vicious egoism of the individual, in favor of the human virtues of love, altruism and selfless self-sacrifice for the benefit of the nation, the majority, the people, humanity or the entire “community”?

Yes, but are they? Do they themselves really practice what they ideologically preach to us, and coercively, fascistically or officially impose upon us? Generally, no. And so they're not very "philosophical," truthful or virtuous after all, are they?

Because the revolutionary priests or schoolmasters served *Man*, they cut off the heads of *men*. The revolutionary laymen, those outside the sacred circle, did not feel any greater horror of cutting off heads, but were less anxious about the rights of *Man* than about their own.

How comes it, though, that the egoism of those who affirm personal interest, and always inquire of it, is nevertheless forever succumbing to a priestly or schoolmasterly (that is, an ideal) interest? Their person seems to them too small, too insignificant—and is so in fact—to lay claim to everything and be able to put itself completely in force. There is a sure sign of this in their dividing themselves into two persons, an eternal and a temporal, and always caring either only for the one or only for the other, on Sunday for the eternal, on the work-day for the temporal, in prayer for the former, in work for the latter. They have then priest in themselves, therefore they do not get rid of him, but bear themselves lectured inwardly every Sunday. [Max, p. 80-81]

Even a directory of the sacred ideas, one or more of which man is to look upon as his calling, is not lacking. Family, fatherland, science [Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Humanity—Ed.], etc., may find in me a servant faithful to his calling.

Here we come upon the old, old craze of the world, which has not yet learned to do without clericalism—that to live and work for an idea is man's calling, and according to the faithfulness of its fulfilment his human worth is measured.

This is the dominion of the idea; in other words, it is clericalism. Thus Robespierre and St. Just were priests through and through, inspired by the idea, enthusiasts, consistent instruments of this idea, idealistic men. So St. Just exclaims in a speech, "There is something terrible in the sacred love of country; it is so exclusive that it sacrifices everything to the public interest without mercy, without fear, without human consideration. It hurls Manlius down the precipice; it sacrifices its private inclinations; it leads Regulus to Carthage, throws a Roman into the chasm, and sets Marat, as a victim of his devotion, in the Pantheon."

[“Maximilien Francois Robespierre (1758-1794) and Louis Antoine Leon de Saint-Just (1767-1794), two maior leaders of the French Revolution who bear responsibility for the Reign of Terror and who were both victims of the reaction against it.”—Editor J. J. Martin]

[Max, p. 77]

* * * * *

Distinguishing the Ancient from the Modern Ideologue, the Socratic Philosopher-King from the Modern Tyrant

And, on the other hand, what exactly is the difference between the modern ideological tyrant and the ancient, Socratic “philosopher-king”?—that spiritual devotee of those strange new gods of Socrates, those unworldly and immaterial thought-gods or ideals of truth, justice, right, and the good?

For if both rulers are ideologues, what then keeps the Socratic philosopher-king from becoming a tyrant, from imposing his “virtues” upon his subjects, the less virtuous?

Is the “philosopher-king” any less absolute or powerful than the modern ideological tyrant or tyrannical ideologue? And if the philosopher-king is also as “constitutionally unlimited” or absolute as the war-time president, tyrant or dictator, then is it only his sensual self-restraint or philosophical temperance which prevents him from becoming a tyrant? Or could some super-sensual “virtue” or other, or some tyrannical spiritual desire, (such as the desire to make all his citizens philosophers or super-sensualists like himself, or to make all his subjects “good,” “virtuous,” “righteous” or “just”), lead the Socratic philosopher-king to tyrannize over his subjects like a modern ideological tyrant-king, “president,” “premier” or “prime minister” forces or coerces his subjects or citizens to become “virtuous,” “righteous” or “just” like himself?

For don’t or wouldn’t both ideologues claim to serve “truth” “goodness,” “right” and “justice”?

Yes, but as every liar, tyrannical or otherwise, damn well knows, to say and to do something, or to claim to be and to actually be something (“just,” “virtuous,” “Godlike,” “human,” etc.) are two very different things. “Virtue” is easier said than done. Or what tyrant has ever claimed to serve and further lies, evil, wrong or injustice? None. And yet many have done so. (See e.g. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, “jewish”-Amerikan president, 1933-45)

Presumably, the genuine philosopher-king would sincerely seek to find, discover, serve and further the Socratic ideals—(“truth” “goodness,” “right” and “justice”)—rather than to merely pretend to do so, as some (if not most) ideological tyrants do. Presumably he would be wise enough not to ever try to force or coerce others (his subjects) to be “virtuous” or idealistic, as this is impossible, neither to believe or have faith in his “truths” or ideals. And presumably he would not do so even if he could, as this would be unjust or tyrannical. (Would God force the vicious to be virtuous, or the faithless to believe the truth? Hell no!) And to stop or arrest the vicious from being themselves (or even to punish them) is not to force them to be virtuous, which again is impossible anyway.

* * * * *

Again, might not some “virtue,” belief, faith, or ideological desire (“to deliver the captives” e.g.) lead a well-meaning philosopher-king to tyranny in the same way that sensuous vice leads a would-be tyrant to tyranny? And would a virtuous or well-meaning tyrant be any less intolerable, onerous, harmful, and hateworthy to us than a vicious and malevolent tyrant?

(The philosopher-king is by Socratic definition or description virtuous. And tyranny or coercion is not virtue. It is neither right nor virtuous to force others to be right or virtuous. And besides, you can’t anyway. All you can do is defend yourself against or vice—within yourself and others whom you must either restrain or banish from your city-state or kingdom.)

(I would say No, the ancient Socratic philosopher-king is not like modern ideological tyrants: Roman Catholic “popes” (“saving the world for Christ”); imperial Amerikan presidents “liberating” (i.e. invading, conquering, occupying) and “making the world safe for democracy,” etc.

For besides his philosophic temperance and self-control, the philosopher-king is a genuine truth seeker...and finder. And therefore he is realistic and knows better than to even try to make a “silk purse out of a sow’s ear”—i.e. to make the vicious virtuous. You can’t anyway, and he’d know that. And he, Godlike, wouldn’t want to even if he could.

And though they claim to serve the very same gods, virtues or principles as this ancient philosopher-king, (i.e. truth or “Pravda,” “goodness,” “right” and “justice”) modern ideological tyrants, being liars, political propagandists and/or self-deceivers, simply don’t.

* * * * *

Once again, is even the Socratic “philosopher-king,” who is master of his senses, but alas, a mental slave, psychological servant or spiritual devotee to his absolute “truths,” his intellectual “principles” or “essences,” his thought-gods or idols, not also at least a **potential** tyrant?

And how is he, you or I benefited by self-liberation from physical, sensual or earthly things only to be self-subjected to spiritual, mental or heavenly things, to intellectual

“essences,” to thoughts, ideas, truths, ideals?—unless (as Max teaches or demonstrates) this is (or rather was) a necessary and progressive mental or psychological development—a gradual, unavoidable and inescapable spiritual ascension of Man’s History—as from mindless childhood to idealistic youth, to mental maturity—i.e. to practical, selfish, egoistic self-mastery, self-control and self-ownership?

(The ancient philosopher-king, worshipping his ideals as gods, a **potential** tyrant? Perhaps. But the modern Socratic philosopher-king? Certainly not. For he has no thought-gods. He worships no ideals. He knows they are merely thoughts, **his** thoughts. He is master of both his body and his mind, his senses and his thoughts, his sensing and his thinking. For he is the philosopher-king. He can do anything. Can you dig it/him? Don’t bother. He walks the earth. Hark! And mark! Something philosophical this way comes.)

* * *

And finally, does absolute power (for good or evil or mediocrity) not corrupt its bearer or wielder absolutely? And so who, dear reader (other than me and thee) can we safely trust with absolute power or autocracy?

* * * * *

The Current World-Wide “Democratic” Tyranny of the Imperious and Peremptory “Liberator(s)”

Let us now look at what modern ideological tyrants have perpetrated or inflicted upon the world in the “holy” names or “sacred” causes of a pair of thought-gods, intellectual sanctities or ideological deities: the gods (or goddess) of Liberty and Democracy.

* * * * *

From The Republic 8, p. 562,

SOCRATES: **And the insatiable desire of wealth and the neglect** [“disregard”—Rouse] **of all other things for the sake of money-getting was also the ruin of oligarchy?**

ADEIMANTUS: True.

SOCRATES: **And democracy has her own good, of which the insatiable desire brings her to dissolution?**

[“**Then is democracy also dissolved by insatiate desire for that which it defines as good?**”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: **What good?**

SOCRATES: **Freedom** [“**Liberty**”—Rouse], I replied; **which, as they tell you in a democracy, is the glory** [“most beautiful”—Rouse] **of the State—and that therefore in a democracy alone will the freeman of nature deign to dwell** [“and therefore this is the only city where a man of free nature thinks life worth living.—Rouse]?

ADEIMANTUS: **Yes; the saying is in everybody’s mouth.**

SOCRATES: I was going to observe, that **the insatiable desire of this and the neglect of other things introduces the change in democracy, which occasions a demand for tyranny.** [The Republic 8, p. 562]

* * * * *

And from Max,

If I sacrifice to him [the loved one—Ed.] everything that but for my love to him I should keep, that is very simple, and even more usual in life than it seems to be; **but it proves nothing further than that this one passion is more powerful in me than all**

the rest. Christianity too teaches us to sacrifice all other passions to this. But, if to one passion I sacrifice others, I do not on that account go so far as to sacrifice *myself*, nor sacrifice anything of that whereby I truly am myself; I do not sacrifice my peculiar value, my *ownness*. **Where this bad case occurs love cuts no better figure than any other passion that I obey blindly. The ambitious [timocratic or oligarchic-Ed.] man, who is carried away by ambition and remains deaf to every warning that a calm moment begets in him, has let this passion grow up into a despot against whom he abandons all power of dissolution: he has given up himself, because he cannot *dissolve* himself, and consequently cannot absolve [liberate or free-Ed.] himself from the passion [craving, desire-Ed.] : he is possessed.** [Max, p. 290-91]

Who, then, is “self-sacrificing?” In the full sense, surely, he who ventures everything else for *one thing*, one object, one will, one passion [one desire-Ed.]. Is not the lover self-sacrificing who forsakes father and mother, endures all dangers and privations, to reach his goal? Or the ambitious [or timocratic-Ed.] man, who offers up all his desires, wishes, and satisfactions to the single passion, or the avaricious [miserly or oligarchic-Ed.] man who denies himself everything to gather treasures, or the [democratic/tyrannical-Ed.] pleasure-seeker? [Or the lustful Socratic tyrant?-Ed.] **He is ruled by a passion to which he brings the rest [of his passions, or all else-Ed.] as sacrifices.**

And are these self-sacrificing people perchance not selfish, not egoist? As they have only one ruling passion, so they provide for only one satisfaction, but for this the more strenuously; they are wholly absorbed in it. Their entire activity is egoistic, but it is a one-sided, unopened, narrow egoism; it is possessedness.

But he [that oligarch, democrat or tyrant-Ed.] who acts from love of filthy lucre does it on his own account indeed, as **there is nothing anyhow that one does not do for his own sake**—among other things, everything that is done for God’s glory; **yet he, for whom he seeks the lucre, is a slave of lucre, not raised above lucre; he is one who belongs to lucre, the moneybag, not to himself; he is not his own.** Must not a [oligarchic-Ed.] man whom the passion of avarice rules follow the commands of this *master*? And, if a weak goodnaturedness once beguiles him, does this not appear as simply an exceptional case of precisely the same sort as when pious believers are sometimes forsaken by their Lord’s guidance and ensnared by the arts of the “devil?” **So an avaricious [or oligarchic, pleasure-seeking or lustful-Ed.] man is not a self-owned man, but a servant; and he can do nothing for his own sake without at the same time doing it for his lord’s sake—precisely like the godly man.** [Max, p. 300]

“Why, those are petty passions, by which, on the contrary, man must not let himself be enthralled. Man must make sacrifices for a great idea, a great cause!” A “great idea,” a “good cause,” is, it may be, the honor of God, for which innumerable people have met death; Christianity, which has found its willing martyrs; the Holy Catholic Church, which has greedily demanded sacrifices of heretics; liberty and equality, which were waited on by bloody guillotines.

He who lives for a great idea, a good cause, a doctrine, a system, a lofty calling, may not let any worldly lusts, any self-seeking interest, spring up in him. Here we have the concept of *clericalism*, or, as it may also be called in its pedagogic activity, school-masterliness; **for the idealists play the schoolmaster over us. The clergyman is especially called to live to the idea and to work for the idea, the truly good cause.** Therefore the people feel how little it befits him to show worldly haughtiness, to desire good living, to join in such pleasures as dancing and gaming—in short, to have any other than a “sacred interest.” Hence, too, doubtless, is derived the scanty salary of

teachers, who are to feel themselves repaid by the sacredness of their calling alone, and to “renounce” other enjoyments.

Even a directory of the sacred ideas, one or more of which man is to look upon as his calling, is not lacking. Family, fatherland, science [Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Humanity—Ed.], etc., may find in me a servant faithful to his calling.

Here we come upon the old, old craze of the world, which has not yet learned to do without clericalism—that to live and work for an idea is man’s calling, and according to the faithfulness of its fulfilment his human worth is measured.

This is the dominion of the idea; in other words, it is clericalism. Thus Robespierre and St. Just were priests through and through, inspired by the idea, enthusiasts, consistent instruments of this idea, idealistic men. So St. Just exclaims in a speech, “There is something terrible in the sacred love of country; it is so exclusive that it sacrifices everything to the public interest without mercy, without fear, without human consideration. It hurls Manlius down the precipice; it sacrifices its private inclinations; it leads Regulus to Carthage, throws a Roman into the chasm, and sets Marat, as a victim of his devotion, in the Pantheon.”

[“Maximilien Francois Robespierre (1758-1794) and Louis Antoine Leon de Saint-Just (1767-1794), two maior leaders of the French Revolution who bear responsibility for the Reign of Terror and who were both victims of the reaction against it.”—Editor J. J. Martin]

Now, over against these representatives of ideal or sacred interests stands a world of innumerable “personal” profane interests. No idea, no system, no sacred cause is so great as never to be outrivalled and modified by these personal interests. Even if they are silent momentarily, and in times of rage and fanaticism, yet they soon come uppermost again through “the sound sense of the people.” Those ideas do not completely conquer till they are no longer hostile to personal interests, till they satisfy egoism. [Max, p. 76-77]

* * * * *

And we are herein speaking of the “great idea” and/or “good cause” of freedom or liberty, of the ideal of Freedom or the goddess of Liberty. And we are speaking of the desire to be free at all costs, i.e. of that “ruling passion” (Rouse) or “monstrous winged drone” of “liberty” (Rep. 9:573); and furthermore, of that monstrous craving, desire or pretension to tyrannically, peremptorily, coercively make or force others (yes, perhaps even the whole world) to be “free” (or democratic) whether they like it or want it or not.

But let us rather seek that liberty which actually serves and furthers us, rather than that bloodthirsty goddess or Satanic demon who demands our sacrificial blood be spilt in her (or its) imperious service, command and furtherance. (Apo./Rev. 17:3-7)

* * * * *

And so the same Socratic quote above shall now be examined from an angle other than **our** “insatiable desires” to e.g. become free, “free lovers,” sensualists, fat pigs, addicts, democrats, “liberals,” or what-have-you? And that is from the perspective of the “insatiable desires” of certain tyrannical others to **make** us all “democratic” or “free” or what-have-they?—i.e. to coercively, imperiously, fascistically or tyrannically “liberate” us or transform us all into “democrats” or slaves to “communistic” tyranny.

In other words, leaving behind those “insatiable desires” by which we bind or enslave and ruin ourselves, let us now examine those “insatiable desires” of certain malevolent others to “liberate,” conquer, bind, enslave and ruin us...democratically, communistically and tyrannically; peremptorily, coercively and imperiously.

SOCRATES: And democracy has her own good, of which the insatiable desire brings her to dissolution?

[“Then is democracy also dissolved by insatiate desire for that which it defines as good?”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: **What good?**

SOCRATES: **Freedom** [**Liberty**—Rouse], I replied; **which, as they tell you in a democracy, is the glory** [“most beautiful”—Rouse] **of the State—and that therefore in a democracy alone will the freeman of nature deign to dwell** [“and therefore this is the only city where a man of free nature thinks life worth living.—Rouse]?

ADEIMANTUS: **Yes; the saying is in everybody’s mouth.**

SOCRATES: I was going to observe, that **the insatiable desire of this and the neglect of other things introduces the change in democracy, which occasions a demand for tyranny.** [The Republic 8, p. 562]

Question: Is the imperious Amerikan demand that everyone on the planet be a democrat, or that every form of government on earth be a democratic one not a kind of (political) tyranny, the most imperious tyranny the world has ever witnessed and suffered?

The imperious Amerikans said their first world war was waged to “make the world safe for democracy.” That meant to destroy all monarchies and/or aristocracies on God’s globe, to dethrone all philosopher-kings, and to impose democracies and imperial Amerikan puppet-governors/governments.

And after their second world war the Amerikans “liberated” and “democratized” eastern Europe real good, didn’t they? How’d you like you and your loved ones to be so “liberated,” dear reader?

And the latest Gentile nation to “benefit” from this imperial “jewish”—Amerikan policy of supernational (SuperNazi) national “liberation” (i.e. invasion, conquest, occupation and puppet-gov’t imposition) is Iraq. Is this not so?

Who are they going to “liberate” next?

* * * * *

And now again from Max,

Under religion and politics man finds himself at the standpoint of *should*: he *should* become this and that, should be so and so. With this postulate, this commandment, every one [confronts—Ed.] steps not only in front of another but also in front of himself. **Those** [humanistic—Ed.] **critics say: “You should be a whole, free man.” Thus they too stand in the temptation to proclaim a new *religion*, to set up a new absolute, an ideal—to wit, freedom. Men *should* be free.**

Then there might even arise *missionaries* of freedom, as Christianity. (in the conviction that all were properly destined to become Christians) sent out *missionaries of the faith*. [How prescient! See “liberation theology.”—Ed.] **Freedom would then (as have hitherto faith as Church, morality as State) constitute itself as a new *community* and carry on a like “propaganda” therefrom.**

[In other words, a nation (or empire) might set out to peremptorily, forcibly, coercively or tyrannically conquer the world in the name of “freedom” or “liberty,” or under the guise of “liberating” it or the banner of “freeing” it. Do you know of any nation/empire like that, dear reader? And what is the name of their Babylonian goddess “sitting [or rather standing—Ed.] upon many waters”—or rather “peoples, multitudes, nations and tongues”? “Miss” what? Is she not rather a whore?—the whore of Babylon? Is she not the Satanic whore, the anti-Christ queen and the “jewish” empress of “Babylon,” N.Y.? (Apo./Rev. 17:1 & :15)—Ed.]

Certainly no objection can be raised against a getting together; but so much the more must one **oppose every renewal of the old *care for us*, of culture directed toward an end—in short, the principle of *making something out of us*, no matter whether Christians, subjects, or freemen and men.** [Max, p. 242-43]

God wants perforce to make the world *blest*, and Man wants to make it *happy*, to make all men happy [or free—Ed.]. Hence every “man” wants to awaken in all men the reason [or the liberty—Ed.] which he supposes his own self to have: everything is to be rational [or “liberal”—Ed.] throughout. God torments himself with the devil [Man with the “inhuman,” and the “liberal” or “liberator” with the unfree, the subjected or the enslaved and their tyrants—Ed.], and the philosopher does it with unreason and the accidental. **God lets no being go its own gait, and Man likewise wants to make us walk only in human wise.** [Max, p. 288]

And the imperious, Super-Nazi “jewish”-Amerikan tyrants wants to make us all “free.”

“You should be free! You should be liberated from the tyranny of monarchy, aristocracy and Socratic philosopher-kings! The entire world should be made safe for democracy! We Americans shall make it so! That’s how good we are! That how much we love our goddess Liberty! We shall conquer the world in her most holy name and sacred cause! And who therefore but (by our definition, judgment or condemnation) tyrants, despots or dictators shall oppose us, or shall we depose? We shall make the world safe for our [imperial, SuperNazi “jewish”-Amerikan—Ed.] democracy! You should and shall all have a democratic form of government!—our form of government! And if with us you do not agree, you shall be liberated forcibly, and **made** to have a democratic constitution and government!—one which we Americans will perhaps write for you and choose for you.

“We Americans want foreign governments which we can control far easier and more completely (than any foreign monarch or philosopher-king), and whose leaders are not merely democratically chosen, but also imperially approved by us! Woe to all governments (whether monarchical or democratic) of which we Americans do not approve. Did you not freely or democratically elect your Hitler after we had militarily deposed your aristocratic Kaiser? And did we not forcibly depose both as [if—Ed.] tyrants, despots or dictators? And therefore in truth we Americans want neither monarchs nor democrats upon foreign thrones, but only our imperial puppets, or in other words, ‘friendly governments.’ Woe to all governments who are unfriendly to us, or who love us less than we deserve or demand.”

Have you ever heard the like of these sayings before, dear readers? And from whom? Do they not come from the imperial, invasive, conquistadorial and occupational agents of “Miss Liberty”? And is she truly a goddess of Liberty, and her city the proverbial “city on a hill,” shedding her light, hope, truth and liberation and to all the world? (Matt 5:14) For that’s what she’s always claimed and professed to be, you know. (Cf. Apo./Rev. 21:11 & :22-27)

Or is she that great anti-Christian, “jewish”-Amerikan “whore of Babylon”? Is she that “MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND [political, “democratic,” socialistic, “communistic,” Marxist, “jewish,” zionist or anti-Christ?—Ed.] ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” (Apo./Rev. 17:5)?

I mean a democratic, humanistic, atheistic, multi-racial, multi-cultural, multi-religious or Babylonian abomination such as Jew York City or the “jewish”-Amerikan empire. I mean this imperial conquistadorial and Babylonian whore, queen and empress of her “Uncle” Satan reproduces or clones herself (spiritually, culturally, socially, racially, politically, monetarily and economically) around the entire globe. And that is why she is to me the “mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.” Do you see?

* * * * *

And anti-Christ or “jewish”-Amerika’s latest political “abomination” is to be seen within Iraq. And they call this latest imperialist war, invasion, conquest and occupation of theirs, “Operation Iraqi Freedom.” (What else?) And you finally starting to understand their perverse and deceitful language, dear reader?

But methinks (Gentile) Americans should liberate themselves first. For only then might they have eyes to see how to liberate the rest of (Gentile) humanity. (Matt. 7:1-5 & Luke 6:39 & :41-49)

And who is going to wage “Operation American Freedom” if not the Americans themselves? Or who is going to liberate the Americans from their evil, Satanic, “jewish,” anti-Christ, anti-God, anti-truth, anti-justice, anti-liberty “federal” tyranny, despotism or dictatorship?—their invasive, mass-murderous, conquistadorial, anti-Gentile, anti-Christian, anti-Mohammedan, imperial, super-national or SuperNazi zionist occupational government?

Aside from the world-“liberating” Amerikans of course, is the political/military business of oppressed citizens everywhere to liberate themselves from “their” oppressive, predatory or tyrannical governments. But it is the political/military business of the world to liberate themselves from a tyrannical empire. Know what/who I mean? And again is there a better pretext, excuse or disguise for national (domestic) or supernational (imperial) tyranny than “liberation” or “liberty”?

* * * * *

Precisely who is going to liberate whom? And shouldn't we all begin by liberating ourselves? Shouldn't liberation begin at home?

Properly [human(istic)–Ed.] **criticism says: “You must liberate your ego from all limitedness [or limits–Ed.] so entirely that it becomes a human ego.” I say: Liberate yourself as far as you can, and you have done your part; for it is not given to every one to break through all limits, or, more expressively: not to every one is that a limit which is a limit for the rest.**

[Even God e.g. is limited in or by time, living “forever in the moment.” He cannot “time travel.” Can you, dear reader? But then time is not really anything at all in, by or of itself. Time is merely the continuation of Life, i.e. God. There is no such thing, being, character or god as “Father Time.” (And by the way, “Does anybody really know what time it is?/ Does anybody really care?”—The Chicago Transit Authority)–Ed.]

Consequently, do not tire yourself with toiling at the limits of others; enough if you tear down yours. Who has ever succeeded in tearing down even one limit for all men? Are not countless persons to-day, as at all times, running about with all the “limitations of humanity?” He who overturns one of his limits may have shown others the way and the means; the overturning of their limits remains their affair. [Max, p. 141]

And so a truly enlightened “city on a hill” (Matt. 5:14) should simply shine her light (and thus be a shining example to all the world), and not go about “liberating” the world, or rather pretending to do so, but actually conquering it for her god, king and whore-master, “Uncle” Satan the Devil.

Why not simply be yourself without pretension, and if others want to be like you then they'll try, and if not, then not?

But Ugliness cannot ever afford to show her real (hideous) face. And so she always wears her Beauty mask. And so if she were ever to be publicly unmasked, revealed, exposed or seen for what she really and truly is, even for a moment, it would not be her doing, but someone else's. Who then shall reveal this hideous whore of Babylon if neither the whore herself nor her whore-master, “Uncle” Satan the Devil? The “false prophet,” Roman “pope” perhaps? (Apo./Rev. 19:20, 20:10 & 13:11-18) Perhaps not.

* * * * *

The Great Amerikan “Liberation” Pretension

Invasion, conquest, or imperialism disguised as “liberation” is like rape disguised as “love.”

Can you refuse the “liberation” or the “love”? If you can’t say “No thanks,” or if your “No thanks” is ignored, then you know damn well you’re being conquered or raped.

Learn to see through lies or pretensions to the truth concealed beneath. Or in other words, “Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment.” [“but pass the just judgement”—By.] (John 7:24)

* * * * *

Consider, dear reader: Is there a more effective disguise, pretext, pretension or mask for the tyrant than to claim to be saving others (his new subjects) from tyranny, dictatorship, oppression, evil, “terrorism,” etc.? Or for an imperialistic, conquistadorial and tyrannical empire than to claim to be saving the world from tyrants or dictators—(and/or **for** freedom and democracy)?

Probably not, or if so I don’t know what it is. But how long can a national or imperial tyrant possibly get away with that “liberal” pretension before most of his (tyrannized) subjects begin to see through it? Long enough to have perhaps disarmed them all?—to have confiscated all their weapons of minute or “mass destruction”—to have extracted all their “freedom teeth and claws” from them—thus rendering them incapable of ever deposing this tyrant of theirs? Because that’s all the time a (national or super-national) tyrant needs to inextricably establish himself. Is it not?

* * * * *

A word to the philosophical is sufficient. But a book to a fool is not.

Remember above where Socrates said that the tyrant usually starts out as a liberator, protector or champion of the oppressed?

SOCRATES: This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears above ground he is a protector.

[“One thing is clear then,’ I said, ‘that **when a tyrant appears, he grows simply and solely from a protectorship** as the root.”—Rouse] [Rep. 8:565]

* * * * *

And in the same dark, evil, predatory and deceitful vein, is there a better disguise, pretext, pretension or mask for a terrorist-state or terrorist-gov’t than to claim to be saving itself and its subjects from terrorism? (See “Israel” e.g.) Or for a terrorist empire than to claim or pretend to be saving the world from “world-terrorism”? (See e.g. the “jewish”-Amerikan empire.)

Again, is there a better excuse or disguise for a tyrannical and/or terrifying emperor than to pretend to be saving the world (of his conquered states and tyrannized subjects) from tyranny and/or terrorism? And is there a better pretext, excuse or disguise for “terribly” aggressive, mass-murderous, “shock and awe[some]” invasions and occupations, or for imperialistic conquests of ex-sovereign nations than to claim to be merely “pre-empting” “terrorism” or “world-terrorism” before it strikes (them)? Or to be deposing “terrorist dictators” before they strike their “terror” or “dictate” further?

Is there a better or more terrible mask for state- or imperial-terrorism than that? Again, if so, I don’t know what it is or might be. Do you, dear reader?

Is the real and true Dragon not most likely to be disguised as a White Knight protecting not only Its local victims but all the world from Evil, Tyranny, Terrorism, etc.?

Is the Devil and Its own not most likely be disguised as God and His angels combating the Devil and Its demons?

And so therefore we would logically expect such a terribly self-serving excuse or self-righteous mask to be used or worn by the world’s most evil, most Satanic, most deceitful,

tyrannical, predatory, shameless and conscienceless state-terrorists and/or imperial-terrorists? Yes?

And so is it? And by whom? The aforementioned “Israelis” and Americans? Who else?

And just who are the real and true terrorists here? I mean by far the most terrible, most violent, most invasive, most aggressive, most belligerent, most murderous or mass-murderous party or parties?

Let’s simply do the math. Let’s count the victims, the bodies, the corpses, the casualties. And there’s our most terrible answer. Is it not by far the accusers, the “devils,” the slanderers: the “Israelis” and the “jewish”-Americans?

Question: Then who’s gonna “pre-empt” them? Who’s gonna liberate or save God’s Gentile globe from them?

Lawrence of Arabia and/or Peter O’Toole? Or the Jewnighted Nations? (Possibly not.)

* * * * *

The imperious Americans invade, conquer and occupy or possess the world under their most “holy” or “sacred” banners of “Freedom” and “Democracy.” And so the coercively, peremptorily and imperiously “liberated” Gentile peoples, nations and individuals simply have no choice but to be thus imperiously “liberated,” conquered and occupied by “jewish”-American armies, and thus imperially ruled by “jewish”-American puppet-governors, “jewish”-American puppet-governments and “jewish”-American puppet-governmental (or “democratic”) forms.

And if the “liberated” peoples or nations of the world would prefer to remain or to go under a Socratic philosopher-king e.g., or an aristocratic/monarchical form of gov’t, then they are not ever to be allowed this “self-determination” by the imperious “jewish”-American empire.

(And why not, really and truly? What’s so wrong or “evil” about national self-determination and self-government? It’s nationalist, and therefore non-imperialist, and therefore “anti-American.”)

And perhaps this imperious denial shall not be made in the “holy” name or “sacred” cause of (Miss or goddess) “Liberty,” but certainly of “Democracy.” Was “jewish”-America’s first imperial war against the Gentile world not to “make the world safe for democracy”—i.e. to dethrone, decapitate, banish or outlaw Gentile monarchy and aristocracy?

But it’s obviously absurd under either “sacred” banner (“Freedom/Liberty/Liberation” or “Democracy”) to imperiously, coercively or tyrannically deny a people or nation their popularly chosen form of government. From one side of his very crooked mouth “jewish”-America’s world-warring president W. Wilson (1913-21) said his country was fighting for the right of national “self-determination” for all peoples or nations. And from the other side of his crooked presidential mouth he said his empire was “making the world safe for democracy.” I.E. the imperially conquered Gentile world shall have the “self-determination” to choose democracy and nothing else. What’s wrong with this imperious, SuperNazi, dictatorial or tyrannical “jewish”-American picture?

Question: Does the “jewish”-American Father (or rather “Uncle” Satan) truly know best, or know what’s best for all the (Gentile) peoples of God’s globe? Or does “Uncle” Satan merely know what’s best for Itself and Its “messianic” “chosen people” and their world-wide, SuperNazi sinagog of Satan? (Apo./Rev. 2:9 & 3:9)

For is it not far easier to conquer or control a Gentile world of democracies than one of monarchies, aristocracies or Socratic philosopher-kings? For the latter are not nearly so easily purchased, influenced or controlled. Aristocrats are not nearly so treacherous and treasonous against their own peoples, races, families, nations, citizens or subjects as are “oligarchs,” “democrats” or imperial “jewish” puppets. (See the Protocols of Zion and/or the last part of the following chapter to see that, among themselves, the anti-Christians know and admit, recognize and lament that this is so. And hence they conspire and plot amongst themselves to exterminate or otherwise destroy all Gentile aristocracies.)

And did Socrates not show us how and why democracies degenerate into tyrannies? And so what form of gov't would these would-be world-wide tyrants choose (or rather impose) upon the Gentile world? And so is their Satanic or "messianic," zionist or "jewish" motive not clear, plain, obvious and transparent to all with Socratic eyes to see? Is this word to the philosophically wise not sufficient?

* * * * *

And so the imperial Americans claim or pretend to feel "threatened," "vulnerable" and "terrorized" by the big, bad, "terrible" world? And so they inform us all (who, by the way, are "either with them or with the terrorists") that they must protect themselves by "pre-empting" "terrorism" wherever they "find," "see" or "suspect" it to exist in the world?

Can we tolerate, allow or permit this terrible "jewish" presumption and imperious Amerikan arrogance?

Is this not a terrible pretext for yet further (indeed endless) "jewish"-Amerikan imperialism, world-tyranny and superstate-terrorism, for endless more "jewish"-Amerikan attacks, invasions, mass-murders and conquests? And have the Americans not officially said as much—that their (world) war against "world terrorism" shall be open-ended, endless, limitless, continuous?

Then who's gonna liberate, save and protect the Gentile world from these terrible "jewish" or anti-Christ Americans? The Jewnighted Nations' Organization? (Possibly not.)

For, unlike the Americans, the Gentile world has every reason to feel threatened and terrorized, and **unjustly** threatened and terrorized by them—AND NOT VICE-VERSA. (See e.g. On Recognizing (Demonic) Terrorists (through their Slanderous Masks): "Allied" Terror-Bombing during W.W. II, within the Political Appendix.)

* * *

And besides, who is going to save or liberate the world from all these "jewish"-Amerikan "weapons of mass-destruction" and "mass-murder"? Shouldn't international disarmament start at the top and work its way down to me and you?

Didn't the Americans invent the nuclear bomb? And weren't they the only people, nation or empire to ever use, drop or perpetrate the nuclear bomb they had invented...twice?

And didn't they start using their eternal poison called "depleted uranium" during their first war against Iraq in 1991, which they called "Operation Desert Storm"? And haven't they continued to perpetrate this eternal nuclear poison of theirs up to the present time?

And they should be terrified of **us**? (I don't think so.)

* * * * *

But should we be at all surprised that the Devil and Its demonic, deceitful and slanderous kindred would slander, damn (condemn or "convict"), persecute and murder their Godly victims in the very name of "salvation" (as did e.g. the Roman Catholic Church)? Or that they would presently pretend to be saving others (even all the world) from "world-terrorism" and from all those whom they accuse, slander or damn (as "terrorists")? And hence that they would "pre-empt" (i.e. bomb, murder, mass-murder, persecute, jail or torture) them and/or us? Should we be at all surprised, dear readers? For has this not always been the very theory, method and practice of Evil and Its own? (John 8:44)

* * * * *

So surely what the world needs now is to liberate themselves from all imperious tyrants or empires who would dictate their form(s) of government or impose or install puppet-governors, puppet-presidents, "ruling councils" or what-have-you? What the world needs now is to choose their own forms of government, and even to govern themselves, yes, self-determination.

But not the "jewish"-Amerikan empire's form or brand of "self-determination" or "self-government" whereby they imperiously determine and govern you and yours, but the kind whereby you determine and govern yourself.

(And many, besides myself, still believe that “the government which governs least, governs best,” and hence leaves the individual citizen/subject (i.e. you and I) maximum freedom of decision and action, thought, speech and movement. (See The Political Problem, and Solution.)

Perhaps Americans should choose just such a “liberal” or “liberating” form of government as they for generations have professed and **pretended** to impose upon the world.

(Oops, I forgot, they have no choice. “Uncle” Satan and Its SuperNazi sinagog make all their political, racial, social, cultural, monetary, economic decisions for them—ever since 1913, president Wilson, and “his” “Federal Reserve Act” and “central banking” corporation.

So perhaps Americans should at last take their political choice back from their Satanic “jewish” masters, overlords, enslavers, owners. Don’t you think so?

Or should foreigners impose, coerce or enforce just such a “liberal” or “blessed” government upon Amerikans as they have for generations so willingly, haughtily, imperiously and tyrannically professed and **pretended** to impose upon so many unwilling and ungrateful other peoples, races and nations? But I don’t mean the political curses and abominations which they **actually** inflicted, upon eastern Europe and elsewhere, but the political blessings which they always professed and pretended to bestow upon the Gentile world?

(I don’t say so. Why bother with them, so long as they are no longer any further threat to you and yours?)

Then do people deserve the governments they get?

Not necessarily. Peoples, races and nations get conquered—both from within and without.

(Americans e.g. used to take an oath to defend their country, countrymen and constitution “from all enemies, foreign and domestic.” Too bad none or so few of them took it seriously. “Treason never prospers, for when it does, none dare call it treason.”)

And so peoples get conquered by enemies foreign and/or domestic. And hence they suffer, languish, decline and even die under treasonous usurpers, conquistadorial nations and enslaving, mass-murderous, predatory empires (such as the “Soviet” or Amerikan “Unions”), and under their imposed, alien and malevolent governors and/or governmental forms—such as “jewish”-Amerika’s “democratic” (i.e. multi-racial, multi-cultural, multi-religious or Babylonian) abominations of the earth. (Apo./Rev. 17:5)

* * * * *

Just a suggestion: Perhaps Americans should begin (to liberate themselves) by liberating themselves from the Devil’s money—from their Satanic, “jewish,” debt-token, monopoly-money—from the “mark” of their imperial “beast”—the money of their “Uncle” Satan and of their SuperNazi “sinagog of Satan”—for which monopoly-money-“mark” and for whose evil, “beastly” money they have repeatedly attacked, invaded, mass-murdered, conquered and occupied God’s Gentile world.

(See Apo./Rev. 13:11-18, 2:9 & 3:9; and see The Monetary/Economic Problem; and don’t say I never pointed the way out for you.)

* * * * *

And finally, with so much modern ado about freedom or liberty, and (alleged) “liberation” from unfreedom, enslavement or tyranny, perhaps a mini-critique of (the god of goddess of) Freedom or Liberty belongs here.

What is freedom? Freedom is getting rid of whatever you don’t want. Is there more to life than freedom or liberty? Is there anything grander, better, or more important than getting rid of what you don’t want? Yes, getting what you **do** want, e.g.

Let professor Max teach us yet again,

If you think it over rightly, you do not want the freedom to have all these fine things, for with this freedom you still do not have them; you want really to have them, to call them yours and possess them as *your property*. Of what use is a

freedom to you, indeed, if it brings in nothing? And, if you became free from everything, you would no longer have anything; for freedom is empty of substance.

.... I have no objection to freedom, but I wish more than freedom for you: you should not merely *be rid* of what you do not want [you should also have what you do want—Ed.]; you should not only be a “freeman,” you should be an “owner” too.

Free—from what? Oh! what is there that cannot be shaken off? The yoke of serfdom, of sovereignty, of aristocracy and princes, the dominion of the desires and passions; yes, even the dominion of one’s own will, of self-will, for the completest self-denial [or self-negation—Ed.] is nothing but freedom—freedom, to wit, from self-determination, from one’s own self. [Max p. 155-56]

* * * * *

Surviving the Great(est?) god Man, Mankind or Humanity

From Max,

Christianity [and Socrates—Ed.] has aimed to deliver us from a life determined by nature, from the appetites as actuating us, and so has meant that man should not let himself be determined by his appetites. This does not involve the idea that *he* was not to have appetites, but that the appetites were not to have him, that they were not to become *fixed*, uncontrollable, indissoluble. Now, could not what Christianity (religion) contrived against the appetites be applied by us to its own precept that *mind* (thought, conceptions, ideas, faith) must determine us; could we not ask that neither should mind, or the conception, the idea, be allowed to determine us, to become fixed and inviolable or “sacred”? Then it would end in the *dissolution of mind*, the dissolution of all thoughts, of all conceptions. As we there had to say, “We are indeed to have appetites, but the appetites are not to have us,” so we should now say, “We are indeed to have *mind*, but mind is not to have us.”

If the latter seems lacking in sense, think of the fact that with so many a man a thought becomes a “maxim,” whereby he himself is made prisoner to it, so that it is not he that has the maxim, but rather it that has him [like the addiction, compulsion or obsession has the addict—Ed.]. And with the maxim he has a “permanent standpoint” again. The doctrines of the catechism become our *principles* before we find it out, and no longer brook rejection. Their thought, or—mind, has the sole power, and no protest of the “flesh” [i.e. the self—Ed.] is further listened to. Nevertheless it is only through the “flesh” [the self—Ed.] that I can break the tyranny of mind [the “sacred” idea(s)—Ed.]; for it is only when a man hears his flesh along with the rest of him that he hears himself wholly, and it is only when he wholly hears *himself* that he is a hearing or rational (*vernunftig*, derived from *vernehmen*, to hear) being. The Christian does not hear the agony of his enthralled nature, but lives in “humility”; therefore he does not grumble at the wrong which befalls his *person*; he thinks himself satisfied with the “freedom of the spirit.” But, if the flesh [the self—Ed.] once takes the floor, and its tone is “passionate,” “indecorous,” “not well-disposed,” “spiteful” (as it cannot be otherwise), then he thinks he hears voices of devils, voices *against the spirit* [the “sacred” ideas—Ed.] (for decorum, passionlessness, kindly disposition, and the like, is—spirit), and is justly zealous against them. He could not be a Christian if he were willing to endure them. He listens only to morality, and slaps unmorality in the mouth; he listens only to legality, and gags the lawless word. The *spirit* of morality and legality holds him a prisoner; a

rigid, unbending *master*. They call that the “mastery of the spirit”—it is at the same time the *standpoint* of the spirit. [Max, p. 63-64]

* * * * *

As the world as property has become a *material* with which I undertake what I will, so the spirit too as property must sink down into a *material* before which I no longer entertain any sacred dread. Then, firstly, I shall shudder no more before a thought, let it appear as presumptuous and “devilish” [“human” or “humane”—Ed.] as it will, because, (if it threatens to become too inconvenient and unsatisfactory for me) its end lies in my power; but neither shall I recoil from any deed because there dwells in it a spirit of godlessness, immorality, wrongfulness [or “inhumanity”—Ed.], as little as St. Boniface pleased to desist, through religious scrupulousness, from cutting down the sacred oak of the heathens. **If the *things* of the world have once become vain, the thoughts of the spirit must also become vain.**

No thought is sacred, for let no thought rank as “devotions”; no feeling is sacred (no sacred feeling of friendship, mother’s feelings, etc.), **no belief is sacred. They are all *alienable***, [discardable—Ed.] **my alienable property, and are annihilated, as they are created, by me.**

The Christian can lose all *things* or objects, the most loved persons, these “objects” of his love, without giving up himself (that is, in the Christian sense, his spirit, his soul) as lost. The owner can cast from him all the *thoughts* that were dear to his heart and kindled his zeal, and will likewise “gain a thousandfold again,” because he, their creator, remains.

Unconsciously and involuntarily we all strive toward ownness, and there will hardly be one among us who has not given up a sacred feeling, a sacred thought, a sacred belief; nay, we probably meet no one who could not still deliver himself from one or another of his sacred thoughts. All our contention against convictions starts from the opinion that maybe we are capable of driving our opponent out of his intrenchments of thought. **But what I do unconsciously I half-do, and therefore after every victory over a faith I become again the *prisoner* (possessed) of another faith which then takes my whole self anew into its *service*, and makes me an enthusiast for reason after I have ceased to be enthusiastic for the Bible, or an enthusiast for the idea of humanity after I have fought long enough for that of Christianity.**

To this day the revolutionary principle has gone no farther than to assail only ***one or another*** particular establishment, to be ***reformatory***. Much as may be ***improved***, strongly as “discreet progress” may be adhered to, **always there is only a *new master*** [idea(l)—Ed.] **set in the old one’s place, and the overturning is a—building up** [to higher and higher ideas, thoughts, ideals—Ed.]. [Max, p. 110-11]

And so we go on with the sacred, grade after grade, from the “holy” to the “holy of holies.” [Max, p. 73-74]

Doubtless, as owner of thoughts, I shall cover my property with my shield, just as I do not, as owner of things, willingly let everybody help himself to them; but at the same time I shall look forward smilingly to the outcome of the battle, smilingly lay the shield on the corpses of my thoughts and my faith, smilingly triumphant when I am beaten. That is the very humor of the thing. Every one who has “sublimier feelings” is able to vent his humor on the pettinesses of men; but to let it play with all “great thoughts, sublime feelings, noble inspiration, and sacred faith” presupposes that I am the owner of all. [Max, p. 357-58]

* * * * *

“If you *devour the sacred*, you have made it your *own!* Digest the sacramental wafer, and you are rid of it!”

And today’s “sacramental wafer,” most “sacred” idol, highest false god or “greatest, truest truth” is (an idea or ideal, a thought or “truth”) called Man, Mankind, Humanity. Beware its priests. For if you lack (not Godlikeness but) “humanity,” they too will tear you to pieces, but not upon a “divine” rack, but upon their most “human,” “humane” or “humanistic” rack. Ouch!

I love men too—not merely individuals, but every one. But I love them with the consciousness of egoism; I love them because love makes *me* happy, I love because loving is natural to me, because it pleases me. I know no “commandment of love.” I have a *fellow-feeling* with every feeling being, and their torment torments, their refreshment refreshes me too; **I can kill them, not torture them. *Per contra*, the high-souled, virtuous Philistine prince Rudolph** in *The Mysteries of Paris* [Eugene Sue, Paris, 1842-43–Ed.], **because the wicked provoke his “indignation,” plans their torture.** That fellow-feeling proves only that the feeling of those who feel is mine too, my property; in opposition to which **the pitiless dealing of the “righteous” man (as against notary Ferrand) is like the unfeelingness of that robber [Procrustes] who cut off or stretched his prisoners’ legs to the measure of his bedstead: Rudolph’s bedstead, which he cuts men to fit, is the concept of the “good.” The feeling for right, virtue, etc., makes people hard-hearted and intolerant. Rudolph does not feel like [his victim–Ed.] the notary, but the reverse; he feels that “it serves the rascal right”; that is no fellow-feeling.**

You [humanists, philanthropists, fanatical devotees of Man(kind)–Ed.] love man, therefore you torture the individual man, the egoist; your philanthropy (love of men) is the tormenting of men. [Max, p. 291]

But who would presume to make “men” of us, or to torment or torture us into becoming more “human” than we are?

(“Are we not men?” / [Chorus]: “We are DEVO!”)

* * * * *

Pre-Christian and Christian [ancient and modern–Ed.] times pursue opposite goals; the former wants to idealize the real, the latter to realize the ideal; the former seeks the “holy spirit,” the latter the “glorified body.” Hence the former closes with insensitiveness to the real, with “contempt for the world”; the latter will end with the casting off of the ideal, with “contempt for the spirit.”

The opposition of the real and the ideal is an irreconcilable one, and the one can never become the other: if the ideal became the real, it would no longer be the ideal; and, if the real became the ideal, the ideal alone would be, but not at all the real. The opposition of the two is not to be vanquished otherwise than if some one annihilates both. Only in this “*some one*,” the third party, does the opposition find its end; otherwise idea and reality will ever fail to coincide. **The idea cannot be so realized as to remain idea, but is realized only when it dies as idea; and it is the same with the real.**

But now we have before us in the ancients adherents of the idea, in the modems adherents of reality. Neither can get clear of the opposition, and both pine only, the one party for the spirit, and, when this craving of the ancient world seemed to be satisfied and this spirit to have come, the others immediately for the secularization of this spirit again, which must forever remain a “pious wish.”

The pious wish of the ancients was *sanctity*, the pious wish of the modems is *corporeity*. But, as antiquity had to go down if its longing was to be satisfied (for it consisted only in the longing), so too corporeity can never be attained within the ring of Christianness. As the trait of sanctification or purification goes through the old world (the washings, etc.), so that of incorporation goes through the Christian world: God plunges down into this world, becomes flesh, and wants to redeem it, that is, fill it with himself; but, since he is “the idea” or “the spirit,” people (Hegel, for example) in the end introduce the idea into everything, into the world, and prove “that the idea is, that reason is, in everything.” “Man” corresponds in the culture of to-day to what the heathen Stoics set up as “the wise man”; the latter, like the former, a—*fleshless* being. The unreal “wise man,” this bodiless “holy one” of the Stoics, became a real person, a bodily “Holy One,” in God *made flesh*; the unreal “man,” the bodiless ego, will become real in the *corporeal ego*, in me. [Can you dig It?—Ed.]

There winds its way through Christianity the question about the “existence of God,” which, taken up ever and ever again, gives testimony that the craving for existence, corporeity, personality, reality, was incessantly busying the heart because it never found a satisfying solution. **At last the question about the existence of God fell, but only to rise up again in the proposition that the “divine” had existence** (Feuerbach). **But this too has no existence, and neither will the last refuge, that the “purely human” is realizable, afford shelter much longer. No idea has existence, for none is capable of corporeity. The scholastic contention of realism and nominalism has the same content; in short, this spins itself out through all Christian history, and cannot end in it.**

The world of Christians is working at *realizing ideas* in the individual relations of life, the institutions and laws of the Church and the State; but they make resistance, and always keep back something unembodied (unrealizable). Nevertheless this embodiment is restlessly rushed after, no matter in what degree *corporeity* constantly fails to result. [And no matter how we fail to conform to the ideal of Man or Humanity, even upon its high priest’s rack.—Ed.]

For realities matter little to the realizer, but it matters everything that they be realizations of the idea. Hence he is ever examining anew whether the realized does in truth have the idea, its kernel, dwelling in it; and in testing the real he at the same time tests the idea, whether it is realizable as he thinks it, or is only thought by him incorrectly, and for that reason unfeasibly. **The Christian is no longer to care for family, State, etc., as existences; Christians are not to sacrifice themselves for these “divine things” like the ancients, but these are only to be utilized to make the *spirit alive* in them. The *real* family has become indifferent, and there is to arise out of it an *ideal* one which would then be the “truly real,” a sacred family, blessed by God, or, according to the liberal way of thinking, a “rational” family. With the ancients, family, State, fatherland, is divine as a thing *extant*; with the modems it is still awaiting divinity, as extant it is only sinful, earthly, and has still to be “redeemed,” that is, to become truly real. This has the following meaning: The family, etc., is not the extant and real, but the divine, the idea, is extant and real; whether *this* family will make itself real by taking up the truly real, the idea, is still unsettled. It is not the individual’s task to serve the family as the divine, but, reversely, to serve the divine and to bring to it the still undivine family, to subject everything in the idea’s name, to set up the idea’s banner everywhere, to bring the idea to real efficacy.**

But, since the concern of Christianity, as of antiquity, is for the *divine*, they always come out at this again on their opposite ways. At the end of heathenism the divine becomes the *extramundane* [the heavenly—Ed.], at the end of Christianity the *intramundane* [the worldly—Ed.]. **Antiquity does not succeed in putting it**

entirely outside the world, and, when Christianity accomplishes this task, the divine instantly longs to get back into the world and wants to “redeem” the world. But within Christianity it does not and cannot come to this, that the divine as *intramundane* should really become the *mundane itself*: there is enough left [in the Christian world—Ed.] that does and must maintain itself unpenetrated as the “bad,” irrational, accidental, “egoistic,” the “mundane” in the bad sense. **Christianity begins with God’s becoming man, and carries on its work of conversion and redemption through all time in order to prepare for God a reception in all men and in everything human, and to penetrate everything with the spirit: it sticks to preparing a place for the “spirit.”**

When the accent was at last laid on Man or mankind, it was again [like the *idea* of God—Ed.] the idea that they “*pronounced eternal*.” “Man does not die!” They thought they had now found the reality of the idea: *Man* is the I of history, of the world’s history; it is he, this *ideal*, that really develops, *realizes*, himself. He is the really real and corporeal one, for history is his body, in which individuals are only members. Christ is the I of the world’s history, even of the pre-Christian; in modern apprehension it is man, the figure of Christ has developed into the *figure of man*: man as such, man absolutely, is the “central point” of history. In “man” the imaginary beginning returns again; for “man” is as imaginary as Christ is. “Man,” as the I of the world’s history, closes the cycle of Christian apprehensions.

Christianity’s magic circle would be broken if the strained relation between existence and calling, that is, between me as I am and me as I should be, ceased; it persists only as the longing of the idea for its bodiliness, and vanishes with the relaxing separation [or integration?—Ed.] of the two: only when the idea remains—idea (as man or mankind is indeed a bodiless idea) is Christianity still extant. The corporeal idea, the corporeal or “completed” spirit, floats before the Christian as “the end of the days” or as the “goal of history”; it is not present time to him.
[Max, p. 362-65]

Man cannot yet shake off Man. He cannot yet devour, digest, dissolve this most “sacred” (and Human) wafer-god of all. Or can He?

The individual can only have a part in the founding of the Kingdom of God, or, according to the modern notion of the same thing, in the development and history of humanity; and only so far as he has a part in it does a Christian, or (according to the modern expression) human, value pertain to him; for the rest he is dust and a worm-bag.

That the individual is of himself a world’s history, and possesses his property in the rest of the world’s history, goes beyond what is Christian. To the Christian the world’s history is the higher thing, because it is the history of Christ or “man”; to the egoist only *his* history has value, because he wants to develop only *himself*; not the mankind-idea, not God’s plan, not the purposes of Providence, not liberty, and the like. He does not look upon himself as a tool of the idea or a vessel of God, he recognizes no calling, he does not fancy that he exists for the further development of mankind and that he must contribute his mite [or rather might—Ed.] to it, but he lives himself out, careless of how well or ill humanity may fare thereby. If it were not open to confusion with the idea that a state of nature is to be praised, one might recall Lenau’s *Three Gypsies*. What, am I in the world to realize ideas? To do my part by my citizenship, say, toward the realization of the idea “State,” or by marriage, as husband and father, to bring the idea of the family into an existence? What does such a calling concern me! I live after a calling as little as the flower grows and gives fragrance after a calling.

The ideal “Man” is realized when the Christian apprehension turns about and becomes the proposition, “I, this unique one, am man.” The conceptual

question, “what is man?”—has then changed into the personal question, “who is man?” With “what” the concept was sought for, in order to realize it; with “who” it is no longer any question at all, but the answer is personally on hand at once in the asker: the question answers itself.

[(Hey Man,—Ed.) “Who are you?/ Who? Who? Who? Who?/ Who are you?/ I really want to know./ So tell me who are you, you, you are you?”—(the Who)—Ed.]

They say of God, “Names name thee not.” That holds good of me: no concept expresses me, nothing that is designated as my essence exhausts me; they are only names. Likewise they say of God that he is perfect and has no calling to strive after perfection. That too holds good of me alone.

I am owner of my might, and I am so when I know myself as *unique*. In the *unique one* the owner himself returns into his creative nothing, of which he is born. Every higher essence [or idea—Editor] above me, be it God [meaning the mere idea, thought or concept of “God”—Ed.] , be it man, weakens the feeling of my uniqueness, and pales only before the sun of this [(Self-) —Ed.] consciousness. If I concern myself for myself, the unique one, then my concern rests on its transitory, mortal creator [and creature?—Ed.], who consumes [or dissolves, returns or ascends back to—Ed.] himself, and I may say:

All things are nothing to me. [Literally, “I have set my affair on nothing.”—the first line of Goethe’s poem, Vanitas! Vanitatum Vanitas!, (“Vanity! All is Vanity! Vanity!”)—Ed.]

[Max, p. 362-66]

Again, the title of Max’s inSpired book is The Only One [or Owner] and His Property. Can you dig It? And so you’re paying rent to whom...but an impostor? If anyone, you should be paying rent to Who.

* * * * *

Socratic Relevance to the Subversive, Satanic, anti-Christ or “jewish” “Protocols of Zion”

Note: “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion” is the demonic conspiracy or plot of the Satanic “jews” to conquer and rule all Gentiles on the planet.

The Protocols are notes of 24 secret lectures given exclusively to “jewish” revolutionary initiates of the highest (33rd) degree engaged in the eternal Satanic “jewish” or “zionist” conspiracy to capture and enslave the entire Gentile globe. These infamous lecture notes providentially fell into the hands of a daughter of a Russian general in Paris in 1884. They were originally hand-written in French, translated into Russian, and first published privately in Russia in 1897, and publicly in 1901.

The “Protocols of Zion” are said to be the second most translated and published (and read?) book in the world—after the Bible. Naturally, characteristically and of course, the “jews” claim the Protocols are a slanderous forgery. I say read them and compare them with the actual history of the last few centuries. A plan historically followed (or in this case, perpetrated) cannot possibly be fictitious. (See “What is Zionism?” within the essay, NYC 2004.)

* * *

Also note: “goy” (singular) and “goyim” (plural) is a hateful, derogatory “jewish” word for Gentiles. It means “cattle, beasts, animals livestock”—i.e. (human) “cattle” owned by “jews” as their “livestock.”

(See e.g. pr. #19 “goyim...our livestock cattle.” Or #15 “We have not counted the victims of the seed of the goy cattle,...” And that’s because Gentiles simply don’t count...to Satanic or “zionist” “jews”...no matter how many they mass-murder. Is this not so?)

* * * * *

The Stages of “jewish” “Revolution”

From Socrates’ Republic 8, p. 562,

SOCRATES: Say then, my friend, **in what manner does tyranny arise?—that it has a democratic origin is evident.**

ADEIMANTUS: Clearly.

SOCRATES: **And does not tyranny spring from democracy in the same manner as democracy from oligarchy...?** [Republic 8, p. 562]

* * * * *

And now from Satanic “jewish” protocol #4,

Every republic [revolution?–Ed.] **passes through several stages. The first of these is comprised in the early days of mad raging by the blind mob**, tossed hither and thither, right and left: **the second is demagogy, from which is born anarchy, and that leads inevitably to** [“jewish” or “zionist”–Ed.] **despotism**—not any longer legal and overt, and therefore responsible despotism [i.e. autocracy or monarchy–Ed.], but to unseen and secretly hidden, yet nevertheless sensibly felt **despotism in the hands of some secret** [“jewish”–Ed.] **organization** or other, **whose acts are the more unscrupulous inasmuch as it works behind a screen, behind the backs of all sorts of agents**, the changing of whom not only does not injuriously affect but actually aids the secret [“despotic”–Ed.] force by saving it, thanks to continual changes [in (disposable) personnel, agents, Gentile fronts or spokespersons–Ed.], from the necessity of expending its resources on the rewarding of long services.

[I.E. Gentile agents are always and inevitably betrayed for their long-term loyalty and service to Satan’s “jews” and their supernatural or SuperNazi sinagog. (Apo./Rev. 2:9 & 3:9)–Ed.]

Who and what is in a position to overthrow an invisible force? And this is precisely what our force is. Gentile masonry [and officialdom–Ed.] **blindly serves as a screen for us and our objects** [(supernational) aims, (imperialistic) intentions, (Satanic, “messianic” or zionist) purposes–Ed.], **but the plan of action of our force** [i.e. these very Satanic “jewish” “protocols”–Ed.], **even its very abiding-place** [Jew York City, London and/or Jerusalem?–Ed.], **remains for the whole people an unknown mystery.** [protocol #4]

Remember **the French Revolution**, to which it is we who gave the name of “Great”; **the secrets of its preparations are well known to us** [“jews”–Ed.], **for it was wholly the work of our hands.** [protocol #3]

Those who know the historic details of that “jewish” usurpation of France (or of Russia 140 years after) can see the truth of the pr #4 excerpt above.

* * * * *

Covert “jewish” Agents of (Gentile) Public Corruption

From Socrates' Republic 9, p. 572-73,

SOCRATES: Then you must **further imagine the same thing to happen to the son which has already happened to the father:—he is drawn into a perfectly lawless life, which by his seducers is termed perfect liberty; and his father and friends take part with his moderate desires, and the opposite** [“licentious, lawless”—Ed.] **party assist the opposite** [immoderate, extreme—Ed.] **ones. As soon as these dire magicians and tyrantmakers find that they are losing their hold on him, they contrive to implant in him a master passion, to be lord** [“protector”—Rouse] **over his idle and spendthrift** [wasteful, prodigal—Ed.] **lusts—a sort of monstrous winged drone—that is the only image which will adequately describe him** [“what else is the ruling passion in such men?”—Rouse]. [Rep. 9:572-73]

* * * * *

And now from the Satanic “jewish” plot against humanity,

...they [secret agents of corruption of the Satanic “Elders of Zion”—Ed.] will be made **acquainted with the whole underside of human nature, with all its sensitive chords on which they will have to play. These chords are the cast of mind of the goyim** [Gentile “cattle” or livestock—Ed.], **their tendencies, shortcomings, vices** and qualities, the particularities of classes and conditions. [from the 8th Satanic “protocol of Zion”—Ed.]

Our triumph has been rendered easier by the fact that in our relations with the men whom we wanted **we have always worked upon the most sensitive chords of the human mind, upon the cash account, upon the cupidity** [sexuality—Ed.], **upon the insatiability for material needs of man: and each one of these human weaknesses, taken alone, is sufficient to paralyse initiative, for it hands over the will of men to the disposition of him who has bought their activities.** [#1]

Behold the alcoholized [Gentile—Ed.] animals, bemused with drink, the right to an immoderate use of which comes along with freedom. It is not for us [“jews”—Ed.] and ours to walk that road. The peoples of the goyim are bemused with alcoholic liquors; **their youth has grown stupid** on classicism [?] and **from early immorality, into which it has been inducted by our special agents**—by tutors, lackeys, governesses in the houses of the wealthy, by clerks and others, by our women in the places of dissipation frequented by the goyim. In the number of these last I count also the so-called “society ladies,” voluntary followers of the others in corruption and luxury. [#1]

In countries known as progressive and enlightened we have created a senseless, filthy, abominable literature. [pr. 12]

I.E. these Satanic “jews” have flattered certain Gentile nations that their “jewish” culture, literature, “art” and pornography is “progressive” and “enlightened,” and hence that whoever thinks otherwise is not. They make the same argument about everything of theirs, and especially themselves. See e.g. their “modern” “art,” “philosophy,” “political science,” etc. In short, they corrupt, destroy and supplant or replace all Gentile standards, mores or morals and cultures with you know whose.

The Satanic “jews” corrupt and then blackmail Gentile leaders. And they employ and advance only those treacherous creatures who are willing to do their demonic bidding, and hence are willing to betray their (Gentile) people, race, nation and “constituents.”

For a time, **until there will no longer be any risk in entrusting responsible posts in our States to our brother-Jews, we shall put them in the hands of persons [traitorous, mercenary and (above all) blackmailable Gentile officials–Ed.] whose past and reputation are such that between them and the people lies an abyss, persons who, in case of disobedience to our instructions, must face criminal charges or disappear—this in order to make them defend our interests to their last gasp. [#8]**

* * * * *

“Secret” “jewish” FreeMasonry

And these loathsome and treacherous Gentile creatures are sifted, selected and advanced from international “FreeMasonry” and other secret, subversive, supernatural and Satanic or evil “jewish” organizations.

We [Marxist “jews” then–Ed.] appear on the scene as the alleged saviors of the worker from this [“capitalist”–Ed.] oppression, and we suggest that he should enter the ranks of **our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists—to whom we always give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly rule (of the solidarity of all humanity) of our social masonry.** [See “FreeMasonry”–Ed.] [from Satanic protocol #3]

The words of the liberal, which are in effect the words of **our masonic watchword, namely, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,”** will, when we come into our kingdom, be changed by us into words no longer a watchword [(Marxist, “communist,” zionist or “jewish” party) slogan and professed or “alleged” (racial-social-political) intention–Ed.], but only an expression of idealism.... [pr. #9]

It is this [dark obscurity (and mysticism)–Ed.] which has served as the basis of **our organization of secret Masonry which is not known to, and whose aims are not even so much as suspected by, these goy cattle attracted by us into the “show” army of Masonic Lodges** in order to throw dust into the eyes of their [non-Masonic Gentile–Ed.] fellows. [pr. #11]

I.E. the “secret” or “jewish” FreeMasonry overlooks, supervises and controls the “show,” “public” or Gentile FreeMasonry. The former are the officers, and the latter the enlisted men.

Every republic [revolution?–Ed.] passes through several stages. The first of these is comprised in the early days of mad raging by the blind mob, tossed hither and thither, right and left: the second is demagogy, from which is born anarchy, and that leads inevitably to [our “jewish” or “zionist”–Ed.] despotism—not any longer legal and overt, and therefore responsible despotism [autocracy–Ed.], but to **unseen and secretly hidden, yet nevertheless sensibly felt despotism in the hands of some secret organization or other, whose acts are the more unscrupulous inasmuch as it works behind a [FreeMasonic–Ed.] screen, behind the backs of all sorts of agents,** the changing of whom not only does not injuriously affect but actually aids the secret force by saving it, thanks to continual changes, from the necessity of expending its resources on the rewarding of long services.

[I.E. Gentile agents are always and inevitably betrayed for their long-term loyalty and service to Satan’s “jews” and their supernatural or SuperNazi sinagog. (Apo./Rev. 2:9 & 3:9)–Ed.]

Who and what is in a position to overthrow an invisible force? And this is precisely what our force is. Gentile masonry [and officialdom–Ed.] blindly serves as

a screen for us and our objects [aims–Ed.], **but the plan of action of our force** [i.e. these very Satanic “jewish” “protocols”–Ed.], **even its very abiding-place** [Jew York City, London and/or Jerusalem?–Ed.], **remains for the whole people an unknown mystery.** [pr. #4]

And from protocol #15 of the Satanic “jewish” plot against God and humanity,

Meantime, however, until we come into our [Ed.]—Satanic, anti-Christ, “messianic” or zionist world-] kingdom, we shall act in the contrary way: **we shall create and multiply free masonic lodges in all the countries of the world, absorb into them all who may become or who are prominent in public activity, for in these lodges we shall find our principal intelligence office and means of influence.** [These “free masonic lodges” would of course include all “Bilderbergers,” “Councils on Foreign Relations,” “Trilateral Commissions,” etc., etc. etc.–Ed.] **All these lodges we shall bring under one central administration, known to us alone and to all others absolutely unknown, which will be composed of our learned elders** [of “zion”–Ed.]. **The lodges will have their** [“secret”–Ed.] **representatives who will serve to screen the above-mentioned administration of masonry and from whom will issue the** [“revolutionary” “jewish” or zionist–Ed.] **watchword and programme.** In these lodges we shall tie together the knot which binds together all revolutionary and liberal elements. Their composition will be made up of all strata of [Gentile–Ed.] society. **The most secret political plots will be known to us and will fall under our guiding hands on the very day of their** [anti-Christ, zionist, “jewish”–Ed.] **conception. Among the members of these lodges will be almost all the agents of international and national police since their service is for us irreplaceable** in the respect that **the police is in a position** not only to use its own particular measures with the insubordinate [FreeMasons–Ed.], but also **to screen** [conceal or protect–Ed.] **our activities and provide pretexts for** [persecuting (silencing, jailing, murdering) “counter-revolutionary,” non-Masonic, Gentile–Ed.] **discontents, et cetera.**

[And therefore all high police officials and chiefs world-wide should be investigated, and those who are found to be members of secret “jewish” societies should not merely be removed from office, but taken out and ... by their former subordinates. Don’t you agree?–Ed.]

The class of people who most willingly enter into secret societies are those who live by their wits, careerists, and in general people, mostly light-minded, with whom we shall have no difficulty in dealing and in using to wind up the mechanism of the [“revolutionary,” SuperNazi, FreeMasonic, zionist or “jewish”–Ed.] **machine devised by us.** If this world grows agitated the meaning of that will be that we [via our “secret societies,” media monopoly, etc.–Ed.] have had to stir it up in order to break up its too great solidarity. [The anti-Christos conquer the Gentiles via dividing them, engendering hatred among them, getting the Gentile states they control to attack the ones they don’t, etc. (See their World Wars I, II, etc.)–Ed.] But if there should arise in its [supernational Freemasonry’s–Ed.] midst a plot, then at the head of that plot will be no other than one of our most trusted servants. **It is natural that we and no other should lead masonic activities, for we know whither we are leading, we know the final goal of every form of** [FreeMasonic–Ed.] **activity whereas the goyim have knowledge of nothing,** not even of the immediate effect of action; they put before themselves, usually, the momentary reckoning of the satisfaction of their self-opinion in the accomplishment of their thought without even remarking that the very conception never belonged to their initiative but to our instigation of their thought.... [I.E. they don’t even know, see recognize or perceive see their thoughts or opinions are “jewish,” zionist, anti-Christ or Satanic.–Ed.]

The goyim enter the [FreeMasonic–Ed.] **lodges out of curiosity or** [ambition, opportunism, self-advancement–Ed.] **in the hope by their means to get a nibble at the public pie**, and some of them in order to obtain a hearing before the public for their impracticable and groundless fantasies: **they thirst for the emotion of success and applause**, of which we are remarkably generous. And the reason why we give them this success is to make use of the high conceit of themselves to which it gives birth, for that insensibly disposes them to assimilate our suggestions without being on their guard against them in the fullness of their confidence that it is their own infallibility which is giving utterance to their own thoughts and that it is impossible for them to borrow those of others.... You cannot imagine to what extent the wisest of the goyim can be brought to a state of unconscious naiveté in the presence of this condition of high conceit of themselves, and at the same time **how easy it is to take the heart out of them by the slightest ill-success, though it be nothing more than the stoppage of the applause they had, and to reduce them to a slavish submission for the sake of winning a renewal of success.** By so much as ours disregard success if only they can carry through their plans. by so much the goyim are willing to sacrifice any plans only to have success. **This psychology of theirs materially facilitates for us the task of setting them in the required direction.** These tigers in appearance have the souls of sheep and the wind blows freely through their heads.

We have set them on the hobby-horse of an idea about the absorption of individuality by the symbolic unit of collectivism.... They have never yet and they never will have the sense to reflect that this [collectivist–Ed.] **hobby-horse is a manifest violation of the most important law of nature, which has established** from the very creation of the world one unit unlike another and precisely for the purpose of instituting **individuality**.... [So much for the sincerity of “jewish” “communism” or “socialism.” These collectivist “hobby-horses” are all false, violent and cynical means to their Satanic “jewish” end: their anti-Christ, “messianic” or zionist world-kingdom of.–Ed.]

If we have been able to bring them to such a pitch of stupid blindness is it not a proof, and an amazingly clear proof, of the degree to which the mind of the goyim is undeveloped in comparison with our mind? This it is, mainly, which guarantees our success.

And how far-seeing were our learned elders [of “zion”–Ed.] in ancient times when they said that **to attain a serious end it behooves not to stop at any means or to count the victims sacrificed for the sake of that end.... We have not counted the victims of the seed of the goy cattle**, though we have sacrificed many of our own, but for that [“sacrifice” of “jews” “for the sake of that end”—(i.e. Gentile world conquest and dominance)–Ed.] we have now already given them such a position on the earth as they could not even have dreamed of. [Even though “jews” have **always** dreamed of world-dominance. It’s simply who and what they genetically are, and always were, by their Satanic “seed.” (John 8:44)–Ed.] The comparatively small numbers of the victims from the number of ours have preserved our nationality from destruction. [from pr. #15]

Meaning “jews” get stupid, foolish, mercenary and traitorous Gentiles to fight their conquistadorial battles and imperial world-wars for them toward their eternal, perpetual, continual and most “serious end” of Gentile world conquest.

“If we have been able to bring them to such a pitch of stupid blindness is it not a proof, and an amazingly clear proof, of the degree to which the mind of the goyim is undeveloped in comparison with our mind? This it is, mainly, which guarantees our success.”

From Gentile (Political, Racial, Social) Unity to “jewish” Disunity, Decomposition, Fragmentation, Destabilization, Chaos, “Revolution” or Conquest

The ideal, monarchial/aristocratic city-state or kingdom of Socrates (which is not really a “republic” but a monarchy) assumes the racial homogeneity of the Greeks, Aryans, Europeans. And it is from this racial Grecian or Hellenic unity that the unity of the Socratic kingdom is derived, the unity of the ruled and their rulers, of the people and their philosopher-king, his aristocracy and his soldiers or military “auxiliaries.”

Of course a multi-racial state by its very nature and character is necessarily and unavoidably disunified, fragmented and unstable. And for this reason the “jew” introduces foreign races into the Gentile nations to destabilize them, in preparation for “jewish” usurpation or Marxist “revolution.”

From The Republic 8, p. 545-46,

SOCRATES: First, then, I said, let us enquire how timocracy (the government of honour) arises out of aristocracy (the government of the best). **Clearly, all political changes originate in divisions of the actual governing power; a government which is united, however small [(?) or large–Ed.], cannot be moved** [rocked, divided, overthrown–Ed.].

GLAUCON: Very true, he said.

SOCRATES: **In what way, then, will our** [aristocratic–Ed.] **city be moved** [divided, fragmented, dissolved–Ed.], and **in what manner will the two classes of auxiliaries and rulers disagree among themselves or with one another? Shall we, after the manner of Homer, pray the Muses to tell us “how discord first arose”?** Shall we imagine them in solemn mockery, to play and jest with us as if we were children, and to address us in a lofty tragic vein, making believe to be in earnest?

GLAUCON: How would they address us?

SOCRATES: After this manner:—A city which is thus constituted [according to Socratic design and instruction–Ed.] can hardly be shaken; but, seeing that everything which has a beginning has also an end, **even a constitution such as yours** [i.e. Socrates and Glaucon’s–Ed.] **will not last for ever, but will in time be dissolved. And this is the dissolution:...**

[The Republic 8, p. 545-46]

* * * * *

From Satanic “jewish” protocol #15,

If this [Gentile–Ed.] **world grows agitated** the meaning of that will be that **we** [“jews” (via our “secret societies,” media monopoly, etc.)–Ed.] **have had to stir it up in order to break up its too great solidarity.** [#15]

The anti-Christians conquer the Gentiles by dividing them, engendering hatred among them, getting the Gentile states they control to attack the ones they don’t, etc. (See their World Wars I, II, etc.)

And that's not all...

When we ["jews"—Ed.] **introduced into the** [Gentile—Ed.] **State organism the poison of Liberalism** [i.e. those two contradictions of liberty and equality—Ed.] **its whole political complexion underwent a change.** [Gentile—Ed.] **States have been seized with a mortal** ["jewish," mental, psychological, spiritual—Ed.] **illness—["jewish"—Ed.] blood poisoning. All that remains is to await the end if their death agony.**

Liberalism produced Constitutional States, which took the place of what was the only safeguard of the goyim, namely, Despotism [i.e. Gentile monarchy/aristocracy: the unified Socratic state government—Ed.]; **and a constitution, as you well know, is nothing else but a school of discord, misunderstanding, quarrels, disagreements, fruitless party agitations, party whims—in a word, a school of everything that serves to destroy the** [unified—Ed.] **personality of State activity.** The tribune of the "talkeries" [Parliament—Ed.] has, no less effectively than the Press, condemned the rulers ["constitutional monarchs" (England, e.g.)—Ed.] to inactivity and impotence, and thereby rendered them useless and superfluous, for which reason indeed they have been in many countries deposed. Then it was that the era of [consitutional—Ed.] republics became a possibility that could be realized; and **then** it was that **we replaced the** [monarchial/aristocratic/Socratic Gentile—Ed.] **ruler with a caricature of a government—by a president, taken from the mob, from the midst of our puppet creatures, our slaves. This was the foundation of the mine which we have laid under** the goy people, I should rather say, under **the goy peoples** [nations, races—Ed.]. [pr. #10]

* * * * *

On further dividing and conquering the Gentile kingdoms or states, both the rulers and the ruled, the monarchs and their subjects: From Satanic "jewish" protocol #18,

It is from us that the all-engulfing terror proceeds [from the Gentile kings against their rebellious subjects, and vice-versa, and from these "jews" against all classes of Gentiles: upper, middle and lower; or aristocratic, "bourgeois" and "proletarian"—Ed.]....

We might have reason to apprehend [fear—Ed.] **a union between the "clear-sighted" force of the goy kings on their thrones and the blind force of the goy mobs, but we have taken all needful measure against any such possibility: between the one and the other force we have erected a bulwark in the shape of a mutual terror between them.** [I.E. the "jews" get the Gentile kings to do something "terrible" to their rebellious people—some "Boston massacre" or other, to be grossly exaggerated, ceaselessly dredged up and endlessly dwelt upon by the "jews" toward further enflaming popular rebellion.—Ed.] **In this way the blind force of the people remains our support and we, and we only, shall provide them with a leader and, of course, direct them along the road that leads to our goal.** [pr. #18]

* * * * *

And from protocol #1 of the Satanic "jewish" conspiracy against Gentile humanity:

It must be understood that the might of a mob is blind, senseless and unreasoning force, ever at the mercy of a suggestion from any side. The blind cannot lead the blind without bringing them into the abyss; consequently members of the mob, upstarts from the people even though they may have a genius for wisdom, yet have no understanding of the political, cannot come forward as leaders of the mob without bringing the whole nation to ruin.

...A people left to itself, that is, to upstarts from its midst, brings itself to ruin by party dissensions excited by the pursuit of power and [timocratic-Ed.] honours, and disorders arising therefrom. Is it possible for the masses of the people calmly and without petty jealousies to form judgments, to deal with the affairs of the country, which cannot be mixed up with personal interests? Can they defend themselves from an external foe? It is unthinkable, for a plan broken up into as many parts as heads in the mob loses all homogeneity, and thereby becomes unintelligible and impossible to execute.

It is only with a despotic [rational, Socratic monarchial/aristocratic-Ed.] ruler that plans can be elaborated extensively and clearly such a way as to distribute the whole properly among the several parts of the machinery of the State; from this the conclusion is inevitable that a satisfactory form of government for any country is one that is concentrated in the hands of one responsible person [a.k.a. “monarch” or “autocrat”-Ed.]. **Without an absolute despotism there can be no existence for civilization which is carried on not by the masses but by their guide, whosoever that person may be. The mob is a savage and displays its savagery at every opportunity. The moment the mob seizes freedom in its hands it quickly turns to anarchy [discord, disorder, chaos-Ed.], which in itself is the highest degree of savagery.** [protocol #1]

* * * * *

Mob Freedom or “Liberation” becomes Chaos, Violence, Revolution, Tyranny

From The Republic 8, p. 562,

SOCRATES: Say then, my friend, **in what manner does tyranny arise?—that it has a democratic origin is evident.**

[“Of course democracy changes into this [tyranny-Ed.], so much is clear enough.”-Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Clearly.

And does not tyranny spring from democracy in the same manner as democracy from oligarchy—I mean, after a sort?

How?

The good which oligarchy proposed to itself and the means by which it was maintained was excess of wealth [“riches”-Rouse]—am I not right?

Yes.

And the insatiable desire of wealth and the neglect [“disregard”-Rouse] of all other things for the sake of money-getting was also the ruin of oligarchy?

True.

SOCRATES: **And democracy has her own good, of which the insatiable desire brings her to dissolution?**

[“Then is democracy also dissolved by insatiate desire for that which it defines as good?”-Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: **What good?**

SOCRATES: **Freedom [“Liberty”-Rouse], I replied; which, as they tell you in a democracy, is the glory [“most beautiful”-Rouse] of the State—and that therefore in a democracy alone will the freeman of nature deign to dwell [“and therefore this is the only city where a man of free nature thinks life worth living.-Rouse]?**

Yes; the saying is in everybody’s mouth.

SOCRATES: I was going to observe, that **the insatiable desire of this and the neglect of other things introduces the change in democracy, which occasions a demand for tyranny.**

How so?

SOCRATES: **When a democracy which is thirsting for freedom has evil [demagogic, freeloading, robbing–Ed.] cupbearers presiding over the feast [“worthless butlers presiding over its wine,”–Rouse], and has drunk too deeply of the strong wine of freedom, then, unless her rulers are very amenable and give a plentiful draught [and sufficient bread and circuses–Ed.], she [democracy–Ed.] calls them to account and punishes them, and says that they are cursed oligarchs.**

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he replied, a very common occurrence.

[From The Republic 8:562]

* * * * *

And now from Satanic “jewish” protocol #5,

[“When we come into our kingdom”–Ed.] **We shall create an intensified centralization of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences [i.e. rights or liberties–Ed.] which have been permitted by the goyim, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportions as to be at any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any goyim who oppose us by deed or word.** [See e.g. their “Soviet Union.”–Ed.]

We shall be told that such despotism as I speak of is not consistent with the progress of these days, but I will prove to you that it is. [pr. #5]

As Socrates has likewise shown us how democracy or too much mob liberty leads to despotism or tyranny.

...**our** [“beastly,” “jewish,” imperialistic, supernatural or SuperNazi, communistic, “messianic” or Satanic world–Ed.] **government...will no longer allow the mass** of the nation **to be led astray in by-ways and fantasies** about the [alleged “jewish”–Ed.] blessings of [“liberal” “jewish”–Ed.] progress. Is there any one of us who does not know that these phantom blessings are the direct roads to **foolish imaginings which give birth to anarchical relations of men among themselves and towards authority**, because progress, or rather **the idea of progress, has introduced the conception of every kind of emancipation, but has failed to establish its limits.... All the so-called liberals are anarchists**, if not in fact, at any rate **in thought. Every one of them is hunting after phantoms of freedom, and falling exclusively into licence, that is, into the anarchy of protest for the sake of protest.** [pr. #12]

Or seeking more freedom for the sake of freedom (above all else), and regardless of the consequences.

* * * * *

Far back in ancient times we [“jews”–Ed.] **were the first to cry among the** [Gentile–Ed.] **masses the words “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,”**... [pr. #1]

Yes, but not to liberate (as they always publicly proclaim(ed), profess(ed) and promise(d), but in fact to enslave those Gentiles whom they pretend(ed) to love and care for.

We [Marxist “jews”–Ed.] appear on the scene as the alleged saviors of the worker from this [“capitalist”–Ed.] oppression, and we suggest that he should enter the ranks of **our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists—to whom we always give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly rule (of the solidarity of all humanity) of our social masonry.** [pr. #3]

As always, Satanic “jews” say, but they don’t do, because they’re liars like their God and Father, Satan the Devil. (John 8:44) They **pretend** to want only to give or share the money and property of rich Gentiles with the poor, and/or the liberties of the Gentile ruling class with the lower classes or the enslaved.

But once the demagogic, freedom-promising “jews” take dictatorial or tyrannical power, they completely change their “liberal” tune—(as we shall see below).

And as Socrates noted above, demagogues (whether Gentile or “jewish”) keep most of the loot for themselves. For that’s their real and true but secret, hidden and unstated motive—(aside from power, absolute power, ownership of everything and everyone).

And as the demagogic “jews” take most of the loot for themselves, so they likewise take most of the freedom too. And that robbed or stolen freedom or liberty of the Gentile peoples becomes the absolute power of these “revolutionary,” usurpatious, tyrannical “jews”—as they malevolently, demagogically, absolutely intended.

* * * * *

But why take my Gentile word for it? Why not listen to the Satanic “jew” himself?

Remember **the French Revolution**, to which it is we who gave the name of “Great”; **the secrets of its preparations are well known to us** [“jews”–Ed.], **for it was wholly the work of our hands.** [protocol #3]

And from Satanic protocol #1,

Far back in ancient times we [“jews”–Ed.] **were the first to cry among the masses the words “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,”** words many times repeated since these days by stupid poll-parrots who from all sides round flew down upon these baits **and with them carried away the well-being of the** [Gentile–Ed.] **world, true freedom of the individual, formerly so well guarded against the pressure of the mob. The would-be wise men of the goyim** [Gentiles–Ed.], the intellectuals, **could not fathom these abstract words; did not note the contradiction of their meaning and interrelation; did not see that in nature there is no equality,** cannot be freedom: that Nature herself has established inequality of minds, of characters, and capacities, just as she has established subordination to her laws : [the hoodwinked Gentiles–Ed.] **never stopped to think that the mob is a blind thing, that upstarts elected from among it to bear rule are, in regard to the political, the same blind men as the mob itself,** that the adept [i.e. one taught by the “learned elders of zion,” or initiated into the political “mysteries” of these secret “jewish” “protocols”–Ed.], though he be a fool, can yet rule, whereas the non-adept, even if he were a genius, understands nothing in the political—to all these things the goyim paid no regard; yet all the time it was based upon these things that dynastic [monarchical Gentile–Ed.] rule rested: the father passed on to the son a knowledge of the course of political affairs in such wise that none should know it but members of the dynasty and none could betray it to the governed. As time went on the meaning of the dynastic transference of the true position of affairs in the political was lost, and this aided the success of our [usurpatious, supernatural “jewish”–Ed.] cause.

In all corners of the earth the words “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-works at work boring into

the well-being of the goyim, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity and destroying the foundations of the goya States. As you will see later, this helped us [“jews”–Ed.] to our triumph: it enabled us to grasp, among other things, the master card—the destruction of the privileges, or in other words of the very existence of the aristocracy of the goyim, that class which was the only defense [the Gentile–Ed.] peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the goyim [monarchic/aristocratic Gentile states–Ed.] we have set up the aristocracy of the educated class headed up by the aristocracy of [our “jewish”–Ed.] money. The qualifications for this aristocracy we have established in wealth [i.e. money, and the properties or things money can buy–Ed.], which is dependent upon us, and in knowledge, for which our learned elders [of “zion”–Ed.] provide the motive force. [pr. #1]

And for knowledge of money, both false and true, both Gentile and “jew,” see The Monetary/Economic Problem.

* * * * *

And yet more proof that the “jews” don’t really believe (much less practice) what they preach to the Gentiles; from Satanic protocol #1:

Political freedom is an idea but not a fact, and one must know how to use it as a bait whenever it appears necessary to attract the masses of the people to one’s [“revolutionary” “jewish”–Ed.] party for the purpose of crushing another [(Gentile, ruling) party–Ed.] who is in authority. This task is rendered easier if the [authoritative Gentile–Ed.] opponent has himself been infected with the idea of freedom, so called liberalism, and for the sake of an idea [“political freedom” or “liberalism”—as defined by the Satanic “jew”–Ed.], is willing to yield some of his power. It is precisely here that the triumph of our theory [of “political freedom” or “liberalism”–Ed.] appears: the slackened reins of [Gentile–Ed.] government are immediately, by the law of life, caught up and gathered together by a new [and “jew”–Ed.] hand, because the blind might of the nation cannot for one single day exist without guidance, and the new [“jewish”–Ed.] authority merely fits into the place of the old already weakened by liberalism.

* * *

The Satanic or zionist “jew” tries to persuade or infect the Gentile monarch with his “liberal” political “theory.”

And let us remember what Socrates said above about the character of tyrants both before and after they get or seize power.

SOCRATES: When such men are only private individuals and before they get power, this is their character; they associate entirely with their own flatterers or ready tools; or if they want anything from anybody, they in their turn are equally ready to bow down before them: they profess every sort of affection for them; but when they have gained their point they know them no more.

[“Well then,” said I, ‘**what is the private character of such men, as they show it even before they are rulers? Whom do they mix with? Either with flatterers who are ready to do anything for them; or, if they want something, they themselves grovel and condescend to any grimaces [or pretensions–Ed.] of friendship—but when they have got what they want, they don’t know you!**’”–Rouse.]

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, truly.

SOCRATES: They are always either the masters or servants and never the friends of anybody; the tyrant never tastes of true freedom or friendship.

["So all their lives they are absolutely friendless, either slavemasters or slaves of someone; the tyrannic nature has never a taste of true freedom or friendship."—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Certainly not.

SOCRATES: **And may we not rightly call such men treacherous** ["faithless"—Rouse; (untrustworthy, disloyal, backstabbers)—Ed.]?

ADEIMANTUS: No question.

SOCRATES: **Also they are** utterly unjust [**"as unjust as unjust can be,"**—Rouse], if we were right in our notion of justice?

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, and we were perfectly right.

[Republic 9: 575-76]

(How "jewish" is the tyrant! And how tyrannical is the "jew"!)

* * *

And now continuing with Satanic protocol #1 (above),

....Freedom is an impossible ideal to achieve because no one knows how to use it in moderation. It is enough to hand over a people to self-government for a certain length of time for that people to be turned into a disorganized mob. Therefore there arises internecine strife, which soon devolves into class warfare, in the midst of which States burn down and their importance is reduced to that a heap of ashes.

Whether a State exhausts itself in its own convolutions, [or] whether its internal discord brings it under the power of external foes—in any case it can be accounted irretrievably lost: it is in our power [via external or internal ("civil") war—Ed.]. The despotism of Capital, which is entirely in our hands, reaches out to it a straw that the State, willy-nilly, must take hold of: if not—it goes to the bottom.

....Is it possible for any sound logical mind to hope with any success to guide crowds by the aid of reasonable counsels and arguments, when any objection or contradiction, senseless though it may be, can be made, and when such an objection may find favour with the people, whose powers of reasoning are superficial? **Man in masses and the men of the masses, being guided solely by petty passions, paltry beliefs, customs, traditions and sentimental theorism, fall a prey to party dissension, which hinders any kind of agreement even on the basis of a perfectly reasonable argument.** Every resolution of a crowd depends upon the chance of a packed majority, which, in its ignorance of political secrets, puts forth some ridiculous resolution that lays in the administration a seed of anarchy. [pr. #1]

For, as Socrates noted, the crowd or majority is irrational, passionate and desirous, and much less rational than its most wise, rational and truthful philosopher-king, whom they condemned to death in 399 B.C.

Now more from Satanic protocol #1,

It must be understood that the might of a mob is blind, senseless and unreasoning force, ever at the mercy of a suggestion from any side. **The blind cannot lead the blind without bringing them into the abyss; consequently members of the mob, upstarts from the people** even though they may have a genius for wisdom, yet **have no understanding of the political, cannot come forward as leaders of the mob without bringing the whole nation to ruin.**

....The mob is a savage and displays its savagery at every opportunity. The moment the mob seizes freedom in its hands it quickly turns to anarchy [discord, disorder, chaos—Ed.], **which in itself is the highest degree of savagery.** [protocol #1]

* * * * *

From Satanic “jewish” protocol #3,

In the present state of knowledge and the direction we have given to its development, **the people, blindly believing things in print** [i.e. the “jewish” media monopoly—Ed.] **cherishes**—(thanks to promptings intended to mislead and to its own ignorance)—**a blind hatred towards** [whatever the Satanic “jew” misleads them to hate, e.g. aristocrats or “bourgeois,” Germans or Christians, Arabs or Mohammedans)—Ed.] **all conditions which it considers above itself** [i.e. aristocrats or “bourgeois,” their true betters or genetic superiors—Ed.], **for it has no understanding of** [natural inequality (among individuals, families, nations and races) and hence—Ed.] **the meaning of class and condition.**

....These [“jew”-inspired, Marxist, communist or democratic—Ed.] **mobs will rush delightedly to shed the blood of those whom,** in the simplicity of their ignorance [of these manipulative and malevolent “jews”—Ed.], **they have envied from their cradles, and whose property they will then be able to loot.**

Ours they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us [“jews” who signal, command and control this lowest “class” attack, or rather war—Ed.] **and we shall take measures to protect our own.** [pr. #3]

And from The Republic 8:563-64,

SOCRATES: **And above all, I said, and as the result of all, see how sensitive** [“touchy”—Rouse] **the citizens become; they chafe impatiently at the least touch of authority** [“hint of servitude, and won’t have it;”—Rouse] **and at length, as you know, they cease to care even for the laws, written or unwritten; they will have no one over them** [“that no one may be their master in anything.”—Rouse].

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, he said, I know it too well.

SOCRATES: **Such, my friend, I said, is the fair and glorious** [democratic, egalitarian and libertarian—Ed.] **beginning out of which springs** [“grows”—Rouse] **tyranny.**

ADEIMANTUS: Glorious indeed, he said. But **what is the next step?**

SOCRATES: **The ruin of oligarchy** [money-seeking—Ed.] **is the ruin of democracy** [freedom-seeking—Ed.]; **the same disease magnified and intensified by liberty overmasters democracy—the truth being that the excessive increase of anything often causes a reaction in the opposite direction** [“To do anything too much tends to take you to the opposite extreme,”—Rouse]; **and this is the case** not only in the seasons and in vegetable and animal life, but **above all in forms of government.**

ADEIMANTUS: True.

SOCRATES: **The excess of liberty** [riot, chaos—Ed.], **whether in States or individuals, seems only to pass into excess of slavery** [imposed order and restraint—Ed.].

[“For too great liberty seems to change into nothing else that too great slavery, both in man and in city.”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: Yes, the natural order.

SOCRATES (continuing): **And so tyranny naturally arises out of democracy, and the most aggravated form of tyranny and slavery out of the most extreme form of liberty?**

[“Then it is likely,” said I, ‘that **democracy is precisely the constitution out of which tyranny comes;** from extreme liberty, it seems, comes a slavery most complete and most cruel.’”—Rouse]

ADEIMANTUS: As we might expect.

[Republic 8:563-64]

* * * * *

Note also, dear reader, how the preceding Socratic excerpt is an excellent description of the advent of “jewish,” Marxist, communist, tyranny: the violent “jewish” overthrow (“revolution”) of Godly Gentile truth, reason and order. And remember this Socratic truth and enlightenment was uttered and shed some 2400 years ago.

In other words, when an individual or group without temperance, the virtue of self-control, is or becomes free to go sensually (socially and/or politically) out of control—(such as a would-be prodigal son suddenly freed from his father’s constraints—or a child set loose in a candy store, or an alcohol or heroin addict freed from jail), they (if lacking Socratic “philosophy and music”) sometimes do not fail to do just that, pig out, go hog wild and run riot, until they (like a mad dog, bull, drunk, or mob) have to be (and thus are) forcibly restrained. And hence via their mad license to run riot the public’s’ sacred rights to and liberties are curtailed, officially, legislatively or tyrannically desecrated, and perhaps ultimately annulled and trampled underhoof by some accursed “tyrant” or other.

(Remember that proverbial “whiff of grape-shot” which Napoleon offered, extended and wafted before the snorting snout of the fierce and threatening Parisian mob? But was Napoleon a malevolent and harmful tyrant or a benevolent and enlightened monarch, emperor, autocrat or (if you insist) “dictator”? Did he come to enslave or free his subjects, curse or bless them, devour or prosper them? Let’s ask the French, if not the Parisians?)

And often (some of) the threatened, battered, frightened and exasperated citizens themselves short-sightedly advocate or well-meaningly plead for tyranny—i.e. for this very kind of official check, coercive curtailment or political limitation on the intolerable liberty or the violent license of the mad mob. (See (or rather hear) the public cries for “curfews” and/or “marshal law” during such social/political “crises” of “democracies.”)

And sometimes these apparent “reactionaries” (calling for total or tyrannical government) are the very instigators or movers of the violent mob in the first place. This seeming-paradox is the “political science” and the practical, “dialectical” and diabolical social-political method of “jewish” Marxism—a.k.a. “communism.”

For the “jewish” mobster encouraging and inciting mob mayhem and violence against the propertied upper class (or the majority race of a polyglot, multi-racial, multi-national, multi-religious Babylonian monstrosity of a state or empire—created, no doubt, by this very Satanic “jew” as the gate-keeper of this “jew”-doomed city-state) all the time maliciously intends to thereby become tyrant (“proletarian dictator”) over all the bickering Gentile classes. Their “revolutionary” method is to deliberately foster, create and exacerbate on cue and all at once all manner of social/political/economic/military crises, and then to present themselves as the all-promising solution—if only they are granted “temporary” dictatorial (tyrannical) powers to effectively confront, curtail and solve the crises (which they themselves secretly, deliberately malevolently created). But of course this allegedly necessary temporary “dictatorship of the proletariat” never ever dissolves itself, nor returns its “public” powers back to the public or Gentile citizenry, nor withers away into general freedom and paradise for all—as sanctimoniously promised by the “jewish” Marxist, communist mobsters. But of course the Devil and Its kind promise heaven on earth, and of course they never deliver it. On the contrary, our earthly hell is their “messianic” or zionist heaven.

“Public” officials are mostly would-be tyrants extremely eager and all too willing to receive (if not usurp) power, but most reluctant to return it. With them, it’s always “two steps forward, [but only] one step back,” thus advancing one step toward their official end, tyranny. That’s why government or officialdom always grows and grows like moss or ivy. (And so where is young George Washington’s proverbial hatchet now when we need it most of all to chop down this all-encroaching tyranny tree?)

* * *

And so the far better public policy is to always keep yourselves armed, dangerous and prepared to defend yourselves, your families, your properties and businesses—just as the

Koreans did during the latest round of Negro rioting, looting murdering and maiming in Los Angeles, California. This way you and yours stay free (to defend yourselves) rather than being officially or tyrannically (and metaphorically) cast within a state-prison system with the violent and dreaded Negro as your beloved cell mate. This way you evade and survive the attempts of the Satanic (revolutionary Marxist or zionist) and would-be tyrannic “jew” (via his media-monopoly) to incite the Negro to riot (via e.g. constantly showing their edited version of the Rodney King tape), thus insuring (if not causing) Negro riot, violence and mayhem, and thus “justifying” their malevolently intended “marshal law” and their further unconstitutional, tyrannical and “jewish” usurpation of public rights and sacrifice of citizens’ liberties (to and toward their complete and total zionist or “jewish” tyranny, dictatorship, police-state and puppet-government). You have to be wise to the Devil (and Its own) to survive them and their ceaseless tricks.

* * *

But as the social-political problem (which the mad, violent, riotous and murderous “democratic” mob represents and personifies) clearly lies with certain intemperate, unruly or riotous members of the society or group, or in other words, with the group’s membership policy, it would clearly be far better for the society or group to expel those members (i.e. to change its membership or citizenship policy) than to lose or sacrifice some or all of their rights or liberties (to some tyrant, official or gov’t) because of those unruly few or that riotous minority. (And if that “democratic” minority is in fact the majority, then get out of that riotous city, county or country before they devour you and yours.)

Why e.g. should the entire class suffer the omnipresence of their teacher simply because he or she can’t safely leave the classroom alone due to one or two violent or unruly students? Or why should a relatively civilized, temperate or self-controlled race, nation or society all lose their liberties within a state-prison because Negroes are so violent and therefore need to be officially watched (by omnipresent police or gov’t officials, or nowadays, spy machines)? Far better to do without the unruly students or violent Negroes than to keep suffering them, and hence to permit, allow or suffer them to be the cause or official excuse for your collective loss of liberty?

But why sacrifice yourself and your loved ones to this false god of Humanity (which includes the violent Negro and his Marxist, “revolutionary” master, the Satanic “jew”)? or to this false god of Equality (with the lowest, most unruly, intemperate, uncivil, violent and harmful races and individuals)?

Why thus so egregiously betray, offend and wound (if not kill) your beloved goddess of Liberty, or more importantly, yourself and your loved ones? Methinks free and mutual association or genuinely voluntary union (i.e. not rapacious, coercive, predatory, Soviet or Amerikan “unions”) is the social-political way to go, rather than to be robbed, raped, imprisoned or enslaved by tyrannical “public officials” or “representatives” using Negroes and other anti-social elements as their attack dogs and tyrannical excuses.

To hell with (the false gods or idols of) Humanity; to hell with Equality! To hell with all states which devour you and yours! (Were you and yours created for the State and/or “its” Law, or vice-versa? Then uncreate the states and laws you suffer under, and create others, or none at all.) Down with cities or states which oppress you and yours!

And up with you and yours! Be selfish and survive! Be selfish and save yourself and your loved ones! Be as selfish as the most “religious” people among us, who seek to save themselves from eternal damnation, and save yourself as well from temporal earthly damnation or self-sacrifice (to these false gods, the Devil, Its “jews” and their Gentile racial allies or Marxist servants).

The true social/political solution is to forever keep the Satanic “jew” out of your city, state, country, nation, race and family—(thus excluding also his Satanic, “capitalist” or “communist,” Marxist, “messianic” or zionist lies, tricks and traps); and to create, coin and employ no other than honest (debt-free), stable and sufficient money; to maintain a unified uni-racial nation with a common language and enough land and water to feed themselves; to

grant themselves the inalienable divine rights to liberty, free-association, self-defense, weaponry and property; and to somehow prevent the growth of that mad, violent, intemperate “democratic” mob. (As a curiosity, see e.g. Socrates’ theoretical program of “sacred” match-making or eugenics. (See Rep. 5:459-60)

* * * * *

The True Meaning or Definition of “jewish” “Freedom” or “Liberation” and “Equality”

And now to reveal the true “liberalism” or “liberation” the Satanic “jew” is planning for the Gentile—(as hitherto seen in Russia, eastern Europe and everywhere the “jew” has enthroned himself).

In truth no Gentile is half as dictatorial (demanding, fascistic, authoritarian, intolerant, illiberal) conspiratorial, false and malevolent as this Satanic “jew” who would be king.

Let’s start with protocol #12 of the Satanic “jewish” plot against humanity.

The word “freedom” which can be interpreted in various ways, is defined by us [self-enthroned “jews”–Ed.] as follows:—Freedom is the right to do that which the law allows. This interpretation of the word will at the proper time be of service to us, because all freedom will thus be in our hands, since the laws will abolish or create only that which is desirable for us according to the aforesaid programme. [#12]

In other words, the poisonous fount of tyranny springs forth thusly, “Obedience to law is liberty.” For Tyranny = the “sacred” will of the tyrant = Law. This tyrannical motto is engraved in stone above the entrance to the court house of Satan’s “seat” or throne: “Obedience to [my Satanic, tyrannic] Law is [your] Liberty.”

The words of the liberal, which are in effect the words of our masonic watchword, namely, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” will, when we come into our kingdom, be changed by us into words no longer a watchword [i.e. their (Marxist, “communist,” zionist or “jewish” party) catchword, catchphrase, slogan or motto, and their publicly professed and solemnly promised (racial-social-political) intention–Ed.], but only an expression of idealism.... [pr. #9]

Voting, which we [“jews”–Ed.] have made the instrument which will set us on the throne of the world [see “universal suffrage”–Ed.]...will then [“at the proper time”, “when we come into our kingdom,”–Ed.] have served its purpose and will play its part then for the last time...

To secure this [Satanic, messianic, zionist or “jewish” “purpose”–Ed.] **we must have everybody vote without distinction of classes and qualifications, in order to establish an absolute majority [of deceivable dupes and manipulable fools–Ed.], which cannot be got from the educated propertied classes. [pr. #10]**

I.E. educated or literate people are not as easy for these Satanic or zionist “jews” to deceive and mislead. And so they seek (and succeed) in controlling “public” or governmental education to see that the public never really learns to (read or write). They banish phonics, etc.

And Satanic “jews” seek (and obtain) a media-monopoly to possess, deceive, manipulate and control the illiterate public. For the (“jewish”) mass-media is to a (Gentile) nation what a mind is to its body. Hence the nations are possessed by Satan’s “chosen people.” And that is

no less than mental, intellectual, psychological and spiritual damnation of the Gentiles by the “jews.” (And see their imperial “jewish”-Amerikan “Federal Communications’ Commission” which made all this demonic “jewish” possession possible.)

But back to those Marxist “professors,” “educators,” writers, “intellectuals,” “theorists, visionaries,” etc. (from Satanic protocol #13),

The part played by the liberals, utopian dreamers [professors of “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” etc.–Ed.], **will be finally played out when our** [“beastly,” imperial, supernatural or SuperNazi, communistic, “messianic,” Satanic, zionist or “jewish” world–Ed.] **government is acknowledged. Till such time they will continue to do us good service. Therefore we shall continue to direct their minds to all sorts of vain conceptions of fantastic theories, new and apparently progressive: for have we not with complete success turned the brainless heads of the goyim with progress** [i.e. “jewish” progress toward their Satanic goal of world dictatorship or tyranny–Ed.], **till there is not among the goyim one mind able too perceive that under this word** [“progress[ive]”–Ed.] **lies departure from truth in all cases** where it is not a question of material inventions, **for truth is one, and in it there is no place for progress.** [That’s not true, by the way. To say that is to say you know all truth. Read Max Stirner or the above chapter, e.g.)–Ed.] Progress, like a fallacious idea, serves **to obscure truth so that none may know it except us, the Chosen of God, its** [i.e. “truth’s”–Ed.] **guardians** [via their mass-media monopoly–Ed.].

[Did you hear, catch or note that, dear reader? For the Satanic or zionist “jew,” truth is not something to reveal, to tell, to shout from the rooftops. Truth is something to control, to “guard,” to hide or conceal from the Gentiles (by lying, deceit or omission). So speaks Evil, Hideousness, Malevolence, the Super-Nazi “sinagog of Satan,” who cannot afford to be seen in the Light of day or of the Truth, because they and their deeds are far too evil, dark, demonic, Satanic and/or “jewish.” (Apo./Rev. 2:9, 3:9 & John 3:19-21–Ed.)

When we come into our kingdom....**Who will ever expect then that all these** [Gentile–Ed.] **peoples were stage-managed by us according to a political plan** which no one has so much as guessed in the course **of many centuries?**.... [pr. #13]

(Me for one; and how about you, dear reader?)

No one shall with impunity lay a finger on the aureole [halo, divinity, sanctity–Ed.] of our [“beastly,” “jewish,” imperial, supernatural or SuperNazi, communistic, “messianic” or Satanic world–Ed.] government.

...our government...will no longer allow the mass of the nation to be led astray in by-ways and fantasies about the blessings of progress [“Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” etc.–Ed.]. Is there any one of us who does not know that **these phantom blessings are the direct roads to foolish imaginings** [about “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,” etc.–Ed.] **which give birth to anarchical relations of men among themselves and towards authority,** because progress, or rather **the idea of progress, has introduced the conception of every kind of emancipation, but has failed to establish its limits.... All the so-called liberals are anarchists,** if not in fact, at any rate **in thought. Every one of them is hunting after phantoms of freedom, and falling exclusively into licence, that is, into the anarchy of protest for the sake of protest.** [pr. #12]

[“When we come into our kingdom”–Ed.] **Our absolutism...will ignore all murmurs, all discontents of every kind and will destroy to the root every kind of manifestation of them in act by punishment of an exemplary character.** [pr. #15]

I.E. these “jews” will not tolerate any Gentile to preach or profess liberty or liberation from “their [world-wide zionist] kingdom,” nor the individual and racial equality of “jews” with Gentiles, nor that “jews” should love Gentiles, and show them true brotherhood or fraternity (instead of Satanic racist treachery). For these “masonic watchword[s], namely, ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,’” were (and are) merely Satanic “jewish” lies, deceits and “poisons” intended to “blood-poison,” destroy, conquer and enslave all Gentiles within a Satanic “jewish” world-kingdom, dictatorship or tyranny. (See excerpt from protocol #10 above.)

Sedition-mongering is nothing more than the yapping of a lap-dog at an elephant.... It needs no more than to take a good example [of public punishment or elephantine squashing of a yapping lap-dog—Ed.] to show the relative importance of both [rulers and ruled, “jews” and Gentiles—Ed.] and [after which “good example”—Ed.] the lap dogs will cease to yap [or bark—Ed.] and will wag their tails the moment they set eyes on an elephant.

[“When we come into our kingdom”—Ed.] **In order to destroy the prestige of heroism for political crime we shall send it for trial in the category of thieving, murder, and every kind of abominable and filthy crime. Public opinion will then confuse in its conception this category of crime with the disgrace attaching to every other and will brand it with the same contempt.**

We have done our best, and I hope we have succeeded, **in preventing the goyim from adopting this means of contending with** [our “jewish” revolutionary—Ed.] **sedition. It was for this reason that** through the Press and in speeches indirectly—in cleverly compiled school books on history, **we have advertised the martyrdom alleged to have been accepted by sedition-mongers for the idea of the commonweal** [or the common good—Ed.]. This advertisement has increased the contingent of liberals and has brought thousands of **goyim** into the ranks of **our livestock cattle**. [pr. #19]

[“When we come into our kingdom”—Ed.] **We shall create an intensified centralization of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences** [i.e. rights or liberties—Ed.] **which have been permitted by the goyim, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportions as to be at any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any goyim who oppose us by deed or word.** [See e.g. their “Soviet Union.”—Ed.]

We shall be told that such despotism as I speak of is not consistent with the progress of these days, but I will prove to you that it is. [pr. #5]

As Socrates has likewise shown us how democracy or too much mob liberty leads to despotism or tyranny.

And finally, from Satanic “jewish” protocol #11,

...the freedom of the Press the right of association, freedom of conscience, the voting principle, and many another that must disappear forever from the memory of man, or undergo a radical alteration the day after the promulgation of the new constitution.

...if [we ever afterwards grant freedoms, permits or—Ed] indulgences it will be said that we have recognized our own wrongdoing and this will destroy the prestige of the infallibility of our authority, or else it will be said that we have become alarmed and are compelled to show lenience for which we shall get no thanks because it will be supposed to be compulsory.

...We desire that from the first moment of its promulgation, while the [Gentile—Ed.] peoples of the world are still stunned by the accomplished fact of the [“jewish”

supernational or Super-Nazi–Ed.] revolution, still in a condition of terror and uncertainty, they should recognize once and for all that we are so strong, so inexpugnable, so superabundantly filled with power, that in no sense shall we take any account of them, and so **far from paying attention to their [Gentile–Ed.] opinions or wishes, we [“jews”–Ed.] are ready and able to crush with irresistible power all expression or manifestation thereof at any moment and in every place, that we have seized at once everything we wanted and shall in no case divide our power with them.** [As the “jews” have coaxed, persuaded or forced the Gentiles to share or “divide” their power with them.–Ed.]

....Then in fear and trembling they will close their eyes to everything, and be content to await what will be the end of it all. [(?) i.e. their being enslaved, devoured or mass-murdered?–Ed.]

The goyim are a flock of sheep, and we are their wolves. And you know what happens when the wolves get hold of the flock?....

[Again, see “what happened” in their “Soviet Union” and what they did to the Gentiles, “the flock” they “got hold of.”–Ed.]

There is another reason also why they will close their eyes: for **we shall keep promising them to give back all the liberties we have taken away as soon as we have quelled the enemies of peace** and tamed all parties....

It is not worth while discussing how long they will be kept waiting for the return of their liberties....

[Recall the Marxist or Soviet promise that their “dictatorship of the proletariat” would soon dissolve into nothingness, or nothing but liberty and prosperity for all.–Ed.]

For what purpose then have **we invented this whole policy** [this “poisonous,” “jewish,” revolutionary “masonic watchword, namely, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity”–Ed.] **and insinuated it into the minds if the goy without giving them any chance to examine its underlying meaning?** For what indeed, if not in order to obtain in a roundabout way what is for our scattered tribe unattainable by a direct road [i.e. conquest–Ed.]? It is **this** [dark obscurity (and mysticism)–Ed.] which **has served as the basis of our organization of secret Masonry which is not known to, and whose aims are not even so much as suspected by, these goy cattle attracted by us into the “show” army of Masonic Lodges** in order to throw dust into the eyes of their fellows.

God has granted to us, His Chosen People, the gift of the dispersion, and in this which appears in all eyes to be our weakness, has come forth all our strength, which has now brought us to the threshold of sovereignty over all the world. [pr. #11]

* * * * *

“Jewish” Mass Murder, Extermination, Genocide or “Holocaust” of the “best of the Gentiles,” or the Gentile “Aristocracy”

“Kill the best of the Gentiles.”—a (if not the) prime commandment of the Satanic “jewish” bible called “Talmud.”

And from Satanic “jewish” protocol #3,

The people under our guidance [i.e. blood-red communist agents or mass-murderous, Marxist revolutionaries (like “Lenin” (Ulyanov) and “Bronstein” (Trotsky)–

Ed.] **have annihilated** [i.e. mass-murdered (as in France and Russia)–Ed.] **the** [Gentile, Christian–Ed.] **aristocracy, who were their** [i.e. the common people’s–Ed.] **one and only defense and foster-mother** for the sake of their own [aristocratic–Ed.] advantage—which is inseparably bound up with the well-being of the people. **Nowadays**, with the destruction of the aristocracy, **the** [common Gentile–Ed.] **people have fallen into the grips of merciless money-grinding scoundrels** [i.e. these very “jewish” banksters or “capitalists”–Ed.] **who have laid a pitiless and cruel yoke upon the necks of the workers.** [pr. #3]

And this is nothing new. “For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay (them) on men’s shoulders; but they (themselves) will not [lift a finger to help–Ed.] move them with one of their fingers.” [Matt. 23:4; also Luke 11:46]

What “jews” say Gentiles did to them in Egypt, Germany, etc., they in fact have always done to Gentiles: i.e. burdened them with “cruel yokes.” (See “jewish” usury, speculation. “capitalism,” “communism,” and their debt-token monopoly money.)

The aristocracy of the goyim as a political force, is dead—we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us since they are self-sufficient. It is essential therefore for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens upon landed property in loading them with debts. [See e.g. the federal “farm-loan agency.”–Ed.] These measures will check landholding and keep it in a state of humble and absolute submission.

The aristocrats of the goyim, being hereditarily incapable of contending themselves with little, **will rapidly burn up and fizzle out.** [pr. # 6]

In all corners of the earth the words “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-works at work boring into the well-being of the goyim, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity and destroying the foundations of the goya States. As you will see later, this helped us [“jews”–Ed.] **to our triumph: it enabled us to grasp, among other things, the master card—the destruction of the privileges, or in other words of the very existence of the aristocracy of the goyim, that class which was the only defense** [the Gentile–Ed.] **peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the goyim** [monarchic/aristocratic Gentile states–Ed.] **we have set up the aristocracy of the educated class headed up by the aristocracy of** [our “jewish”–Ed.] **money. The qualifications for this aristocracy we have established in wealth, which is dependent upon us**, and in knowledge, for which our learned elders [of “zion”–Ed.] provide the motive force. [pr. #1]

We [Marxist “jews” then–Ed.] **appear on the scene as the alleged saviors of the worker from this** [“capitalist”–Ed.] **oppression, and we suggest that he should enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists—to whom we always give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly rule (of the solidarity of all humanity) of our social masonry.** [See “FreeMasonry”–Ed.] **The** [Gentile–Ed.] **aristocracy, which enjoyed by law the labor of the workers, was interested in seeing that the workers were well fed, healthy and strong. We** [“royal” or “messianic” “jews”–Ed.] **are interested in just the opposite—in the diminution—the killing out of the goyim** [i.e. Gentiles, “jew”-owned human “cattle” or livestock–Ed.]. **Our power is in the chronic shortness of food and physical weakness of the worker because by all that this implies he is made the slave of our will, and he will not find in his own** [Gentile–Ed.] **authorities either strength or energy to set against our will.** [See e.g.

the chronic food-shortage and endless bread lines of the “jews” “Soviet Union”—Ed.] **Hunger gives capital** [i.e. “jewish” money—Ed.] **the right** [i.e. power or “authority”—Ed.] **to rule the** [Gentile—Ed.] **worker more surely than it was given to the aristocracy by the legal authority of kings.**

By want and the envy and hatred which it engenders we shall move the mobs, and with their hands we shall wipe out all those who hinder us on our way.
[pr. #3]

Paris was mysteriously breadless at the time of the “French” Revolution, 1789, in order to better incite the Gentile mob against the Gentile aristocracy which was accused (by these bloody, revolutionary, “jewish” agents) of trying to starve the common people into death or submission. How often Evil blames Its opponents for Its Own evil intentions and deeds! Or how often Evil “projects” Itself onto Its victims!

And compare #3 above with these following words of Socrates,

SOCRATES: **Has he** [the tyrant—Ed.] **not also another object, which is that they** [his subjects, the tyrannized—Ed.] **may be impoverished by payment of taxes, and thus compelled to devote themselves to their daily wants and therefore less likely to conspire against him?** [Republic 8, p. 566]

See e.g. the endless and exhausting bread lines or cues outside the unstocked or empty public, citizens’ or workers’ grocery stores within the “people’s” “Soviet Union”—as opposed to the plentifully-stocked and inexpensive stores for the exclusive use of “Communist” party members or “jews.” (“Party members only! All comrades or workers keep out!”)

In the present state of knowledge and the direction we have given to its development, **the people, blindly believing things in print** [i.e. the “jewish” media monopoly—Ed.] **cherishes**—(thanks to promptings intended to mislead and to its own ignorance)—**a blind hatred towards** [whatever the Satanic “jew” misleads them to hate, e.g. aristocrats or “bourgeois,” Germans or Christians, Arabs or Mohammedans)—Ed.] **all conditions which it considers above itself** [i.e. aristocrats or “bourgeois,” their true betters or genetic superiors—Ed.], **for it has no understanding of** [natural inequality (among individuals, families, nations and races) and hence—Ed.] **the meaning of class and condition.**

This hatred will be still further magnified by the effects of an economic crisis, which will stop dealings on the exchanges and bring industry to a standstill. We shall create by all the secret subterranean methods open to us and with the aid of gold, which is all in our hands, **a universal economic crisis whereby we shall throw upon the streets whole mobs of workers simultaneously in all the countries of Europe.**

These [“jew”-inspired, Marxist, communist or democratic—Ed.] **mobs will rush delightedly to shed the blood of those whom**, in the simplicity of their ignorance [of these manipulative and malevolent “jews”—Ed.], **they have envied from their cradles, and whose property they will then be able to loot.**

Ours they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us [“jews” who signal, command and control this lowest “class” attack, or rather war—Ed] **and we shall take measures to protect our own.** [pr. #3]

See Moses the Egyptian’s tale about smearing animal blood on “jewish” door posts so the “angel of Death” (i.e. his mass-murderous “Hebrews”) would peaceably pass by. (Exodus 12:7, :21-23 & :29-33) And note how these mass-murderous “Hebrews” did not leave Moses’ Egypt “empty-handed,” but with “borrowings” of silver and golden jewels, and other loot, plunder, booty or “spoil.” (Exodus 3:19-22 & 12:35-36)

(And hence I must say, the blood-red “jew”-beast yet lives to this day! Therefore beware, be armed and be organized for when they and their mad “democratic” mobs come for you and yours.)

* * * * *