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**INTRODUCTION**

This is not about differences in interpretation or quibbling about nuances; this is about the total disregard for facts. This book is supplemental and follow-up to “Doric Crete and Sparta, the home of Greek philosophy”. Socrates mentions that Crete and Sparta are the home of Greek philosophy and every modern scholar and academic has laughed that off. Well, they shouldn't have. They missed a ton of small clues, evidence and other material to support that contention not even touched upon in the previous article. This work lays out the ancillary and circumstantial evidence outside the Protagoras statement to prove that Socrates wasn't making that up. Moreover, this dissertation will bear out that much of what Socrates achieved and did was copied from the Spartans such as the elenchus. Socrates in his life portrayed Doric/Spartan life and their culture. This circumstantial evidence also can be connected to other philosophers thus showing that the heart of philosophy is Doric Greek. This inattention to detail to this aspect of Socrates in past academic works and teachings has destroyed Western Culture. This article serves as an historical catalogue of not only of the past but a snapshot of present events of academic malpractice. An in-depth analysis of the Protagoras section will follow to show that the characterization of it being “ironic” is simply illogical, dastardly, and unbelievable.

Modern Academia will be taken to the woodshed in this piece and there will be no apologies for what follows. The Peloponnesian War was never over. It resurfaced in the Renaissance and Athens has been winning the war in Academia and the West ever since. This is the counterattack; this is the Aegospotami for modern academia.

Also it will point out that Western culture was transformed by Hegel; he changed the definition of philosophy. Western Culture is no more and has been changed into a totally different culture.

This is about the prosecution of malpractice in the halls of academia. A case in court is about the facts and facts will be presented here. It is the prosecution of myth-making by colleges and universities.

**THE SKEPTICAL RECORD**

This is the last nail to the coffin for skepticism regarding Doric Crete and Sparta as the home of Greek philosophy. The 11th Platsis Symposium on September 23, 2012, supported by the Classics and Modern Greek Department at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, was convened to examine "The Greek Background of the Natural Law". At the question and answer session, when it was mentioned that Sparta was the home of Greek philosophy and it was the origin of the Natural Law, the head of the department grew furiously indignant at the mention of Sparta having anything to do with philosophy. The first speaker reiterated that Athens was the origin of the Natural Law and that there is nothing connecting Sparta with the Natural Law. (From the brochure: "…which emerged ***clearly*** in fifth century Athens." ª) Afterwards, in the reception that followed in a private conversation with two attendees, this author presented the proof that Socrates himself stated that Crete and Sparta were the home of Greek philosophy. One of them turned to his partner to explain that yes, that it is in the Platonic corpus but it was an anomaly and it was to be discounted.

In a talk with an advisor to the board, he said there is no evidence that Crete and Sparta is the home of Greek philosophy and just because Socrates said that doesn't make it so.[[1]](#footnote-1)

That very same line "Crete and Sparta, the home of Greek philosophy" was the title of paper published in the fall of 2007 that set out Socrates statement as being true. And in the age of the internet, five years later, it seems no one has heard about it and there is no discussion about it anywhere on the internet. It is not so bad that after five years of something this groundbreaking that the same old meme is being presented but that Socrates is still being demeaned and his statement is still being dismissed outright.

The *carte blanche* dismissal is not just throughout academic interactions and environment; it is throughout academic literature of classical studies, philosophy and political science. The first fragment of Doric Greek philosopher (Burnett, 70)[[2]](#footnote-2) Empedocles’ work begins this way:

“Meagerly scattered among the body’s members are the means of acquiring knowledge, and many are the evils that burst in and blunt the edge of attentive thought”. (Wheelwright, 26)

There seems to be many evils attendant upon the recognition of the true history of philosophy. In earlier papers, A. E. Taylor, Elizabeth Rawson, and Gregory Vlastos, some of the greats in classical studies, have been noted in dismissing Socrates statement in the *Protagoras* (§342a-343c).[[3]](#footnote-3) In a recent book (2007) on Socrates, Prof. Luis E. Navia, who describes himself as having “devoted many years to the study of Socrates and have read countless accounts and interpretations of him” (p. 9), and who acknowledges the comments in both the *Protagoras* and in Aristophanes, (p. 27 and noting all the Socratics were Laconophiles, p. 69) makes no connections to a Spartan influence whatsoever and implies a total denial thereof; there is no value accrued to these statements; no bearing on his assessment of Socrates except that is one of the reasons the Athenians put him to death. I. F. Stone remarks that the Socratic admiration for Sparta and Crete is puzzling and that “Sparta and Crete were culturally and politically the two most backward regions of ancient Greece”. (p. 124)

This author’s two most beloved classical scholars, the renowned Edith Hamilton and Werner Jaeger, express the same sentiments. Ms. Hamilton describes Sparta as a backwater (1993, 131) and writes, “The Spartans have ***left the world nothing*** in the way of art or literature or science.” (ibid, 119 ª) Prof. Werner Jaeger parallels the comments of A. E. Taylor: “Plato ***ironically*** makes Socrates say (Prot.342b) that all Spartans (and Cretans) are philosophers…” (Vol. I, 436, #7 ª) A. H. M. Jones echoes the same old message, “Sparta produced no art and no literature and played no part in the intellectual life of Greece (p. 66) and notes Sparta’s “cultural sterility.” Even though he recognizes that the intelligentsia of Athens admired Sparta, the evidence of their witness doesn’t faze him; he finds it “odd”. One of the leading modern experts on Sparta, Paul Cartledge, compares Lycurgus as “a mixture of George Washington – **and Pol Pot**” (p. 29 ª), and notes “**their lack** of high cultural achievement” (p. 25) and states that “Athens is justly credited with phenomenal achievements in …philosophy and democratic politics…” (ibid ª) Prof. Hicks, translator of Diogenes Laërtius’ *Lives*, claims that, in regard to the Seven Sages of the Protagoras section, “modern criticism rejects it all as forgery”. (Bk I, footnote 36)

The idea that Sparta is culturally sterile is across the internet, “…explain[s] why philosophy only occurred among some Greeks (e.g. Milesians, Athenians, etc.) and not among others (e.g. Spartans).” Or “…like Sparta, that were never venues of Greek philosophy.” (Ross)

The caricature of Sparta is so thorough, so bad that even a British scholar of Greek pens a poem, c. 1938, about teaching the Greek civilization with the line, “*the dummies at Sparta*”. (Knox quoting MacNeice, 30; 65)

What we have then, is that Socrates is a liar. Socrates is being ironic. Socrates is playing games. Socrates is being facetious. Is the mention of Crete and Sparta as the home of Greek philosophy by Socrates an anomaly? Do modern day academics know more than Socrates, Plato and the Athenian intelligentsia? This is the opinion of the day. But as we will soon find out…

"Action speaks louder than words".

**THE PHILOSOPHICAL NATURE OF THE SPARTANS**

Let’s pretend that those sections in *Protagoras* never existed. Outside the Protagoras section, can it be proven that Crete and Sparta were the home of Greek philosophy?

It can be easily done.

First, the groundwork has to be laid. Did Sparta have philosophy?

There are plenty of clues outside of the Platonic corpus such as the witness of Aristophanes, as noted in the previous paper, as linking Socrates to Sparta. The Athenian general Thucydides in his history of the Peloponnesian War is another one. He puts speeches in the mouths of his characters. One of those speeches is from a Spartan king at the outset of the war addressing his compatriots and foreign delegations. Thucydides has King Archidamus say, “And we are both warlike and wise, and it is our sense of order that makes us so.” (Strassler: 47; I.84.3) Philosophy is about wisdom and here in the Doric Greek’s speech, are two characteristics of the Spartans, “warlike and wise”. Modern academia harp on the warlike part but where is the attention directed to the “wise” part? To them that is just nonsense. Surrounding this statement are immediate clues of philosophy which is based on the natural law: i.e. “…it is our sense of order that makes us so”. Order is what makes up the cosmos and it is the laws of nature that puts order in the cosmos. The Spartans are about “order”. And as order undergirds the cosmos, order is paramount in their culture. Order is the Logos in the cosmos and is the ‘Sophia’ in the word “philosophy”. Another hint is the phrase “wise moderation” that precedes the quote above. (I.84.2) “Wise moderation”, in other words, is the Golden Mean which is a law of nature. The Golden Mean is found in the phrase “Nothing too much” which was inscribed upon the temple of Delphi. Delphi was dedicated to the god, Apollo and it was a Doric Greek temple. A third hint is the repetition of the Golden Mean in the following sentence, “we are educated with too little learning…and are brought up not to be too knowing…” Notice the phrases “too little” and “too knowing” mirroring the “Nothing too much” proverb inscribed upon the Temple of Delphi. The phrases “too much” and “too little” are the parameters essential of the Golden Mean. The whole sentiment of the Spartans is guided by the Golden Mean. The statement that we are wise is backed-up with ideas of “order” and the Golden Mean. Order and the Golden Mean are integral, foundational in Greek philosophy. These two allusions surrounding the word “wise” in the context of the first quoted sentence shows that Thucydides, a former enemy of the Spartans and therefore a hostile witness, is aware of the philosophical culture of the Spartans and truly, fully recounts it.

Another witness outside the Plato’s writings is Plutarch. Plutarch, a non-Doric Greek was a priest of Apollo at the Temple of Delphi. If anybody would have a clear understanding of things Spartan in context with the Greek world, it would be Plutarch. He, along with Polybius, were the first analysists of the culture and settings of Classical Antiquity; i.e. the first classical scholars.

At the end of his bio of Lycurgus, Plutarch concludes that

“…all those who have written well on politics, as Plato, Diogenes and Zeno, have taken Lycurgus for their model, leaving behind them, however mere projects and words; whereas Lycurgus was the author, not in writing but in reality, of a government which none else could so much as copy; and while men in general have treated the individual philosophic character as unattainable, he, by example of **a complete philosophic state**, raised himself high above all other lawgivers of Greece.” (Dryden & Clough, 73 ª)

The bio of Lycurgus should be standard reading of any and all students and teachers of classical studies. Plutarch expressly uses the word “philosophy” [[4]](#footnote-4) in describing what kind of state Sparta was. Yet, everyone has stated the complete opposite, “turning its back on the intellectual life of Greece”. How is this missed? This is clear and in bright daylight. No interpretation is needed here. There is no building of assumptions on scattered remnants of circumstantial evidence; there is no reading between the lines. Plutarch even quotes Socrates earlier in the piece when he says “that one [that being Socrates] said well that intellectual much more truly than athletic exercise was the Spartan characteristic”. (ibid, 66 quoting *Prot*., §342e) If it wasn’t true, why repeat it a second time? Was Plutarch being ironic too? …Or being an historian? Note also that Plutarch characterizes Socrates statement as “***said well***”! When every modern academic assails the Socratic statement in the Protagoras, Plutarch, a priest, a person of virtue, a man well-educated and versed in Classical literature and history, categorically affirms Socrates statement about their intellectual culture.

Another gigantic inference is in one of the early Platonic dialogues but is on the other hand, outside it, meaning it guides us to an outside source. It also is missed and overlooked. The dialogue of *Crito* is usually paired with the *Apology* in required reading and should be familiar to all philosophy students and teachers. Way before the Protagoras section, Plato has Socrates, at the end of the dialogue, elucidate the argument of the Laws and Constitution of Athens against him for running away from his death penalty. Plato has the Laws and Constitution of Athens ask why he didn’t move earlier to Crete and Sparta because they were his favorite forms of government. (§52; Hamilton, 1963: 35)

Now, why is that there? Why would Socrates favorite forms of government be Crete and Sparta? If as many state, that Sparta was an oligarchy---why would someone, who the French Catholic thinker Jacques Maritain called a person “possessed with extraordinary power of philosophic contemplation …” and who was guided by a divine impulse, “a better principle” (pg. 34) be an advocate of states that are akin to Pol Pot? Why? This is illogical. If anything, Socrates isn’t illogical. Instead of investigating the claim, it was laughed away.

There are two things here. This claim is repeated twice, once in the *Crito* and again in the *Protagoras*. If it is repeated twice—how can the Protagoras section be irony? You don’t repeat irony twice; you repeat things twice to prove a point. Second, it is not just “Sparta” being mentioned. Elizabeth Rawson condemns the heritage of Sparta in her very first line of her work as “a militaristic and totalitarian state, holding down an enslaved population, the helots, by terror and violence…” and slimes it by associating them with Nazi Germany. This is the attitude of all the academics along with Paul Cartledge who writes, “…on through to the Nazis in the twentieth century AD and their contemporary would-be emulators today”. Or the celebrated historian Paul Johnson who has this to say: “…sustained in power by the Spartan troops in the Acropolis, playing the role of the Nazis”. (pg. 146) And better yet is Bertrand Russell’s comment that “To us, the Spartan state appears as a model, in miniature, of the state that the Nazis would establish if victorious.” (1945, 98) Modern academics can’t help themselves and have to insert Nazi references to all things Spartan.[[5]](#footnote-5) Everybody overlooks Sparta on that basis but Sparta is not the only state mentioned! Crete is mentioned.

So where is Crete? Did anybody look at Crete? Did anybody do any investigation of Crete?

No.

Do classical students and scholars look at anything else? Is not their studies supposed to be comprehensive?

For if they had, they would have discovered many things.

Crete and Sparta share many things in common. Throughout classical literature, from the Platonic texts to Aristotle to even Cicero, the phrase “Crete and Sparta” appear and reappear. (q.v. Wheeler, “Crete/Sparta Connection”) Yet, there is no recognition of this quirk and its ramifications anywhere promulgated (except K. O. Müller and he is not quoted anyway). If they constantly appear together throughout classical texts, how come no modern texts about Sparta or ancient Greece treat them together? All eyes are on Sparta; Sparta is an oligarchy; and so dismissed. End of story. No need to dig deeper. No need to look at any other state either.

The ancients thought it important.

Maybe, it should be important to us.

What Crete and Sparta share together is their peculiar form of government among other things. [[6]](#footnote-6) In the *Laws*, Plato does discuss their form of government. Contrary to modern academia, Plato calls their government a “true politeia”, not an oligarchy. The Romans translated the Greek word “politeia” as “*respublica*”!

“Politeia” has many meanings but one of them means “society” where unlike monarchy, aristocracy/oligarchy, or democracy where a single class controls the government, several estates/classes share governmental duties in a politeia, i.e. the ‘society’ controls government. There is no dominant factor in a politeia. The higher part of society governs the state, not just one section. A “politeia” or a republic is mixed government. (Wheeler, 2007a)

Mixed government by itself is very complicated and cerebral structure. Compare that to democracy which is simplicity squared. Democracy is based on “Ugh, me want this”. It requires no thought, has no structure, and is rather simpleton.

Democracy is the government of the vulgar; it is the rule of the poor. (Aristotle, *Pol*. III, v, 4; 1279b 5-10; Loeb, p. 207) Whereas mixed government is a sign of a very intelligent, sophisticated people. Do knuckle-dragging, drooling, Neanderthals create a sophisticated governmental system? Is this why Socrates favorite form of government was Crete and Sparta? But this is what we are led to believe by academia.

There is more than just this surface observation.

From the quote above from Plutarch, he says that Plato used Lycurgus’ plan for his model government. Plutarch is referring to Plato’s *Republic*. Plato’s *Republic* was recognized as based on the Doric Greek societies and their philosophy, especially the application of *dikaios* by Morgenstern, cited by Prof. Müller,(1839: II, 193{q.v. Jaeger, III, 219}). The classical Greek word Dikaios is either translated as ‘righteousness’ or ‘justice’ in English; righteousness is the dictum that “all things are created to do one thing”. (Aristotle *Pol.* 3; Cicero, *Resp.* 233) Righteousness is a law of nature (or natural law) for it is derived from nature. The comprehension of this coming from nature is found in Xenophon, a philodorian:

"Yet again, the earth willingly teaches righteousness to those who can learn;" (*Oeconomicus* v, 12)

“The earth teaches” means, in other words a law of nature. The Doric republics of Crete and Sparta were based on the natural law of righteousness. Righteousness is the core theme of Plato’s *Republic*. Each estate/class was given one function to do. Righteousness immediately demands that things be mixed. If only one thing can do one thing in order to accomplish several tasks, several different things must be combined, thus mixed government.

Another Natural Law that naturally occurs in the makeup of the Doric republics is harmony. Aristotle defines harmony as “such-and-such a combination of high and low”. (*Metaphysics*, VIII, ii 7; 1043a 10; Loeb, p. 407) This make up is seen in the family where the family is the combination of the male (high) and the female (low). In the case of the Doric republics, as in Aristotle’s definition of a politiea, there is a mix of aristocracy (the high) and of the *damos* (‘*damos*’ is the Doric dialect for ‘demos’ which is Ionian) which is the low. As is also the case with the Roman Republic, republics are based on the harmony between the aristocracy and demos. The Doric republics are built on the Natural Law.

Socrates did not favor Crete and Sparta because they were oligarchies; he favored them because they were based on the laws of nature, i.e. The Logos, which is embedded in nature;

**“…that a city established on principles of nature would be wise as a whole.”** (Hamilton, 1963: *Resp*. §428e {q.v. Appendix VI: the original in the Greek reads “according to nature”.})

That “city” is the Doric republics of Crete and Laconia. And those people who do so are “wise”. The Logos is the “Sophia” of the cosmos. The appellation of “wise” is given to the Doric Greeks—not to Athenian democrats! To be “wise” is what philosophy is about!

Reverse engineering of a complicated item showcases its principles and reasons. Reverse engineering or forensic investigation of the *respublicas* of the Doric Greeks yield a sublime reasoning. If modern academics in political science and in classical studies did their job and acted truthfully, and defined the governments of Crete and Sparta rightly, then, it would have been readily apparent the philosophical basis of their states and that would have confirmed that Socrates was speaking the truth. Moreover, if these researchers then studied the government of the Doric states of Crete, as Prof. Müller had done, they would have come across the fact that the supreme magistrate of the Cretan republics were named “Cosmus” derived from the word “cosmos”. The cosmi of Crete were similar to the royal office in Sparta. (Müller, II, 2; 133)[[7]](#footnote-7) Prof. Müller ties this to what King Archidamus, quoted above, stated about their wisdom tied to their sense of order (cosmos). The term cosmos is a government title in Crete and put in the mouth of Spartan King by Thucydides (two separate witnesses). Greek philosophy is centered around and on the cosmos. As their title of their supreme magistrate tells us, is that their governments were formed around the principles, laws, and patterns derived from nature, the cosmos; as nature is ordered, their state is ordered and as nature is ordered, their state is ordered upon nature. The very nature of mixed government of Crete and Sparta indicate their philosophical basis. When Plato’s *Republic* is centered in righteousness and is copied from the Doric republics, it is no wonder then that Crete and Sparta were the favorite forms of government for Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and other Athenian intelligentsia. At Lacedæmonia, there was a temple dedicated to Zeus Cosmetas, i.e. Zeus “the orderer”. (*New Century*) In relation to Crete and Sparta, the word “cosmos” is throughout their culture. Given the fact that the supreme magistrates of the Doric Cretan republics were named Cosmus, how can anybody say that what Socrates said in the Protagoras is ironic? Clearly, the natural law was being used by the Dorians way before the Ionians. Democracy has nothing to do with the natural law; Aristotle points out that democracy is based on the general will as being supreme, (Pol. Bk V vii 22; 1310a 25; pg 437) [[8]](#footnote-8) not the natural law. The title of “Cosmus” is a sign, a hint, a clue, of the philosophical nature of the Doric Greeks. Without the Protagoras statements at all, just looking at the governments of Crete and Sparta one would know that these Doric Greeks had philosophy and Plutarch says that Lycurgus formed a “philosophic state”. This alone proves that Crete and Sparta were the home of Greek philosophy without any assistance from the Protagoras sections.

Another peculiarity of the Spartans was that the only job that a Spartiate could hold was that of a soldier. This is proven by the story told by Plutarch in his bio of King Agesilaus. There was a meeting of allies with the Spartans and the allies complained about the size of the Spartan contingent compared to theirs. Agesilaus ordered all the participants to sit and then had the herald call out jobs that everybody held such as baker, potter, carpenter and so forth and as their occupation was called they were to stand. Soon, all the allied members were standing while all the Lacedæmonians remained sitting. King Agesilaus retorted, “See I bring more soldiers than you do”, meaning that all his soldiers were professionals whereas the allies were all part-time soldiers. Every other Greek city relied on part-time citizen/soldiers. Not Crete and Sparta; they were very peculiar this way. This peculiarity shows that there is something else going on. The natural law of righteousness is exhibited here. If the dictum of righteousness says that all things are constructed to do one thing, the citizens of Sparta were all dedicated to a single task—that of being a soldier and nothing else. They were professionals in the military art. The natural law of righteousness was practiced in all facets of their culture and not just in their style of government! Again, proof, outside the Protagoras’ statement of the use of philosophy by the Spartans. This was true for the Doric Cretan republics as well.

In this respect, the serfdom of the indigenous people by the Doric Greeks in Crete and in Laconia points to the recognition of the principle of righteousness and it is the contention of this author that this was the impetus for migrating—to conquer a subject people in order to free themselves for the express purpose of concentrating on one job. Whereas the Hebrews genocided the indigenous people of Canaan and other European peoples displaced people from before them, the Doric Greeks practiced another way, instead of genociding or displacing, they subjugated the indigenous inhabitants in order to practice righteousness, the division of function in society in order to bring about perfection in their lifestyle.[[9]](#footnote-9) Philosophy, the application of the laws of nature, was inherent in the Doric reasoning of the migration. Moreover, with Homer noting the “thrice-divided” nature of the Dorians, one can say that philosophy was practiced by the Dorians deep in their history without any outside Eastern influences.

**THE BAREFOOT SOCRATES**

Let us turn from the historical and literary evidence to the life of Socrates.

In the *Phaedrus*, Plato draws a picture of Socrates meeting an acolyte outside the walls of Athens where Socrates directs them to meander along the Ilissus.[[10]](#footnote-10) Phaedrus comments on himself being barefoot and remarks “you of course always are so”. (§229a) Socrates is ALWAYS barefoot! Why is Plato painting this picture? Why is that there? What’s the importance of him being barefoot? If he is mentioning that, it means that going barefoot was not an Ionian cultural practice. Plato again mentions this peculiarity in the *Symposium* at §174 where it is noted that Socrates always went barefoot. Not only that but earlier in §173b there is another admirer of Socrates going barefoot. Why is Plato mentioning this? Why is this insignificant detail being regaled for?

Is Socrates going barefoot for “shits, grins, and giggles”? Is going barefoot a pleasure? Is going barefoot in rocky Hellas a stroll in the park? Is going barefoot a sign of irony? Or is he putting his money where his mouth is?

The barefootedness of Socrates is noted by many scholars, and academics. The Routledge entry for Socrates mentions this fact.[[11]](#footnote-11) Navia notes that Socrates went barefoot (p. 50), Robert Waterfield also registers this condition (p. 54), Fredrick Copleston, S.J. in his massive tome on philosophy’s history (p. 118) and the entry “Socrates” at the online *Stanford Encyclopædia of Philosophy* does.

Who else went barefoot?

The Spartans!

Xenophon in his *Constitution of the Lacedæmonians* documents this very fact about the Spartans. (II, 3-4) They went barefoot and wore one garment throughout the year.

Funny thing, two very different sources, Prof. Waterfield and the *Stanford Encyclopædia*, recognizes the fact that Socrates mannerisms were “Spartan”. The Stanford entry is this: “Socrates let his hair grow long, Spartan-style (even while Athens and Sparta were at war), and went about barefoot and unwashed, carrying a stick and looking arrogant”. Neither of them connected the dots to the statement in the *Protagoras*! Nor has anybody else. They have walked right over this mind-blowing clue. What does this say? Socrates is going barefoot and he is wearing “the same old coat” (Hamilton: *Symposium*, 220a-b) Socrates is imitating the Spartans! Is he imitating them for the sake of showing off? Socrates going barefoot puts the lie to the statements in the *Protagoras* as irony. One doesn’t go barefoot and walk on ice in the winter as a joke as he did at Potidæa. Plato wouldn’t have written that if it was a lie because many people living would not have accepted what he had written!

Socrates’ actions speak louder than words.

Also notice that Socrates acolytes also go around barefoot. What this shows is that philosophy was an ars *vivendi*, a living art, and Socrates, in order to do philosophy was following their ways.

Those are not the only parallels.

Socrates professes that he is “in the same service as the swans and dedicated to the same god”. (Hamilton: *Phaedo*, 85b) That god is Apollo. Apollo is the god of the Spartans and Cretans. It was the Doric Greeks that introduced Apollo to ancient Hellas. (Müller, Vol. I, 13; 219f; 235f; 248)[[12]](#footnote-12) Edith Hamilton relates that he is “the most Greek of all the gods”. (1962: 30)

Another consonant is Socrates lying down on the grass beside the Ilisus to hear Phaedrus recount the speech of another friend. Socrates is lying down in order to relax so that he may concentrate and contemplate at the same time while being enchanted by the beauty of the sky above. Xenophon recounts this same thing in his *Hellenica* where King Agesilaus and his entourage are lying down in the grass for a meeting with the Persian Satrap Pharnabasus (IV. I. 30, Loeb: 275) As the Asian way of contemplation is in the lotus position, lying down flat may have been the Doric way of contemplation. Sitting cross-legged for Asians is *au naturel*, but for taller, thicker Europeans that just may have been a tad too uncomfortable. The European Way is to lie down.

On top of Socrates personal witness, there is the portrait of Pythagoras that mirrors Socrates that doubles down on the Spartan connection. The coining of the term ‘philosophy’ is attributed to Pythagoras. (Maritain: xxi) Pythagoras visited both Crete and Sparta and he went around barefoot and ragged. (Burnett: 67; Ferguson: 126[[13]](#footnote-13)) Furthermore, Pythagoras only sacrificed at the altars of Apollo. (Müller: I, 331) Many of the institutions that were set up in their cities of Magna Graecia were patterned after the Spartan way. (Müller: II, 393-5) Porphyry passes on that the works of Pythagoras were written in Doric Greek and thus, the reason Pythagoreanism died out, was that no one understood the subtleties of that dialect. (§53) What we have here then is that Pythagoras is also an imitator of the Doric Greeks. It has been remarked that many see that Plato’s school was part of the Pythagorean tradition. (Burnet: 60-61) And just like Socrates so infuriated his kinsmen that they put him to death, so the citizens of Magna Graecia finally had run the Pythagoreans out of their cities.[[14]](#footnote-14) If Socrates had to sting the Athenians awake, how could the Ionians be the founders of Greek philosophy? Did anybody go to Sparta and sting them awake? If Pythagorean teachings were written in the Doric dialect, how is philosophy Ionian? All of the circumstantial evidence points to the Doric Greeks of Crete and Laconia as the authors of Greek philosophy.

There are other corollaries as well.

Above it was noted that Apollo was “the most Greek of all the Gods”, Apollo encompassed the totality of the Greek spirit and mentality, this idea of Apollo was Dorian and so the persona of the god demonstrates the Doric spirit. W. K. C. Guthrie notes that “Pythagoras was the foremost apostle of the Hellenic spirit” (pg 36) and who did he worship and who did he emulate? In the *Laches*, where Socrates is holding a conversation with a couple of Athenian generals no less, Plato has one of the generals exclaim that “the true Hellenic mode, …is Dorian”. (§188d) The Athenian general disregards the Ionian, Phrygian and other styles and points to the Doric type as exhibiting the true Hellenic mode. These two examples confirm the height of perfection, or *arete*, the grasp of the loftiest ideas within the culture of the Dorians. If these Doric cultural elements are the best, wouldn’t other things point to the Spartan practice of bringing all things they did to perfection? Xenophon praises the fact that nowhere else could one find the healthiest and handier men than in Sparta. (*Laced*.: V, 9; Loeb: 157) Do these examples sound as if Crete and Sparta was culturally backward? On the contrary, the example of Apollo and Pythagoras and the Athenian intelligentsia admiration for the Doric mode shows that they had the highest cultural values in the Hellenic world. The Greek spirit was essentially Doric.

At the end of his book, *Politics*, Aristotle starts on his theory of the best state. At the end of his discussion he takes up the matter of music. Aristotle counsels that “for education, as has been said, the ethical class of melodies and of harmonies must be employed. And of that nature is the Dorian mode…” (VIII., vii, 8; 1342a 25; Loeb, p. 673) He goes on to praise the Doric mode for it alone out all the modes out there for its manly character and its pursuit of “the mean between [the] extremes”. (VIII, vii, 10; 1342b 10; Loeb, p. 675) He recommends that all young pupils be educated in the Dorian mode. Aristotle notices a very peculiar aspect of the Dorian mode—its characteristic of the golden mean which is essential for virtue. It is also a Natural Law. Doric music incorporated this. Their whole culture was infused with the Natural Law.

Aristotle’s teachings on virtue are placed in the golden mean. In the above quoted section, Aristotle says “we ought to pursue the mean between the extremes.” This “pursuing the mean between the extremes” is the methodology of philosophers; it is the mentality of Aristotle. In the article “The Spartan Republic”, this author pointed out that Plato placed the Spartan politiea in the golden mean between Asian monarchical despotism and Athenian democracy. Aristotle confirmed that in his Politics when he said:

“This then is the mode of the mixture; and the mark of a good mixture of democracy and oligarchy is when it is possible to speak of the same constitution as a democracy and as an oligarchy; for manifestly the speakers feel this is so because the mixture is complete, and this is case with the form that lies in the middle, for each of the two extreme forms can be seen in it. **This is the case with the constitution of Sparta.**” (Aristotle: *Politics*, IV, vii 4-5; 1294b 15-20; Loeb, 321-323 ª)

Aristotle backs up Plato’s conclusion that the Spartan republic is of the golden mean. If parts make up the whole, then the character of the Spartans practicing virtue would have their state being a mirror of their spiritual character as Plato taught. As they were in the golden mean, their state was in the Golden Mean.

Again, Aristotle remarks that “one might praise the Spartans in respect to this, for they pay the greatest attention to the training of their children, and conduct it on a public system.” (VIII, i, 3; 1337a 30; Loeb, p. 637) In the whole of the ancient world, it was the Doric Greeks of Laconia and Crete that created a public school system. They created a very sophisticated educational system that habitualized their young into virtue, taught geometry, reading and writing, physical fitness, stamina and agility and trained their minds to philosophy. Their women were trained similarly. Was there anything like this anywhere in the ancient world? Is their educational system a sign of being ‘backward’?

When Plutarch has a list of sayings from Spartan men and women, is that a sign of cultural sterility? Is there a similar list of Athenians? Diogenes Laërtius’ bio of Socrates reads like the Plutarch’s sayings of Spartan men; it is full of witticisms of particular situations. And this brings another fact, Plato a couple of times quotes the Spartans: *Meno* §99d, *Phaedrus* §260e. Why quote them if the Spartans were illiterate imbeciles? It doesn’t make sense. It only makes sense if the Spartans were the home of Greek philosophy!

There are two other stories that belie the intellectual culture of the Spartans. K. O. Müller relates a story from Herodotus about “Anacharsis the Scythian [who] had visited the different states of Greece, and lived among them all, …reported to have said, that ‘all wanted leisure and tranquility for wisdom, except the Lacedæmonians, for these were the only persons with whom it was possible to hold a rational conversation’.” (II, p. 395).

Maybe one of the first science experiments ever conducted may have been Lycurgus when he took two puppies from two different breeds (depending on which story one chooses), one from a hunting breed and another from non-hunting breed. He trained the non-hunting breed to hunt and didn’t train the other. The story is told he showed his result to the people to convince them that it is education that imputes value to a thing; “education is more effective than birth to produce noble behavior.” (Talbert: 172) One can see science here, hypothesis is supposed, then a test, followed up by a conclusion. Their education system was based on a scientific test. It shows that decisions were based on scientific evidence. This is a sign of very high intelligence and wisdom. And we are to imagine that the Spartans were low-IQ idiots?

The Doric god of Apollo appears in the history of Pythagoras and Socrates. One must assume then that the practice of philosophy was tied to the temple and cult of Apollo. Heraclitus also exhibits these characteristics; he alludes to “the lord whose oracle at Delphi” and to “War is both father and king of all” and that “…all things come to pass through the compulsion of strife”. (Wheelwright, 70-71) Who was the god at Delphi? Apollo. What society was constructed around War? The Doric Greeks of Crete and Laconia. Who formed their societies around putting their classes in opposition with each other? The Doric Greeks of Crete and Laconia. The sentiments he sounds is Doric and not only the only god he mentions is Apollo, but that the populace, as in the case of Pythagoras and Socrates, hated him as well. Moreover, he mentions in the case of harmony, the bow and the lyre, two symbols of Apollo, are necessary. He would only know this if he was connected to the cult of Apollo. Both Aristotle and Hippolytus observe that Heraclitus and the Dorian Empedocles say almost the same things. (Wheelwright, 80, 87) His speech was noted for its “brevity and weightiness…” (Hicks, IX, #7) as befits Lacedæmonian speech. As Pythagoras and Thales are recorded to having visited Crete and Sparta, there seems to have been a lot of travelling done in those days. It can’t be dismissed that either Heraclitus travelled as well or became an acolyte of Apollo of a nearby temple because of the massive Doric migration throughout the Aegean part of the Mediterranean Sea.[[15]](#footnote-15)

It is very clear that philosophy is tied to the cult of Apollo. Where temples were built, philosophical teachings accompanied them. The cult of Apollo was not just about rituals but a certain teaching. If it is acknowledged the centrality of Apollo in philosophy of Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Socrates, it must also be accredited that the Dorians whose central god was Apollo produced those teachings.

What we have, is a ton of circumstantial and ancillary evidence outside the Protagoras statement to prove that Socrates was not being facetious, was not being ironic, nor is it an anomaly. There is the witness of Plutarch, Thucydides, and the Doric form of classical republicanism. There is Socrates and Pythagoras imitating the Cretans and Spartans in their barefootedness, the wearing of one cloak and then their membership in the cult of Apollo. There is the lying down to philosophize. And then there is other cultural evidence that exhibits their high culture. Finally, the Protagoras statement becomes just icing on the cake.

**THE PROTAGORAS SECTION**

The first paragraph of the Protagoras section begins thusly:

“The most ancient and fertile homes of philosophy among the Greeks are Crete and Sparta, where are to be found more sophists than anywhere on earth. …they pretend to be fools.”

Then, he explains their methodology of hiding their wisdom and ends the paragraph with this:

“And in these states there are not only men but also women who are proud of their intellectual culture”.

Now to remark upon the “proudness” of the people requires personal observation! This is not something one discovers studying secondary sources especially since if one remembers, they wrote nothing down. If the first sentence existed alone and without circumstantial evidence, then it could be considered ironic. But to notice the Spartan and Cretan pride in their intellectual culture is observable only when one listens to them personally. Socrates (and therefore Plato who wrote this) must have observed that firsthand. This fact is not known thru historical investigation of literary remains but had to be seen and heard directly and firsthand.

The second paragraph begins with a declarative statement “this is how you may know that I am telling the truth that the Spartans are the best educated in Philosophy and speaking.” Now, if the Protagoras statement is ironic, what is this “know that I am telling the truth” in there? You don’t back up an ironic statement! You don’t join an irony with “telling the truth”. This phrase “telling the truth” nullifies irony! How this was passed on as irony is unbelievable!

Next, Socrates continues “If you talk to the most ordinary Spartan, you will find that for most of the time he shows himself a quite unimpressive speaker. But then, at some chance point in the conversation, like a brilliant marksman, he shoots in a telling phrase, brief and taut, showing up whoever is talking to him to be as helpless as a child”.

Is this statement ironic? NO. This is another incidence of personal experience of Socrates and Plato. This is not, again, due to interpretation of an historical record, but is due to a close interaction with these people in conversation! These are first-hand accounts. Notice that Socrates points out that it is the “most ordinary Spartan”. If one takes Plutarch as saying Lycurgus created a “complete philosophic state” then that means that Sparta produced generations of philosophers; the major goal of the agoge was not only physical fortitude, agility but also mental acuity and a philosophical disposition. Their whole state was a country of philosophers for over centuries! Their most ordinary Spartans are, in Socrates/Plato’s words, **the best** in philosophy and in speaking. When Plato writes that the full stature of a man is only attained when he has a complete use and grasp of wisdom, the agoge was formed to produce that. Every Spartiate was trained to be a philosopher; how else to maintain a highly sophisticated governmental system over the centuries without the *anakyklosis* occuring? Second, we have an eye-witness to how they spoke. If found in a conversation, they “like a brilliant marksman, shoots in a telling phrase”. This “telling phrase” is what is called the essence. Maritain describes Socratic philosophy as “the philosophy of essences” because he “required that the essential should in all cases be distinguished from the accidental”. He continues that “Socrates’ aim was to attain the proper intellectual expression of everything”. (p. 37) Maritain analyzes the Socratic method as helping his interlocutors find their proper object, that of “to seek essences and the definition of things”, for definitions are a type of essence. Because, as related earlier, of the bastardization of the historical record of philosophy, the French Catholic thinker Jacques Maritain thinks that Socrates invented this form of searching for essences thus perfecting Pre-Socratic Thought. With the Protagoras section, it is now known (or the record can be corrected) that Socrates did not invent or create this. This was already being done by who? …the most ordinary Spartans. How then in God’s name did the Protagoras section get passed off as ironic? …or a joke? …or an anomaly?

Socrates lays out more history: “…namely that to be Spartan implies a taste for intellectual rather than physical exercise, for they realize that to frame such utterances is of the highest culture”.

**“The Highest culture”.**

Through what has to be two recorded personal experiences, barefoot Socrates concludes that their pursuit of mental perfection is of the Highest culture. The whole of the Spartan state is geared toward arête and arête is only achieved when every aspect, every part has arête; this includes the mind.[[16]](#footnote-16) The pursuit of arête means that all the parts have to have arête. If the human being is to have arête, then, the body, the mind and the soul must also have arête. To form arête in the person is of the Highest culture. Remember this is Plato who is writing; he is a second witness. Plato, after the death of Socrates left Athens for over a decade and travelled. What is this “high culture”? It is the use of their mind to grasp the essence of the subject at hand; the Spartans were famous for their creation of apothegms and proverbs. Why was it of the highest culture—because they cultivated their minds. Arete is formed out of ‘agon’—out of struggle. Just like they put their bodies thru struggle to achieve physical arête, in the principle of macrocosm/microcosm, they formed their minds thru mental gymnastics thus perfecting an intellectual culture. The German scholar Karl Otfried Müller writes that Sparta was the home of the riddle (II, 392) and “…that up to the time of the Persian War all mental excellence, so far from being banished from Sparta, flourished there in the utmost perfection”. (II, 395) Proverbs and riddles were the way in which the ancient understanding of wisdom was conducted. (John Franklin)

Then, Socrates does do historical research and points to the Seven Sages of Greece. Their teachings were all ensconced in “pithy and memorable dicta”. He further elaborates that they were all “emulators, admirers, and disciples of Spartan culture and that their wisdom may be recognized as belonging to the same category”.

This is historical research of early philosophy. In the last line of the subject, Plato has Socrates say that “this laconic brevity was the characteristic expression of philosophy”. First, Socrates lays out a premise that it is Crete and Sparta are the most ancient and fertile home of philosophy. Second, he lays out what one may call, not one, but two personal experiences. One being their pride in their intellectual culture and the second, a skill to get at the nub of a conversation. If these two proofs are not good enough, he then resorts to historical research and points out that early philosophy was formed in laconic brevity.

Does one do irony with personal experiences and historical research?

But is that enough? When Socrates mentions that the Seven Sages of Greece were “emulators, admirers and disciples of Spartan culture”, is he not proving this when he, himself, is going barefoot, thinly clad and belonging to their cult? Is he not putting teeth into this with the example of his own life? Is he not setting the example? In the Protagoras section, Socrates stipulates that the Seven Sages of Greece were all emulators, admirers and disciples of Spartan culture. Is Socrates so shallow that he is just copying their shoeless custom? What about his commitment to Apollo? Socrates’ own way of life puts teeth and steel to his words. He lived that statement and it shows that Socrates is not a liar; he is not being ironic; he is not being facetious; it is not an anomaly. Socrates' way of life proves his statement. This Protagoras section is not a forgery. Not only that, but Socrates shows the concrete essence of philosophy as imitation.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Socrates, following in the footsteps of the Seven Sages, himself, is an emulator, admirer and disciple of Spartan culture. If he is going barefoot…, If he is wearing but one coat…, If he is a devotee of Apollo…, Is he not also imitating their intellectual culture? Or are we to believe that Socrates imitated their outside appearance and not their mental habits, ideas and ethics as well? If he went that far to go barefoot and was a devotee to Apollo, that means he also went further and adopted their intellectual culture and values as well. To be a devotee of Apollo was to carry the values and ethics of Apollo. The so-called Socratic elenchus is not of Socrates; it is Doric; it was borrowed from their culture. It is the Doric elenchus. Testing of thought was throughout their culture. (*Protagoras*: §348a; Plutarch cited by Müller: II, 390) Another thing that is most probably borrowed from the Spartans is the watching of tradesmen at their jobs. Watching tradesmen was probably a part of the agoge and was used as an educational tool for comprehending the Natural Law. Socrates is copying their philosophic life in all of its details as much as possible for not having grown up in that system. When we view Socrates and his methods, we are watching what was done in the agoge to train their boys into the philosophic life. In a later section of the Protagoras (§347e-§348a), Plato writes “The best people avoid such discussions and entertain each other with their own resources…These are the people, in my opinion, whom you and I should follow”. These “best people” are the Spartans that he is alluding to and he further counsels to follow them!

He ends the Protagoras section with this declaration: “I mention these facts”. Twice in this subject section, Socrates uses statements of veracity; first he says “that you may know I am telling the truth” and then concludes with, “I mention these facts”. Two statements of personal integrity about the honesty of the situation. He may be joking in some sections throughout the Platonic dialogues where he professes his ignorance but here, Socrates is stepping out of character, he really does, and professes strongly that he knows something. He is not asking others to believe what he says is true because he said it—he proves it by telling of two personal experiences and historical research and *then living it*! Socrates is not asking anyone to believe him on his personal integrity or his authority—but on FACTS. Facts that are then backed up on his personal integrity as being true.

There is absolutely no way on God’s green earth that the Protagoras section is irony, a forgery or even an anomaly. The Protagoras section is a statement of fact. With all the circumstantial and ancillary evidence presented earlier, one may quibble and some may disagree. But here, there are declarative statements backed up by two personal experiences and one of historical research. Then these statements are assisted by two claims of personal integrity. Moreover, when he states that the Seven Sages of Greece were emulators, admirers, and disciples of the Spartans, Socrates in his life is living this exactly. This only makes the circumstantial and ancillary evidence, oh—so much stronger!

The Protagoras statement gives teeth to the circumstantial and ancillary evidence while the circumstantial and ancillary evidence backup the Protagoras statement. It is an ironclad case.

The witness of Thucydides, Plutarch, and Socrates with the presence of the Doric Greek republican form of government proves their possession of philosophy.[[18]](#footnote-18) Just because the emulator Socrates said that Crete and Sparta is the home of Greek philosophy means that it is just another nail in the coffin; another fact in a sea of facts; it is just more confirmation which is out in the open—no need of guessing or building suppositional arguments! Prof. Navia writes that Plato was familiar with all the doctrines of the early philosophers such as Heraclitus, Parmenides, Hermogenes, Euclid and Pythagoras and that Plato had “grasped with unparalleled depth the philosophical contributions of earlier philosophers”. (p. 98) Navia posits that Plato’s travels to Sicily and Southern Italy confirmed him in his studies in early philosophy. (Is it also very possible that Plato visited Crete and Sparta in those missing years?) In other words, Plato, according to Navia, is an expert in early Greek philosophy and as the author of the Protagoras section, he would also be an expert in this regard. The Protagoras section is NOT an anomaly!

**DORIC/SOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY**

This becomes important now because of what Socrates is attempting to do, the reason for his death and the philosophy he taught. When the best champion and scholar of Sparta in academia, Prof. Müller, characterizes the Protagoras statement of Socrates as “half in joke and half in earnest”, (II, 388) even he hasn’t grasped the import of Socrates and why he finds Aristotle’s definition of a ‘politeia’ as strange. In the previous paper, “Doric Crete and Sparta, the home of Greek philosophy”, it was stated:

Socratic philosophy is really Doric philosophy. Socrates recounts in the *Protagoras* that the Seven Sages of Greece were all "emulators, admirers, and disciples of Spartan culture". (§343 b) Socrates is continuing in this line of tradition, this way of life, this profession; a profession of wisdom. In order to be wise, Socrates himself becomes “an emulator, admirer and disciple of Spartan culture.” Furthermore to become wise, he followed their ways like the Seven before him.

It can be safely and concretely determined now that Socratic philosophy is Doric philosophy. Doric philosophy entailed some very important points.

“By philosophy the Greeks meant a serious endeavour to understand the world and man, having for its chief aim the discovery of the right way of life and the conversion of people to it”. (Burnet, 58)

After the attainment of knowledge, the second goal of philosophy was to become a missionary. The story of Plato’s cave exhibits this two part process of philosophy. The first part is the renunciation of shadows, the ascension to knowledge; i.e. moving toward the light. The second part is that when once one has become a philosopher, he must then return back into the cave and lead others out or in Socrates’ words “to midwife” the cure. He is about freeing them from their bodily, sensory shackles, from their opinions. Burnet sees this role in the Pythagoreans who thru their asceticism gain their soul’s salvation and then seek “to convert other men”. (p. 66) It can be imagined the same case existed with Heraclitus and Pythagoras. Socrates was in this vein of work. Socrates was returning to the Cave of Athens. In the *Apology*, he states it was his duty to “sting the Athenians awake”; Socrates had a mission to perform.[[19]](#footnote-19) Socrates was a missionary of Doric philosophy.

And what was that mission?

The accusation leveled at his trial and the Platonic and Xenophonic dialogues teach us about his mission. The accusation at the trial was about rejecting the old gods of the state and bringing in new gods.

To understand the atheist charges against him, it is necessary to understand one line in *The Republic*:

“…that a city established on **principles of nature** would be wise as a whole.” (Hamilton, 1963, 670: *Resp*. §428eª)

These “principles of nature” is what is called the Natural Law. [[20]](#footnote-20) Plutarch along with a few other modern academics recognizes that Plato’s *Republic* is based on Sparta. Sparta’s government was built around principles and patterns discovered in nature. This is also key in understanding the word philosophy. Socrates in the *Phaedrus* says that the epitaph of wise is “proper only to a god” (§278d) so that men only appropriate that wisdom and so are only “lovers of wisdom”. Pythagoras, also a philodorian, is also attributed to saying the same thing. (Maritain quoting Cicero and Diogenes Laertius: xxi)

We know a cobbler by the shoes he builds. We know a mason by the stonework he creates. We know a carpenter by the furniture he makes. Swiss watches are called by the adjective “Swiss” because of their attention to detail and their extreme accuracy; Swiss watches are head-and-above the rest. To label something a Swiss watch is the sign of perfection and excellency compared to the rest. We know the creator by the thing he builds. The study of any craftsman would tell you that. This is what nature teaches.

So where is God’s wisdom found?

"How great are thy works, O Lord! in wisdom (sophia) hast thou wrought them all;..." (LXX, Psalm 103.24)

....in Nature! From the thing God created.[[21]](#footnote-21) The Sophia of God is found in Nature for the Logos created it all as St. John in his Gospel dictates:

“In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God. He was in the beginning with God; all things were made through Him, and without him was not anything made that was made”. (Nestle-Aland, John 1-3)

The Doric Greeks stumbled upon, discovered, something so miraculous, so marvelous, so new, and so stupendous that they organized their society around it. It is they who discovered the cosmos. Heraclitus, who is passing on Doric philosophy from the earliest, times inscribes:

* “Although this Logos is eternally valid, yet men are unable to understand it…all things come to pass in accordance with this Logos.” (Wheelwright, 69)
* “Wisdom is one—to know the intelligence by which all things are steered through all things.” (Wheelwright, 79) ª

It is the Wisdom of God that created the cosmos. A reason is found in nature.
The Greeks called this ‘Logos’. Philosophy is the Love of the Logos. Philosophy is the Love of the Sophia in the Natural Order. Philosophy is the Love of the Sophia of God. As nature is ordered by the Logos, everything the Doric Greeks did was ordered to the Logos; their religion, their morals and their metaphysics. The Logos, found in nature, defined those things. Prof. Inge writes:

“The conception of philosophy as an *ars vivendi* is characteristically Greek. Nothing can be further from the truth than to call the Greeks ‘intellectualists’ in the disparaging sense in which the word is now often used. The object of philosophy was to teach a man to live well, and with that object to think rightly about God, the world, and himself. [There is a] close union between metaphysics, morals and religion”. (p. 45 º)

The first sentence needs to be corrected. The conception of philosophy as an *ars vivendi* is NOT characteristically Greek—but Dorian. This is Doric culture and civilization of Crete and Laconia. These three areas, religion, morals and metaphysics are all incorporated in Doric philosophy because nature touched all of these. Their metaphysics were borrowing The Logos hidden in nature. Socrates as a devotee of Apollo was bringing this new message that is ensconced in their religion, morals and metaphysics. As Socrates was a devotee of Apollo, so he was the missionary of Doric philosophy. Socrates engaged these three areas in Athenian life.

In Religion:

Prof. W. R. Inge writes that “Nature, for Plato, is God’s vicegerent and revealer, the Soul of the universe.” (p. 56) Nature is the revealer of God. Socrates was a missionary of a new idea of god that contradicted the established Athenian gods. Whereas even the Olympian gods were products of the poets, Socrates’ god was the one behind nature; the one who built nature. The god Apollo was not your normal Olympian god. He was not an Olympian. A clue resides in Plutarch where he dissects the name of Apollo and that maybe it means “not many”. Apollo really means “not many gods”. Socrates was preaching this new god for it was “according to nature” and thus superior and right. Socrates was preaching a monotheist god. (Copleston, 133; Ehrlich, 19-20)[[22]](#footnote-22) This is alluded to by Anaxagoras who said that “Mind” (nous) was behind all things. (*Phaedo*: §97b-c) There is one order in nature and so there is one Mind that produces that one order. The Dorians conceived of their god by looking at nature.[[23]](#footnote-23) It was Nature that taught them about god, His oneness and his tripartiteness as well. This is what Socrates was teaching, a god based on science, on the principles of nature. It was a new god, not an elementary god, not an Olympian god, but the God of Nature. Of course it attacked the Olympian gods but it wasn’t atheism. “For a Pythagorean there was a unity to truth. The path to knowledge about the universe and the path to reunion with the divine were one and the same path. Truth about nature, and divine truth, were one and the same truth.” (Ferguson, 103)

A further difference is that the god Apollo was a moral god. This God didn’t rape women, murder, engage in gossip and backstabbing. The logic of being Good, guided the conception of Apollo: Nature’s God is only the author of good and never evil. This is why Socrates demands that the poets be censored. God is the author of Good and nothing else. The God of Nature was head and above any of the Olympian gods. This was the God Socrates was preaching. And he was put to death for this.

In Ethics:

Along with proselytizing a new god, Socrates other part to his mission was to get people to think of their “mental and moral well-being” (*Apology*: §36c); to care for one’s soul for philosophy offers “liberation and purification” (*Phaedo*: §82d). For the end goal of philosophy is to “spend the rest of time with God”. (*Phaedo*: §81a) This is called theosis and is derived from two principles in nature called macrocosm/microcosm (Wheeler: 2011)[[24]](#footnote-24) and Like to Like. In order for that to happen, man must in all respects be “like God”. This means that man must perfect his “divine nature” over and above his animal instincts.[[25]](#footnote-25) What man resembles God in, is his reason but man was also recognized as part of the animal kingdom. (*Gorgias*: 516b) Man has two natures; one divine and one animal. In order for man to be with God, he has to perfect his divine nature and his reason, which is the divine part, and in turn the divine part must control his animal drives. This is the whole story behind the charioteer and his three horses in Plato’s *Republic*. This is what Plato was driving at; for man’s animal drives prevent him from friendship with God. Reason must control the animal part. And for that to happen, Reason must have the tools to subjugate the Animal.

There is a secondary need for mental and moral well-being. The soul must be cleansed in order for it “to get a clear view of facts”. (*Phaedo*: §65c) “Like produces like” is a proverb continuously repeated throughout the Platonic texts.[[26]](#footnote-26) It is a Law of Nature or if you like a “principle of nature”. As Homer’s principle, a Natural Law, “the rule of one is best” is the core of the religious part (it drives the monotheist part), “Like produces Like” is a Natural Law that is the core of the ethics/morality portion. In order to know reality, one must be real. One must cut himself off as much as possible from his eyes and ears and virtually all the rest of his body, because a man who pursues the truth must apply his pure and unadulterated thought to the pure and unadulterated object. (paraphrase *Phaedo*: §66) Connect this with Empedocles statement above that “…many are the evils that burst in and blunt the edge of attentive thought”. It is about knowing reality and dispersing the shadows of the world. Again, in order to know the good, one must be good for all things are by nature; like produces like.

And why is ethics important? That those people who are bad bring ruin to one’s own home and in the principle of macrocosm/microcosm, as one brings ruin to one’s home, one also brings destruction to one’s body and soul. (paraphrase, Xenophon, *Memorabilia*: I, v, 3) This is the whole *raison d’etre* of Plato’s Republic. The spiritual structure of a man is mirrored in the life of the state. Xenophonic Socrates alludes to the Spartan state when he says that the wisest and most enduring of human institutions, cities and nations are the most god-fearing. (*Memorabilia*: I, iv, 16) The most god-fearing city of the Hellenic world was Sparta. Being good has political effect. In the *Apology*, Socrates states a basic moral methodology that wicked people have a bad effect upon those they are around and that good people exhibit a good effect. (§25c)

In the *Memorablia*, Socrates does a study of animals and man and his sense organs and comes to the conclusion that they are the result of forethought. He asks if these are by “chance or design”. (I, iv, 6) The answer that Xenophon puts in the mouth of Aristodemus is that “they do look very like the handiwork of a wise and loving creator.” It is by going to nature that we know god. And this is called “wisdom”. It is by wisdom that the things in earth work the way they do. Man becomes wise when he appropriates the hidden wisdom in nature.

By acknowledging then, the sovereignty of the one who made everything, …we are obligated to honor him, and they in turn would “counsel you in matters hidden from man”. (I, iv, 18) This “counsel” is what one would call “enlightenment” or “inspiration”. As Xenophon points out, and it would be the point of the Doric Greeks, God does interfere in the lives of men; He helps them. This is borne out in the real life of Socrates’ Daemon guiding him. This counsel or enlightenment will take many different forms like plain inspiration for one. But one must be good, honor the gods, become like God, so one can receive help from Him.

Socrates in his argument against suicide substantiates it by referring to the teachings of mystics who say, “…the gods are our keepers, and we men are one of their possessions.”[[27]](#footnote-27) (Phaedo: §62b) To be a friend of God is to be good like God is good. Moreover, only the good can attain the Truth.

One of Socrates most important teachings is Virtue. (By the way, Virtue was practiced in Sparta for Lycurgus demanded the practice of all citizens when in public in his commonwealth.) The Greek word is arête; arête means excellence, or perfection. (Jaeger) Virtue is the cloth of the divine. It is what clothes the soul.

*That is the reason why a man should be of good cheer about his own soul, if during life he has ignored the pleasures of the body and its ornamentation as of no concern to him and doing him more harm than good, but has seriously concerned himself with the pleasures of learning, and adorned his soul not with alien but its own ornaments, namely, moderation, righteousness, courage, freedom and truth* ..." (Mason, quoting *Phaedo* 114d-115a2)

What is moderation, righteousness, and courage? Virtues. At death, when the soul is separated from the body, the soul takes its virtue with it. The soul is clothed in Virtue, in excellence. This is why the Spartans called a good man “divine”; he was godlike. (*Meno*, 99d; Hamilton, 1963, 383)

Socrates struggled hard with the people to understand a single standard, i.e. meaning, to the definitions of the words they used; otherwise, the misuse of words, or one’s own concoction of meaning lead to moral anarchy. (Guthrie: 78) Socrates demanded single order in the language because the cosmos had a single order. The third leg of the Doric elenchus was based on the macrocosm/microcosm principle that throughout the cosmos there is consistency from one sphere to the next. The same laws operate on all the spheres. The right use of words was a necessary component of ethics and of being good. Because only the good can attain the Truth.

In Metaphysics:

Though this is the last of the sections, it actually feeds the first two. There is a close union between religion, ethics and metaphysics. All three of these fields are intertwined for they feed each other. What unites them all is the Natural Law that undergirds them.

Doric philosophy begins with this: “What does Nature teach?” In the *Timaeus*, Plato lays down that “the nature of the universe” is the source where they have derived philosophy. (§47a-b)

Scientific knowledge begins on the back of facts. As was stated in the signature referenced article, philosophy is based on reading reality. Truth is “the faithful representation of reality”; the key word is “faithful”. It is about “the goal of reality” (Phaedo: §66a) It is related that Socrates had “the skill to draw his arguments from facts.” (Hicks: II, §29) Nature teaches Facts. Facts are the building blocks of deductive and inductive reasoning. No facts—no deductive or inductive reasoning!

“All knowledge is in pyramid form with facts as the foundational stones of the edifice of knowledge.”

From the study of Nature that facts provide is the apprehension of the Natural Law. From there, with the use of the Mind’s eye, the Natural Law or laws of nature are perceived; these are metaphysical; they lie underneath or in physical beings. Metaphysics is the physics beyond the physical concrete manifestations; it is the physics of the unseen world, the world of eternals.

The “**principles of nature**.” (Hamilton, 1963, 670: *Resp*. §428eª)

(q.v. Appendix V)

The phrase “law of nature” is first used in the *Phaedo* §71e. Finding the laws of nature includes two fields, actually looking at the world of nature of matter and animals and the second the world of human beings, the study of their interactions and works. These principles are then appropriated into human thought to create reasoned thought. This is far different from rationalizations. There should be a new distinction made; reasoning is based on principles of the Natural Law; the Natural Law is the logos used in a sort of mathematical way. The Natural Law is a standard, the measuring device of what one says is true or not. “Plato had said, ‘The only standard today [speaking of the sophists and demogogues of Athens] is the pleasure of the hearers no matter what sort of men they are’, but ‘those are blind who have no clear standard, and the divine is the eternal measure’.” (Hamilton, 1957, 42) The Natural Law is the divine in nature. Rationalizations are a man’s reasoning that doesn’t have the natural law—doesn’t utilize the natural law; rationalizations are opinions. Case in point, Euthyphro expresses his rationalizations for bringing his father to court in the death of a slave. As can be plainly seen his rationalizations and his definition of terms is cockeyed; they are all wrong from head to foot. Socrates comes in and attempts to have Euthyphro use scientific language of terms and the use of the Natural Law in his reasonings; so that Euthyphro can apprehend truthfully what he is attempting to do, mirror true justice and have a better case with the possibility of winning in court.

As Homer’s “The rule of one is best” that guides the theology sphere, as the “Like to Like” guides the ethics sphere, the principle/system of macrocosm/microcosm guides the metaphysical sphere. The principle of macrocosm/microcosm is that “things repeat”; from one sphere to the next, principles, laws and patterns are repeated. (Wheeler, 2011) In the principle of macrocosm/microcosm, what operates the physical world—also operates the unseen world. As the natural law operates the physical world, the natural law also operates theology and ethics. One transports what one learns from Nature into the realm of the unseen, thru the principle of macrocosm/microcosm and then know exactly how the unseen works as well. Much of the Platonic dialogues are about the battle between true knowledge arrived at scientifically and opinion. Men rationalize everything they do but opinion is not science. When the Logos is applied into human reasoning, one can be assured of scientifically approaching Truth.

Metaphysics is the use of the Natural Law in the unseen world.

Not only is the Natural Law metaphysical in and of itself, it is also the parameters of human metaphysical thought. It is the ability to arrive at truth in the eternal unseen world with the use of the Mind’s eye.

If anything the most consequential thing for Socrates is that

All things are a science.

Science requires true knowledge and true knowledge is based on (1) facts and (2) the grasp of essence; the core of a thing. If that is the case then theology, ethics and metaphysics are all approached as science and they are sciences. This is what Socrates (and the Spartans) learned when observing the vanavsos (banausos),[[28]](#footnote-28) the tradesmen and manufacturers of products. To be a cobbler requires science of not only of what type of materials to use but how to put them together to produce a shoe. It takes a science to cure the skin of animals to be turned into leather usable by human beings. To be a stone mason requires science of the use of tools, what material is best and the skill of striking. And on and on it goes. For tradesmen, every field requires scientific knowledge and skill to produce.

~~Greek~~ Doric philosophy in its metaphysical state is the use of the Natural Law seamlessly infused in the reason of humans. The Natural Law in the cosmos is the Logos. In other words, the Logos of the cosmos is appropriated by humans; it is the borrowing of the wisdom hidden in nature. It is important to repeat what Plato says in the *Timaeus*, philosophy is derived from the nature of the universe. (§47a-b) Prof. Guthrie summarizes Pythagorean/Doric thought:

“Pythagoras, being by nature a philosopher, argued that if we want to identify ourselves with the living cosmos, to which we believe ourselves to the essentially akin, then while not neglecting the old religious rules, we must first and foremost study its ways and find out what it is like. This in itself will bring us closer to it, as well as enabling us to conduct our lives in closer conformity to the principles which it reveals. Just as the Universe is a *kosmos*, or ordered whole, so Pythagoras believed that each one of us is a *kosmos* in miniature. We are organisms which reproduce the structural principles of the macrocosm.” (pg. 37 º)

This is metaphysics: going beyond the material shadow world, and finding transcendent principles that undergird the cosmos. (q.v. Appendix V) Socrates uses the natural law of “like to like” in its various forms, macrocosm/microcosm, righteousness, “Hard is it to be Noble” in its various forms, telos, and the Golden Mean in his arguments. The Doric elenchus uses the natural law of righteousness that upholds the principle of identity, Parmenides principle of non-contraction and the principle of consistency that is derived from the natural law principle of macrocosm/microcosm. Through the principle of macrocosm/microcosm, the teaching that all things repeat, one can view the hidden realm of spirit and lower invisible physical spheres scientifically.

As an example that most can quickly grasp, everybody and their cousins know that Nature kills off the weak. What do the weak lack? Prof. Guthrie has an interesting take on the word “arête” which is usually translated as virtue. He summarizes Pythagoras teaching as being “Full and efficient life depends on organization”. (p. 37) Guthrie makes arête mean “efficient”. (p. 8) Evil in the personal individual marked by the disorder of language which is a symbol of thought makes one inefficient and thus without virtue. The same disorder causes a society to be dysfunctional. Dysfunctionality brings about death. The weak and the ignorant lack virtue. Socrates taught that self-control and integrity make for good citizens. (*Phaedo*: §82a-b) Self-control which is the obeying of limits and integrity are virtues necessary for citizenship and the life of society.

Aristotle writes “The main species of beauty are orderly arrangement, proportion, and definiteness:…” (*Metaphysics*: XIII, iii, 11) The main species of beauty are derived from nature; it is “what Nature teaches”. The attainment of definiteness in language was central to Socrates. In that case, the essence of a thing must be comprehended correctly. Maritain describes Socrates demand that “the essential should in all cases be distinguished from the accidental” and that words must be “fitted exactly the outline and structure of reality”. (p. 37) It was by this methodology using the Natural Law that he attacked opinions and ignorance and enforced a scientific approach to all things, religion, ethics and knowledge.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Language as well, has to be treated and used scientifically, i.e. professionally. Horkheimer and Adorno recognize in Homer’s *Odyssey* that “Stupidity and lawlessness share a common definition…” (p. 51; Odyssey 9.428) It is not the lawlessness of morality but the lawlessness in the mind. Language is the sign of the mind. Language that is inconsistent, language that contradicts, language that is imprecise, language that is confusing is a sign of this lawlessness. The lawless mind is a concomitant of foolhardiness. Wisdom is allied to Beauty and just like Beauty, the mind must hold order, proportion and definiteness, i.e. clarity [[30]](#footnote-30) in its thoughts. It is logocentric.

The Fourth part in the mission of Socrates: Combat the Sophists.

“I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,

And the cleverness of the clever I will thwart.” [[31]](#footnote-31)

St. Paul quoting a line each from Isaiah and The Psalms encapsulates Socrates fourth part to his mission. In more ways than one, Socrates’ (and Plato’s) mission was divine and it was also to combat the sophists. (Guthrie: 71) [[32]](#footnote-32) The Sophists, as what the name implies, where the wise men of Greece. They were also known for their cleverness. But the Sophists were known for something else, teaching anything to anybody without any scruples and charging for their services. Their aim was solely to help the student achieve worldly desires of position, power or wealth. The Roman Catholic Jacque Maritain characterizes the Sophist with “a vicious attitude of the mind”. (p. 31) Socrates, the teacher that he was, immediately recognized their malice, “All knowledge, when separated from justice and virtue, is seen to be cunning and ***not*** wisdom”. (*Menexenus*: §247 ª) Despite the word “sophist” in their name, they were merchants of cunning.

Socrates point is that man must direct his life around the unseen things of life, his soul and God; to the higher things in life as befits man’s divine nature. To not perfect one’s own divine life and live rightly was injustice, *adikia*.

Another facet, the Sophists for the most part were atheists and materialists. On the other hand, the Socratic School at Athens, Socrates, Plato and Xenophon, were all god-believers. And in Xenophon’s treatise *On Hunting*, at the very end, curiously is a parallel to the Platonic dialogues and their critique of the sophists:

“We have never seen anywhere the man whose goodness was due to the sophists of our generation. Neither do their contributions to literature tend to make men good: but they have written many books on frivolous subjects, books that offer the young empty pleasures, but put no virtue into them. To read them in the hope of learning something from them is mere waste of time, and they keep one from useful occupations and teach what is bad. Therefore their grave faults incur my graver censure. As for their writings, I complain that the language is far-fetched, and there is no trace in them of wholesome maxims by which the young might be trained to virtue”. (xiii, 1-2f)

Who coined “maxims”? It was the Doric Greeks. Maxims is what carried the Natural Law, i.e. early philosophy. Xenophon who was in love with Spartan culture and who wrote this after his time with King Agesilaus and living in the environs of Sparta probably is expressing Spartan sentiment as well. Along with atheists, Epicureans were forbidden in Sparta (Rawson: 85) and sophists probably weren’t welcomed either. Xenophon continues to call them “masters of the art of deception” and he reiterates that he will not call them “philosophers”.[[33]](#footnote-33)

What is missed by most is that Socrates and Plato preface the term ‘philosophy’ with the word ‘true’. This happens more than once. The phrase occurs at *Phaedo* §64e “I think the true philosopher despises them” so it is intimated that a true philosopher is one who keeps his attention “toward the soul”. At §80e that one “pursued philosophy in the right way”. §82c “…why true philosophers abstain from all bodily desires”. And on to §83b and §83e. In the *Republic*, Plato has Socrates repeat those arguments from the Phaedo, when the argument is proffered “Whom do you mean, then, by the true philosophers”. (§475e)[[34]](#footnote-34) For Socrates in a sense says not all who say ‘Lord, Lord’ will enter the kingdom of heaven—only some people “DESERVE the appellation of philosophers or lovers of wisdom” (*Resp*., §476a-b ª) Not everybody or anybody who thinks and writes is a philosopher. Plato (and hence the Spartans) were very concerned that no one hijacked their way of life for nefarious agendas.

True philosophers are those who “welcome true being” (§480a); “are capable of apprehending that which is eternal and unchanging” (§484b){which is the natural law}; “fix their eyes on absolute truth”; [know] “the laws of the beautiful, the just, and the good” (§484c-d) and which have grasped “that essence which is eternal”. (§485b) A philosopher is one who has a “reluctance to admit falsehood in any form, the hatred of it and the love of truth”.[[35]](#footnote-35) (§485c) This leaves out materialists.

The Sophists did not have any of the above. They did not care for the Truth, only what furthered their and their students’ personal agendas of self-gratification.[[36]](#footnote-36) People assume titles to themselves all the time. Just because Johnny said so, doesn’t make it so. Many people impressed with Doric teachings and were enamored of them or were taught second or third hand those things abrogated to themselves the title “philosopher”. [[37]](#footnote-37) Plato made sure in his dialogues to stop this misrepresentation. Socrates and Plato’s mission was to preserve the exclusiveness of philosophy to certain parameters of its origin.

In the *Protagoras*, who was a sophist, Socrates is engaging Protagoras over Simonides attack and campaign to undercut Pittacus statement “Hard is it to be noble”. Pittacus is a member of the Seven Sages of Greece and as such is an admirer, emulator and disciple of Spartan culture. What Socrates is doing is defending Pittacus’ statement which one can see was the bedrock of Doric Crete and Spartan culture. Sophists were the skeptics/relativists/materialists[[38]](#footnote-38)/rebels of their day; constantly undermining the society they lived in; they are pretenders to the art of philosophy. The Sophists were the deconstructionists of their day; the Jacques Derridas’s of their era. (And to this point, Diogenes Laërtius damaged philosophy when he labeled everybody a philosopher. DL labeled Protagoras a philosopher!)

True philosophy is those that have a love of the truth and a hatred of lies. True philosophy deals in the eternal and the unseen world. True philosophy is a way of life. Many people don’t have those parameters. Socrates, Plato and Xenophon were protecting the Doric/Apolline patrimony of true philosophy from the corruption of charlatans. They were protecting the Way of Doric philosophy by being hijacked by people of shady, vicious, imperfect characters, from agendas foreign to its original intention. Socrates was doing the Lord’s work by destroying sophistry and the cleverness of the clever.

Fifth, Living Philosophy

Philosophy is lived; it is an *ars vivendi*. As was discussed in the paper “Macrocosm/Microcosm in Doric Thought”, imitation is central to the life of philosophy. It is man’s business “to contemplate the cosmos and imitate it”. (Cicero) The Seven Sages of Greece and Socrates were all emulators, disciples and adherents to Doric Greek culture and devotees to their god Apollo. Imitation is central to the philosophical life.

If it is man’s business to contemplate the cosmos and imitate it, to accomplish that the philosopher must be a “reader of nature”. As was related earlier, Socrates was always looking at trades-people and how they worked. That is being a reader of nature. If the goal of philosophy is reality, then, one must look and read nature.

There are other facets to the philosophical life. There is something even more significant fact in Socrates life that Burnet misses about philosophy and it belies the connection between Socrates and the Spartans. It is Obedience to the Law and to God. Herodotus records a speech of the Spartan King Demaratus explaining Spartan character and conduct to the Persian King Xerxes.

“The point is that although they’re free, they’re not entirely free: their master is the law, and they’re far more afraid of this than your men are of you. At any rate, **they do whatever the law commands**…” (vii, §104; pg. 440 ª)

As a priest at the Delphi, Plutarch had to be aware of Apolline teachings as he was very aware of Doric/Spartan culture and ethics. He passes on, one of their most central teachings:

“We are not in this world to give the laws…

but in order to obey the commands of the gods.”

This reverence of god is strong throughout Doric culture. Their attitude is one of a child to his father. It is God who makes the rules—not people. This is Western Culture. Obedience is the highest value.

What got Adam into trouble was disobedience. That is the very first thing. (Philosophy is about First Causes.) This is so important that Jesus Christ, The Logos incarnate, commanded “That if you love me, you will obey me”. Love and obedience go together and what underlies that obedience is Trust. Do you trust God? Obedience is a sign of Love and this Obedience is what God wants to see. Obedience is central to life. All things in the cosmos obey their laws; inanimate matter, insects, animals. All things obey—except man. The Doric Greeks discovered this while looking at nature. The Doric Greeks took that to heart. It was central to their culture.

In the *Apology*, Socrates makes this statement “I must obey the law…” (§19a) The whole of Socrates life was about always obeying the law, even unto death. Xenophon commends Socrates’ “scrupulous obedience to all that the laws required, both in civil life and in military service” and that “he was a pattern of discipline to all”. (*Mem*., IV, iii, 18; Loeb 309 ª) In a second time but towards a different object, Socrates says, “I owe greater obedience to God than to you”. (*Apology*, §29d) Just like the Spartans, Socrates was not only obedient to the law but to God and his *daemon*. (*Mem*., I, ii, 64-iii, 4) Throughout his life, Socrates exhibited a character that is the epitome of what it means to be a citizen and a good man. Socrates was exemplifying two of the greatest attributes of Spartan culture, their obedience to law and their piety towards God; “to be god-fearing and ***godlike***” (*Rep*., §383c ª). The atheist agitator Marquis de Condorcet tries to pull Socrates into his cause when he stated that the death of Socrates “was the first crime that marked the beginning of the war between philosophy and superstition”. (Schneewind, 337 {superstition meaning religion}) The Marquis has totally failed in reading “the condition of what is”. If Virtue is the mainstay of philosophy, Virtue teaches not only to Honor God and the Spirits but also exercise timely and proper liturgical rites; there is no war between philosophy and religion; philosophy’s war is with error and false opinion. True philosophy teaches, as the Spartans and Socrates exhibit, obedience to the law and to God. Central to the practice of philosophy, after imitation, is obedience; obedience is part of the *ars vivendi* of philosophy.

“Where a man has once taken up his stand, either because it seems best to him or in obedience to his orders, there I believe he is bound to remain and face the danger, taking no account of death or anything else before dishonor”. (*Apology*, §28d)

And Xenophon puts this speech in Socrates:

“Lycurgus the Lacedæmonian now—have you realized that he would not have made Sparta to differ from other cities in any respect, had he not established ***obedience to the laws*** most securely in her? Among rulers in cities, are you not aware that those who do most to make the citizens obey the laws ***are the best***….For those cities whose citizens abide by them prove strongest and enjoy [the] most happiness” (*Mem*., IV, iv, 15-16; Loeb 317 ª; *Laced*., viii, 1.)

Obedience to the law was Spartan culture and no one else’s. And contrary to conventional opinion, this obedience led to happiness; this is the witness of Xenophon who lived among them. Socrates followed along. No classical scholar or modern educated so-called philosophers have made this connection. Xenophon, a foreigner, an Ionian, who knew Socrates in Athens and the Spartans personally, gives the award of “best” to a city all modern academics describe as “a horde of half savages”. (Müller, II, 192) A horde of half-savages don’t obey laws, nor are they the best in anything. Socrates’ imitation of Spartan discipline and values shows that modern academia is just so full of blarney. Socrates discipline is the capstone, the finality of proof of his imitation of the Spartans and their excellency.

The fourth part of the ars vivendi of philosophy is the hard, ascetic lifestyle. The saying is “The Good comes thru the Hard”. It is what Nature teaches so it is a law of nature. For a farmer to make hay is hard work. For any tradesman from cobbler to mason, all labor requires hard labor. To be a philosopher, in order to live the life of the Good is Hard; one must be in touch with nature and reality. To this extent, the Spartans did not seek to escape the vicissitudes of reality—its revolving coldness, heat, sunshine, darkness, etc.

Socrates was the living embodiment of Plato’s Cave. At some point in his early life, he came into contact with Doric Greeks and became a devotee to Apollo. He was freed from the shadows of this world and apprehended the Light. He, then, was duly and duty bound to return to Athens and lift his fellow citizens up to apprehend the Light. Socrates is not so much bringing in new doctrines but that he was bringing the Dorians’ discovery of the Natural Law, the values and ethics of their Apolline religion and their high intellectual culture to bear upon the Athenians. He hoped that the imitation of him would help his friends and fellow citizens attain to that excellence. (*Memorabilia*: I, ii, 3; Loeb, 15) To all that point to Crito and Alcibiades as failures as students of Socrates, Xenophon points to Criton, Chaeropon, Chaerecrates, Hermogenes, Simmias, Cebes, Phaedondas and others “who consorted with him not only that they might shine in the courts or the assembly, but that they might become gentlemen,[[39]](#footnote-39) and be able to do their duty by house and household, and relatives and friends, and city and citizens. Of these not one, in his youth or old age, did evil or incurred censure.” (ibid: I, ii, 48; Loeb, 35) And to that list may be added Plato and Xenophon themselves! Notice that Xenophon positions “duty” as the last most important fact of these people. The Socratic legacy was that these people were able to do “their duty”. That is what is important! Socrates for these people was a success; he was efficacious in leading his compatriots, those so inclined, out of the cave. The whole process of philosophy is about salvation and being good citizens of their society, and the cosmos.

Philosophy is an *ars vivendi*. The central core of philosophy is the natural law, the principles of nature and that is done by “contemplating the cosmos and imitating it”. True philosophy is a universal science that covers theology, ethics and metaphysics as a total package. Philosophy is the science of Life, not any life but the Life of a Citizen of one’s state and one’s God and of the cosmos. Philosophy is about Perfection, the reaching of arete in all forms in one’s life. It teaches obedience to God and country and the ultimate goal of theosis. The Cretans, Spartans and Socrates, in their lives exhibit the living art of philosophy.

After the death of Socrates, Plato left Athens for twelve years. (Navia, 98-99) What did he do in those twelve years? No doubt he visited Crete and Sparta. Naturally, due to Athenian hostility and to gain adherents, the Spartan tradition could not be stated outright by Plato so he hid clues throughout his texts. The Cretans and the Spartans are mentioned at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of his writings; i.e. the beginning, the *Crito*; the middle, the *Protagoras* and *The Republic* (§452d); the end *The Laws*.[[40]](#footnote-40) The whole of the Platonic dialogues are surrounded by references to the Spartans! Another interesting factoid that has been buried is that Plato set up his school in the gardens of Academus. Aren’t we told that Plato set up his school IN Athens? That is not exactly right. Who is Academus? The teachers in colleges and universities are collectively known as “academics”; it is derived from the place Plato started his school. History records that Academus saved Athens by showing the Discoursi where Theseus hid Helen. For this act and to reward him, “the Spartans ever after treated him with great honor and courtesy. After his death, when the Spartans warred on Athens they spared his estate on the Cephissus river.” (*New Century*, entry ‘Academus’) Plato did NOT set up his school IN Athens but at a farm outside of Athens and not only on an estate with holy grounds but that it was protected and honored by the Spartans. Is it a coincidence that Plato held his teachings there? This nuance completely changes the conception of philosophy, of Plato and his school that is part of the conventional opinion of today. This nuance heightens the Protagoras statement. Is this not another tell of the Spartan connection to Socrates? Plato purposely set up his education in a place which was protected by Spartans. The name of his school is of a person honored by the Spartans. It was also a place that held a gymnasium, a place of physical exercise and wrestling. (Plato was a wrestler. {DL: III, 2.4}) It was a theatre of the *agon*, a place of struggle—which philosophy is connected to. Just like the Spartans, philosophy is found in nature, not in the city. Plato’s school is found at a farmhouse; the barnyard is the schoolhouse of the natural law. Moreover, Plato’s school is connected to a sacred place honored by the gods. The choice of his school shows that Plato wanted to recreate a miniature Apolline/Doric pattern. As Socrates was a veteran hoplite and Plato, a wrestler, Philosophy is a fighting man’s profession for a warrior must be tied to objective reality in order to live and win. Plato, the swan of Socrates’ dream (Navia, 96), immortalized this patrimony, expanded it, and wrote it down for posterity and for the great benefit of Western Culture and Christianity **in a farmhouse outside of Athens**.[[41]](#footnote-41)

(To understand another fundamental aspect of philosophy, masking, q.v. Appendix III.)

**NIETZSCHE’S CRITIQUE OF SOCRATES**

Navia and Owens C. Ss. R. both quote Nietzsche as saying that Socrates ruined Western Culture because he split the Dionysian and Apolline influences apart, giving it an intellectual cast. (N, 176; O, 165) In Nietzsche’s view, the sophists were the sincere carriers of authentic Greek culture and spirit and that Socrates “brought the demise of the Classical world”. (Navia, ibid) Socrates brought degeneration into Western Culture.

Nietzsche couldn’t be more wrong. Socrates was a missionary of Apollo and these teachings were entrenched in the Doric societies of Crete and Sparta for over a thousand years from King Minos on (and probably earlier). Far from making anything up, Socrates was copying, imitating and carrying on a culture that has been going on for 1000 years or more. Throughout the Hellenic world, Crete and Sparta, especially Sparta, held the admiration of all and sundry. Why would the Seven Sages of Greece be emulators, admirers and disciples of Spartan culture, if they weren’t the best or the home of philosophy? For a society to last that long, is not a sign of degeneration or decadence.[[42]](#footnote-42) Moreover, the creation of these cultures had nothing to do with Dionysus. Prof. Müller writes that:

“The worship of Dionysus did not enjoy equal honours among all the Dorians. It had indeed penetrated as far as Sparta, where it had driven even the Lacedæmonian women to phrensy; and the Delphic oracle itself had ordered the institution of a race of Bacchanalian virgins. But nothing is known or any sumptuous or regular ceremonies in honour of Dionysus; and we might indeed have supposed *à priori* that the austere and rigid notions of the Spartans would have been very averse to that deity. The same is probably true of Argos, which had for a long time abstained from the worship of Dionysus, but afterwards dedicated to him a festival called *τύρβη* (*turba*).” (I, 403-404)

Nietzsche has it absolutely backwards. One didn’t need Dionysus to have song and dance. The worship of Apollo of course had its intellectual side, but with the lyre as one of his symbols, song and dance was very much a part of Apollonian culture. The Spartans had festivals where choruses of boys and men of all ages competed in contests that combined dancing and singing at the same time. The Spartans were known as the land of cicadas. (Müller, II, 335) Laughter was worshiped in Sparta. (Müller, II, 391) Plato takes up dance and music themes all the time in the education of boys and considers these arts very important aspect of paideia. Diogenes Laërtius reports that Xenophon relates in his *Symposium* that Socrates’ regular habit was to dance. (Hicks, II, §32) One didn’t have to have Dionysus to enjoy or celebrate life; it wasn’t a must have. Ms. Hamilton reports that some of the characteristics of Dionysus are cruelty and that he “drove men to frightful and atrocious crimes”. (Hamilton, 1962, 60) His female attendants were known for their “savage brutality”. (ibid, 57) Is this something that one in his right mind would want to participate in, in an act of frenzy? Do men of virtue let themselves lose self-control so much that they participate in “atrocious crimes”? Dionysus, as god of the vine, had the Janus face of wine, its ability to bring joy and madness. It was only later as the god of the vine matured in the mind of the general Greek culture that he took over the Eleusinian mysteries with their plays and tragedies. The German classicist Prof. Werner Jaeger tells that Plato, who knew Athens inside and out, “traces the degeneracy of Athens to the decline of music and poetry into license and lack of discipline.” (III, 237) Lack of discipline is what deteriorates things. Plato is an expert—not Nietzsche. Though Plato reports that there was an old and unqualified censure against the Dionysus cult (*Laws*, §672a), he authorizes the indulgence of the cup, invoking Dionysus for men in the forties and older as a “medicine against the dryness of old age”. (*Laws*, §666b) Unlike Apollo, Dionysus had a very bad and dark side; Dionysus is not needed for Doric culture. Like most modern academics and superficial observers, Nietzsche approached classical Greece as a monolithic whole and never took into account the racial differences and hence the different cultures of Ancient Greece. Nietzsche just lumps them all into one and thinks that Dionysius was common to all. Doric culture was created and lived a thousand years without the need of Dionysius. The cult of Dionysus mentored plays for the common citizen for entertainment and the off-chance for education in other areas of Greece but the Doric Greeks had their *syssitia* where music, recitation of poems, chanting, invocations and intellectual discourse occurred. Choral lyric poetry chiefly and originally belonged to the Dorians. (Müller, II, 378) Doric culture was full and had no need of Dionysus; Doric culture was far more well-rounded than Athenian. Far from Socrates creating this intellectual strictness, Socrates was actually borrowing, imitating what was going on for a thousand years in the Doric cultures of Crete and Laconia. The witness of the Roman Cicero visiting the tomb of Pythagoras and the city of Sparta reveals his admiration and high esteem for these two things that had no Dionysian influence. Nietzsche’s claims are just absurd.

Echoing Nietzsche’s claim much later is F. A. Hayek,

In Greece it was of course chiefly the Spartans, the people who resisted the commercial revolution most strongly, who did not recognize individual property but allowed and even encouraged theft. To our time they have remained the prototype of savages who rejected civilization... (Ross quoting Hayek)

Contrary to Hayek, Sir Livingstone writes that there are three underlying concepts of Western Culture—science, technology (which produces the material fabric of our civilization) [[43]](#footnote-43), and “a certain ideal of human nature and conduct”. (p. 56; Jaeger, I, xxii, xxiii, 4) Sparta had those in spades. As proven by the life of Socrates and Lycurgus’s experiment with education on dogs, science was used. Theology, ethics and the apprehension of essences were all approached scientifically by the Doric Greeks through the use of the Natural Law. The professionalism of their armies and their extensive educational system of the agoge is technology. The realization of a certain ideal of human nature and conduct can be surely seen in a Spartiate; “Sparta created not things in words or stone, but men” (Kitto, 95); she created living art in her men, not material art. The biggest praise though comes from Xenophon who writes “it would not be easy to find healthier or handier men than the Spartans” (*Laced*., vi, 1); “…So Sparta, as a matter of course, surpasses all other states in virtue, because she alone makes a public duty of gentlemanly conduct.” (*Laced*., x, 4; Loeb 169) The Greek word translated as ‘gentlemanly’ is *καλοκάγαθίαν*. It means the “Beautiful and the Good”. Contrary to F. A. Hayek, the Founder of Libertarianism which is an ideology of nihilism, every Spartiate was “the Beautiful and the Good”. Only a high civilization produces that. Civilization is about order and what undergirds order is discipline. As the saying goes, “The Good comes thru the Hard”, the Doric Greeks lived a hard and ascetic life which achieved the ideal of human nature and conduct; the attainment of arête, their obedience to the Laws and to God, and their intellectual culture. Socrates stated that they had “the Highest Culture”. Only a High civilization produces High Culture.

At this point what produces civilization, Apolline discipline or the party fever of Dionysus? Were the Spartans savages or “The Good and the Beautiful”?

If Nietzsche wants to complain about the strictness of Socrates, there is no other proof of the efficacy of strictness and discipline than in the historical record of the Spartan Army’s many victories in the field. No army exists without those two things. This shows that Nietzsche had no practical wisdom whatsoever. The proof is in the historical record. During the early parts of the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians never ventured out to meet the Spartan army—it was that good. Philosophically, it is a teaching from nature. Second point, is that organisms, living entities, have at their basis order but what maintains that order is discipline and strictness. The word organism comes from the word organization. No organism nor organization exists without discipline. Discipline is the central component of organization. Cancer is the lack of discipline, when cells multiply with abandon. Cancer soon kills its own body. To follow limits is behind this strictness and discipline. No army, no living body, no institution can exist without it. If one builds a house sloppily, it soon fails and falls down. It is strictness that leads to precision, that leads to perfection which leads to success; a house that stands for 500 years. The Acropolis in Athens is a sign of this precision/perfection.

The LXX has this teaching:

“Wisdom is glorious, and never fadeth away:

Yea, she is easily seen of them that love her, and found of such as seek her.

For the very true beginning of her is the desire of discipline;

And the care of discipline is love;

And love is the keeping of her laws;

And the giving heed unto her laws is the assurance of incorruption;

And incorruption maketh us near unto God:

Therefore the desire of wisdom bringeth to a kingdom.” [[44]](#footnote-44) ª

The care of discipline is love. That could only be said of one people—The Spartans. Socrates in imitating the Spartans exhibited great love. Instead of decadence and degradation, the care of discipline is love and love is the keeping of her laws.[[45]](#footnote-45) Nietzsche doesn’t know his head from a hole in the ground. Strictness/discipline is a part of civilization. Truly, the Doric Greeks of Crete and Sparta achieved exactly that; they had love. And Plato, thru Socrates continues this teaching.[[46]](#footnote-46)

And this is another teaching: the beginning of Wisdom is the desire of discipline. Nietzsche doesn’t know wisdom. Mental discipline exhibits itself as “exactness” and Aristotle notes that some people are annoyed at “exactness”; Nietzsche is one of these people; he is annoyed at “exactness”. Aristotle continues in his observation that these same people consider “exactness” as “being mean”. (Aris., *Metp*., II, iii, 2; §995 10; Loeb, 95) As an army requires discipline to be successful, and discipline is also necessary for perfection (arete), in the principle of macrocosm/microcosm, discipline, exactness, is also needed in mental thought. “Exactness” is the character of science; science needs exactness that opinion doesn’t have. Nietzsche was rebelling against this component of philosophy.

Philosophy teaches Parmenides principle of non-contradiction; it is central to logical thinking; it keeps reasoning from becoming circular and producing contradictions. If Philosophy teaches from its own store non-contradiction, shouldn’t the practitioners also be non-contradictory? Meaning: the Doric mode is harmony of word and deed and shouldn’t the teachings of philosophy also pertain to itself? It must practice what it preaches.

Socrates teaches that: “…philosophy holds always to the same.” (*Gorgias*, §482a)

*The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* labels Fredrick Nietzsche a philosopher who said that the Sophists are the real carriers of Western culture. The Natural Law is “thief knows thief”, “Like to like”. Nietzsche knows his own. Nietzsche is a Sophist and not a philosopher; the witness of Xenophon parallels that of Plato, thus denying Sophists the title of philosopher. Whereas Socrates was very religious and moral, “Nietzsche was openly and profoundly hostile to most forms of morality and religious thought”. (ibid) Nietzsche’s hostility is Sophistic; he is a modern Sophist as befits an atheist. Nietzsche’s teaching is far different from Socrates; Nietzsche’s antagonism towards Socrates is the sign of contradiction. Nietzsche is NOT a philosopher for philosophy holds always to the same! Furthermore, Nietzsche wants to dictate on Classical Antiquity and yet if he picked up Müller’s work on the Dorians, Müller who is his own countryman and language and of almost the same time period, he should have known better. There is no excuse. Again, he paints with a wide brush of unsalutary comments things that if he picked up a book and read, and had the spirit of truth, would have prevented him from looking like an ignorant buffoon.

**THE ORIGINS AND KNOWLEDGE OF PHILOSOPHY**

Werner Jaeger, one of the premier classical scholars, authors “Both in the history of philosophy and in that of art, Sparta holds a subordinate position. The Ionian race, for example, led Greece in the search for philosophical and ethical truth, but no Spartan name occurs in the long roll of Greek monotheists and philosophers”. (I, 79)

He couldn’t be more wrong. What the opinion of the day is and what reality was in classical antiquity is quite different. Prof. Müller writes that much of what Pythagoras taught came from Doric practices and that Pythagorean philosophers always found a welcome reception at Sparta. Religious sages such as Abaris, Epimenides (who was Cretan and helped Solon in his law-making), Pherecydes visited Sparta. Anaximander and Anaximenes lived for some time in that city. (II, 394) Chilon of the Seven Sages was a Spartan, Myson of Chen was probably Cretan. Müller says that possibly four of the Seven Sages were Doric Greeks. Empedocles was a Doric Greek.

When Plutarch, the first classical scholar writes that Lycurgus formed “a complete philosophic state”, contrary to Jaeger and worldly opinion, the Doric Greeks of Crete and Sparta produced generations upon generations of unnamed philosophers! How else could one maintain such a sophisticated governmental form over the centuries? Only thru philosophy! Socrates and Plato who wrote the Protagoras, states that at their time, there are more sophists there than anywhere on earth! Clinias the Cretan and Megillus the Spartan of Plato’s *Laws* are philosophers. The kings, aristocracy and all their citizens were philosophers.

In this case the whole idea of a “Pre-Socratic” category should be reconsidered. What all these so-called pre-socratic philosophers capture is different aspects of the same philosophy as it was being developed thru the centuries. They are snapshots, snippets, windows of opportunity where the Doric Greeks never wrote anything down, but their foreign students did. Socrates did not overhaul philosophy whatsoever; he was merely imitating what he found. The misreading of the history of philosophy has produced the “Pre-Socratic” category.

Keith Quincy (2003) writes “Plato’s claim that the Spartan constitution is a safeguard against exploitation is as preposterous as his suggestion in Protagoras (342a-343b) that the Spartans are the most philosophical of all the Greeks, closest philosophers who study philosophy in secret so other Greeks will not guess that correct philosophy is the real source of their strength. The truth is that the Spartans were closed-minded and were concerned first and foremost with oppressing the ruled.” (p. 235 ª)

Contrary to Quincy’s opinion and the Cartledge’s epithet of being like “Pol-Pot”, Polybius had this to say about Lycurgus:

“…for securing unity among the citizens, for safeguarding the Laconian territory and preserving the liberty of Sparta inviolate, the legislation and provisions of Lycurgus were so excellent that I am forced to regard his wisdom as something superhuman” (Polibius 1959: 493).

The Truth is that leisure is the mother of philosophy and it was exactly the serfdom that provided the leisure necessary for the conduct of philosophy and the perfection of their military arms.[[47]](#footnote-47) And it was philosophy that helped them maintain their liberty.

Philosophy is Doric culture, mentality, and life. The Doric Greeks created philosophy which Pythagoras, Empedocles, Heraclitus and Socrates borrowed. It is theirs. And it was Plato who captured it for posterity. It is Socrates, Plato and Aristotle that formed the mental milieu of Hellenistic Greece and since Socrates was an emulator, admirer and disciple of the Spartans, it is the Doric Greeks that formed much of the foundation of Western Culture and civilization; the Doric Greeks of Crete and Laconia showcase hyper-traditional European Culture, Tradition, values, and Civilization. Traditional European culture is a warrior culture. Burnet rightly and justly concludes that:

“…The Platonist tradition underlies the whole of western civilization”.

(p. 93)

But Burnet has Pythagoras bringing “at least the beginnings of what he called philosophy from eastern Hellas.” (p. 61) Owens pens “Greek philosophy was born in the Ionian city-states that dotted the Western coast of Asia Minor and adjacent lands”. (p. 3) *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* has Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes as the first philosophers.

Barry Sandywell is even more fanciful in his dissertation on the foundation of what he calls Pre-Socratic reflexivity. “The earliest paradigms of intellectual reflexivity, then, were rooted in an urban, commercial, and mercantile soil” of Ionian Miletus of Asia Minor where East meets West.” (p. 79) This included the “conscious rejection of old practices and ideologies”. (p. 80) He continues his Oz-like deposition; it is so out-there that a large portion is quoted for your enjoyment:

“The laissez-faire attitude toward alien and heterodox forms of life would prove to be an indispensable training-ground for the development of new forms of free speech (cf.Plutarch, Greek Questions 32). This new self-critical spirit formed one of the necessary preconditions for the project of speculative inquiry.

The situation of the Ionian colonies in the seventh century exemplifies these general observations—on the one hand Ionian culture experienced a linguistic and verbal continuity with a ‘heroic’ past, but spatially and geographically it had been cut free from traditional social forms; in the latter respect Ionia was indeed a country without a past, open to new ideas and cultural influences (Burnet, 1930:14). {ed. note: *Here he brings in multiculturalism, trying to legitimize it through antiquity*.}Breaking the grip of the past was facilitated by the existence of alternative languages and ways of life. {ed. note: *whereas the Spartans were concerned with following their ancestors and maintaining their way of life*} Ionian civilization was thus forced by historical and geographical circumstances to be innovative and future-directed in every department of social and cultural life. {ed. note: Thus it is progressive and thus good.} Indeed the violence of forced mobility that characterized Greek colonization may have been one of the key factors encouraging the development of a more disinterested and secular attitude toward the world.” (ibid)

“…the ‘beginning of philosophy’ remained like a rare and delicate flower frozen in amber for the next two generations of thinkers. It would only become historically effective by being exported westward to Italy and Athens where the Ionian impulse of theorem was reshaped and given a different meaning and orientation. We have the unusual situation that these great export cities on the Asian seaboard would, in the fifth century, export the idea of reflexive inquiry back to the home polis. Philosophy—along with history, science, and the new spirit of learning—migrated to Athens as one of a range of consumer goods shipped from the ports of Asia Minor. At the turn of the century Athens was an unlikely soil for what was at the time an essentially foreign and exotic institution of reflection. (ibid, 83) {ed. note: *In a sense, philosophy is a foreign import.*}

“Thales was perhaps the first known individual to name and conceptualize the universe with the word kosmos…” (ibid, 85)

Here is a grand tar-pit of assumptions and speculations, all wrong which are all weaved together in some multicultural progressive spasm of joyous affirmation of modern multicultural, vibrant, progressive society of today. Philosophy is about multiculturalism, vibrancy, and progressiveness. This is myth-making at its best! His *Presocratic Reflexivity* is 600 pages long and he is the author of another two large tomes dealing with the same sociological basis of philosophy. In view of what has been related here to the huge amount of ancillary and circumstantial evidence pointing to Doric Crete and Sparta as the home of Greek philosophy, wouldn’t you think that his three volume work was a waste of time? But the real reason for his investigation is to dismantle the “Eurocentric basis” of Western philosophy:

“To critically appropriate this insight, however, we have radically to revise the traditional Eurocentric account of the relationship between Greek and Egyptian scientific culture in the ancient world.” (ibid, 88)

It has become standard practice that an academic must deconstruct anything that smacks of “Eurocentrism” for that is racialism and that is a secular sin.[[48]](#footnote-48) And because Sparta did not coin money and advance to newer economic models, Sparta damaged her culture. (ibid, 117)[[49]](#footnote-49)

And this brings us to another point, how does Mr. Sandywell connect the rise of philosophy with capitalism and mercantilism when reading the Platonic texts and even Aristotle, it exhibits the exact opposite. Lycurgus forbade Spartans to enter the marketplace and in their early history forbidden to own gold. Both Plato and Aristotle use the term ‘vanavsos’ (banausos) of the working and merchant class; it is a derogatory term; vanavsos is the Aristocracy’s term for the working/mercantile class. How is philosophy connected to capitalism? As for any classical scholar that is impossible to imagine Sandywell’s assumptions. In the *Republic*, Socrates can be paraphrased to say in a laconic way “Where money is prized, Virtue is despised”. (Jowett, §550-551; pp 301-302.) Virtue is central to philosophy and the methodology of pleonexia connected to money-getting is at great odds with the practice of Virtue. Prof. Werner Jaeger writes that Plato is very concerned about Paideia in his work *The Laws* and that “no type of training in special activities can strictly be called Paideia, culture or education. They are banausic, aiming at making money or at cultivating one particular skill which is devoid of a governing spiritual principle and right aim,…” (III, 224) It is impossible for the vanavsos, the proletariat and bourgeois, to not only philosophize but to live the philosophic life. Plato in his *Laws* sets his ‘*kalipolli’*, far from any seacoast as to not be corrupted by foreign elements and away from mercantile lifestyle that is corrupting.

“Had it to be on the coast, well furnished with harbors and ill off for many of its necessaries, not productive of all, we should need a might protector and lawgivers who were more than men to prevent the development of much refined vice. {ed. note: Philosophy requires virtue.} …It is agreeable enough to have the sea at one’s door in daily life, but, for all that, it is, in very truth, a briny and bitter neighbor. It fills the city with wholesale traffic and retail huckstering, breeds shifty and distrustful habits of soul, and so makes a society distrustful and unfriendly within itself as well as toward mankind at large.” (§704a- §705b ª; §705b-d)

Plato ought to know firsthand for he grew up and lived in a city just like that! Plato ties his city to agrarianism; citizens were to have two houses, one in the city and the other on their farm. This is why Plato set up his school on a farm outside Athens. Moreover, Plato decries the huckstering that goes along with retail. (Laws, §705a; §918a) If anybody who is an expert on philosophy, it is Plato and definitely Plato’s kalipoli is nowhere near Sandywell’s wonderland. Philosophy is not borne out of capitalism or mercantilism of any kind; it is born out of agrarianism and a warrior culture. (For a greater understanding of the dichotomy then existing in Greece and that philosophy had absolutely nothing to do with capitalism q.v. Appendix I.)

Aristotle mirrors the same thing Plato said:

“But almost all the other classes of populace, of which the remaining kinds of democracy are composed, are very inferior to these, for their mode of life is mean, and there is no element of virtue in any of the occupations in which the multitude of artisans and market-people and the wage-earning class take part, and also owing to their loitering about the market-place and the city almost all the people of this class find it easy to attend the assembly…” (Pol., VI, ii, 7, §1319a 20-35; Loeb, p. 503)

Aristotle before this paragraph and after ONLY condones democracy made strictly of farmers or pastoral people because Nature hardens them and they are spread out most of the time—their time being occupied with working in the field. Thus, the evils inherent in democracy are somewhat thwarted and kept in check. Plato and Aristotle knew the history, the clime, the milieu, the people of the world’s first democracy and they didn’t like it.

But this is what Socrates said:

“The most ancient and fertile homes of philosophy among the Greeks are Crete and Sparta, where are to be found more sophists than anywhere on earth.”

That One line… demolishes 400 years of textbooks. If you don’t know the origin of a thing, you don’t know the thing. Philosophy is about the searching for First Causes. [[50]](#footnote-50) What is the First Cause of Philosophy? Athens or Sparta? Every textbook on philosophy has it being an Ionian thing and that philosophy teaches democracy. This is a glaring gigantic mistake. Aristotle makes clear “We cannot know the truth apart from the cause”. (*Metp*., II, i, 6; §993b 20; Loeb, 87) When the Protagoras statement is out in the open with no need for interpretation with a ton of supporting evidence—this is unconscionable. The cause of Philosophy wrongly attributed to democratic Athens is totally false. Whereas Barry Sandywell’s work is a colossus of assumptions and speculations, Socrates statement is based on personal experience, historical research and personal connections. See, when Xenophanes states, “…it takes a wise man to recognize a wise man”, (Wheelwright, 37) the rejection and outright dismissal of the Protagoras statement means that modern people are nowhere near the truth. There are no “philosophers” in the modern age. Instead, they are myth-makers. Then it is no wonder that English Lit. Professor, Alvin Kernan, sadly titles his memoirs of his academic career as ***IN*** *Plato’s Cave* ª. His forward has a large chunk of Plato’s description of the cave of phantasms. This is the state of modern academia.

Plato’s *Republic* is the center of Philosophy. It revolves around dikaios; righteousness. Righteousness is a “principle of nature”. (Hamilton, 1963, 670: *Resp*. §428e) Those principles of nature are called the Logos, the Natural Law, the Sophia of God. This is what Philo-sophia is, the taking of the Sophia of God which are hidden in nature and applying them in human reasoning. [[51]](#footnote-51) The Spartan Republic is the concrete manifestation of the principles of nature. Returning to that phrase in the Republic, i.e.,

“…that a city established on **principles of nature** would be wise as a whole.” (Hamilton, 1963, 670: *Resp*. §428e ª)

Wisdom is tied to the “principles of nature” and those people, who establish their city on the Natural Law, **are wise**! Without that knowledge, there is no philosophy. If everybody and their grandmother deny the home of Greek philosophy as Doric Crete and Sparta, that means, they do not know philosophy whatsoever; they don’t know the first cause NOR the essence of philosophy. The Natural Law CLEARLY emerged amongst the Doric Greeks and NOT in Athens. The most important leg of Catholic thought is the Natural Law and yet, they don’t even know what the real, original Natural Law is.[[52]](#footnote-52) Today, in the 21st Century, nobody, and I mean nobody knows or has philosophy. All those degrees are worthless. 400 years of textbooks are wrong (and they are still printing new ones!). One has to have the real, original principles of nature, the “laws of nature” or the “Natural Law”, in order to do philosophy—and no one does! No one knows the true origins of philosophy either! That means they don’t have philosophy nor Truth! It’s all a joke. Furthermore, one has to live the Natural Law—to imitate the cosmos. Is there anybody today doing that? NO. Then, there are no philosophers today. To say someone has a degree, a B.A., a Masters, or a Ph.D. in philosophy, is just outrageous. Wise man knows Wise man. Like to like. In this regard, the total and abject, across the board rejection of Sparta, off the cuff, means there is nobody today that does philosophy for they do not recognize their own—“Wise man knows Wise man”, or otherwise “Thief knows thief”.

The definition of science is “to know the condition of that which is”. (*Republic*: §478a) Philosophy is a science. (Maritain, 60) But many people have not treated philosophy itself scientifically. How wrong is this? Do you not practice what is preached? Carved on the wall at Apollo’s Temple at Delphi is this:

“Know Thyself.”

If this is a dictum of philosophy, which Navia himself uses in his book for over several pages discussing, why doesn’t modern Philosophy obey its own dictum? If one of the premier postulates is “Know thyself”, why is Socrates statement that Doric Crete and Sparta the home of Greek philosophy overlooked, denied and laughed at? Is that having “harmony of word or deed” or is that not hypocrisy? How do philosophy teachers and students NOT know their own occupation and skill? Does Philosophy “Know itself”? Does Western Culture “Know Itself”? Does true philosophy produce hypocrisy? This means that NO modern so-called philosophy students and teachers have a clue on what they are doing.

Moreover, Socrates in the *Republic* brings up the point of being a “stickler for precision”. (Rep., I, xiv; 340e; Loeb, 55) Jowett translates that as “accuracy”. No science exists without accuracy. Philosophy does not exist without accuracy, precision. Socrates was always, always a stickler when it came to the definitions of words. The clear and concise, demarcationness (clarity) of word definition [[53]](#footnote-53) is the beginning of science. How can one say he is a philosopher, when in the treatment of his own science is inaccurate? The dismissal of the Protagoras statement is imprecise, is inaccurate. How does one conduct a science when it starts off inaccurately? How, when one has to be a reader of nature, to have the data of experience, “to know the condition of what is”, when one treats is own origins flippantly? What does it mean when science is based on knowing “the condition of what is” when modern so-called philosophers are so ideological that they refuse to know “the condition of what philosophy is” of what they themselves think they are practicing? This is just ludicrous.

The next problem is one of logic. Logic is the tool of philosophy. (Maritain, 99) One of the first lessons one should learn is that for the conclusion of an argument to be true, all premises must be true. It can be defined thus:

t+t+t+t=t

That part of logic is also based on the Natural Law—that of “The parts make up the whole”. Throughout nature, this commonsense principle is self-evident. All material objects are the sum of their parts. If this is a law of nature, it is also true in the metaphysical sphere. Truth is the sum of its parts. For a conclusion to be true—all the premises must be true. One false premise causes the whole to be false:

t+t+f+t=f

No matter how many true premises, one false premise leads to the conclusion being false. As Aristotle put it, there are many roads to error but only one road to Truth.[[54]](#footnote-54) If philosophy is about “the goal of reality” and is about finding Truth, how can that be accomplished when the premise that philosophy is an Ionian creation be false? The misrepresentation of philosophy as Ionian has skewered the whole conception of what philosophy is. The whole modern conception of philosophy is a house of cards; …is built on a false foundation—what is the conclusion? It is all false. That philosophy is Ionian is a false premise. This nullifies all of modern philosophy thus making it pseudo-philosophy or sophistry. The whole of modern Western Culture rests on sophistry and it has been misread. Western culture has been destroyed. Everything is wrong.

Does anybody know what philosophy is?

Obviously not! Is what is preached—practiced?

Obviously not! Philosophy departments pride themselves on producing students with critical thinking skills. Are we to believe that none of these skilled students in critical thinking brought up the Protagoras section and discovered the truth in the past 400 years? Does this not seem a little incongruous?

And then there is the nub of the predicament of this misreading of philosophy’s own history. Socrates and Plato demanded Virtue, arête. Plato (or the Doric Greeks) discovered something important, the connection between Virtue and Knowledge. Virtue is central to philosophy. Socrates ends the Protagoras section with this statement: “I mention these facts”. So, if every modern-school-educated pseudo-philosopher has read Plato and reads the importance of Virtue and then disregards the Protagoras section, what kind of morality and ethics makes one disregard facts? Socratic teaching on virtue “went thru one ear and out the other”. A man of Virtue does not disregard facts. This is a sign of the total lack of virtue within the halls of academia. No Virtue, No philosophy!

**LE MIRAGE MODERNE**

The French scholar François Ollier, in 1973, disturbed over the relation between the myth of the people who admired Sparta and the supposed reality regarding the “horde of half-savages” that really is Sparta titled his book *Le mirage Spartiate*. (Cartledge, 36) The only mirage going on is the whole of modern culture. There is no mirage regarding Sparta; it takes a “Wise man to know wise man” and since everybody denies that truth of the Protagoras statement, it means that there is no wisdom in modern academia for “Wisdom is not manifest to many.” (LXX, Book of Sirach, 6:22) To fools wisdom is clouded; it may look like a mirage but this mirage is only in the minds of wicked men. The only real mirage going on is in modern textbooks and in the halls of modern academia. The complete misrepresentation of Sparta, of philosophy and the true nature of the classical form of republican government is a mirage, one gigantic miasma in modern minds. Prof. Kernan is right in titling his book *In Plato’s Cave*.

Not only is the Protagoras section misread skewing the field of philosophy, but their form of government is totally and maliciously mislabeled thus damaging political science and the field of Classical Scholarship is harmed as well. The three most important fields for a Liberal Education are severely damaged! Three fields of study, three of the highest and cultural forming fields of Western Culture are severely deformed.

There are several things that have caused this problem: Academics loathing of war and things military, ideology has crept in so much so that colleges and universities are nothing but propaganda mills,[[55]](#footnote-55) and that Western culture has been overthrown beginning in the Renaissance.

To shed light on what is going on, it is enlightening to understand a parallel situation going on in the medical field; it mirrors the academic/Protagoras situation awfully well. Dr. Robert Young M. D. inscribed a book, *The pH Miracle*, to enlighten people that we are supposed to have alkaline bodies. Our modern diets are very acidic and this “overacidification of body fluids and tissues underlies all disease.” (p. 16) On the other hand, “Classical biology, based on the work of Louis Pasteur in the late 1800’s, relies on the idea that disease comes from germs that invade the body from the outside.” (pg. 18) And so modern medicine is centered around antibiotics and other pills to cure disease thus ignoring pH balance in nutrition. At the same time that Pasteur was doing his research, Antoine Bέchamp and his followers, in their research, discovered something else; that it was acidic environment that let dangerous bacteria grow. Yet, Bέchamp’s studies and conclusions were forgotten because “Pasteur’s friends in high places, his showmanship and his ability to basically market himself and his work started the ball rolling in favor of ‘the germ theory’.” (p. 28) The acidic/alkaline basis became overlooked and buried over time because of the demagoguery of Pasteur and friends.

Dr. Young is about recovering the teachings of Bέchamp et. al.[[56]](#footnote-56) to bring back into focus the real cause of disease which is the acidic nature of current nutrition that breeds disease and cancer. (Cancer tumors are surrounded by an acidic sac.) Contrary to the conventional wisdom that it is solely bacteria and viruses that are the cause of disease, Dr. Young points out that it is the acidic environment of our bodies that propagate bad bacteria and lets them do damage. Dr. Young is a medical Socrates in that he is trying to bring people out of the cave, blind to the dangers of acidity. In surveying incompetence of the medical field, Dr. Young concludes that:

“All those decades ago, and mainstream medicine adheres to this theory to this day. That tradition is so strong, and the alternatives so revolutionary, that even something so plain to see, observable with your own eyes, nonetheless goes unseen.”

Those are the conditions of The Cave for Plato. The medical field is not the only place that has become blind. It seems that Academia across the board, Catholic and secular, due to their preconceptions and prejudices have blinded themselves to Truth. The Protagoras statement is out in the open, in plain Greek/English language, and yet it went unseen. Socrates barefootedness also went unseen. Dr. Young’s quote can be rewritten to fit the academic field in its assessment of the Protagoras statement:

“…the mainstream academic/philosophy model is so deeply involved with its own ***myths*** of democracy, equality, freedom, and its bias against things military that it was blind to simpler truths.” (paraphrase of Young, 3)

The myths of democracy, equality, freedom along with the prejudice against the traditional time honored European warrior culture of the Dorians, has closed the minds of academics. It is not so much being blinded, but that modern academia is pushing an agenda when they are supposed to protect and teach Western Culture and Civilization.

Crete and Sparta were the most warlike tribes of the Hellenes. They kept to this warrior culture of their ancestors and kept their liberty because that is the dictates of Righteousness, a Virtue.[[57]](#footnote-57) Just because of this, they are to be dismissed. The academic feeling is that military people are automatic idiots. Prof. Navia quotes Bertrand Russell’s “poster child” opinion of Xenophon: “a military man, not very liberally endowed with brains”. (p. 62)[[58]](#footnote-58) Needless, to say this is the opinion of every academic towards military men—they’re brainless. When an academic of the Classics and Modern Department was approached with the dictum that “Life is War”, trying to prove a point about the necessity of Strife in classical republics, the academic scrunched his face up as if he ate a lemon and got punched in the stomach at the same time. He couldn’t leave fast enough. His nature made him repel instinctively in disgust and horror. He couldn’t “examine facts”. He was automatically and perpetually repulsed by the Natural Law.[[59]](#footnote-59) This prejudice is world-wide and throughout the atmosphere and climate of all of academia. Their gut hatred has blinded them.

Funny, Plato (along with Pythagoras and Socrates) had no problem. Plato quotes a Cretan in the *Laws* where he says “He meant, I believe, to reprove the folly of mankind, who refuse to understand that they are all engaged in a continuous lifelong warfare against all cities whatsoever”. (§625e) In short, “Life is War”. (Jaeger laconized the sentence. III, 221) What does Philosophy teach? The folly of mankind is to think that Peace is the status quo and that Peace is the standard. What does Clinias the Cretan, a true philosopher, say about that kind of mentality?—It is FOLLY; foolishness. Foolishness is the opposite of Wisdom. What modern academia engages in is foolishness. Strife is everywhere in reality. The academic proves himself a fool when he runs away from wisdom. Wisdom repels the foolish. Is not philosophy supposed to protect its people from folly?

The proof that Life is war, even now, is that as you are sitting here reading this book, in your bloodstream, white blood cells and T-cells are fighting bad bacteria and viruses. There is a war in your bloodstream that is never-ending. War is at every level of reality. The Virtue of Prudence teaches to be prepared for that; to strengthen and harden oneself in the face of this reality. To do otherwise is foolishness. Heraclitus also points to this reality of life:

* “War is both father and king of all; some he has shown forth as gods and others as men, some he has made slaves and others free.
* “It should be understood that was is the common condition, that strife is justice, and that all things come to pass through the compulsion of strife.
* “Homer was wrong in saying, “Would that strife might perish from amongst the gods and men.” For if that were to occur, then all things would cease to exist.” (Wheelwright, 71)

Wisdom teaches that Life is War; it is an observable fact of reality. One has to prepare for it, for it is never-ending. Christianity teaches the same thing in the form of Original Sin which affects all human beings, in the past as well into the future. Original Sin causes Dysfunctionality. Original Sin affects not only libido but the mental capacities, abilities to perceive, and the understanding of reality. This dysfunctionality is the root cause of evil in the world; Plato recognized this as *pleonexia*. The overreaching that this causes is just one of the many instances of strife in the world. The true philosopher Clinias the Cretan states that every man is “in a state of internal warfare with himself”; this statement presupposes the doctrine of Original Sin. (*Laws*, §626e; Hamilton, 1963, p. 1228) [[60]](#footnote-60) The Christian doctrine of Original Sin presupposes War at all times. The person who thinks Peace shall reign thinks that they can overcome Original Sin in the world by force of will, or “changing The System”. Original Sin is here to stay on this present earth and no amount of human effort or “will” or utopias can change that. Original Sin is always operative. What this entails, is that many people refuse to see reality. They can’t handle it. Philosophy is about “the condition of what is”, ***not*** about “what we wish it to be”. Traditional orthodox Christianity would back up Clinias and Heraclitus or that Clinias the Cretan is backing up traditional orthodox Christianity. As Pythagoras taught, memorializing Doric teaching for the ages there is a congruity between the physical and spiritual realms. There are many parallels between Doric/Platonic philosophy and Christian teachings.

There is another teaching in the Bible that corresponds to Life is War. In the book of Genesis, after the breach of trust and the collaboration of Eve with Satan, God intervened into history. God said:

“And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed.”

In other words, this means that great hatred is placed between Good and Evil so that they will never cooperate again. Good must hate Evil and Evil must hate Good. This is locked into reality. There is no changing it. People who adopt evil must hate Good. There will be no relationship between the two. [[61]](#footnote-61) Either Good suppresses evil or Evil will terminate Good. This was proved in the French, Russian revolutions, and the Spanish, Greek civil wars where evil forces of revolution killed the Good, i.e. priests, nuns and monks and destroyed Catholic and Orthodox Churches. This is set in stone. Life is War and that cannot be changed. Atheists are automatically repulsed by religious behavior; it irritates them. Christian religious doctrine backs up the claims of the Cretan legislator that Life is War. The true philosopher, a Doric Greek, Clinias the Cretan agrees with Christian dogma.

When the true philosopher Heraclitus portrays that “war is the common condition…” and that “…all things come to pass through compulsion of strife”, can be easily said about the agrarian life. The Farmer is at war with the soil, insects, raiders, animals, fungus/molds, and the weather in order to procure his crop. In Genesis, God cursed the ground so that man “only by the sweat of his brow” can reap its benefits. (LXX, Genesis, 3:20) Any and all Farmers are at constant war with conditions in order to get his crop in. War is the condition of all things in this life. Agrarianism teaches that Life is War; it hardens man.

It is a warrior people who face reality, who have to see reality as is, with no pretensions and no prejudices. They have to read reality right in order to live. Academics are divorced from this environment. Once divorced, they create a pseudo-environment where they can create their own laws; they live in dreamland.

If it is to be acknowledged that Apollo is central to Western Culture and many scholars have used Apolline characteristics to understand and teach Western Culture, then, it is necessary to understand Apollo.

Apollo was the prophet warrior of the northern Greek tribes. (Müller: I, 16) At Athens, “Apollo was adopted for the military caste alone, the ancient Hoplites; hence he was not a god of artisans and husbandmen, but of warriors”. (ibid: I, 264) Among the many offices he held, Apollo was the warring and victorious god. (ibid: I, 317) Before and after battles, the paean to Apollo was sung. Many academics praise the Apolline character of Western Culture. What is going to happen now when it is found out that Apollo was a warrior god? Does this information turn their stomach as well? The two Gods of Western Culture, the one of the Bible and Apollo, are connected to war; in the Masoretic text, it has “The Lord God is a man of war”.[[62]](#footnote-62) The appellation “Lord God of Hosts” throughout the Old Testament signifies the Hebrew war god. The Bible is one of the central texts of Western Culture. Western Culture was formed by Warrior Gods. [[63]](#footnote-63)

War is a fact of life. To be disturbed about that and/or rewrite classical history and sociology to hide that fact damages understanding of reality and classical antiquity; it gives false impressions and thus creates The Cave. (More myth-making.) For seminaries, colleges and universities to be places where young men can escape their duty to country as during the Vietnam War in America, has had a very deleterious effect on scholarship where their peacenik proclivities has been to bury Spartan influence and patrimony under a pile of smears thus skewing the foundation of Western Culture and understanding of philosophy.[[64]](#footnote-64) This is a very good lesson on why Virtue is connected to Knowledge and to Truth. Cowards portray Vice, Not Virtue. Cowards cannot do philosophy. No Virtue, no Knowledge and no Truth. The prejudice of academics, especially Marxist academics, has really done huge damage to Classical Studies and Philosophy.

Another problem seems to be facts. Socrates ends his Protagoras section with this claim:

“I mention these facts”.

How and why this was dismissed as irony when the section ends with “I mention these facts” is absolutely mind-boggling. This condition though, is now normal throughout liberal studies on colleges and universities. The academic that worked at the most prestigious flagship universities of the American college system, Prof. Kernan, an English Lit. professor, who worked in academia during the 1960’s cultural revolution, records a situation where certain professors in defending another’s creative thesis at a tenure board, “railed against ‘facticity’ and ‘the tyranny of facts’.” (p. 195) In his conclusion of his memoir, he quotes another when he says of the higher level educational standards within academia as “there are no facts, or even approximation of facts, only endless fictions”. (p.299)

How and when did this situation arise? One has to look no further than one of the major so-called philosophers of the modern era, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). The story is told that when a student of his observed that the facts contradicted his theory, Hegel looked at the man severely over his spectacles and said: “All the worse for the facts”. (Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, 1990, 488, #1150) Hegel had an epiphany that human thought “ought to govern reality, instead of the other way around”. (Oxford, “Hegel”, p. 341) At this moment, Hegel reversed Greek philosophy and 2000 years of Western Thought. For this very reason, Hegel is NOT a philosopher.[[65]](#footnote-65) This is called “contempt for reality” which is a vice of ideologues. Socrates and Plato did NOT teach a “contempt for reality”. For Hegel, in the process of dialectic, ideas are reached in stages until absolute idealism reveals itself which is the Mind of History, knowing itself as all reality. (ibid, p. 342) [[66]](#footnote-66) Furthermore, it was Hegel who wrote that the Spartans were despised by the other Greeks, and, the most far-fetched claim, that “they had no intellectual culture”. (Rawson, 325) He created those things out of thin air. Those statements about Sparta are completely,…totally,…opposite of what has been previously examined in this paper. Hegel’s claims are outrageous lies, falsehoods and complete fabrications. Is Hegel a philosopher that is about “knowing the condition of that which is”? Absolutely not! He’s an asshole. There are three points here that thoroughly disabuses the claim that Hegel is a philosopher; his total rejection of facts, his attitude that human thought governs reality and then as Xenophanes points out, it takes a “Wise man to know Wise man”, his entire manufacture of derogatory fairytales about Sparta. Hegel is a myth-maker. He is a man **without** Virtue. Hegel is imprisoning people in the cave of shadows of his own making; he is a weaver of darkness. If he was a philosopher, he would know his own, i.e. the Spartans—but he does not. This is all solidified by George Lichtheim, in his book *The Origins of Socialism*, who states in the form of a question, that the followers of Hegel realized that he,

**“…brought traditional philosophy to a close”!**

(p. 156 ª) [[67]](#footnote-67)

What? Brought traditional philosophy to a close? Are you kidding? And he is lauded as a “major philosopher”? A person who destroyed traditional philosophy, is then crowned with the mantle of ‘philosopher’? How unreal is this? Or better yet, is anybody going to tell us this? Obviously not! His followers recognized what Hegel had done. When Hegel is lauded as a great philosopher and that he is studied and followed everywhere [[68]](#footnote-68) is a very black eye for academia not to mention philosophy departments everywhere.[[69]](#footnote-69) As was stated earlier, there is NO philosophy whatsoever being conducted anywhere in the Western Hemisphere or in the Western diaspora.[[70]](#footnote-70) The patrimony of the Dorians through Socrates, Plato and Aristotle has been completely shredded and thrown in the dumpster. Hegel is an ideologue who taught that one can make up reality as he sees fit; in that case no need for facts. Not only has Hegel destroyed the science of philosophy and rejected human obedience to the Logos buried in Nature, he has also destroyed Classical Studies of our Graeco-Roman heritage that undergirds European Civilization! Everybody has repeated the Hegelian lie that the Spartans “had no intellectual culture”. It is a crime that everybody echoes Hegel but the brilliant, studious, meticulous, Karl Otfried Müller, a pious Protestant and a Lover of the Dorians, is submerged in obscurity; he is nowhere taught in any classical department and is quoted by nobody. Funny how that is; Funny how modern academia picked a hater over a lover—Again, it is “kin to kin”. Whereas the Greeks were lovers of this and that,[[71]](#footnote-71) modern Western culture is built on the spirit of hate. Is this Western Culture?

That is not even the half of it. What is going on is that a spirit, a spirit of hatred, has invaded into Western Culture and that is why modern culture has a hatred towards its own foundations. The myths of democracy, equality and liberty is the driving impetus of all that is written in academia. What is going on? Why was the Protagoras statement dismissed out-of-hand? Why is a Cave being built in the halls of Academia? Why are professors who claim the title of “Academus” in honoring of Plato, betraying their Forefather in the rejecting of facts? This is now going to be explored at length. The importance of the Socratic mission becomes clear when he states in the *Republic* that “everything that deceives appears to cast a spell upon the mind”. (§413c; Hamilton, 1963, 658) A spell has been cast onto Western Culture and Western man’s mind is clouded and befuddled indeed. The whole of modern culture and civilization is ***Le grande mirage***! With no facts, there is only mirage and with Vice, there is no understanding; it is the Cave which Plato described. The hypocrisy is that these very same people are the progeny of the so-called “Enlightenment” which was about freeing people from the supposed superstition of the Roman Catholic Church and the Old Order. There was no superstition of the Roman Catholic Church nor in the Old Order. The critics, the “*philosophes*”, the revolutionaries who thought they were creating the “Age of Reason” instead created one grand mirage; they created The Cave. Truly, it can be said,

“The whole modern world is like one huge Jim Jones Temple, and everybody has drunk the Kool-Aid.”

What follows is why the Spartan heritage must be buried or must be greatly disparaged. The whole modern world is a mirage.

**THE REAL MYTH-MAKING AND THE DEATH OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY**

The ideologue Hegel is very important for the intellectual history of the modern Western world. The Austrian, Catholic, aristocrat Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, who has done much study on the intellectual currents that formed Fascism, writes in a nutshell that

“…Hegel is the mentor of Marx and Treitschke, hence the trailblazer of socialism, nationalism and statism. Marx gave his doctrine to German, Austrian and Czech socialists alike. Treitschke, on the other hand, influenced Schönerer, and Schönerer influenced Hitler. Marx is also behind French socialism, which produced Sorel, who in turn is admittedly the spiritual father of the young socialist Mussolini, the admirer of Hus. And Mussolini influenced Hitler.” (Von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, 1993, 211) [[72]](#footnote-72)

Marx plays a huge role in this intellectual history. In a previous paper [[73]](#footnote-73), the claim by Wikipedia and *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* that Karl Marx is a philosopher was debunked. This is Marx’s opinion of philosophy: “Philosophy stands in the same relation to the study of the actual world as masturbation to sexual love”, (Marx Quotes) so said the man “who claimed to have made Socialism scientific”. (Russell, 1945, 782) He also “criticized the notion of ‘truth’”. (Russell, 1945, 784) He cannot possibly be a lover of wisdom. Karl Marx, who is Jewish, is an ideologue and a great admirer of Hegel. There is more to Hegel than just being a thought engineer of idealism. Hegel is the one that thru his dialectical theory of history led to the possibility of the apotheosis of the antithesis of German National Socialism and the Final Solution to the thesis of International Socialism founded by Karl Marx. And because of the horrors of WWII, Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, who are Jews, of the hugely influential Marxist Frankfurt School find “the National Socialist terror was not an aberration of modern history but was rooted deeply in the fundamental characteristics of Western civilization.” (p. 218) Since they have condemned Western Culture by direct linkage to the Holocaust, not only does Western Culture need to be destroyed but the Spartans are dragged into this mess and condemned as well.[[74]](#footnote-74) It is then no wonder that students at Stanford University, an institution of Western Culture that traces its lineage back to Plato’s Academy, which houses the prodigy of the Frankfurt School, called “The Institute of Social Research”, SHOUT: “Hey, Hey, Ho, Ho! Western Civ has got to go!” (Veith, 147) Really? Where does all this hate come from? Hatred of one’s forefathers? Is this the practice of Virtue? …of Righteousness?

The proverb is “Thief knows Thief”, which is based in the Natural Law—“Birds of a feather flock together” (Jowett uses this phrase in his translation of the *Republic* in lieu of the Greek phrase “Like to Like”.); all the domesticated animals, except the domestic cat, are herd, i.e. social animals, who obey that dictum; “All things are by Nature”. This dictum is not only physical, but by spirit. Karl Marx saw a very kindred spirit in Hegel but it wasn’t just the imposing of human reason upon reality, and the ability to create reality according to one’s whims that attracted him to Hegel. Hegel also proffered the idea of ending conflict between the individual and the collective; of ending conflict altogether. (Oxford, “Hegel”) Hegel was already much attuned to the values of Karl Marx and there’s a reason for that.

Prof. Glenn Magee unknowingly provides the link on why Marx liked Hegel. In his book, he conclusively proves that Hegel is a Hermetic thinker; (p. 1) that is to say that in his Germany at the time, Germany was awash in esoteric writings that emerged during the Renaissance which many people at that time thought that it originated with Moses or at most certainly existed way before Plato who they think copied it. Hegel was enmeshed in “the theosophical Pietist tradition of Württemberg” (p. 3) where he lived. For that time, that was normal. The Hermetic Tradition is the background for Rosicrusianism and Freemasonry. In a quick outline, Magee traces just some of the Hermetic tradition throughout Hegel’s writings:

“These include, in broad strokes, a Masonic subtext of “initiation mysticism” in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*; a Böhmean subtext to the *Phenomenology*'s famous preface; a Kabbalistic-Böhmean-Lullian influence on the *Logic*; alchemical-Paracelsian elements in the *Philosophy of Nature*; an influence of Kabbalistic and Joachimite millennialism on Hegel's doctrine of Objective Spirit and theory of world history; alchemical and Rosicrucian images in the *Philosophy of Right*; an influence of the Hermetic tradition of *pansophia* on the system as a whole; an endorsement of the Hermetic belief in *philosophia perennis*; and the use of perennial Hermetic symbolic forms (such as the triangle, the circle, and the square) as structural, architectonic devices.” (p. 2)

Prof. Magee brings up much more evidence of Hegel’s interest in the esoteric field. Among those, is that Hegel was informally associated with Freemasonry lodges and Rosicrucian circles. (p. 6, 254) (Several of the Founding Fathers of America were in the exact same line—Freemasons. {Sora, Ridley} Thomas Paine, the intellectual goad of the American Revolution, though not a Mason, wrote a favorable treatise on them. Thomas Jefferson, again not a Mason, is recorded as having attended Masonic meetings and knew Rosicrusianism. {Sora, 170})

The Hermetic tradition, along with the Kabbala, is embedded in Freemasonry which claims to be this *philosophia perennis*. This tradition is a subconscious, subtle rejection of dominant Roman Catholic culture and its intellectual milieu of Platonism and most certainly Aristotelianism; i.e. the allure was that it was NOT connected to the hated Roman Catholic Church and its intellectual culture. It was the Protestant/Deist/Atheist ‘philosophy’ counterpoised to the Aristotelianism of Roman Catholicism. The Kabbala teaches primitivism, i.e. defined as “which is first” is the most authentic and true. Protestantism is based on returning to “Christian primitivism”. In the Renaissance, the lie began that the Hermetic tradition was very old, older than Plato. The Hermetic Tradition along with the Kabbala was crowned with the mantle of ageless antiquity, therefore great authority and it was seized upon one and all who hated the Roman Catholic Church. The Hermetic Tradition taught tolerance, diversity, equality and the ability to save oneself thru gnosis. The Hermetic tradition is a mish-mash of all things, a smorgasbord of everybody and anybody that wrote anything down. For example, one can see it freely in Albert Pike’s *Morals and Dogmas* of Freemasonry which quotes from Zoroaster, the Bible (both Old and New), Pythagoreanism, the Kabbala as mentioned, Egyptian mythology, Gnosticism, Plato, Neoplatonism, the Stoics, Hindus, Judaic practices, etc. In essence, it is Oriental thought; the syncreticity of incongruity. Freemasonry, basically, is Oriental.[[75]](#footnote-75) Much of it is contradictory to its own self.

Amazingly, this very same pattern of conflicting ideas is a character of Hegelian thought. The article on “Hegelianism” (Oxford) showcases these very features:

* “Hegel believed his own philosophy to be not ‘one-sided’ …but a ‘universal’ philosophy” which embraced or sublimated all other philosophical teachings. He taught both sides of the fence, doing justice to realism, materialism, idealism, atheism and theism. [[76]](#footnote-76)
* There are NO straight answers to anything.
* His teachings were so ambiguous that his followers were divided into ‘right/left’ or ‘old/young’ groups because his philosophy could support either side.
* “…Hegel’s thought is too rich, complex, and ambivalent for any single individual to swallow whole”

All those conclusions above can be said about Freemasonry. With all the material Albert Pike includes in his massive 861 page tome of small print, it is too rich, too complex and too ambivalent to comprehend succinctly what is wanted. One can create anything one wants out of it except Roman Catholic dogma and teachings which it scorns. It is as if this whole paradigm is a maze where one has to pick his own ending or gets lost (maybe that’s the plan after-all).

There is a parallel or even a foundation of this if you like found in Jewish thought. Keith Hopkins, in his book, *The World is Full of Gods, The Strange Triumph of Christianity*, quotes one of his favorite passages from the Talmud:

“In a discussion about whether ritually pure foods stored in one corner of a basket were polluted by a dead snake found in another corner of the basket. Hezekiah stated that the foods which were previously clean remain clean. Rabbi Yohanan stated that the foods which were previously clean were now regarded retrospectively as unclean. But Shammai and Hillel agree that in the case of a basket, the foods which were previously considered clean are now retrospectively deemed unclean. But Shammai and Hillel concur only in case of a basket without a bottom. But if the basket has no bottom, what could R. Yohanan's reason be?" (p. 81)

He contrasts this with Christian leaders who know precisely what constituted correct belief. Keith Hopkins, an atheist, rather prefers the Jewish achievement of anti­unanimity than “Christian theological dogmatism”. Jewish thought does not demand a single answer. What it does show is a 360° outlook; all and none are correct. This is confirmed “in the expression, ‘s*hiv'im panim laTorah’*: ‘the Torah has 70 faces’, meaning that different perspectives on paradoxical issues should all be given their voice.” (Parsons) From a Greek standpoint, the above situation is unreal and unfathomable; it is repulsive; there is no Logos in their thought, tons of rationalizations but no Logos. Fundamentally, Freemasonry and Hegelian thought are Jewish for they break Parmenides principle of non-contradiction which is the hallmark of Western linear masculine thought patterns. One of the reasons behind the Doric elenchus that Socrates uses is to catch contradictions. Socratic/Platonic thought was one harmonious stream of consistency; things have to agree one-with-another. One of the meanings of ‘logos’ is ‘standard’. The Doric elenchus has three standards; the principle of identity, the principle of non-contradiction, and the principle of consistency. In other ways the real, original natural law provides a standard for human reasoning. It is dogmatic in that sense. The Doric Greeks are central, core of European thought patterns and methods. (Edith Hamilton {1993a} and Jacques Maritain in the beginning of each of their respective books have a chapter dedicated to exhibiting the difference between East and West, differences of thoughts and values {which will not be covered here}.[[77]](#footnote-77))

This is not the end of it either. There is another more important element to the Hermetic Tradition that Hegel picks up on. The Kabbala is quoted quite frequently in Pike’s *Morals and Dogmas*; it is a major component of Freemasonry. Outside of Freemasonry, many Christians including Catholics were Kabbalists. Hegel had to be well versed in the Kabbala to structure his sophistry along its lines. The Kabbala and Lullism that Hegel is interested in, carries within it a certain Talmudic teaching—the ingredients necessary for Jewish Messianism to occur.

The Chief Rabbi of the London Synagogue, Rabbi Ari Kahn (2012), teaches that World Unity and a Utopia have to be established before the Jewish Messiah can come. The Utopia includes World Peace (connect this with Hegel’s teaching of ending conflict). Those teachings are incorporated in the Kabbala and Lullism. All things that have at their foundation the Kabbala, have those Jewish Talmudic teachings. Although there are religious and atheistic branches of Freemasonry, the core of Freemasonry does teach these two dogmatic things as well, the Brotherhood of Man, or in other words World Unity and the establishment of a Utopia that has World Peace. (q.v. Appendix II) Another concept which is part of Kabbalistic teaching is that Jews have a duty to help God perfect his creation called “Tikkun Olam” or “fixing the world”. [[78]](#footnote-78) They work with God to correct the shortcomings of His creation.

“Messianism envisions human existence as a three-part process, consisting of an original unity, a middle period in which man has "fallen" into history, and an eschatological final period. Messianism sees history as destined for the restoration of the original unity broken by the sin of Adam. The Jewish discontent with the present is rooted in the feeling of loss of this original harmony and the deep desire for its return. Jewish messianism understands the restoration of the original unity as a public, communal event which occurs on the stage of history. It is here that Jewish and Christian messianism has parted company.” (Weisberger, 116)

In other, simpler words, the rebuilding of the Tower of Babel. The original unity mentioned above is the Tower of Babel, the middle part is that men are divided by race, the third part is the rebuilding of the Tower of Babel (and hence the League of Nations and when that didn’t work, WWII to spur membership in its rebirth in the United Nations).[[79]](#footnote-79) Hegel captured this spirit in his writings. The Marxist scholar George Lichtheim writes of the significance of Hegel when he corrected Immanuel Kant. Kant taught that moral and political decisions could not be reached theoretically: “what ought to be cannot be deduced from what is”. (Lichtheim, 155) “Hegel did away with this distinction, and thereby opened the road to revolution.” The pro-Marxist scholar George Lichtheim categorizes Hegel as a political conservative because he supported the Prussian monarchy and state and praised its efforts of liberalism but that is not the case that Hegel was a conservative. The Prussian king that Hegel was born under was King Frederick the Great; he was a Freemason. And the successor king was King Frederick William II who was a Rosicrucian (Wikipedia). The leadership of the Prussian states were Hermeticists; they were his intellectual kinsmen. This is why Hegel supported the Prussian monarchy. So in other words, Hegel is still a revolutionary; he is true to his values.

What Hegel did teach was that “there is absolutely nothing beyond the reach of human thought. …Once this faith had sunk in, it did not take his bolder followers long to conclude that *the material world can be* (and therefore must be) *transformed*, so as to turn it into a creation of the human spirit (itself consubstantial with the divinity)” (Lichtheim, 155 º) hence no need for facts. This mirrors exactly Jewish teaching. Transforming the world is the Jewish goal. This is part of the process to force the appearance of the Jewish messiah. Hegel provided the process, the legitimization, the intellectual know-how to accomplish their goals. In other words, myth-making.

This is what enthused Karl Marx. This is exactly what meshed with what Karl Marx learned from his teacher Moses Hess who is Jewish. Hess is the connecting line between Hegel and Marx. "Hess was a pioneer, for right from the start he had seen in Hegelianism not merely a vantage point for radical social criticism, but a force for total social change. Thus, in his first book, published in 1837, Hess already described the inevitable goal of the historical process as a society in which all men would be fully free and equal." (Frankel) It was about ending all forms of social inequality through the adoption of communism/socialism. Social inequality is hierarchy or castes. Hierarchy and castes is central to Indo-European civilization.

Hegel is not only the Father of Ideology, he is Orientalizing. Better yet, with Hegel’s strong interest in the Kabbala, and Lullism which is another form of Kabbala, Hegel is a Judiazer. Not only did he destroy traditional Western philosophy, but he surreptitiously brought in and legitimized Jewish Messianic designs under the title of ‘philosophy’. He deconstructed Western philosophy and substituted Jewish ideology. Jewish ideology has no need for facts or the natural law. Karl Marx was enthralled with Hegel because what he taught not only made possible the ability to transform the world but had an affinity to what Judaism teaches. “Thief knows Thief”. Hegel turned his back on and slimed the true warrior philosophers of Lacedæmonia, his European cousins, and adopted a foreign ideology from the East. Along with Freemasonry and Rosicrusianism, he injected Eastern thought patterns into the West.

Idealism, (it is called German Idealism) is nothing more than Jewish Kabbalistic teachings! “In light of kabbalah’s impact on Idealism, it is not surprising that Jewish philosophers, especially those with kabbalistic backgrounds, recognized in Idealism a kindred spirit.” (Franks) German Idealism is the intellectual system for Marxism. German Idealism is the “science” of Myth-making and Marxism is the grandest Myth.

**WHY THE HATRED**

“Marxist doctrine is tied very closely to philosophical theories that are in the main Hegelian.” (Russell, 1959, p. 270)

Marxist doctrine is socialism. For Marx, “history is the process whereby man changes himself in the act of changing the world”. (Lichtheim, 192) For this very goal of changing the world, Marx claimed to have stopped being a philosopher “because philosophy was by its very nature incapable of transforming the world.” (ibid, 194) He is very much correct. True traditional Western philosophy has nothing to do with changing the world or revolution. Why Oxford labels this man as a philosopher is beyond comprehension. Marx is a revolutionary, an ideologue, a deconstructionist but not a philosopher. As a revolutionary, his system was created out of a synthesis of different European parts that would accomplish his goal of transformation. Socialism is this vehicle of alteration. Socialism is a mixture of Hegelianism (German Idealism), Feuerbach naturalism, French revolutionary and socialist practice and British economics. It was Marx that brought all four of these streams together. (Lichtheim, 185-195) Feuerbach taught that there was no God because man created him and so man is “species being” and with that comes materialism. This is how the dialectics of Hegel were morphed by Hess and Marx into dialectical materialism. But there was no morality in Feuerbach so to the vacuum left by Feuerbach, Marx borrowed French utopian socialism and revolution. “’True socialism’ was French socialism (of the Saint-Simon variety)…” which was translated into German philosophical language of Hegel. (Lichtheim, 179-180) Robert L. Heilbroner categorizes Saint-Simon with another Frenchman Charles Fourier as Utopian socialists. What makes them Utopian was their hope of convincing the upper classes to join them, their economic reform ideas, and their insistence of a New Society all-together. (Heilbroner, 118-119; Spargo & Arner, chapter XVI) Karl Marx took their Utopian socialism and converted it into “scientific socialism”.

Modern Socialism teaches almost the same stuff as Utopian socialists. (Spargo & Arner, 201) “Every socialist is of necessity an idealist”. (Spargo & Arner, ibid) An idealist doesn’t have to pay attention to facts but should be dwelling, as Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno put it in their preface, in “theoretical imagination”. (p. xvi) In the light of this definition of socialism as idealism, can there be such a beast as “scientific socialism”? No, the ‘scientific’ part of this phrase is the marrying of British economics to social idealism. “Scientific Socialism” is an oxymoron. If socialism means idealism, then you can’t logically or commonsensically marry idealism with science! It is moronic.

Another ingredient is that “Modern Socialism is essentially international”. It has the vision of a great world unity that is older than Marxian socialism, older even than the Christian religion. (Spargo & Arner, 202) Of course, this is the echo of the Tower of Babel. Despite Spargo and Arner’s protestations that socialism doesn’t lead directly to a “former world federation”, John Kiang does in his book *One World*, where,

"As far as world unity is concerned, Marx and Engels were the pioneers who expounded that modern industry had furnished a real foundation for a world unity, and declared not only that 'working men have no country,' but also that 'Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationalities.' (Pg 248-9)

And is footnoted with:

"In this declaration Marx and Engels claimed that the struggle of the workers was international in essence. National differences, they pointed out, were being wiped out by the development of free trade, by the growth of a world market, and by the increasing uniformity of industrial and social conditions. The workers in particular were being denationalized by modern industry, and had no fatherland." (p. 248)

Spargo and Arner note that with industrial globalization the state dies out. Lenin said, “Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism, be it even of the ‘most just’, ‘purest’, most refined and civilized brand” Woods and Grant declare that "Nationalism and Marxism are incompatible"; it is an essential teaching of socialism.

Another component of socialism is universal peace: “The vision of world-peace which the Hebrew prophet proclaimed when he foretold the coming of a time when the social consciousness of the world must destroy war and forge its weapons into tools of peaceful industry finds its expression in the Socialist propaganda of to-day.” (Spargo and Arner, p. 203) Here there is an ideology that almost all people and even its adherents is basically atheistic and yet here, the adherents, the scholars of the movement quote from the Old Testament a Hebrew prophet that legitimizes what they are trying to accomplish; a bunch of atheists, a materialist movement, is trying to fulfill religious prophecy. Isn’t this a little bit inconsistent? This whole program is about “immantizing the eschaton”, about bringing heaven down to earth; it is the creation of utopia.

Socialism incorporates the totality of Jewish messianic teachings. It is said that:

“The completion of the world is socialism.” (Weisberger, 131)

“…they will bring out socialism, and upon the basis of socialism will raise the human society resting on universal communism.” (Waton, 225)

When Socialism is everywhere, the unity of man and the Utopia established with total equality, then the world is ready for the Jewish messiah. When the whole world has adopted Jewish ideas and has become Jewish, [[80]](#footnote-80) then it is “completed”; it has completed the trajectory that Hegel mapped out for the dialectics and end of history. Socialism is Jewish ideology. Marxism is Jewish ideology. This is why meetings of Communists were called International Socialism because the end goal was to do away with nations and states and bring about world unity. [[81]](#footnote-81)

Freemasonry and Socialism have ensconced within them the same thing. This is why it is called Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism. Freemasonry and socialism are the vehicles for transforming the world for the needs of Jewish messianism. Western Culture nor civilization exist anymore. The atheist Thomas Paine who lived and worked in both the American and French Revolutions saw exactly what these revolutions entailed:

“A revolution in the state of civilization is the necessary companion of revolutions in the system of government."

And

"It is a revolution in the state of civilization that will give perfection to the Revolution of France." (Vincent, pgs. 143; 165)

Modern republicanism overthrew Western civilization and Hegel overthrew Western culture. In his book, *In Plato’s Cave*, Prof. Alan Kernan is a witness to the completion of the stripping of the last vestiges of Western thought and mental discipline from European and American colleges and universities in the 60’s Cultural Revolution. Catholic higher education and seminaries fared no better. Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism is now the civilization, culture and mentality of the Western Hemisphere and Western diaspora. (This will be covered in more depth in a later book.)

This happened thru a technique that was preached by the atheist Machiavelli (it is suspicious if he created himself or was taught this) of ‘revolution within the form’. Prof. Paul A. Rahe highlights this issue in his massive study of ancient and modern republics by a quote from Machiavelli:

“He who desires or wishes to reform the condition of a city and wishes that it be accepted and that it be able to maintain itself to everyone's satisfaction is forced to **retain at least the shadow of ancient modes** so that it might seem to the people that order has not changed—though, in fact, the new orders are completely alien to those of the past. For the universality of **men feed as much on appearance as on reality** {ed. note: this is Plato’s cave}: indeed, in many cases, they are moved more by the things which seem than by those which are....And this much should be observed by all **who wish to eliminate an ancient way of life** (un antico vivere) in a city and reduce it to a new and free way of life (ridurla a uno vivere nuovo e libero): one ought, since new things alter the minds of men, to see to it that these alterations retain as much as the ancient as possible; and if the magistrates change from those of old in number, authority, and term of office, they ought at least retain the name." (Machiavelli as quoted by Rahe, Vol II, p. 291 ª)

Yes, the ancient way of life was eliminated; traditional European civilization and culture was extinguished. “Revolution within the form” is the methodology where the name is retained but the substance, the definition, is changed underneath the name, the designation; in other words, a different meaning is inserted under the old name. This is again myth-making. This same paradigm of keeping the name but changing the definition underneath, is what the ideologue Hegel did to philosophy. The name was retained, traditional Western philosophy was brought to a close and a foreign, Eastern ideology replaced it so that a newer and freer way of life can be accomplished. This was also done to the term ‘republic’; modern republicanism is 180° different from classical republicanism. (Wheeler, 2005) Modern republicanism eliminated the ancient way of life, traditional Western civilization of Throne and Altar, and Hegel eliminated ancient traditional Western thought. Prof. Eric Nelson writes that the Reformation brought into being a thing called ***Hebraic politica***; the interest in things of the Bible, especially the Old Testament changed European culture, i.e. "The Hebrew revival transformed European literature and criticism, medicine and science, theology and ecclesiology and philosophy and law". (p. 16)

Socialism adopted modern republicanism; it became republican socialism under Blanquism. (Lichtheim, 62-65). Blanquism is the forerunner of communism. Modern republicanism is plain-old democracy. (Wheeler, 2005)

* "Democracy is the road to socialism." Karl Marx
* "Socialism is impossible without democracy." Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (Souvarine, 563)
* "Modern Socialism is inseparable from political democracy." *Elements of Socialism*, p. 337.
* "The view that democracy and Socialism are inwardly related spread far and wide in the decades which preceded the Bolshevist revolution. Many came to believe that democracy and Socialism meant the same thing, and that democracy without Socialism or Socialism without democracy would not be possible." *Socialism*, Ludwig von Mises, p. 67.

Modern Socialism is intricately intertwined with democracy; [[82]](#footnote-82) one can say they are one and the same thing. A grand majority of academics are Marxists. Others are plain socialists/liberals and what few left are supposed to be conservatives. The problem is that so-called ‘conservatives’ in the Anglo-sphere, England, Canada, America, Australia, New Zealand, are liberals. The term ‘conservative’ in the Anglo-sphere means liberal. (Lichtheim, 258; Russell quoted by Schapiro, p. 21) True conservatives, continental conservatives, are for Throne and Altar; they preserve the Old Order. [[83]](#footnote-83) On the other hand, Socialists and Liberals are all for democracy and a new order. American so-called conservatives are about the Novus Ordo of Americanism—of modern republicanism. Liberalism is a form of Nihilism; it is the first stage of Nihilism. (Rose, 23-33)[[84]](#footnote-84) They share in some of the same ideas of the socialist/ideologue agenda. Even though Anglo-sphere ‘conservatives’ have the word ‘conservative’ they are still nihilists; they are ideologues of the soft sort.

In order to further the socialization of European peoples, democracy must be pushed. It is the agenda. Not only must democracy be promoted, but it must be taught as the “best” government out there. What does democracy do? It destroys hierarchy and caste systems! It is ancient synoceism; the ending of particularity. Democracy ends the social inequality that Hess railed against. Democracy is the vehicle for not only the Jewish Utopia but also for leveling European civilization. But there is a big problem—the witness of the classical record is the complete opposite! Why are all these academics, ‘puzzled” or “find it odd” that Socrates’ favorite form of government was Crete and Sparta? From the Renaissance on, a certain program was pushed irregardless of what the ancients said.[[85]](#footnote-85) The record is that throughout the Platonic dialogues, Socrates and Plato both excoriate democracy.[[86]](#footnote-86) Listen to Socrates in the Republic on how a champion of the people becomes a tyrant:

“And is it not true that in like manner a leader of the people who, getting control of a docile mob, does not withhold his hand from the shedding of tribal blood, but by the customary unjust accusations brings a citizen into court and assassinates him, blotting out a human life, and with unhallowed tongue and lips that have tasted kindred blood, banishes and slays and **hints at the abolition of debts and the partition of lands**…” (*Rep*., VIII, xvi; 565e-566a; Loeb, pgs. 319-321 ª)

This sounds exactly like the Roman Gracchi brothers, the Tribune Saturninus, Babeuf, Blanqui, Hess, Karl Marx, the French Revolutionaries, Leon Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin, Bill Clinton and Hussein Obama. Even though the current president of the U.S.A., Hussein Obama took an oath to the Constitution and to the execution of its laws, he is refusing to uphold the Defense of Marriage Act and enforce immigration laws; furthermore, he preaches class envy and digs at the rich all the time. Democracy has no respect for either property of the rich or the rule of the law.

Aristotle is even against democracy. He describes the lawlessness of democracy when “assemblies override the law” and that in others resolutions of the assembly are supreme and not the laws, “by referring all things to the people”. (*Pol*., IV, iv, 3-6; 1292a; Loeb, 303) Like Plato, Aristotle records that “some people assert that the best constitution must be a combination of all the forms”. He goes on to say that a government that is composed “of a larger number of forms is better”. (*Pol*., II, iii, 10-11; 1265b 30-1266a 5; Loeb p. 107) Further on, Aristotle goes thru his list and clearly posits democracy as the BAD FORM of constitutional government, the ‘politeia’. (*Pol*., III, v, 4; 1279b 5; Loeb, p. 207) As Plato’s most genuine disciple (Gerson), Aristotle in describing the *àρíστης πολιτείας* (best constitution {*Pol*., VII, viii, 2; 1328b 30; Loeb, p. 575}) goes on to mimic the mixed constitution and culture of Sparta, copying Plato. On top of this, Aristotle doubles down on Plato’s intuition that democracy always transforms into tyranny:

“Moreover the characteristics of a tyranny also are all thought to be democratic, I mean for instance license among slaves, which may really be advantageous for the popular party up to a point, and among women and children, and indulgence to live as one likes; a constitution of this sort will have a large number of supporters, as disorderly living is pleasanter to the mass of mankind than sober living.” (*Pol*., VI, ii, 12; §1319b 25-30; Loeb, 507)

This “disorderly living is pleasanter to the mass of mankind than sober living” is the essence of the whole transformation of European culture and civilization. European culture and civilization is similar to Spartan society and it was a hard life. Everybody wants the easy life and no one wants the hard life. What is Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism? Anarchy.

To continue, none of the intelligentsia, none of the true philosophers of classical Greece subscribed to democracy. Democracy is one of the bad forms of government. Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn in all his works, (which no one reads anyway for obvious reasons) catalogues modern writers that have pointed out the same thing and the deleterious effects of democracy.[[87]](#footnote-87) This is the true anomaly: Plato and Aristotle call democracy the bad government and promote politeia, the mixed form of government, yet all the modern works produced promote democracy. And why is that?

In order to have mixed government, one must have a mixed society which presupposes a real and effective hierarchy and caste system. The definition of a politeia is the mix of aristocracy and democracy. This is the rub: hierarchy. Socialists and liberals are egalitarians; equality and liberty are the goals. Hess wanted to end social inequality and Marx’s had a great hatred of feudalism; social inequality is hierarchy which expresses itself in feudalism or a caste society. Marx (1845) wanted to do away with the “division of labor”. They have an aversion to hierarchy. Instead of just teaching democracy and promoting it, they feel a need to obfuscate and change the record in Classical Antiquity.

For example, the atheist utilitarian John Stuart Mill reviewing several volumes of Grote’s great history of Greece, echoed Grote’s minimizing of Sparta’s intellectual and cultural achievements and noted that “**their state did nothing for progress**”. (Rawson, 359 ª) [[88]](#footnote-88) This is why Sparta must be denigrated in the halls of academia—she is not “with the program of progress”; Sparta is opposite of the socialist and liberal program even though at this time of Grote and Mill, England had mixed government so Sparta’s castigation is hard to fathom! The armchair classicist John Aylmer during the Tudor period classified the Spartan government as matching the English government of his day. Him and Sir Thomas Smyth both classified republics as mixed government and Sparta and Tudor England had republics. But for modern academics Classical studies shall be slanted to fit “the modern modes and orders” of a novus ordo. Grote was a liberal and hence a democraphile, a lover of democracy. What is Grote doing? He is myth-making. To change history, to not record “the condition of what is” is myth-making. Like everything else, history is not being treated as a science but is being falsely portrayed! History is being rewritten for the sake of ‘progress’! History, which is supposed to be a science, is being used as an ideological weapon. This is unbelievable! Again, ethics come into play—where there is no Virtue, there is no knowledge. Grote and Mill are not academics but propagandists; they undermined their own society for the sake of “progress”. As befits two atheists, they pushed an agenda that wrecked their traditional society thru their jobs as “teachers”.

Enormous damage has occurred in Classical, Political and Philosophy studies because there is no apprehension or understanding because many in academia are either socialists or liberals and have purposely or unwittingly hidden the true form of Sparta’s government. The road to acknowledging the truth of the Protagoras statement rests on the true definition of Crete and Sparta’s republican form of government. The practical being and historical existence of these states is the evidence of the natural law and of philosophy.

On top of the misclassification, misidentification, and just plain ignorance of Crete and Sparta’s form of government is the characterization of Plato’s Republic as a utopian piece of work, as if it was a figment of Plato’s mind. It is not a utopia but a manual on how to prevent the anakyklosis. Plato called Sparta a “true politeia”. Plato is not an idealist. Another idiotic presumption is this phrase “Aristotle’s theory of mixed government” as if mixed government never existed in reality; as if Aristotle cooked this up by himself. Prof. Stephen Hodkinson of the University of Notingham writes a paper titled “The Imaginary Spartan Politeia” which states that it was 4th century Greek writers that “””idealized Sparta””” and gave her “mixed government”. Plato and Aristotle really didn’t know what they were talking about, but Hodkinson, 2000 years later, does. [[89]](#footnote-89) The republican character of Sparta is “imaginary”. Another professor of classical studies, concentrating on Crete, Paula Perlman, says the same thing, “In an article written over a decade ago I suggested that the Cretan *politeia* was a philosophical construct developed in Athens during the late Classical period.” (p. 286) Her article is also very similar to Hodkinson’s, “Imaginary Crete”. What Plato and Aristotle wrote were all fantasies cooked up by them. It is obvious that the presence and idea of Sparta is a threat to modern academia and the world they created.

The Virtue of Righteousness teaches “to tell the truth when interest is at stake” (Aristotle, *Virtues and Vices*, v, 2; Loeb 495) so the proper definition of Sparta should have been told but Hegel and his fellow travelers hid that on purpose. Crete and Sparta have to be obscured for the sake of the cause of Socialism and the dialectics of history and progress. Hierarchy is an automatic evil and therefore any society that exhibits it is evil. Socialists and liberals are naturally repulsed by Sparta for their leveling sophistry; they are not going to be beholden to facts and tell the truth; no need if what they live on is theoretical imaginations and that history is the inexorable process of freedom and equality. Education is fine to promote one’s pet project, but when the historical record is mangled to fit ideological needs, colleges and universities become propaganda mills. The Truth is not going to be told even if it is just about Classical Antiquity.

Fr. John Hardon (c. 1970s) in his essay “The Influence of Marxism in the United States Today” concretely concludes that America is a Marxist country.[[90]](#footnote-90) Fr. Hardon also recognizes that Marxism teaches a Messianic ideal. There are two further proofs of this state of affairs. Americans define their government as a ‘democracy’ and democracy is the carrier of socialism. Second, America is a Masonic country (Sora, 99)[[91]](#footnote-91) that means that America has a close culture affinity to the teachings of Marxism for Marxism and Freemasonry have the same foundation in the Kabbala. Third, every plank in the Communist Manifesto has been implemented in America. In 1880, there were over 200 Socialist and Communist organizations which led to the adoption of the suffrage of women, the progressive income tax, and a central bank called the Federal Reserve all in 1913 under President Wilson. Furthermore, the states of the union were disenfranchised when the Constitution was changed regarding the Senate; instead of state legislators sending senators, the people were now to vote on senators thus fulfilling socialist dreams of removing senates. (Wheeler, 2004) 1913 was a huge transformation of America into socialism. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a Mason, completed the alteration. If America is a Marxist country then its educational system is Marxist.

The whole milieu of modern academia, both Catholic and secular, in the Western Hemisphere is Marxist and this can be proven by the ethics they teach. What does Academia teach across the board and everywhere? Political Correctness. The term ‘political correctness’ was coined in the Soviet Union. (Ellis) [[92]](#footnote-92) It is also called ‘Cultural Marxism’. (Lind; Wikipedia entry “Political Correctness” quoting Buchanan; Adorno also uses the phrase. [[93]](#footnote-93)) Frank Ellis writes that political correctness provides the base and framework on which supports multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is the culture for globalization; the World Unity that is the goal for Jewish Messianism to occur. Multiculturalism is the culture for Jewish world unity. Political correctness or social justice is about enforcing the values of Marxism which is total equality for all, eliminating domination (hierarchy) and ending racism, i.e. the Utopia and World Unity. In order to accomplish World Unity, races and nationalism must disappear. So, inherent in cultural Marxism is deracination. When someone uses the phrase “That’s racist” or “That guy is racist” is Marxism; it is deracination. [[94]](#footnote-94) No one is to think of their racial ties and no one is to have group think towards one’s racial group. Racial groups are to be dissolved. The dissolving of racial groups is existential genocide. Marxism/communism/democratic socialism/Freemasonry, et. al. are all a genocidal ideology. Every university and college, Catholic and secular, engage in the genocidal ideology of Marxist political correctness.

Genocide is fundamental to International Socialism. At the very beginning of so-called scientific socialism, Marx and Engels called for the genocide of reactionary people, i.e.:

“The next world war will result in the disappearance from the face of the earth not only of reactionary classes and dynasties, but also of entire reactionary peoples. And that, too, is a step forward.” (Irbe)

"In January 1849, months before he migrated to London, Karl Marx published an article by Friedrich Engels in Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung announcing that in Central Europe only Germans, Hungarians and Poles counted as bearers of progress. The rest must go. "The chief mission of all other races and peoples, large and small, is to perish in the revolutionary holocaust." (Watson; DeMeo)

Joseph Stalin, in his *Foundations of Leninism*, seconded that notion when he argued passionately for wholesale genocide as a legitimate tool of socialism. (Martin, 239) Fr. Malachi Martin writes that Adolf Hitler, who was a voracious reader, found the model and justification for his “Final Solution” in Communist practice and doctrines. (ibid) The Soviet gulags were the inspiration for the National Socialist concentration camps.

Around 1918, Rosa Luxemburg, a German Jew, wrote a pamphlet on “The Nationalities Question” castigating Lenin for supporting nationalist groups when they should have been dismantling them. Karl Kautsky, an Austrian Jew, wrote on the same subject. Marxism is not just about economics. It has a cultural program, that of getting rid of nations and states; Rosa Luxemburg’s pamphlet is about teaching Marxist doctrine. Antonio Gramsci, an Italian Marxist theorist, looked at the failures of the 1848 revolutions and the lack of success of converting England and Germany to communism. He figured out that the Christian and classical influence was too strong against solely political revolution. Gramsci saw that the cultural elements prevented communist victory. Knowing that the dominant Christian/classical culture stood in the way of Marxist propaganda and advancement, Gramsci realized that the culture has to be different before the politics can be changed. His idea is that “Culture defines politics”.

”In a developed society, the passage to socialism occurs neither by putsch nor by direct confrontation, but by the transformation of ideas, which is to say, a slow reshaping of consciousness. …The seizure of political power is not possible until after the seizure of cultural power.” (McAlvany)

Change the culture and the politics will naturally follow without resistance. This is the *raison d’etre* of political correctness. Political correctness is about changing the culture, in “reshaping of consciousness”. That is accomplished in one part by deracinating countries by attacking the sense of racial cohesion found in Herder’s principles of sense of belonging and racial prejudice. Political correctness attacks those two principles, which are Natural Laws; a person can no longer have a loyalty to his racial group which is the sense of belonging and discriminate against strangers which protects the group’s integrity. [[95]](#footnote-95) Political correctness is a genocidal ideology! Marxism advocates the genocide of reactionary people that stand against ‘progress’, and its culture of political correctness is existential genocide.

There would have been no National Socialism if there wasn’t any International Socialism. Marxism/communism/Fabian socialism/democratic socialism/Bolshevism are all International, meaning the end goal is the extinction of nations and races.[[96]](#footnote-96) Adolf Hitler rightly knew of communist goals.[[97]](#footnote-97) That is the whole point in the ‘National’ adjective in the phrase “National Socialism” as opposed to International Socialism. It was precisely the Jewish Messianic ideology enmeshed in Marxism that threatens all nations. [[98]](#footnote-98) Socialism is Jewish ideology. The existence of the German nation was threatened by Jewish messianic ideology of deracination and deconstructionism. This was the foundation for the Holocaust—Not Western Culture! If there was no International Socialism threatening national deracination and dissolution, there would have been no National Socialism. The rise of International Socialism is due solely to the Hermeticist Kabbalist Hegel and Jewish Messianic teachings.

As Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn has pointed out, Hegel is the ideological father of Socialism, both International Socialism and National Socialism. Hegel was a Kabbalist. The foundation of the Holocaust is found in Jewish ideology pure and simple. Western Culture and Civilization was already destroyed by the American and French Revolutions and by Hegel. Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism was the culture and civilization at the time of the Holocaust.

The ubiquity of Political Correctness on every college and university campus belies the dominance of Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism. In 2002, Frank Ellis writes that “In the West we are experiencing a process of slow and incremental Sovietization.” That has already happened.[[99]](#footnote-99) Every academic, and that means every so-called Anglo-sphere conservative that upholds political correctness, like Sean Hannity, is a Marxist or if a liberal or libertarian a cultural Marxist. What is practiced in the halls of academia is Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism. Western Culture and Civilization was long dead before the Holocaust ever rolled around. What is being taught in the halls of academia is Cultural Marxism and the students are being brainwashed into Socialism. European students are made to hate their own heritage and guilt-tripped by Marxist professors into hating their own old culture and civilization.

A “Harvard professor, Barbara Johnson, as part of the AWARE campaign (Actively Working Against Racism and Ethnocentrism), declared that `professors should have less freedom of expression than writers and artists, because professors are supposed to be creating a better world'.” (Ellis) Colleges and universities are not teaching Western Culture or the true history of Europe or of Classical Antiquity. Education is directed towards multiculturalism and ideology, of “creating a better world”, thus the true categorization of modern education as nothing more than propaganda. Modern education is about presenting a purified history expunged of all traces of Europeanism and culture. As Marxism is a genocidal ideology and promotes existential genocide, it also seeks to genocide the Spartan patrimony from Western man’s mind. Mr. Ellis in his conclusion of his article notices that:

“All human existence is politicized and everything is judged according to political/ideological criteria and corrected or destroyed accordingly. If a man's mind cannot be ‘rectified’ or freed from ‘incorrect’ thoughts then he ceases to be a man. He becomes an ‘enemy of the people’. Extermination is justified, demanded in fact by the logic and ideology of class war…” [[100]](#footnote-100)

Sparta is being judged by Jewish criteria and so has to be destroyed. Bertrand Russell also recognizes the same thing:

“In the social field itself this provokes some rather odd consequences. For if you do not agree with the Marxist doctrine, you are deemed not to be on the side of progress. The term of distinction reserved for those who have not been visited by the new revelation is the word ‘reactionary’. Literally, the inference is that you are working against progress, in a backward direction. The dialectic process, however, ensures that you will be eliminated in due course, for progress must win in the end. This, then, becomes the rationale for violent removal of non-conformist elements. There is here a strong messianic streak in the political philosophy of Marxism. As the founder of an earlier creed had put it, he who is not with us is against us.” (1959, p. 272 ª)

In his summary observations of Marxism, Ludwig Von Mises likewise adjudges that

“The cause of progress must conquer. Then all conflicts concerning judgments of value will disappear. The liquidation of all dissenters will establish the undisputed supremacy of the absolute eternal values.” (Mises, *Theory*, 51)

However which way you look at it, Marxism is a genocidal ideology that exists in the practical material world, in culture and in the intellectual field. This is why we are witnessing a scorched earth policy in the books of all types from academia. Marxist/Socialist/Liberal professors are conducting a scorched earth policy in regards to Sparta for she doesn’t legitimize democracy, equality, individual liberty or progress; progress meaning “secularized millenarianism”. [[101]](#footnote-101) Moreover, when the establishment of peace throughout the world must be created, warrior cultures, like Sparta must be denigrated and be painted as a “horde of half savages” or as “militarism”. Sparta by her very being is an enemy of International Socialism. Sparta is totally incorrect. In the “reshaping of consciousness”, she must be tarred-and-feathered so that no one would look at her. Just like reactionaries must be exterminated, the memory and patrimony of Sparta must be destroyed.

This just points out the total hypocrisy of these people. Liberals, Socialists, Marxists all claim to want Peace but then they engage in intellectual and cultural warfare. It is all hypocrisy. These people claim “peace” but conduct war. Life is War and the modern reception of Sparta exhibits this war. For liberals and socialists, they say one thing out of their mouths but do another. This underlies their whole program—it is all lies; it is all myth-making. Thru their intellectual and cultural warfare, they are proving the Cretan legislator right,… “Life is War”.

Just as the Peloponnesian War is not over, the Persian War, the war between the East and the West will never be over. The East is dangerous to the West and the Eastern influence in the West is about exterminating Western Culture, Thought and Civilization. It has already happened. Separate a man from his culture and he is no more.

By now one should see that the ancient perspective of Sparta and the modern perspective is far different. The ancient perspective of Sparta was unanimous in admiration and praise. Socrates, the wisest man in Greece, emulated them and was their disciple. What is the difference between the ancients and the moderns? All of the moderns have become Judaized. The proof that Western Culture is dead is the across the board condemnation of Sparta by the modern European world. If the proverb is “wise man knows wise man” and “thief knows thief”, then it should hold that “European knows European”, but that is not the case. Europeans no longer know what it means to be European.

**DOXASTIC DISSONANCE [[102]](#footnote-102) and Hypocrisy**

Not only must Sparta be destroyed, but Western culture is tagged as being the roots of the Holocaust. The editor of Horkheimer’s and Adorno’s book *Dialectics of Enlightenment* states that their goal was to “show why the National Socialist terror was not an aberration of modern history but was rooted deeply in the fundamental characteristics of Western Civilization”. (p. 218) In another book, *Negative Dialectics*, Adorno stressed that, “Whoever pleads for the preservation of a radically culpable and shabby culture turns into its accomplice,…” (Adorno, p. 451) The crime of the Holocaust taints all of Western Culture and so by ‘guilt by association’ Western Culture has to be destroyed. In their *Dialectics of Enlightenment*, they make reference to “Spartans old and new”—the “new” Spartans obviously being the German National Socialists. (p. 53) The Doric Greek patrimony is thus linked to the Holocaust. This is the charge of Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno. But do they have the facts for this charge. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno are completely mistaken about their inference that the roots of the Holocaust are in Western Culture. If Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno find that the Holocaust has its deep roots in Western Culture, then, is the reason for the Soviet gulags also there? If Socrates was here, he would ask them for the principle of consistency, which the same criteria should apply to the same situation. Or if the lining up of Jews to be shot, can the same be said for the priests, monks and nuns that were lined up by the Spanish Republican forces, who were communists, and shot, before the Holocaust, have the same foundation? If the Nazi concentration camps were the offspring of the Soviet gulag, then the same reason would have to apply to both. If Marx and Engels called for the genociding of reactionary peoples, then the National Socialism genociding of enemies of nationalism socialism would likewise be canonical. If Stalin said genocide is a legitimate tool of socialism then it is a legitimate tool for national socialism. Another interesting question would be is why Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno are only worried about the Nazi concentration camps—why are they not worried too about the Soviet gulags? If the Soviet Union is the product of Marxism and Hegel the Kabbalist, what is the reason for the Soviet gulags? Western Culture? Marx and Engels, both being Jews, called for genocide not based on anything in Western Culture but because for the sake of the purity of the movement and progress, Jewish ideology; all retrograde persons and things cannot be allowed to exist. Nothing will be allowed to stand in the way of Hegel’s dialectical progress. Or what about the genocide of the Russian Royal Family? The genocide of the Russian Royal Family was carried out by a squad of soldiers led by a Jew.[[103]](#footnote-103) Are the roots of the Russian Royal Family genocide found in Western Culture? Absolutely not. It is found in the Talmud where the English Protestant Levelers, the coalition of Thomas Cromwell, were influenced by a Talmuldic teaching that monarchy is idolatry and so they beheaded their own monarch, Charles I because of that teaching. (Nelson, 25, 42) All the other regicides and monarchical abdications throughout the Western Europe followed the example set by the beheading of Charles I. All the regicides and the genocide of the Russian Royal Family were instigated by Jewish teachings—Not by Western culture.[[104]](#footnote-104) These Cromwell revolutionaries were proud to call themselves ‘Talmudic commonwealthsmen’. (Nelson, 26) The English Great Revolution motivated the American Revolution and the American Revolution fueled the French Revolution. Modern republicanism began its political birth in these Talmudic commonwealthsmen. The beheading of Charles I, led to the beheading of Louis XVI and his wife in the French Revolution by modern republican forces which led to the genocide of the whole Russian Royal Family in the Russian Revolution by Russian modern republican forces. Notice how the beheading of Charles I, a single ruler, lead to the beheading of two people in the French Revolution then to the extermination of a whole family; the growth in the widening of the victims of egalitarian hate; it kept growing from a single man to the whole family. All the Western hemisphere and Russian regicides have their roots and foundation and legitimacy in Jewish teachings. Regicide is a definite element of modern republicanism. Regicide is a fundamental requirement for globalization. Regicide is the spirit of hate. No mercy—just extermination.

With all the history presented here about the transformation of Western thought by Hegel, where do Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno get their justification for condemning Western Culture? Are we to believe that these thorough-bred Marxists are ignorant of their own ideology? They don’t know what Marx and Engels taught? They never read Stalin’s *Foundation of Leninism* [[105]](#footnote-105) or read Rosa Luxemburg, their own party and tribal member who lived at the same time, in the same country, as they did? Are we to believe that the Frankfurt School is blind to its own teachings? Are they blind and ignorant of what their own religion teaches? Are we to think that Horkheimer, Adorno, Fredrick Pollack, Jürgen Habermas, and all the other members of the Frankfurt School are unaware of the bloody history that their own movement has caused? The doxastic dissonance here is amazing to behold. There is a huge disconnect. There is no registration that maybe their own agenda and their own ideology is at fault. Like the Protagoras statement and the barefootedness of Socrates that modern academia glossed over, these people walk right over their own excrement.

Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno began to investigate what they called the self-destruction of enlightenment in WWII and the Holocaust in a series of manuscripts started in 1942. At the very beginning, in their preface to their published edition of 1947, these two brilliant sociopaths warn about the strict limiting of the human mind “to the observation of facts” and that this would lead to charlatanism and superstition. (pgs. xv-xvi) They worry that “the blocking of the theoretical imagination has paved the way for political delusion”. They further down the page notice that the sons of modern civilization have a fear of departing from the facts and that “tabooing any thought which sets out negatively from the facts…holds mind captive in ever deeper blindness”. If anything is opposite of reality, it is the ruminations of these two fellas. The exact opposite of commonsense is used to justify “theoretical observations”, i.e. ideology. Prof. Kevin MacDonald, who has done a masterful research of the Frankfurt School, noticed that they were politicizing the field of social research in opposition to “the fetishism of facts”. (Ch. 5, 157)

They actually counsel that what is needed to free modern man from facts, he has to live in theoretical imaginations. If that is not an oxymoron, nothing else is. To think that the allegiance to facts brings about political delusion is absolutely ludicrous. If what they say allegiance to facts leads to political delusion, then the same would be said for the courtroom. But in the practical world, in the legal world, the district attorney does not present theoretical imaginations but must build his case on facts; people are not convicted on whimsies. If it is true in the courtroom that facts rule, then it is true everywhere else in reality. In the Western legal system, to first accuse, and then judge them guilty must reside on the presentation of facts. If one is to ape the courtroom in the sphere of public opinion and scholarly discourse and condemn Western Culture, then one should copy the real process of the courtroom and present facts that Western Culture is culpable and present the case with proof based on facts; no one is entitled to bring their “own facts”.

Another example is the army in a war situation. Does an army use “theoretical imaginations” to win the war or must an army use “facts” in order to know where the enemy is and defeat him? The historical record shows that many an army was defeated because it was either fooled by the other enemy or did not have knowledge of the enemy.

It is true that WWII and the Holocaust has come out of “The Enlightenment” but all the intellectuals of The Enlightenment were atheists or deists who were proud of their reasonings and rationalizations over-and-above the superstition of the Roman Catholic Church. The revolutionaries of France thought they ushered in the “Age of Reason”. So we are to take Horkeimer’s and Adorno’s premise seriously in that there is a fault in the theoretical imaginations of the revolutionaries. All socialism, whether democratic, International, national is a delusion, not based on facts but on theoretical imaginations, on Hegelianism. These people who reject facts, Horkheimer and Adorno then begin to write some two hundred pages on how the failure of enlightenment is found in Odysseus, in Greek myths and in other places. Why continue reading anything when the authors begin their dissertation with the excoriation of facts—facts that hinder theoretical imaginations? Is not their whole book then—theoretical imaginations? There is no logical, commonsensical reason to take their *Dialectics of Enlightenment* seriously. If there are no facts, there is no legitimization. It is just their ramblings. In the Socratic/Platonic sense, it is all opinions and no one in their right mind are to take opinions seriously; it is a grand fault to justify human action, ethics and values on opinions. Their ramblings are nonsense. A favorable reviewer of the book even states at the beginning of his summary that ”the essays in this book are written in a challenging and literary style which offers a few chances to the reader to catch all the allusions with which the text is densely sown.” (Harris) “Challenging” is putting it mildly! To cut to the chase, the book is incomprehensible; it is all dense gibberish.[[106]](#footnote-106)

Secondly, these people are so ignorant of history. As has been shown earlier, Western Culture and Civilization had been overthrown. The so-called Enlightenment transformed the Western Hemisphere. The Enlightenment championed modern republicanism that was in a sense democracy; it was the “classless republic” which is another oxymoron. Second, Hegel overthrew traditional Western philosophy and inserted ideology in its place but under the same name of philosophy. Western Civilization and Culture, Throne and Altar, were dethroned. What replaced it was Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism; just what the observers of the day who were living it, such as Vidkun Quisling and Generalismo Franco [[107]](#footnote-107) stated. Many Roman Catholics warned about the same threat of Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism.[[108]](#footnote-108) The Holocaust was committed under the aegis of Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevist Culture and Civilization. The proof even comes from two sources, Adolf Hitler and an American Jew Harry Waton.

Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn quotes Hermann Rauschning, the German Danzig Gauleiter, who held private talks with Adolf Hitler. Rauschning quotes Hitler who claimed that “I am not only the conqueror but also the executor of Marxism—of that part that is essential and justified, stripped of its Jewish Talmudic dogma”. (1952, p. 365, #965) Here Adolf Hitler proudly claims his intellectual heritage—he is a version of Marxism! Notice also that he is smart enough to know that Marxism is mixed with Talmudic teaching. And what were the elements of Jewish Talmudic dogma that Hitler did away with? The International element! And the class warfare contingent. [[109]](#footnote-109)

In a book published in 1939, an American Jew, Harry Waton figured out the same thing. He writes: “Nazism is an imitation of Judaism; nazism adopted the principles and ideas of Judaism…” (pgs. 54, 63, 81) Without reference to Waton at all, the Sociology Professor Kevin MacDonald also backs this claim through his own insight: “…in this regard National Socialism was very much like Judaism, which has been throughout its history fundamentally a group phenomenon in which the rights of the individual have been submerged in the interests of the group.” (Ch. 5, p. 165) [[110]](#footnote-110) The first biographer of Adolf Hitler, Konrad Heiden [[111]](#footnote-111) writes that even though the Austrian Social Democrats repulsed Hitler, he had great admiration for them and he told a friend of his that his organization “would have to be copied from the Social Democrats”. (pgs. 66-67) Social Democracy is just another form of International Socialism.

Dr. Snyder, an American Exchange Fellow, who was in Germany in 1928 and again in 1929-1930, noticed that Hitler borrowed the Nazi red flag from the red flag of the Socialists and Communists; red symbolizing anti-capitalism. (p. 21) There were many other such borrowings from “the other side”. International Socialism and National Socialism are kissing cousins; both are enveloped in idealism; both were born out of German Idealism; both were formed by the thought of Hegel; both are about transforming traditional society into a new progressive society; both are messianic; both were anti-clerical, having a hatred of the Roman Catholic Church.[[112]](#footnote-112)

The socialism in German “National Socialism” is still Jewish. German Idealism formulated by Hegel came out of the Kabbala. The whole thesis of their book is overthrown just by knowing and understanding the intellectual history of socialism. Western Culture and Civilization had absolutely nothing to do with either the rise of the thesis of International Socialism, the anti-thesis of Fascism or the Holocaust, gulags and the genocide of the Russian Royal Family. Horkheimer and Adorno are on a quest for an imaginary grail of disrepute; they are Don Quixotes chasing after an ephemeral specter; a specter of their own theoretical imaginations—their prejudice against Europeans and their culture. It was their own ideology of genocide, of Cultural Bolshevism that caused a reaction. One doesn’t have to look far. They just need a mirror. The only charlatans are Horkheimer, Adorno, Fredrick Pollack, Jürgen Habermas, and all the other members of the Frankfurt School.

What is described in this chapter is the case of Doxastic Dissonance. Peter Myers’ introduction to Waton’s book has this analysis:

“What amazes me about Rabbi Waton, is the combination of intellectual brilliance with blinkering. He identifies with the pre-Stalin Jewish Bolsheviks yet, despite the ideological universalism he proclaims, ignores and denies the cruelty and totalitarianism of the system they created. For a Jewish source acknowledging that fact, see Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace*, pp. 30-33 & 53-56.”

The doxastic dissonance is the blinkered reading of reality. The Australian Jew, Peter Myers continues his remarks that after his studying across the board of his fellow kinsmen, he finds that “these powerful minds are devoted to propagandizing; omitting part of the data, making the data fit a preconceived outlook.” [[113]](#footnote-113) Horkheimer and Adorno are nothing more than propagandists, making the data fit their preconceived ideology. This is why facts hold no relevance for this type of people; they are bladders of Jewish sophistry.

There is nothing but the majestic grand hypocrisy of people who condemn Sparta for “oppressive rule over the Helots” but then hold and teach a genocidal ideology. Marxism was ever so bloody; it has more blood on it than National Socialism yet practically every academic, Catholic or secular, is a Marxist in one way or another—either doctrinaire or cultural. Italian Fascism was a benign form with no crimes attached to it. On the other hand, everywhere that Communism appeared, in Russia, in the Weimar Republic, in the Spanish Civil War, in the Greek Civil War, in China, in Cuba, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Cambodia and throughout South America, Marxists lined up Catholic clergy and religious and murdered them outright; mass killings attended everywhere communism has gone. Lenin, Stalin, Mao and Pol Pot, all Communists, are mass murderers. Fascism had only one. Mussolini and the Italian Fascists were quite benign.[[114]](#footnote-114) There has never been, nor shall be, a benign Marxism.

Sparta never committed genocide yet the Hebrews in their ancient history committed at least ten of them.[[115]](#footnote-115) Not only were they genociders in their early history but in modern times, their millenarianist ideology actually teaches the genocide of reactionaries and for people to existentially genocide themselves thru the program of political correctness; they are master genociders. The culpability of the genocide of the Russian Royal Family is totally Jewish. The Jews are forever genociders. *The Communist Manifesto*, the playbook of this genocidal ideology, is required reading for Western Civ classes in many college curricula and is even included in the Great Books canon! When academia wouldn’t dare to pass out or have anything to do with National Socialism/Fascism, they are only too happy to pass out Marx’s genocidal bloody Jewish ideology. [[116]](#footnote-116)

This was the point of Socrates mission. Here, a whole bunch of people with Ph.Ds. who think they are the smartest people in the world, who teach young minds of mush Marxism, engage in existential genocide at $120,000 salaries. And no one says “Boo”. Facts be damned. When a teacher in Western Civilization is supposed to breathe life of their culture into young people, they are instead teaching death—Jewish ideology. Only Truth leads to life and deceivement leads to death. Western Culture and Western Civilization are dead. If Western Culture and Western Civilization are dead, then, Western man is dead as well. Western academia are only dupes and have participated in this killing of Western man. This is what myth-making does. Is that the purpose of education? –to kill its culture? To kill its own people?

These examples showcase what was going on in Athens many eons ago. Along with nihilism attendant with democracy, Socrates was fighting a major intellectual illness, that of doxastic dissonance and hypocrisy. Dissonance is the antonym of harmony. What was the Doric mode? That of harmony between word and deed; what one says, should be matched by what one does. This is the greatest lesson of the Doric Greeks and of Socrates, is that in this case there has to be a harmony between reality and the mind of man. Harmony is central to Truth and Goodness. What is needed for the benefit of man himself is cognitive harmony, the relation of man’s mind to reality—Truth. The dismissal of facts and twisting of reality to meet one’s preconceived notions is the setting up of doxastic dissonance. Doxastic Dissonance is one of the bases of evil; it is the path to Error. Doxastic Dissonance is part of original sin that incapacitates, corrupts and inhibits the human mind and human reasoning. Doxastic Dissonance leads to death. Picking up the Natural Law, the wisdom of God, and inserting it into human reasoning is one of the cures of original sin.

**POLYLOGICISM**

In the age of Marxist cultural hegemony, the idea is that anybody can do philosophy, that the nature of people are all the same; there can be no discrimination or discretion.

One of the fathers of Libertarianism, Ludwig von Mises (1881-1973) expounds in his book, *Human Action*, in a chapter called "Economics and the Revolt against Reason" under a subheading "polylogism" claims the fallacy of polylogicism; polylogicism being the validity of different thinking patterns amongst races. He notes that:

"Racial polylogism differs from Marxian polylogism only in so far as it ascribes to each race a peculiar logical structure of mind and maintains that all members of a definite race, no matter what their class affiliation may be, are endowed with this peculiar logical structure." (p. 75)

Even though throughout his intellectual career, he acknowledges the inherent inequality of man, (Mises, *Action*, 89, 134, 158; *Theory*, 47) he dismisses that different men have different reasoning processes; for him, there is no such thing as polylogism. [[117]](#footnote-117) He writes:

The behavior of people of all races, nations, religions, linguistic groups, and social classes clearly proves that they do not endorse the doctrines of polylogism and irrationalism as far as logic, mathematics, and the natural sciences are concerned. (p. 6)

He notes the “biological inequality” [[118]](#footnote-118) but doesn’t recognize that difference further extends to all spheres. If there is biological inequality, wouldn’t that automatically presuppose mental inequality as well? Or spiritual inequality? Differences in racial character? Doesn’t the multiplicity of cultures across the globe reflect that there are not only biological inequalities but also mental and spiritual inequalities?

Ludwig von Misses is building his case on the past writings of Gottlob Frege and Edmund Husserl. (Long) Both of these men were mathematicians and into logical theory per se based on arithmetic methodology. Gottlob Frege (1848-1925) worked on mathematical logic and created a new form of calculus. He was interested in psychologism – “the view that the laws of logic and mathematics are simply empirical generalizations about the way the human mind works.” (Long, 9) Frege wrote that “Whether what you take for true is false or true, your so taking it comes about in accordance with psychological laws.” (quoted in Long, 10) Long writes that by inference, psychologism might lead to polylogicism and Frege went ahead to deny the possibility of polylogicism. Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), another German, based his work on Frege. He started out by claiming psychologism but after reading Frege, changed his viewpoint. (Oxford, entry “Husserl”) Husserl continues the work of Frege which influenced Ludwig von Mises. (Long, 12) It is the work on arithmetic logic that determined Mises take but then it was an affinity to what he already felt.

This thing “Polylogicism” is what is occurring in this book; between the standard European culture of the Doric Greeks, the foundation of Western Culture and the conflict with an Eastern foreign race bringing in its values and judgments. What is going on in the Western Hemisphere is a clash of different ideas, values, and ways of thought. Among others, Hegel brought in a whole different way of thought, very different from the Greeks and Romans. Now, this foreign way of thought is about to exterminate all remnants of Western thought from its own people.

Mises comments that the proponents of polylogism “never ventured to demonstrate precisely in what the logic of the proletarians differs from the logic of the bourgeois, or in what the logic of the Aryans differs from the logic of the non-Aryans, or the logic of the Germans from the logic of the French or the British.” (*Action*, p. 75) He writes that “If there had been races which had developed a different logical structure of the mind, they would have failed in the use of reason as an aid in the struggle for existence.” (ibid. p. 86)

Is there proof of polylogicism?

Again, Ludwig von Mises is Jewish. It behooves him to slant reality. Or is he so materialistically minded that he can’t see? What is behind most rationalizations is wishful thinking. But is that “the condition of what is”?

Automatically, commonsense would dictate that there is Polylogicism; commonsense jumps up and says Mises is off track. Upon all people is the realization that there is a multiplicity of cultures in the world which don’t produce the same stuff. The diversity of the human cultures and their products, which is self-evident, bespeaks to an underlying reason of diversity. The differences of culture across the cosmos are a sign of a different form of racial spirit, logicism and spiritual moral condition. They produce different stuff.

And this is the first problem with a lot of what is going on—human reasoning is not “pure logic”. Frege and Husserl, which Mises is copying, are approaching reasoning in a mechanical way—that human reasoning is some sort of mathematical process. WRONG! Commonsense enters into the picture. Commonsense is not reasoning but “*the immediate apprehension of self-evident first principles*”. (Maritain, 86 º) [[119]](#footnote-119) Commonsense is a sort of intuition that is quasi spiritual. Commonsense is not a mathematical process. Human beings are not mechanical objects and so neither is their thought. The presence of commonsense nullifies the approach of Frege, Husserl and Mises right off the bat. Commonsense is just one aspect of philosophy.

The difference of writings, art, and structures produced by manifold races throughout the world demonstrate a polylogicism. Von Mises has it a little bit off. Having different logical structures is not the same as having an impossibility for survival. There is a basic logic amongst all humans of putting two-an’-two together but there it stops. Human reasoning is not as simple as pure logic. The matter is more complicated than that because human beings are not mathematical equations (a lot of people though would like to think and/or hope that). A human being is a mixture of animal emotions, spirit and divine reasoning, i.e. the body and the soul. The human being is a very complex mixture that Plato describes as a charioteer with three horses. These three things, emotions, spirit (or thumos), and reasoning are heavily intertwined. Who is to say what thing is driving what and that the same thing drives all people the same way, all the time.

Is there a science that backs up commonsense’s apprehension of polylogicism?

The difference in logical thinking begins with the very first thing—between God and man. This is stated in the Bible quite clearly:

“My counsels are not as your counsels, nor are my ways your ways, But as the heaven is distant from the earth, so is my way distant from your ways and your thoughts from mine”. (LXX, Is. 55:8-9)

This is the very first indication of polylogicism; God’s reasonings are not man’s reasonings. Right here is a truth about reality. God’s ways are not man’s ways. There is a huge difference.

Many will complain now, how dare he bring religion into the picture. But, *au contraire*. Ludwig von Mises is an agnostic, a believer in evolution; he would never look in the Bible or use the Bible. On the other hand, the Doric Greeks thought holistically. Their thought encompassed all things. As Jacques Maritain points out that the practitioners of philosophy “inquired into everything—knowledge itself and its methods, being and non-being, motion, the world, beings animate and inanimate, man and God”. He concludes that “Philosophy therefore is concerned with everything, is a *universal* science”. (p. 61 º) [[120]](#footnote-120) Philosophy is a product of the Doric Greeks. The evidence of the science is the sign of the mind of the people who created it. Doric Greeks concerned themselves with everything, the Spiritual along with the material. All truth harmonizes. The Doric Greeks acknowledged that. Moreover this is the tradition of Socrates and Plato, the seamless integration of all knowledge. This is the Western Way of thought; this is how true traditional Western Culture does it. With his agnosticism, Mises is cutting off half of reality; he is not part of the Western Way of thought.

The Bible is central to Western civilization; it is a part of Divine Revelation; what it teaches has an impact. It is all a part of Truth, a teaching of Pythagoras, a philodorian who taught that spiritual truth should match physical, material truth. Polylogicism begins here, in the Bible.

“For my counsels are not as your counsels, nor are my ways as your way, saith the Lord.” (LXX, Isaiah, 55:8)

The prophet Isaiah, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, speaks to a truth; there is a polylogicism of God and man. This is justification of the theory alone. Second, the natural law operates all things. One of the central aspects of the natural law is its system of macrocosm/microcosm which teaches that things repeat. (Wheeler, 2011) If polylogicism exists between God and man, then, the principle of macrocosm/microcosm would demand that polylogicism exists between men and men. There is polylogicism amongst all men.

To discover this truth and lock it in as a part of reality, it will be necessary to duplicate a method that Socrates probably does invent in Plato’s *Republic*. The way of Socrates is to start off with what is most easily seen and then advance to where it is more difficult to see. Socrates proposes to use the example of a Doric republic and its caste system, which can be easily seen, to discover what justice means and then what is learned there is then applied to the interior life, the soul of the individual which is unseen. (§368f) The easiest case of figuring out polylogicism then is the polylogicism between men and women. Yves Christen has a whole chapter called “Sex Differences in Brain Structure”. (p. 65) He writes that “there are more cells in certain parts of the brain in one sex than in the other and that they are organized differently.” These very noticeable differences would lead to dissimilar logical/ratiocinational abilities. These ratiocinational abilities are directed to different goals. One of these noticeable differences is in male babies. The corpus callosum is larger in females. In the growing male embryo, the testosterone hormone shrinks the corpus callosum causing asymmetrical brains in males. In the female brain the corpus callosum grows many connections between the two halves of the brain whereas the male corpus callosum kind of shuts off communication between the two sides of the brain. One of these effects is that women are “less able to dissociate their emotional behavior from verbal analysis” (p. 68); i.e. “Women are less able than men to dissociate their emotional and rational behaviors.” (p. 91) [[121]](#footnote-121)

Male and female brains, even though they are both from human beings, are greatly differentiated. This leads to very different social behaviors and affects logical thinking. Though intelligent quotients are the same between men and women, there are differences in spatial aptitudes “which make it possible to visualize a three-dimensional object in space, rotate it mentally, etc.” (p. 69) Christen pulls up a study that women can build watches but not repair them. (pgs. 70-71) A further problem that complicates things is instinct natural to men and women. Women have a maternal instinct that men do not have. This difference in instinct then directs the object of reasoning. In the childhood years, “while girls do not mind playing boys’ games, boys despise the ways of the other sex”. (p. 58) Women are drawn to the weak whereas men are repelled by weakness; men are rather drawn to strength and power. Women’s reasoning would then back up their sentiment to weak things whereas the reasoning of men would back up their strong and powerful inclinations. The maternal instinct, in some cases will drive ratiocinations to a goal that a man would not reach. Pity would motivate female individuals and then that pity would direct, steer the course of their logical reasonings.

Reverse this process. It was started by looking at differences in the brain. In the natural law of macrocosm/microcosm, the principle states that things repeat. In this case of men and women, the brains are very different between the sexes. Are not the bodies, the physical manifestations, of men and women different as well? They are very different. The bodily physical differences mirror the mental differences. As there are physical differences, there are as well mental differences. This is a truth that cannot be denied. The natural law of macrocosm/microcosm works everywhere. The physical is a sign of the hidden interior world.

Mises makes a huge mistake about polylogicism, that of to gain food or build a shelter does take logic, but to grasp the idea of “good and evil” which are metaphysical concepts—to reach that, takes a greater amount of reasoning tools, skills and understanding. To grasp higher truth, The Good, and Spiritual reality requires metaphysics that gaining material rewards doesn’t need; two different ratiocinations are required; it is like the difference between two kinds of vehicles that take one from one place to another; one can take a bicycle or a Ferrari. The field of economics doesn’t require metaphysical training, nor metaphysics but philosophy which studies and knows The Good does. Another analogy of this truth can be found in the medical field: to fix a broken limb requires a wood splint and some cloth strips easy to do; to correct a bad heart requires specialized knowledge, skills and tools. You can’t compare the two; the logic needed for both is different. Again, to pull up the Swiss watch example: creating a sun dial doesn’t take much, but the mentality, skill and knowledge to produce a Swiss watch, or a Parthenon is far different. Mises is a materialist; The Good and metaphysical truth require transcendence, special skills and special knowledge. One can go thru life and survive with the barest minimum reason but to create a highly sophisticated culture or religion requires metaphysics, requires transcendence; reasonings that are supercharged like an engine with a turbo charger.[[122]](#footnote-122)

Now to the more difficult part where change is more subtle, more hidden.

The denial of polylogicism is a necessary to the conventional sophistry of the equality of all men.

“With five simple words in the Declaration of Independence—‘all men are created equal’—Thomas Jefferson undid Aristotle’s ancient formula, which had governed human affairs until 1776: ‘From the hour of their birth, some men are marked out for subjection, others for rule’.” [[123]](#footnote-123)

Aristotle was not an ideologue but a philosopher who is required to read nature as it is; Aristotle has no ideological pretensions to say otherwise. Aristotle, a true philosopher and a scientist, puts both cases on the board but thru experience and observation chooses that men are born unequal; it is the natural condition of men; Mises recognizes this. Aristotle notes:

“The nations inhabiting the cold places and those of Europe are full of spirit but somewhat deficient in intelligence and skill, so that they continue comparatively free, but lacking in political organization and capacity to rule their neighbors. The peoples of Asia on the other hand are intelligent and skillful in temperament, but lack spirit, so that they are in continuous subjection and slavery. But the Greek race participates in both characters, just as it occupies the middle position geographically, for it is both spirited and intelligent; hence it continues to be free and to have very good political institutions…” (*Pol*., VII, vi, 1; §1327b 15-30; Loeb, 565-567)

There is not only a difference in intelligence noted here but also “spirit”. Aristotle is being a real scientist cataloguing a difference he notices and their behaviors. The races of the earth have very different modes and ways.

On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson, who was familiar with Freemasonry and the revolutionary ideas associated with them, a son of the Enlightenment and Locke, pronounced “all men are created equal”; his basis is nothing more than ideological theory. George Lichtheim traces:

“…the doctrine that all men are created equal is of Stoic origin and has no Biblical foundation”. (p. 222, #7)

He is quite right; the Hermetic Tradition carried this idea of the Stoics into Europe. The Bible does not teach equality. Neither did Greek philosophy. In rather quick time, the Stoics undid traditional philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. The Stoics rejected hierarchy of their day; they attacked the society of their day. They were not philosophers. Were the Stoics teaching “the condition of that which is” or were they propagating an ideology? [[124]](#footnote-124) Does their teaching have any scientific observable basis in fact? The next question, if the Stoics rejected hierarchy, how can they be the foundation of the Natural Law?

That is the conventional sophistry that is behind the denial of polylogism in a sense. In order to have the “equality of all men”—one must have the “equality of logicism amongst all men”! How can Mises deny the possibility of polylogism while affirming the biological inequality of man? These are conflicting accounts. What does the Bible say?

“And all men are from the ground, and Adam was created of earth. In much knowledge the Lord hath divided them, and made their ways diverse. Some of them hath he blessed and exalted, and some of them hath he sanctified, and set near himself: but some of them hath he cursed and brought low, and turned out of their places. As the clay is in the potter’s hand, to fashion it as his pleasure: so man is in the hand of him that made him, to render to them as liketh him best.” (LXX, Ecclesiasticus 36:10-13)

This is Scripture for both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. This quote speaks to “their ways”, “man’s ways”, as being diverse from one another, not their biological manifestations. Moreover, it confirms Aristotle’s observations that men are different by degrees. There is a hierarchy of the races of men. Like some men are stronger or more intellectual than others within a race, this same paradigm, as macrocosm/microcosm teaches, is carried into races as a whole. Some are gifted with this and some are gifted with that, and some are deprived of this-n-that. This quote suggests that there is polylogism; how else would “their ways [be] diverse”? We are taught that God diversified man as God is diversified from man. The same teachings in the spiritual world will show up in the observations of the material physical world. In their much maligned book, *The Bell Curve*, Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray back up that quote from Scripture with copious amounts of statistical studies that look at Intelligence quotients and visuospatial abilities. In their preface to the Thirteenth chapter, they write: “…ethnic differences in cognitive ability are neither surprising nor in doubt. Large human populations differ in many ways, both cultural and biological. It is not surprising that they might differ at least slightly in their cognitive characteristics.” (p. 269) Their study is valuable but their arguments will not be repeated here but whole other tact will be taken here. The argument for polylogicism could end here with their book but there is much more ground to cover that is not considered in their book.

It is very important to be a student of Classical Antiquity, to know the Greeks and the Romans. It is the basis of our Western culture and civilization. One has to know the origins, in order to know a thing. Mises and others denial of polylogism show their ignorance of the Classical milieu.

Any classical scholar worth his salt would laugh at the denial of polylogism. Nothing screams polylogism more than the difference between the Greeks and the Romans. They are as night and day. There cannot be a more perfect example of polylogism than the difference between the Greeks and the Romans.

A teacher of the classics for some thirty years, the American classicist, Ms. Edith Hamilton, describes the Romans as being not able to “perceive beauty in everyday matters or indeed care to do so” (1993b, 135) unlike the Greeks. Romans castigated their own kinsmen found to be doing artful things with the epithet “the hungry Greekling”. (ibid) Ms. Hamilton continues:

“The Romans were not philosophically minded. Theories of knowledge and of final causes were unimportant and could be accepted without much probing into the basis of truth they rested on. But when the question had to do with the guiding principles of needed for life, they knew better than the Greeks what was important. They were men of practical vision: they perceived the struggle between good and evil as the Greeks never did. Pleasure and morality were not seen as opposed to each other in Greece. Socrates visiting a famous courtesan to discover if she was as beautiful as people said, carrying on an agreeable conversation with her, giving her advice how best to attach her lovers to her, leaving her with a charming compliment to her beauty, is representative of all Greece. But to the Romans the opposition between duty and pleasure was absolute. Men’s natural inclinations were evil; their manifest obligation was sternly to control them. Socrates’ idea, so characteristically Greek, that no one can know virtue without embracing and practicing it—we needs must love the highest when we see it—was totally inadequate to life’s hard demands, as Romans saw them.” (1993b, 172)

Metaphysics was not the Roman purview. No Roman actually did philosophy. As Roman character was very different from the Greeks, their mentality did not encompass metaphysics. As in Keats famous poem, “Ode on a Grecian Urn”,

“’Beauty is Truth, Truth beauty’, —that is all

Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.”

(Bartlett)

Beauty and Truth are metaphysical concepts. Beauty and Truth are Greek things. Beauty and Truth are both defined by the Natural Law: “The main species of beauty are orderly arrangements, proportion, and definiteness”. (Arist. *Metaphysics*, XIII, iii, 11; §1078b; Loeb, 193) Where did those ideas come from? From Nature. Nature displays those things and they are drawn from nature with people who see with the Mind’s eye, the eye of transcendence. Truth follows the same parameters. The apprehension of The Beautiful and Truth comes thru transcendence—a metaphysical outlook. First one must have an interest in looking for it and then the wherewithal to study it. And then, philosophy is a study of Truth. [[125]](#footnote-125) With their regular nonchalance towards art and beauty, the Romans show their lack of concern of the eternal and unseen. Their racial character precluded them from philosophical theorizing. Even though the Romans were not a philosophical people, Cicero, their most lettered among them, was a philosopher due to the fact of being educated in Athens but he was not too occupied with the art. Though he “was the main channel by which Greek standards reached mankind”, (Hamilton, 1993b), he did that by copying the Greeks. It is so bad that the Romans had a difficult time coming up with original thoughts, the classical scholar Michael Grant intuits that one of Cicero’s greatest works, *De republica,* was plagiarized from Dicaearchus of Messana’s *Tripoliticus*. (1995)

“Know thyself”, the proverb of introspection was not a Roman value. The study of The Good, did not interest the Roman. Ms. Hamilton notes that “Goodness apart from patriotism did not exist to the Roman”. (1993b, 51)

Here there is not so much a difference in polylogism than the Romans were never predisposed to higher thought. Both the Greeks and the Romans could build magnificent temples, organize navies and lead armies but philosophy was not something the Romans did. The Romans were quite successful in conquering much of the known world at their time without ever doing philosophy; they were never philosophers. It is more than polylogicism involved here; ratiocination of higher values rests on something else, another component that is married to logicism. Even Harry Waton notices the difference between the Greeks and the Romans: “The Greek consciousness is contemplative, while the Roman consciousness is pragmatic. The Greek mind is contemplative; the Roman mind is practical…” (p. 185)

What one sees is the outward appearance of something that is differentiating the Greeks from the Romans. Is it something specific residing in genes that formulate the brain or is it in the racial soul of the people. Whatever it is, the concrete Truth is that there is a difference in reasoning between the Romans and the Greeks. The Roman/Greek dichotomy is simple to behold, examine and understand; any layman can grasp this—if he was schooled in classical studies. It greatly helps that someone as educated and perceptive as Edith Hamilton was very helpful in writing two books discussing the different cultures, *The Greek Way* and *The Roman Way*. It also helps in understanding polylogicism when she opens her book, *The Greek Way*,with a chapter discussing the Greek/East dichotomy. Concept precedes knowledge and Ms. Hamilton broaches the concepts necessary for the knowledge of polylogicism and an in-depth knowledge of the Graeco-Roman milieu. The “Compare and Contrast” method in education is a great learning tool that she uses quite well.

Did the Romans have the same logicism as the Greeks?

The answer would have to be no. The example of the Greek/Roman dichotomy can then be expanded now throughout human experience. The examples in Classical Studies have not been exhausted. There is the polylogicism between the Ionian and Doric Greeks.

Once more, a good student of Classical Studies would recognize a difference between the Ionian Greeks and the Doric Greeks. Plato did. Karl Otfried Müller did. The Ionians and the Dorians exhibit two very different kinds of cultures, yet they were both of the Hellenic Family. For instance, “The Dorians in general had evidently less poetical skill and feeling than the Athenians,…” (Müller, II, 368) Another example was in their manner of speaking: the Ionians were loquacious, making long speeches while on the other hand, the Doric Greeks were noted for their peculiar manner of speaking. The Doric Greeks, Cretan, Spartan, Argive, spoke by apophthegms and sententious and concise sayings. In the Doric communities of Crete and Sparta, the young were especially habituated to this form of speech so that they would “convey as much meaning in as few words as possible, and to allude to, rather than express, the thoughts of the speaker”. (Müller, II, 386-387) [[126]](#footnote-126) This compression of thought which is mirrored in their pithy, laconic speech leads the speaker to find the essence of a situation. The finding of the essence is the core of philosophy. (Maritain, 36) The thinking patterns of the Dorians are depicted in the shape of their speech. Here is a definite style of logicism that is different from the Ionians. Their speech formed them into natural philosophers.

This linguistic style is also found in their architectural style. Prof. Müller remarks that “the dwellings of the Dorians were plain and simple.” (II, 265) As for their sacred temples, “The Dorians employed a style of building which they themselves invented, from the strict principles of which they never deviated, and which at the same time they took the utmost care to bring to perfection.” (II, 267) Their temples engaged a simple unornamented character married to an unobtrusive grandeur that the ancients unanimously called *the Doric*. (II, 269 º) Their public buildings encompassed strict rule, simple proportion, and pure harmony. (II, 271) Prof. Müller notes that “The Doric character, in short, created the Doric architecture.” (II, 270)

It didn’t stop there: Rhodes which was a Doric city “was designed with such perfect symmetry, that, according to the expression of the astonished ancients, it seemed like *one house*.” (II, 267 º)

This is enough to prove that there exists polylogicism but there is another phenomenon that strengthens this fact of reality.

The Dorians always migrated in groups of three; Hylleans/Dymanes/Pamphylians (Müller 1839:I, 32-3). The Dorians were so peculiar in this trait that in classical texts they were called the “Thrice-divided” Dorians (Müller 1839: I, 34). Wherever they migrated, the new land was divided into three parts (Müller 1839: I, 33). In Lacedæmonia, the Dorians not only divided themselves from the aboriginal peoples into a triad of Dorians/Perioci/Helots, they also divided Doric society into three parts, royalty/aristocracy/equals (or similars). Furthermore, the tripod figured prominently in their religion of Apollo. (Müller 1839: I, 14)

This is called Trifunctionality, a principle of Indo-European character that the linguist, Georges Dumezil formulated after research into the structure of Indo-European language. As the evidence above supplies, this trait evinced by the Doric Greeks was especially strong. Prof. Michael Mendle, in like manner, assigns Trifunctionality to the Anglo-Saxons of the 9th century A. D. who divided into three groups (estates): these were the *oratores*, those who pray; *bellatores*, those who fight; and *laboratores*, those who work. (pgs. 21-37) This trifunctionality principle in both the Doric Greeks and the Anglo-Saxons led to the creation of the tripartite forms of their respective republics. Dicaearchus of Messana was to label his treatise on the Spartan form of government, the *Tripoliticus*. Not only was their society divided between the helots, perioeci and themselves, the Dorians, their government was split between the royal office, the aristocracy and the homoioi, i.e. similars. The trifunctionality behavior was throughout their culture.

Plato is conscious of this paradigm when in his work *The Laws* he alludes to a lawmaker who has enough foresight to “limit sovereignties and make one of three”. (§692c; Hamilton, 1963, 1287) A little later in the same work in the formation of his ideal city, Plato counsels to “establish a threefold division.” (§697a; Hamilton, 1963, 1291) Plato is consciously trying to recreate the trifunctionality paradigm in his *kalipoli*.

In the *Republic*, Plato, renumerating the tripartite soul, discusses the end goal of philosophic ethical training when the man

“should dispose well of what in that true sense of the word is properly his own, and having first attained to self-mastery and beautiful order within himself, and having harmonized these three principles, the notes or intervals of three terms *quite literally the lowest, the highest, and the mean*, {ed. note: Trifunctionality} and all others there may be between them, and having linked and bound all three together and made of himself a unit, one man instead of many, self-controlled and in unison, he should then and then only turn…” (§443d-e ª)

The tripartite paradigm of the Doric republics, thru the macrocosm/microcosm principle, was applied to the nature and structure of the human soul. Thus Doric philosophy, Doric logicism, constructed much of its thought around this trifunctionality. Plato was to later on theorize on a nature of a godhead that was tripartite, that of nous, demiurge and world soul. The racial proclivities of the Doric soul drove the logicism of the Doric Greeks.

Concepts were laid out in a tripartite manner. In one proverb, that assuredly has a Doric patrimony, Plato recounts:

"My friends! This is what I would say to them—God, who as the old saw has it, holds in his hands **beginning, end, and middle** of all that is, moves through the cycle of nature, straight to his end, and ever at his side walks right, the justicer of them that forsake God's law." (*Laws*, §715e ª)

Notice the tripartite form of the description of God as the “beginning, end and middle”. The Doric Greeks placed concepts subconsciously and/or consciously into groups of three. There are other places that this occurs. They organized reality according to this instinct of Trifunctionality.

Just like the maternal instincts of women drive their reasonings, the trifunctionality theorem drives the reasonings of the Indo-European. In some European races it is stronger and in others it is weaker. The Trifunctionality code was proven inherent in the European linguistic record by Georges Dumezil. The language is a sign of the workings of the European mind. But also this Trifunctionality principle drives behavior as well. It informs the thought and behavior. Trifunctionality operates like an instinct in the character of Indo-European peoples or maybe is an instinct that not only informs behavior but ratiocinations.

The similarity of governments between the Dorians and Anglo-Saxons was scientifically accepted by A. H. J. Greenidge, in his work, *A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*, who writes that Sparta and Britain had the same form of government: “History has shown that such forms of government (speaking about mixed government) are suited to a commonsense non-idealistic people: the Phoenicians of Carthage, the Dorians of Greece, Romans, and Englishmen have all developed this type of polity” ( 2001: 76). Solon with the counsel of the Cretan sage Epimenides reconstructed the Athenian polis along the lines of the Dorian republics. As soon as it was set up, it failed. The German classicist Karl Otfried Müller noted that the Doric form of mixed government was not to succeed in Ionian Athens because "...the temperature which he (Solon) chose was too artificial to be lasting..." (II, 8) The character of the Athenians was too wild to adopt the Doric form of mixed government.

There is more going on other than logicism and instinct going on. The Ionian Greeks were not like the Doric Greeks. While the Doric Greeks of Crete and Laconia enjoyed stable governments, the Ionian Greeks of Athens were constantly falling into the *anakyklosis*, the turning of governments. The Ionians, as a society, were unstable. Ms. Rawson, a hostile anti-Spartan and pro-democrat researcher even had to acknowledge this sentiment that the Ionians were in decline, they were partly Orientalized, acquiring a reputation for softness and political instability. (p. 15) This paradigm exists throughout European history. This dichotomy is repeated between Venice and Florence; Venice was stable while Florence was in constant turmoil. Prof. J. Salwyn Schapiro in his study, *Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism*, compares and contrasts France’s and England’s response to revolutionary forces and ideas. He points out the violent reaction along with the plethora of ideas created in France to the smooth transition to liberalism in England. It is not just logical thinking that creates action amongst men. The difference of racial tones directs acceptance or resistance to things. Logicism doesn’t exist in a vacuum. As the example of France and England show, temperament also affects logicism. As these examples show, there is not a monolithic whole; neighboring people of the same family do not exhibit the same characteristics.

One thing one can infer from nature is that a multiplicity forms the whole. One can’t subscribe “Sola Scriptura”, a Protestant theorem, or monism, to nature. Things are formed in nature of a combination of things. If one is to look at the insect and animal world, instinct drives all of the creatures with an inherent goal in mind. The Ant family is a perfect example of this. Even though all Ants are one, there is a diversity of form and function between them all. What differentiates them is their genes and instinct. It is instinct that guides them to their function. If what many advocate is evolution, then men are not free from this paradigm. As human beings are part animal, which is Christian/Western teaching, then instinct, as it exists in the ape and gorilla species, would also be found to some extent in human beings.

Therefore, there is no “pure reasoning”. Logicism of human beings is guided to their goals by their instincts, temperaments, and ability to abstract.

Nor is this the totality of it. In the 5th chapter, on the Metaphysics of Socrates, it was noted that the Doric Greeks picked up principles from nature to form their logical reasonings. The Doric art of philosophy was the use of principles, laws and patterns hidden in nature; this formed their ratiocinations. What Doric philosophy entails then is the use of commonsense as an intuition, their embedded instinct of Trifunctionality, their temperament of severe gravitas, topped off with the Natural Law; thus, Doric logicism. It is not “sola” this-n-that but a combination of different streams. They had the perfect storm.

The error of transporting arithmetic methodology into human thought is that mathematics has no value attached to it but everything a human does has value attached to it. It has feeling, emotion, intuition, instinct pushing it. Totally different from an application of arithmetic methodology. It is interesting to note that Frege comments on the characteristics of mathematics as “the truths of arithmetic were not synthetic at all, neither a priori nor a posteriori. Unlike geometry—which, he agreed with Kant, rested on a priori intuition—arithmetic was analytic, that is to say, it could be defined in purely logical terms and proved from purely logical principles.” (Oxford, entry “Frege”, 295) On the other hand, Doric philosophy was based on geometry and they too compared and contrasted the two fields. Plutarch records the Lycurgan teaching on geometry and its importance to philosophy:

“For Lycurgus, I suppose you know, banished out of Sparta all arithmetical proportion as being democratical and favoring the crowd; but introduced the geometrical, as agreeable to an oligarchy and kingly government that rules by law; for the former gives an equal share to every one according to number, but the other gives according to the proportion of the deserts. It doth not huddle all things together, but in it there is a fair discretion of good and bad, every one having what is fit for him, not by lot or weight but according as he is virtuous or vicious.” (*Moralia*, Bk VIII, question ii)

The Doric Greeks understood already the difference in the mathematical fields. Arithmetic does lead to democracy and geometry leads to a more sophisticated governmental form. Arithmetic denies the participation of instinct and the intuition of commonsense. Geometry is more transcendental; it requires formulas for different situations. Geometry is also about the intricacies of problem solving. Frege and Husserl, both Germans, in their favoring of arithmetic over geometry show the very logical structure of the Germans. In personal interactions with Germans, philosophy is difficult; they are too practical, too logical to perform true philosophy. Germans make great soldiers, businessmen, manufacturers but philosophers? Germans are too logically minded to be true philosophers. This is also probably why Hegel rejected traditional Western philosophy. The Oxford entry on Frege describes others as referring to Frege as the “philosophers’ philosopher”. As Hegel transformed philosophy into idealism, Frege and Husserl pick up, what was once considered a tool of philosophy, i.e. logic, and converted logic into being philosophy itself. Philosophy is now “reductive logical analysis and the doctrine of the analytic (purely formal, factually empty) character of logic and mathematics.” (Oxford, entry “Analytic Philosophy” º) As one can see, the Germans destroyed traditional philosophy. As the Greeks are not a single racial unit but a diversity of different tribes, the Germans are as well and what is occurring here is that the extremes of German character, its idealism and extreme practicality come out, not in a harmony but in creating two very different systems of sophistry. Here two people, Frege and Husserl, who deny the veracity of polylogism, **transform traditional philosophy by their polylogicism**. German character transformed philosophy. They have stripped the spiritual, transcendent nature out of true philosophy. They succeeded in secularizing philosophy by emphasizing a certain element, the tool of logic, into its reigning, sovereign element. German tendency, arithmetic methodology, can produce a great Swiss watch but that same element is nowhere capable of producing and working with traditional Doric philosophy.

Prof. Long points out that logicism “depends on what their preferences are.” (Long, 26) Preferences? Does not Preferences defeat logic? So before logic ever begins, there is preference. Can you have logic with preference? Socrates and Plato noticed that long before; there is nothing new under the sun. In their day, preferences were called “opinion”. “Opinion” is not science. Logic only works with knowledge—not with opinion/preferences. Logic is a tool of science, not of economics. Logic was developed to serve philosophy, an abstract science. The Doric elenchus is a form of early logic. It is built around the principles of non-contradiction and consistency. Opinions by their very nature change; change daily or change weekly, or from minute to minute. If Opinions change, how does one have consistency? Only true Knowledge, by its very nature does NOT change. So the whole argument that Ludwig von Mises is trying to prove that economics is based on a single logicism is absolutely ludicrous. Logic is only tied to true knowledge.

On a side note: most of all economics exist in the appetites of man. It is half psychological. In other words, half of economics is in the mind of man. It is not a pure science which Mises wants to develop it into, a science of exchange. One example ought to suffice to prove the point. The economic saying is “Sell high, buy low”. It is about maximizing the greed of the person and minimizing the cost to the person. Is there any Virtue in that saying? If it costs $2.00 to produce an object, if that object is very rare, is it virtuous to open bidding war to get more out of it if it only costs $2.00 to produce it which includes the manufacturer’s labor? Instead of just selling it at two dollars, someone can get ten dollars for it. Is that honest? Or is that greed? Logic only works when there is honesty and virtue. This is why the founders of philosophy, the Doric Greeks, were forbidden to enter the marketplace or engage in economics. Biology, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, physics, and the Natural Law all exist outside the human mind. Economics is the only sphere that does not. Some of it exists in the outside but mostly it exists in the mind and appetites of man. It is not a pure science like the others.

Ludwig von Mises cornerstone book is *Human Action* where he lays out “praxeology” which “presuppose that human beings think and act logically. (Long, 18)

* “Action is will put into operation and transformed into an agency, is aiming at ends and goals, is the ego’s meaningful response to stimuli and to the conditions of its environment, is a person’s conscious adjustment to the state of the universe that determines his life.” (p. 11)
* “Action is a real thing. What counts is a man’s total behavior, and not his talk about planned but not realized acts...” (p. 12-13)
* “Action means the employment of means for the attainment of ends.” (p. 13)
* “Human action is one of the agencies bringing about change. It is an element of cosmic activity and becoming.” (p. 19)

Mises is very concerned about human action. In the last quote, it seems he is channeling Hegel. Disregarding both causality and teleology, Mises is only concerned with “the cognition and analysis of our own purposeful behavior” because that is the only thing that has real meaning. (p. 26)

This concern about that reality is defined solely by action, is echoed by Harry Waton who in 1939 wrote: “Reality is to be found only in action.” (pgs. 183-184)

This elevation of human action to the forefront of human concern is brought to the fore by the observation of the atheist thinker Bertrand Russell who quotes Marx’s opinion of truth:

"The question whether objective truth belongs to human thinking is not a question of theory, but a practical question," he says. "The truth, i.e., the reality and power, of thought **must be demonstrated in practice**. The contest as to the reality or non-reality of a thought which is isolated from practice, is a purely scholastic question. . . . Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways, but the real task is to alter it." (1945, 784 ª)

This “demonstrated in practice” is “human action”. The running current of all these Jews is their materialism and that, it is not transcendental thought that is useful, but only what can be seen, human action. The only reality, the only real thing, is action. Harry Waton is brilliant in his analysis of the dichotomy between the Greek and the Jew:

“It is still the influence of the Greek thought-forms in our own traditions that is one of the main obstacles in the way of understanding Christianity. Greek thought is dualistic; it is thought that sees existence in two opposing aspects: ideal and material, transcendental and phenomenal, mind and body, thought and action, and so on. Christianity was crystallized by the Jewish mind, and **the Jewish mind thinks integrally, monistically**. When Christianity was interpreted in terms of the dualistic thought of the Greeks, Christianity itself became dualistic, and so lost its original and true significance. Greek thought divides between thought and action, while Jewish thought regards them as one.” (p. 183 ª)

What one sees in Mises thought when he compresses all things as saying all think and act logically, he is applying the Jewish characteristic of monism, i.e., all people act logically. Everything is torn down, levelled out, and everything is made to fit one size. There is only one mode to everything. Monism is the regressing of a multiplicity to one. Mr. Waton uses the term ‘monism’ and its cognates five different times in his text as describing Jewish thinking. He describes monism as “complete rationality”. (p. 187) In other words, there is only one reason and it is all there is needed. Monism is the natural effervescence of Jewish thought. The major Jewish thinker of the Early Modern Age, Baruch de Spinoza (1632 – 1677) “reworked parts of Cartesian philosophy into a monist system” (Israel, 34) The Cartesian system was based on a mind/body dualism. Furthermore, Spinoza developed his system upon the mystical teachings of the Kabbala where God and nature are combined into a oneness which is a resurrection of pantheism. (Volk, quoting Durant, *Story of Philosophy*, p. 142) Hegel, the Kabbalist, would acclaim "You are either a Spinozist or not a philosopher at all.” (Wikipedia entry “Spinoza”)

This rationale of monism is found in the foundational Jewish prayer said at every Sabbath, The Shema: “Hear O, Israel, The Lord our God is One Lord”. (LXX, Deut. 6:4) This idea is replicated in the Muslim religion, a religion of another group of Semites, the Arabs. They purposely reject the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; they are strict monotheists like the Jews. Moreover, it is very easy to see a similarity of instinct in their architecture, where Semitic Arabic mosques match their counterparts, Semitic Jewish synagogues with the absence of art. They have clean walls, empty spaces, mostly empty of art.

As Trifunctionality is to the Indo-European peoples, monism is to Semitic peoples. This here is polylogicism. There are two different methodologies of reasonings here that are instinctive.

Second point is the materialism of Jewish thought. Again, Mr. Waton elaborates: the “Hebrew religion, in fact, was **intensely materialistic** and it is precisely this that gave it persistent and effective reality”. (p. 125 ª) The Sadducees of Christ’s time are an historical record of the general materialism of the Jewish race. They denied the possibility of resurrection and the immortality of the soul (which were Greek imports anyway {Ehrlich}). They were the traditionalists of Judaism.

Steven Volk ascertains that the pantheism of Spinoza led to naturalism, that “everything belongs to the world of nature”. (Oxford entry “Naturalism”) “It insists …[that] the world of nature should form a single sphere without incursions from outside by souls or spirits, divine or human, and without having to accommodate strange entities like non-natural values or substantive abstract universals.” (ibid) Naturalism has an affinity, cousin in materialism. Volk goes on to demonstrate that the consequence of this ideology is that “the ideals of Goodness, Beauty, Truth, vanish from the world as naturalism interprets it. Naturalism is philosophically insufficient as it is opposed to man's higher ideals of Goodness, Beauty, and Truth.” Goodness, Beauty, and Truth are the mainstays of Greek philosophy; they are its focus. K. O. Müller relates that the Spartan prayer was “Give us what is good and what is beautiful”. (II, 381) Goodness, Beauty and Truth is European culture and naturalism/materialism cuts out the life of the European ethos

This naturalism/materialism is a like a blindness and affects the cognition of the Spiritual unseen world. The presence of either naturalism/materialism or transcendental thinking has an effect on reasoning. This is another aspect of polylogicism. Plato talks all the time of the use of the Mind’s eye. This aspect is what is behind the parable of The Cave. Plato’s Cave is the material natural world. Transcendental thought is about seeing the essence of things, what underlies the material world. With that comes the apprehension of the Natural Law, i.e. the principles of nature, that are hidden under the physical manifestations of nature. The totality of reality cannot be read or understood by the naturalist/materialist mind. Traditional Greek philosophy is a product of the supernatural thinking of the Doric Greeks. What has been documented in this work is that Greek philosophy is not understood or is destroyed in the hands of materialist people. Contrary to Hegel’s claim, Philosophy is a Doric thing; like Hegel himself, Spinoza is not a philosopher.

There is another part to this materialistic aspect of the Jews that Harry Waton beautifully brings up and contrasts:

“And now we come to the idea of progress. The notion of progress is totally foreign to the Greek mind and to the Roman mind…For the Greek thinkers, the very idea of change is excluded from the essence of the divine; and the life of God is a life of eternal changeless contemplation of the eternally changeless. In this we see the apotheosis of leisure—the ideal of aristocracy. God is the opposite of the worker. Greek reflection cannot even think of progress. And the same is true of the Roman mind. Over against both stands the inherent purpose of the Hebrew mind—the effort to achieve a universal family, which becomes fully explicit in Jesus. It is precisely the absence of dualism in the Hebrew mind which necessitates the unity of the two elements, which Greece and Rome separate. And in this Jewish conception of the universal family there is immanent the notion of progress. (p. 193)

He is absolutely right in that Plato conceived of the eternal world as changeless in contradistinction to the ever-changing material world. This natural inclination of Jews leads their ratiocinations. Spinoza married God to the physical world and then the evolution paradigm of nature is very much tied to their theological thinking. Socialism which encompasses progress, i.e. “evolution”, is the flowering of the Jewish mind.

Yes, the material world is constantly changing but the Natural Law never changes. It is eternal and unchanging. This is the condition of reality. Reality is a dualism itself that encompasses the ever-changing material world with the static world of the unseen, eternal world of the Natural Law. The existence of the Natural Law undercuts the Jewish outlook.

In a side note, Einstein formulated the General Theory of Relativity that things change, physical matter and parameters, change. But throughout the universe, the Natural Law is always there. Any point in the universe, or even outside it, the Natural Law exists without change. The Natural Law even exists in Heaven without change.

Another aspect of the Greek/Hebrew dichotomy is the sense of order. David Lamb, a journalist and an author on Arab culture, noting the decrepit condition of Cairo mentions the lack of community upkeep of the environs. He quotes T. E. Lawrence, who lived and worked with Arabs, more than seventy years before about his observation: "The Semitic mind does not lean toward system of organization. It is practically impossible to fuse the diverse elements among the Semites into a modern, closely knit state." (Sailor quoting Lamb)

As was mentioned earlier in the second chapter, the Doric Greeks were in tune with the ideas of order. Order is intrinsic across the Indo-European world. (Franklin, 1) One of the basic ideas undergirding this concept is the Greek word *άρμονία*, harmony. It carries the ideas of “continuum” and “held together”. Prof. Franklin goes on to describe harmony as:

“Harmony then is not simply the *absence* of conflict, but a conflict which, in neutralizing itself, gives rise to a productive reconciliation. The dynamics of a complex system in a state of harmonic equilibrium may be reduced to the dualism of conflict and reconciliation; at the same time, the harmonic equilibrium itself may be regarded as a unity…” º

What symbolizes harmony was the bow; specifically the bow that is attached to the Doric god of Apollo. “The living bow was a very simple, ancient, and striking example of a transcendant whole, the parts of which are caught in a continuous, circular interplay—mutually causing what has been called in whole-systems theory an ‘emergent property’, a subject of much current interest in the science of complexity.” (John Franklin, 5) What the bow taught about harmony, the Doric philosopher Empedocles articulated in his cosmic sphere with its unity, duality, equilibrium (the Golden Mean), circularity, the articulated continuum, mutual causation and supervenience. Apollo and the bow with the lyre were components that inspired philosophy. Doric Greek philosophy is the capturing of these ideas in a universal whole and why their state took on a tripartite form. Prof. John Franklin endorses that the whole of the philodorian philosophers, Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Parmenides, Empedocles, and Plato all expressed harmonic elements in their writings. Franklin quoting another researcher perceives that Indo-Europeans have an “almost omnipresent tendency to dichotomous thought” and that has become characteristic of their “methods of arguing and reasoning”. (John Franklin, 19) Contrary to Franklin’s supposition that harmony is only on the margins of order, Aristotle defines harmony, *συμφωνία*, as a “combination of high and low”. (Met., VII, ii, 7; §1043a 10; Loeb 407-409) [[127]](#footnote-127) The bow and the lyre are both composed of this dichotomy, the soft string and the hard wood; it is what Nature teaches. Symphony, a concomitant of harmony, automatically intimates hierarchy. The Indo-European mind incorporates this. The Doric communities like their cousins in India all produced caste societies. Harmony is a component of Order. Prof. Franklin strongly endorses Benveniste’s case that Order is the foundation of the religious, moral and societal construct of Indo-European civilizations. As their societies are ordered from high to low, ideas and concepts are ordered in similar way. This is the how-n-why the term ‘Metaphysics’ came into being. Aristotle wrote a book on *Physics* and his second book on transcendent ideas was titled *Metaphysics*. Polylogicism is very real.

Whereas the Doric Greek philosophy is a universal science, Jewish thought is monistic. Doric Greek philosophy is the science of complexity and Jewish thought is primitive. They are not in the same league.

Ms. Edith Hamilton opens her book, *The Greek Way*, with the chapter, “East and West”. She writes that with the Greeks, “something new came into the world. They were the first Westerners; the spirit of the West, the modern spirit, is a Greek discovery and the place of the Greeks is in the modern world”. (p. 15) She goes on to state that “what divides the West from the East, is the supremacy of mind in the affairs of men, and this came to birth in Greece and lived in Greece.” (p. 16) The Greeks were very conscious of the difference between them and the East. While the East lived under the despotism of their monarchs, the Greeks had self-government. It was this fact alone that brought home to them their difference. Whereas luxury was rampant in the East, they were mostly hard-scrabble farmers. This bred a difference; the Greeks saw the East as effeminate.

“…for because the barbarians are more servile in their nature than the Greeks, and the Asiatics than the Europeans, they endure despotic rule without any resentment.” (Aris., *Pol*., III, ix, 3; §1285a 20; Loeb, 249)

This is not some personal opinion of Aristotle; he is recording the general observation and conclusions of the Greeks of his day toward the barbarians. The Asiatics have a servile spirit—that means a feminine spirit. The Hebrews were fine with their 400 years under Egyptian rule. They didn’t want to leave and God had to drag them out. God had to create a situation with the Pharaoh to set up a break. Once they left, on several occasions, the Hebrews wanted to return to Egypt. This is the servile spirit. The East was dangerous to the Greek. The East encompasses the female spirit of servility while the West incorporates the masculine spirit.

The Jewish conception of Truth is very different from the Greek. In contradistinction to the Greek way, philosemitic pastor, John J. Parsons explicates the Hebrew way:

“Truth therefore is a matter of *trust*—not abstract knowledge—whereas "knowledge" is primarily about practical ethics, moral obligation, and cult practices (i.e. Temple worship). For the Hebrew mind, truth is more akin to *moral fidelity* than it is to propositional correspondence; it is more a matter of the heart than of the head.” º

This “matter of the heart” is femine. This has nothing to do with ratiocinating. It is an instinct, a spirit, a feeling, a sentiment that logicism sits upon. The claim by Frege, Husserl, and Mises that all men think logically is just pure horse puckey. Pity drives the Jewish mind. And this pity for the supposed undertrodden class is socialism. Ms. Hamilton notices the same thing about the Hebrew way. She writes that

“Hebrew and Greek are poles apart. Hebrew poetry is directed to the emotions; it is designed to make the hearer feel, not think.” (1993, p. 50)

And this general sentiment of the Hebrews drives their hatred of facts. “To feel” is feminine; logic is masculine. This very same sentiment is seen quite clearly in the modern age with Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adornos’ excoriation of facts. Judge for yourselves, is their *Dialectics of Enlightenment* the product of logic or their conception of truth as “matters of the heart”? One now can fully understand the problem that is going on.

Of the Greeks, Ms. Hamilton writes that “the observing reason which works on what we of the West calls facts of the real world, is not esteemed in the East.” Just preceding that quote she writes:

“When we find that the Greeks, too, lived in a reasonable world as a result of using their reason upon it, we accept the achievement as the natural thing that needs no comment. But the truth is that even to-day our point of view obtains only within strict limits. It does **NOT** belong to the immense expanse and the multitudinous populations of the East. **There what goes on outside of a man is comparatively unimportant and completely undeserving of the attention of the truly wise.**” (pg 16 ª)

This paradigm of looking inward and not outward is the same paradigm that Yves Christen finds in his book *Sex Differences* where he quotes a study that the play amongst boys and girls are different: “the girls emphasize inner space, the boys outer space”. (p. 102) In other words, girls play inside a doll house, whereas boys play at the exterior of the house with lots of action.

The gifted Frenchman, Jacques Maritain, backs up Ms. Hamilton’s observation by adjudging that Semitic and Egyptian civilizations were devoid of philosophy. He goes further to maintain that the Jews were “without aptitude for such investigations”. (pgs. 2-3) In conclusion, the Jewish spirit is feminine and their logicism is formed by that spirit.

The magisterial scholar of the Dorians, Karl Otfried Müller, calls attention to the central feature of Doric culture:

“In short, the whole race bears generally the stamp and character of the *male sex*…” (II, 401 º) [[128]](#footnote-128)

The Dorians had a hyper masculine character. This hyper masculinity drives black/white linear thinking, i.e. logic. The masculine mind is strongly logical. The science of logic was created by a race that “bears generally the stamp and character of the male sex”. This is behind Parmenides principle of non-contradiction. As was noted by Yves Christen of the gender difference of inner and outer space, outward-looking is of very masculine instinct. It looks at the cosmos, is drawn to the cosmos and is enthralled with the outside world. One finds this outward instinct in a peculiar word in the definition of the Virtue of Righteousness. It is also found in the first line of the Boy Scout Oath as in “…to do my **duty** to God and my country…”. The word is “Duty”.

“First among the claims of righteousness are our **duties** to the gods, then our **duties** to the spirits, then those to country and parents, then those to the departed; and among these claims is piety, which is either a part of righteousness or a concomitant of it.” (pseudo-Aristotle, *Virtues & Vices*, v, 2 ª)

Duty is outward looking. It is opposite of self-aggrandizement. Economics is about self-aggrandizement. Self-aggrandizement is inward looking—what is in it for me attitude. ‘Duty’ on the other hand, is the masculine/Aristocratic instinct. It is about self-sacrifice. Duty is the warrior/Aristocratic code. All those claims above are outward looking; they are outside the self. The self works, labors in behest of something outside itself. The whole of Spartan culture is based on this masculine outlook of duty. And a concomitant of duty is Truth. As the definition in the book *Virtues & Vices* attests to, “to tell the truth” is a part of the Virtue of Righteousness.

The Masculine character of the Dorians forced them to look outward, not inward for Truth. Truth is an Intellectual abstract movement of harmony with the outside world. In this case, facts are very important. Whereas in the Horkheimer and Adorno’s *Dialectics of Enlightenment* is the exposition of their theoretical imaginations (feelings), the Dorians created science that is based on the reading of reality by ascertainment of facts from nature. These two very different sentiments of the Greeks and Hebrews drive their ratiocinations. There is NO pure logicism going on. Logic doesn’t really work either in “theoretical imaginations”. Clearly, polylogicism is driven by several factors of race, gender and spirit. The modality of the East is not the modality of the West. In this case, the Jews are ill-fitted for the practice of philosophy. As the Germans are too logically minded for true philosophy, the English too pragmatic/practical, the Jews are too materialistic, idealistic, and touchy-feely.

Ms. Hamilton concludes that the Greek way is the love of reason, the love of life and the delight in the use of the mind and the body. She quotes Aristotle at length who, she notes, is usually impersonal and detached in his habit of writing but in this case, he breaks character and writes of his own unbounded joy in his art:

“Since then reason is divine in comparison with man’s whole nature, the life according to reason must be divine in comparison with (usual) human life. Nor ought we to pay regard to those who exhort us that as men we ought to think human things and keep our eyes upon mortality: NAY, as far as may be, we should endeavor to rise to that which is immortal, and live in conformity with that which is best, in us. Now, what is characteristic of any nature is that which is best for it and gives most joy. Such to man is the life according to reason, since it is this that makes him man.” (1993a, 31)

That is Greek. The life of reason is the fullness of a man. To use reason and life with what is eternal and immortal—to share in the divine life of the Creator. To share in the divine nature is the joy of the Greek. To always look to the best, not only to be the best but to strive toward what is perfection is the direction of the Greek way; it is the masculine spirit. This is Hellenism squared. This is the basis of Western Culture.

The second aspect of Jewish mentality is their ability of criticism. Baruch Spinoza was really the first to introduce this Jewish mentality into Western literature. In his very first writing, the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, Spinoza initiated “the movement of higher criticism”. (Durant, 153) Spinoza learned this technique in the Talmudic school where he started his education. He attacked the history of the Bible and labelled it all myth.

Central to Judaism is iconoclasm, i.e. the destruction of idols, cherished beliefs and superstition. Genocide is the concomitant of iconoclasm. The describing of monarchy in the Midrash tradition which fueled the English revolutions of the 17th century as idolatry (Nelson) is the spirit of Jewish iconoclasm. With this revelation, the Jewish character demands the total extermination of evil (in their opinion). (Waton, 119) [[129]](#footnote-129) As was shown in the last end of the conclusion to the paper “Macrocosm/Microcosm in Doric Thought”, paradigms in human thought go across the board. Jewish character is infused with iconoclastic ideology. It goes to all sectors of their thought. As they are iconoclastic in their religion, they are iconoclastic in their thoughts. This is what breeds criticism—the need to deconstruct. Deconstructionism is a major component of modern thought. In its critical methodology, deconstructionism, as a tool of political analysis has been seized by Marxists, feminists and gay promoters to attack all facets of Western culture. (Veith, 136-137) While quoting another, Prof. Veith writes that “To believe in ‘a transcendental signified’, that words point to ideas that themselves have an objective, ontological status, is to be logocentric. Logocentrism ‘identifies language with voice, presence, Western metaphysics, and ultimately derivation from the world of God’. The deconstructionist ‘tried to topple this hierarchy’.” Greek metaphysical thinking tied into language, creates a hierarchy of values. With language, the mind ascends to understand the transcendent world. When the materialist Jewish mind encounters this, the tool of criticism is used as a form of iconoclasm to demolish Hellenic/Western thought. Their anti-hierarchical sentiment is carried into the realm of metaphysics. Though the precursor is Spinoza, the father of modern deconstructionism as a sophistry in its own regard is Jacques Derrida (1930- ), a Jew. Veith names Susan Handelman, Herbert Schneidau and G. Douglas Atkins as placing Jacques Derrida in the Jewish tradition. Veith summarizes Handelman’s view that “the Jewish approach is far different from the Hellenic thought” and that the conclusion of these other professors that Jacques Derrida’s deconstructionistic ideology is part of “the radical iconoclasm of the Biblical tradition”. (Veith, 141) It is not so much the Biblical tradition as the culture of Talmudic studies. Here is another form of polylogism recognized in the other fields outside of economics.

Criticism is the function of very intelligent people. As Aristotle was quoted earlier as saying, the peoples of the East are highly intelligent. The religious sentiment of Hebraic iconoclasm finds its home in the logical thinking of the people. This in turn drives the Critical Theory launched by the Frankfurt School which will be discussed in a later chapter. Not only is the spirit of the Hebrews feminine but their mind is highly caustic bellying their iconoclastic nature. Criticism/iconoclasm is of Jewish nature.

Surrounding racial polylogicism is another form of logicism which isn’t logicism at all, the effect of good and evil. This form supersedes the working of logicism. Lycurgus demanded Virtue be exhibited by all the citizens of their state. [[130]](#footnote-130) This was so important that Socrates carries this over into his activities in Athens as well. Lycurgus, as Plutarch quantified, created a “complete philosophic state” and Virtue was a necessary ingredient for the realization of that philosophic state. Socrates continues this mode. If philosophy is the study of The Good, then, the character of the individual MUST BE Good itself, the *καλοκάγαθίαν* (the Good and the Beautiful). To be “good” is what Virtue is and it must be habitualized in order to do and live the philosophic life.

This is based on the Natural Law of “Like produces Like”. An evil person cannot, with all the logic in the world, with all the arithmetic methodology in the world, produce a good conclusion in the world of values. Logic cannot produce The Good by itself.

Plato recognizes this when he recounts Socrates saying as:

“All knowledge, when separated from justice and virtue, is seen to be cunning and ***not*** wisdom”. (*Menexenus*: §247 ª)

The Natural Law is “Like produces Like”, or “Like to Like”. The character of a man drives the conclusion he will reach. This same paradigm was familiar and known by Jesus Christ, the Logos since He was the author for it:

“For no good tree bears bad fruit, nor again does a bad tree bear good fruit; for each tree is known by its own fruit. For figs are not gathered from thorns, nor are grapes picked from a bramble bush. The good man out of the good treasure of his heart produces good, and the evil man out of his evil treasure produces evil; for out of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaks.” (Luke, 6:43-45)

This is the Natural Law of “Like produces like”. The apprehension of the Good is not a logic formula—it is discerned. It is kin to kin that produces it. Metaphysics approaches the spiritual and so, here in the rarified field of The Good and the Beautiful, spirit takes over, not logicism. Here is proof enough of the necessity of Virtue. Virtue and knowledge go together. Only a Good character can apprehend and know The Good and the Beautiful. Evil cannot. Instead evil is repulsed by The Good as what Genesis teaches. As there is a War between good people and bad people, the Spirit of Good wars against the Spirit of Evil. St. John in his First Letter says as a Christian, “We know the spirit of Truth and the spirit of error”. (I John, 4:6) It is spirit, inclinations, instincts that direct the logicism of man.

One of the main errors of modern sophistry today is to consider ‘philosophy’ just ‘reasoning’. But that is absolutely not so. The word ‘philosophy’ includes the word ‘wisdom’. Wisdom is not reasoning—is not rationalizations. Wisdom is the “knowledge of certain principles and causes”. (Arist., *Met*., I, i, 17; §932a; Loeb, 9) In the Aristotelian *Magna Moralia*, it teaches that “Philosophic Thought or Wisdom ***is a compound*** of Scientific Thought and Intuition”. (I, xxxiv, 14; 1197a 20; Loeb, 561 ª) Wisdom itself is a duality—it is composed of two things. Built on Greek philosophy, the LXX goes further, “Reasoning is, then, intellect accompanied by a life of rectitude, putting foremost the consideration of wisdom. And wisdom is a knowledge of divine and human things and of their causes”. (IV *Macc*., I:15-16) Here again is the duality that wisdom is composed of divine and human things but it is accompanied by human character, i.e. rectitude. Wisdom is not free from human character. It is a duality of knowledge of divine and human things and then this knowledge is combined with the human character of rectitude. It is a duality within a duality. Wisdom connected to a life of rectitude is only seen in the communities of the Doric Greeks in Crete and Laconia. Did Athens have this? No.

The character of a man is component of any achievement in wisdom. One of these facets of character is the degree to which he is masculinized. K. O. Müller notes that Doric society is the form of a very high masculinity. The Doric Greeks had a very ascetic nature. As the saying from Pittacus states, “The Good comes thru the Hard”. Hardness is part of the Virtue of Manliness. If the Good is hard, then men who try to attain to The Good, must be hard themselves. It is hardness of character that procures The Good. Again, this mirrored in another saying of the Logos, Jesus Christ who said,

“Enter by the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the way easy, that leads to destruction, …For the gate is narrow and the way hard, that leads to life,…”

The way of Life is Hard. Philosophy is the Way of Life and the road of Philosophy is Hard. The ascetic lifestyle of the Pythagoreans, of Heraclitus, of the Socratics, of the Cretans and the Spartans show the lifestyle of philosophy. Philosophy is connected to the lifestyle of hardness. This is the life of rectitude.

In a study published in *Psychological Science*, it was found that men who have great upper body strength, on a whole, differed politically from those who had weak upper body strength. (Innes) Quoting Professor Petersen: “Despite the fact that the United States, Denmark and Argentina have very different welfare systems, we still see that - at the psychological level - individuals’ reason about welfare redistribution in the same way. In all three countries, physically strong males consistently pursue the self-interested position on redistribution.” That is to say, strong men are conservative in their outlook while soft men are leftists. Character impacts reasoning.

A frightening statement of purposely effeminizing men is found in the first plank in “The Communist Rules for Revolution” which were claimed to be found in Germany in 1919. [[131]](#footnote-131) It states:

“1. Corrupt the young; get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.”

To destroy ruggedness in men is to enervate them. Though Snopes.com thinks it has discredited them as out-of-this-world and abnormal, a classical scholar would defend that as very possible political strategy for it is enumerated as a possible goal in Herodotus. [[132]](#footnote-132) Further, the “Communist Rules” are similar to a very modern day Chicago communist and Jew Saul Alinsky and his *Rules for Radicals*. A die-hard communist, albeit a cultural communist, Herbert Marcuse, a member of the Frankfurt School, in his *Eros and Civilization* advocated just such a position as promoting sex in order to undermine Christian morality. Any honest observation of today’s culture in the 21st century would see that those Communist Rules are alive and well in our current vulgar lowbrow entertainment industry. Communists just love publishing “Rules”. In a personal experience of college, the author witnessed the school administration and academia encouraging and promoting childish behavior in the students. If communism is about promoting peace, then, emasculating men, getting rid of their pride, pretensions, honor and testosterone would be one step in the road to peace. Whereas, the Doric Greeks in love with beauty and the good endeavored to masculinize their boys into manhood, communism, as a political strategy does seek to enervate boys and men. Not only will this bring about peace, but also effeminacy will stifle and corrupt the logical thinking of linear thought patterns; effeminate men will emote instead of using reason and logic. It is necessary for communism to succeed that European men be effeminized, to destroy their ruggedness. Ratiocinations of men are affected by their character.

And this goes to the heart of philosophy and logic. As was seen with the polylogicism of women, their rationality is entwined with their emotionality. The same can be said about imperfectly masculinized males. The development of black/white linear thinking, which is a necessary component of Western thought and true philosophy which is the apprehension of Truth, is connected to very masculinized males. [[133]](#footnote-133)

As was quoted earlier, Xenophon pointed to a very important truth about the training of Virtue and of being good and pious is that the gods would “counsel you in matters hidden from man”. (*Memorabilia*, I, iv, 18) The true definition of enlightenment is the inspiration of God. Ancient, Classical and Christian man has always recognized this part of human existence. Some men have done things so miraculous that others considered them divinely impressed. The discovery of making fire was considered by the Greeks so out of this world that it was a god that brought it down to man. This is enlightenment. The Doric Greeks thought this a very important part of gaining wisdom. The Virtue of Righteousness teaches holiness and Doric philosophy teaches theosis. One can say that another component of wisdom is inspiration from God. Part of the wisdom of Socrates is seen in his collusion with his daemon.

As reality fundamentally incorporates duality throughout, there is also an opposite to inspiration and that of delusion. The Natural Law is always at work. And what would commonsense teach? That wicked men receive inspiration from God just as good men do? The Natural Law is that “Like produces like”, “Like to Like”. God only works with His own.

The wicked man does not benefit from his character. Once a man accepts a lie, more will follow. St. Paul in his Second Letter to the Thessalonians warns that those who refuse truth, God will send upon them “strong delusion”. Whereas good men receive inspiration, wicked men will be marched into delusions. All the logic and rationality in the world will not correct that. Marx thought he found “scientific socialism” and where did that lead? How successful was the communist revolution in Russia? It lasted 80 years and afterwards, Russia is full of environmental degradation, the mass of the male population are alcoholics, and it has a falling birthrate. Russia has been destroyed and a history covered in bloodshed and fomenting of internecine warfare in other places around the world. One can conclude that mass delusion was a reality with communism.

Ancient, Greek, Doric, Socratic, Platonic, true Western philosophy is about Wisdom; it is not about logic, or reasonings, or arithmetic methodology. Character, manly and goodness, is a major component of philosophy. The body is not separate from the mind it contains. Yet, every modern thinker has thought they can waltz around write copious amounts of pages of dissertations and call it philosophy and think that logic and reason or rationality is all that is required. It is quite clear that modern academia don’t have a clue on what true philosophy really is. Not only do they not practice Virtue, they are totally deficient on what Wisdom is and what it entails.

Logicism rests on the character of the man. The character of a man directs the travel of the reasoning. Just like concept precedes knowledge, predisposition towards truth and goodness allows reception of the good. This is why Plato purposely doesn’t end five of his dialogues. All the Logic in the world will not sway an evil man. Look at the example of the American states that passed laws by democrat majorities to defend marriage as being between one man and one wife. Seventeen federal judges all struck them down. All the logic/reasonings presented, did not make a hill of beans to them. Not one judge differed from the rest. What logic is there? These judges are all socialists, communists and liberals. If a Christian stood up and said marriage is only between a man and a woman and gave all the reasons in the world, these judges will still have struck them down—because of their character. All these court cases can be settled by a single statement, if the claimant is a conservative and/or a Christian, the case can be automatically dismissed by the liberal judge. No amount of reasonings will sway a liberal judge, so in order to save time, each claimant should just claim if he is a liberal or a conservative; the liberal wins his case and the conservative loses his case; just-cut-to-the-chase; no need to play charades as if a court room hearing is really necessary. That is the state of things today.

It is character that drives logic. Just like a gun. Jacques Maritain places logic as a tool of philosophy. And just like any tool, it can be wielded to fit any need. The difference in the end is not the use of logic—but the character of the individual that wields it. What is the difference between a robber with a gun and a policeman with a gun? Character. One does evil with a gun and another does good. The tool of logic has the same paradigm as a gun. This bears repeating:

“All knowledge, when separated from justice and virtue, is seen to be cunning and ***not*** wisdom”. (*Menexenus*: §247 ª)

That is a truism that will never change. It is the Natural Law: Like to Like. Ethics cannot be divorced from logic for character drives logic. Logic is not some mathematical tool. As demonstrated in the difference between the polylogicism of men and women, their gender issues drive difference in reasonings. Look at the Protagoras statement: out in the open, but men of liberal, socialist, Marxist character walked right over it and dismissed it. What good is knowledge, when even when it is out in the open, in plain sight—and gets dismissed? Did the monologicism, the pure logic of Frege, Husserl or Mises resurrect the Protagoras statement?

NO.

Has anybody of the so-called analytical school of philosophy recovered the truth of the Protagoras statement?

NO.

All the king’s men and all the king’s horses of the Frege/Husserl school of pure logic did not put the egg of traditional Greek philosophy back together. Race/character matters.

Another facet to character is the training of the soul to Good. Plato wrote 2400 years ago about the necessity of good music to train the soul to the Good. Yet this is a very important component of philosophy which all and sundry has overlooked. As the Aristotelian stated:

 “Philosophic Thought or Wisdom ***is a compound*** of Scientific Thought and Intuition”. (*Magna Moralia,* I, xxxiv, 14; 1197a 20; Loeb, 561 ª)

This is a teaching of Plato and of the Doric Greeks. See, Frege and Husserl have it all wrong. Philosophy is Wisdom. Wisdom is part scientific thought and Intuition. Intuition is a sense like instinct. To know the Good requires an instinct, an intuition of the Good. The analogy is the lyre. One doesn’t pick up any stringed instrument and start playing it. It has to be tuned first. An untuned lyre does not produce good music but a grating sound. The music produced from something untuned is discordant and ugly. But a tuned lyre, along with a masterful player and a virtuous tune, produces beautiful music. So as the lyre has to be tuned, the soul, which apprehends the Good must be tuned to the Good. Good music should, as the laws of beauty hold, have proportion, harmony and symmetry. Music forms these properties upon the Soul. These aspects create in the soul an intuition, an instinct toward the Good. Without the tuning, there is no grasping of The Good. Just as the Protagoras statement has been overlooked, the necessity of character building, both manly, beautiful (which integrates proportion, harmony and symmetry), martial and virtuous, has been totally forgotten, overlooked and disabused. Just like the ground has to be prepared to accept the seed, the character of the individual must be prepared to accept and perform the living art of philosophy. There is no such thing as an “Introduction to Philosophy”, or for that matter a four year college degree that produces “philosophy”. Philosophy begins first and foremost in character and manly training from childhood.

The problem here is that Mises, economist by trade and a materialist, is building his inferences upon the work of mathematicians that sought to carry the world and values of arithmetic methodology into the philosophical world. This is an error; an error of righteousness, an error of the natural law. Righteousness is the dictum that all things are constructed to do one thing. Righteousness also teaches boundaries; this was the whole point of Plato’s Republic that the appetites of the human were overstepping the privilege of reason; the appetites are to stay in their field, that of supplying the body of its “just” needs. Here, the same paradigm is happening, mathematics, a separate field of science, is now going to dictate the parameters and field of philosophy which it has no right and no ability to do. The structure and methodology of arithmetic is being moved into the field of philosophy, thus destroying it. The field of economics is not metaphysical; it is totally materialistic. Moreover the field of economics is about supplying the appetites of man—it is quite foreign to the reign of Virtue and Wisdom, True Philosophy.

Polylogicism exists between God and man, between the genders of male and female, between the different races of men and finally between the races of Good and evil. All of this comes into play. Yes, all people can do arithmetic but not all people can do calculus. Logicism is the same way, has the same modality. All people can do simple logic of the syllogism but to do calculus logic of transcendental thought is beyond many. Western metaphysics, Doric philosophy takes a calculus type of logic and a manly, virtuous and beautiful character that many people are not equipped to do or have. There is polylogicism and it exists in every sphere just how the natural law principle of macrocosm/microcosm would dictate it should.

This is also why philosophy is an *ars vivendi*; it is a living art. Philosophy is lived; it has to have harmony between life and thought, the mix of the high and low. Both components have to be good in order to achieve the good. The parts make up the whole. One has to live The Good in order to Know The Good—and one must know The Good in order to live The Good—a circularity, a harmony. This is what Doric philosophy teaches. And that circularity is the same for evil. Once a person adopts a lie, it feeds upon itself. A lie attracts other lies. A lie is a delusion and it is the character of the man that allows that to happen.

And one more thing that demonstrates the existence and truth of polylogicism is that Wisdom is only found in the old. The young do not have Wisdom. This is why one sees that the upper body of the Spartan republic is called the “gerousia”—old men. Lacedæmonian practices were copied into the Roman republic and their upper body followed the same principle, i.e. their upper body was called “senatus”—old men. There is a polylogicism between the old and young, the old have wisdom and the young do not. This is why socialism in all its brands relies on the youth and is essentially a youth movement. Born mostly idealistic, youth, devoid of wisdom and highly idealistic, are easily swayed which Socialism/Marxism preys upon. And with these idealistic youth, their energy is then directed to destroy and attack traditional European society and religion.

What is going on is a war against particularity. If what they want to say that all men are equal and there is no difference amongst men, Socrates would ask the for the principle of consistency. Does a furniture maker go out to the woods and just grab any tree out there? Is there a difference between a poplar and an oak? If all men are created equal then all trees are created equal. Does a stone mason go out to the quarry and grab any rock out there to carve? Is there a difference between gypsum and marble? If all men are created equal then all rocks are created equal. Does a farmer go to a Hereford for milk the same way he goes to a Holstein? If all men are created equal then all cows are created equal.

But that is not reality is it? Thomas Jefferson’s phrase “All men are created equal” is just baloney. It has no philosophical basis; it is not scientific at all; science being “the condition of what is”. See this is the principle of consistency. The principle of macrocosm/microcosm would teach that what works in the cosm of trees, stones and bovines would also work in the cosm of men. But that is not how it is working today.

The natural laws of harmony which is the combination of the high and low, duality, and the golden mean all operate here. All of reality is created with those laws. Trees are the universal but poplars and oaks are far different. All things are constructed of their universal and a particular. No furniture maker goes out to the woods and grabs any piece of wood. That is idiotic, foolish. A furniture maker pays attention to the particular not to the universal aspect of a thing. That is true for farmers, stone masons and every other tradesman. It is a truism of reality.

In the Natural Law of duality then, all things are constructed of their universal and particularity. Harmony teaches that the universal is the base and the particularity is the high. Truth, Beauty and Goodness all lie in the Golden Mean. The Golden Mean is throughout Nature. The universal is one extreme and the particularity is another. All things consist of a combined universal and a particular. The universal and the particular all have meaning; all have value.

One of the Virtues is Prudence. Prudence does not disregard the particular. Philosophy is about reality and knowing that reality is dangerous, the virtue of prudence is a necessity of life and survival. Ideology that seeks to dismiss the particularity, especially Jewish messianism that seeks to dissolve all particularity into the universal, only causes harm. Communists tried to create a uniform Yugoslavia but once Communism collapsed, all reverted back to their ethnic identities and bloodshed ensued.

Race is a part of the Natural Order. Race is nothing more than family writ large. Race is a community of inter-related families. What makes up Race? Family. So what is the whole? Family. Deracination is about attacking the Natural Order; it is nihilism. It is about attacking particularity which God created. God created race as in telling Abraham, “I will make of you the father of many races”. God created race. Race is the Order amongst humans. In Leviticus (LXX), 19:19, God commands that “…thou shalt not let they cattle gender with one of a different kind,…” Here is not so much Mosaic law but a law directed to the Natural Order. God created particularity and it is to stay that way. As Plutarch states the mentality of Western Civilization, “We are not in this world to give the laws, but in order to obey the commands of the gods”. We are to respect what God has done. There is no progressiveness in Plutarch’s Doric teaching.

What is going on is the resurgence of Gnosticism. Eszter Spät sums up pretty succinctly the essence of Gnosticism:

“…where nature and the natural order is seen as alien, even contrary to God and everything divine. The same anti-cosmic attitude may also explain the even more mysterious lines: 'Oh commoner, do not eat by day, and do not sleep by night', as eating, as well as sleeping, are signs of men's subjection to the laws of nature, that is the laws of matter.” (p. 672)

The failure of Gnosticism is that it fails to distinguish between man’s fallen nature and the goodness of the cosmos which was made by The Logos, Jesus Christ. All utopianism incorporates this hatred of the natural order. It is the rebellion against God.

Philosophy guides and works thru the Virtue of Prudence. Prudence, aware that Life is War, teaches discretion and if needed discrimination; all things can not be treated equally. Humans can not abrogate the Natural Law. Humans may break the Ten Commandments and Christian morality all the time, but the Natural Law, humans can not break. God will not allow that to happen. The Church can not abrogate the Natural Law neither does it have the authority to do so. Those that try are called fools and Nature kills off the foolish. As the Roman poet Horace said,

“Throw out nature with a pitchfork, and yet she shall return". (fr. Horace, Epistles I.X.24)

 That is the Natural Law: Nature will always collect her “butcher’s bill”.

**Appendix I: Philosophy and capitalism**

In order to understand the total and complete failure of Barry Sandywell to understand where philosophy was formed, one must understand the word ‘vanavsos’ and the cultural mindset in which it was used. When Cicero and Aristotle both concur on the deleterious effects of capitalism, just confirms what Socrates says in the Platonic dialogues. This is how much the dismissal of the Protagoras section has damaged the understanding of Classical Antiquity, European culture and philosophy. Mr. Sandywell’s conjecture of capitalism as the impetus for philosophy is just outrageous fiction.

Almost the complete author’s online encyclopædia article on this subject is reprinted here for your immediate education. In the face of the Marxist cultural takeover of European culture, this value needs to be reinvigorated and used in the restoring of European culture. This is one of the articles deleted off from Wikipedia.

**Banausos**

from **Wikinfo**, an internet encyclopedia

**Βαναυσος** (transliterated into English as **vanavsos**; plural *βαναυσοι*, *vanavsi*) is an ancient Greek term coined to describe the bias of the warrior class against the values of the commercial class and in the [Greek republics](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Classical_definition_of_republic) established a [social distance](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Social_distance) between the citizens and the traders. 9 The word refers to the peasants, the laboring class and tradesmen. It includes artisans, such as potters, stone masons, carpenters, etc; professional singers; artists; farmers; musicians and all persons engaged in trade. It makes no distinction between slave or free. [Aristotle](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Aristotle) writes, "Those who provide necessaries for an individual are slaves, and those who provide them for society are handicraftsmen and day-laborers." This ancient Greek term delineates the ethos of the warrior class from the ethos of the commercial class.

*βαναυσος* is said to be formed from the word *βαυνος* (vavnos) meaning furnace and *αυω* (avo) meaning 'to dry'. It acquired the sense of 'cramped in body' (Politics 1341 a 7) and 'vulgar in taste'(1337 b 7). 2 (Though the word is an [Ionic](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Ionic) Greek idiom and probably only used in Ionic Athens as such, here, it is used to convey the overall sentiment of the whole Greek aristocratic warrior contempt for the commercial ethos then beginning to take hold in the Greek world. Therefore, it is a convenient label for the social distance concept.)

Its strict English connotation is "mechanical" but in Greek it is an epithet of contempt; it is not a complimentary term. "It is used of people who spend money with vulgar ostentation, of accomplishments inconsistent with a perception of the true purpose of life, and it is constantly coupled with the word “aneleutheros”, ‘illiberal’, ‘unworthy of a free man’ (or, as it was said in [Victorian](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Victorian) England 'unworthy of a gentleman')." 1 In ancient Athens, this derision heaped upon retailers and artisans was so overpowering that a law had to be passed to protect those in the [agora](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Agora).4 "Even where the marketplace was allowed to intrude upon the political life, the merchant and craftsmen were generally objects of contempt, ridiculed on the stage, if not banished from respectable society." 5

**Background**

The economic activity of the pre-classical ancient Greeks centered on *autarkia* (self-sufficiency) based on their [agrarianism](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Agrarianism), gift-giving, and barter. On the other hand, capitalism has its roots in the Near East and was originally foreign to the ancient Greek world. "The seeds of capitalism system were produced in Mesopotamia and sown throughout the ancient world by merchant warriors and their successors." 12 From these Semitic merchants, the Phoenicians, as sailors, picked it up and spread it abroad the Mediterranean basin. Just as the ancient Greeks picked up their writing system from the Phoenicians, they, esp. the Ionian Greeks, assimilated also the capitalist/commercialist system from the Phoenicians. The introduction of this new economic system brought with it a clash of cultures--between the old aristocratic warrior class then prevalent and the new and rising mercantile class and finally, between the commercialistic Ionion Athens and the traditional Doric warrior society of Sparta.

**The Philosophical and Cultural Significance**

The ancient Greek polities were "brotherhoods of peasant warriors". 6 They saw that commerce had a corrupting influence in communities and acquisition of wealth destroyed their *homónoia* (like-mindedness) and was the principle cause of *stásis* (faction). Furthermore, "merchants and craftsmen would be less willing to defend the civic territory than farmers would" and saw that commerce and mercantilism had a morally corrupting influence. 7 *Βαναυσος* is a word that describes the "prejudice" of the warrior class for the "values" of the commercial class. Moreover, it was a psychological device to train their people to turn away from the commercial fields of endeavor by it being a word of contempt. Many Greek states implemented steps to exclude those engaged in trade and industry from participation in politics.5 The [Doric](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Dorian) states of ancient Crete, Sparta, and non-Doric Thebes set up their constitutions to take this into account.3

In political philosophy, the Greeks are concerned with the "best" state and the best state requires citizens who are the best and in consequence practice [arete](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Arete_(excellence)). This required leisure accompanied with pursuit of arete. Technical education was necessary but did not make good citizens. Leisure was a necessity of good citizenship something the *βαναυσοι* do not have. *Βαναυσια* deforms the body rendering it useless for military and political duties. Those occupations tire out the body and therefore the mind preventing self-education by reading and conversing with others. "It accustoms a man's mind to low ideas, and absorbs him in the pursuit of the mere means of life."

Plato and Aristotle teach that the highest thing in man is reason and therefore, the purpose of human perfection lies with the activity of reason; i.e. the 'theoretic' or contemplative life. Trade, industry and mechanical labour prevent this idea. These activities are necessary for a good human condition of life but when these activities are merely regarded as means to making money and not as acts of service to truth, service to others and arête, then these, occupations become base.

In Athens, in the sixth century B.C., the Cretan seer [Epimenides](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Epimenides) warned in prophecy the dangers inherent in the commercial trade then going on at the [Munychia](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Munychia). [Cicero](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Cicero) also commented on the dangers to republics that commerce entailed and that maritime trade brought with it "a corruption and degeneration of morals". 8

**Revivals**

This Greek martial idea of the Greek republics influenced the [English](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=English) and [German](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=German) language. The word *βαναυσοι* became an adjective for the mechanical trades. (*See below*: "Occurrences of the word".)

It has been conjectured that the [Elizabethan](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Elizabethan) use of "mechanical" (as in e.g. [Shakespeare](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Shakespeare)'s [*Midsummer Night's Dream*](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Midsummer_Night%27s_Dream)) is a translation of *banausos*. This is certainly possible — the earliest recorded usage (OED *s.v.*) is from [John Lyly](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=John_Lyly), who knew more Greek than was good for his style.

*Banausos* (or rather – *banausikos*) has also been adapted into English, as the rare word **banausic**; both as a term of abuse, and to represent Greek usage. "Banausic" is not found before [1845](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=1845), with the Victorian revival of classical learning.

One of the contributions of classical [philology](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Philology) to the [Kultur](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Kultur)-movement in [Wilhelmine](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Wilhelmine) and post-Wilhelmine [Germany](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Germany) was the use of *banausisch* as an insult — along with the [myths](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Myth) that the German Soul is essentially Greek, that the ancient Greeks were blond, and that the modern Greeks are not descended from them. Today in German *Banause* is used to mean an uncouth person indifferent to high culture, like English [philistine](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Philistinism).

These ideas have become less accepted since about [1945](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=1945), but they were occasionally reflected in the English-speaking world. For example, [Edith Hamilton](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Edith_Hamilton) ingenuously accepted them as the best scholarship of her schooldays. Again, a junior colleague of Sir [Gilbert Murray](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Gilbert_Murray) permitted himself (in 1935) the following, which goes well beyond Greek usage:

*The aim of a journalist may either be to enlarge the circulation of a paper or to give his readers a true and intelligent picture of the world; of a lawyer either to extend his practice or to help justice be done; of a business man either to grow rich or to play his part as a 'nurse' of the community. These alternatives are not exclusive. But where the former predominates, the amount of* [*arete*](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Arete_(excellence)) *generated will be small, and journalists, lawyers and industrialists will be banausoi rather than men.*

**Excerpts from classical texts**

**Plato**

* Socrates, "And then one, seeing another grow rich, seeks to rival him, and thus the great mass of the citizens become lovers of money. Adeimantus, "Likely enough. Socrates, "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. Adeimantus, "True. Socrates, "And in proportion as riches and rich men are honored in the State, virtue and virtuous are dishonored. Adeimantus, "Clearly. Socrates, "And what is honoured is cultivated, and that which has no honour is neglected. Adeimantus, "That is obvious. Socrates, "And so at last, instead of loving contention and glory, men become lovers of trade and money; they honour and look up to the rich man, and make a ruler of him, and dishonor the poor man. (*The Republic*, trans. by Jowett, §550-551; pp 301-302.)
* "There can be no doubt that the love of wealth and the spirit of moderation cannot exist together in citizens of the same State to any considerable extent..." (ibid, §555; p. 308.)
* "And the insatiable desire of wealth and the neglect of all other things for the sake of *money-getting* was also the ruin of oligarchy". (ibid, §562; p. 318.)
* "For such an organization (talking about his {Plato's} planned state that no citizen can sell his land) leaves no great room for the making of fortunes; 'tis a consequence of it that none has either need or license to make them in any sordid calling--as even the sound of the reproach 'base mechanical' repels the man of free soul--and none will stoop to amass wealth by such devices." (*Laws*, [Plato](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Plato), 731d-e.)

**Aristotle**

* "Citizens must not live a mechanic or mercantile life (for such a life is ignoble and inimical to virtue {arete}), nor yet must those who are to be citizens of the best state be tillers of the soil (for leisure is needed both for the development of virtue (arete) and for active participation in politics)." *Politics*, Aristotle, Loeb, Book VII, viii., 2; 1328b35f; p. 575.
* "A task and also an art or a science must be deemed vulgar if it renders the body or soul or mind of a free man useless for the employments and actions of arete. Hence, we entitle vulgar all such arts as deteriorate the condition of the body, and also the industries that earn wages; for they make the mind preoccupied and degraded. And even with the liberal sciences, although it is not illiberal to take part in some of them up to a point, to devote oneself to them too assiduously and carefully is liable to have the injurious results specified." *Politics*, Aristotle Book VIII, ii, 1-2; 1237b 5-10; pg 639.
* "And besides all this, agriculture contributes notably to the making of manly character; because unlike the mechanical arts (**βαναυσοι**), it does not cripple and weaken the bodies of those engaged in it, but inures them to exposure and toil and invigorates them to face the perils of war". *Oeconomica*, Aristotle, Loeb, Bk I, ii, 3; 1343b 1-5; pg 331.

**Plutarch**

* "Oftentimes, we take pleasure in the work, but despise the workman (dēmiourgós)—as in the case of perfumes and dies. For we enjoy these things, but regard dyers and perfumers as unfree men (aneleuthérous) and as rude mechanicals (banaúsous)...If a man applies himself to servile or mechanical employments, his industry in those things is a proof of his inattention to nobler studies. No young man of noble birth or liberal sentiments, from seeing the Jupiter at Pisa, would desire to be [Phidias](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Phidias), or, from the sight of the Juno at Argos, to be [Polycletus](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Polycletus); or [Anacreon](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Anacreon), or [Philemon](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Philemon), or [Archilochus](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Archilochus), though delighted with their poems." [Plutarch](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Plutarch)'s *Life of Pericles* (Langhorne's translation).

**Septuagint**

* A section (chap. 38) in the Book of Ecclesiasticus in the Septuagint mirrors that of the Greek idea. This is an example of the infiltration of Hellenic culture into Hebrew literature. Notice the underlined phrase below in its exact rendition of how the word banausos came to be coined.

"(24) The wisdom of a learned man cometh by opportunity of leisure: and he that hath little business shall become wise. (25) How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough, and that glorieth in the goad, that driveth oxen and is occupied in their labours, and whose talk is of bullocks? (26) He giveth his mind to make furrows; and is diligent to give the kine fodder. (27) So every carpenter and workmaster, that laboureth night and day: and they that cut and grave seals, and are diligent to make great variety, and give themselves to counterfeit imagery, and watch to finish a work:

(28) The smith also sitting by the anvil, and considering the iron work, the vapour of the fire wasteth his flesh, and he fighteth with the heat of the furnance: the noise of the hammer and the anvil is ever in his ears, and his eyes look still upon the pattern of the thing that he maketh; he setteth his mind to finish his work, and watcheth to polish it perfectly:

(29) So doth the potter sitting at his work, and turning the wheel about with his feet, who is always carefully set at his work, and maketh all his work by number; (30) he fashioned the clay with his arm, and boweth down his strength before his feet; he applieth himself to lead it over; and he is diligent to make clean the furnace: (31) all these trust to their hands; and everyone is wise in his work. (32) Without these cannot a city be inhabited: and they shall not dwell where they will, nor go up and down: (33) they shall not be sought for in public counsel, nor sit high in the congregation: they shall not sit on the judges' seat, nor understand the sentence of judgment: they cannot declare justice and judgment; and they shall not be found where parables are spoken. (34) But they will maintain the state of the world, and [all] their desire is in the work of their craft.

But he that giveth his mind to the law of the Most High, and is occupied in the meditation thereof, will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients, and be occupied in prophecies."

**Occurrences of the word "banausic" in English literature**

* "When the **Banausic** principle (we must coin a word from the most expressive of languages to express all its intense vulgarity) to obtain.” G. Smyth in *Oxford & Cambridge Review*, Aug. pg 206, 1845. [OED](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=OED)
* "Alleged that the teaching music as a manual art was **banausic** and degrading." Grote, *Ethical Fragments*, vi, pg 227. OED
* "A sensitive, self-conscious creature...in sad revolt against uncongenially **banausic** employment". *London Magazine*, July 1957. OED
* "Herodotus specifies that the Spartans of his time were more contemptuous of the **banausic** trades than any other people." 17

**Quotes**

* "Phoenicians make fine sailors but are all rogues."—[Homer](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Homer) 14
* "The man enslaved by wealth can never be honest."—[Democritus](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Democritus) 15
* "Where money is prized, virtue is despised".—Socrates. 16
* "The yeomen of America are not the canaille of Paris."—Thomas Jefferson

**Miscellanea**

* The Christian scriptures also warn of the corrosion of money:
	+ [Old Testament](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Old_Testament) "He that loves silver shall not be satisfied with silver: and who has loved gain, in the abundance thereof? This is also vanity". [Septuagint](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Septuagint) [Ecclesiastes](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Ecclesiastes) 5.9.
		- "And they lay wait for their own blood; they lurk privily for their own lives. So are the ways of every one that is greedy for gain; which taketh away the life of the owners thereof". KJV Prov. 1.18-19.
	+ [New Testament](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=New_Testament) "For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows". [KJV](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=KJV), [I Timothy](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=I_Timothy) 6.10.
* Speaking of the [Peloponnesian War](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Peloponnesian_War), the orator [Demosthenes](http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Demosthenes) lamented the fact how money corrupted and changed the old Greek laws of war:

"Whereas all the arts have made great advances, and nothing is the same as it was in the past, I believe that nothing has been more altered and improved than matters of war...The Lacedæmonians, like all the others, used to spend four or five months—the summer season—in invading and ravaging the territory of their enemy with hoplites and civic armies and then retire home again...They were so bound by tradition or rather such good citizens of the polis that they did not use money to seek advantage, but rather was by rules and out in the open". 13

* Montesquieu also recognizes the power of commercialism. He writes: "...to attack a religion is by favor, by the commodities of life, by the hope of wealth; not by what turns away, but by what makes one forget; not by what arouses indignation, but by what renders men lukewarm—so that other passions act on our souls, and those which religion inspires are silent". He said this approach would work by pointing to a real historical event, the advent of the United States, a "democracy founded on commerce". 10
* Christopher Lasch writes ". . . individuals cannot learn to speak for themselves at all, much less come to an intelligent understanding of their happiness and wellbeing, in a world in which there are no values except those of the market. . . . the market tends to universalize itself. It does not easily coexist with institutions that operate according to principles that are antithetical to itself: schools and universities, newspapers and magazines, charities, families. Sooner or later the market tends to absorb them all. It puts an almost irresistible pressure on every activity to justify itself in the only terms it recognizes: to become a business proposition, to pay its own way, to show black ink on the bottom line. It turns news into entertainment, scholarship into professional careerism, social work into the scientific management of poverty. Inexorably it remodels every institution in its own image". 11
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**Appendix II: Freemasonry**

The Renaissance was not only about the resurrection of the Greek and Roman heritage but also the discovery and incorporation of ancient Egyptian (mainly Gnostic) texts called the Hermetic Tradition. Another facet was the reading of the Kabbala. The Hermetica and Kabbala texts became *de rigueur* for all up-becoming intellectualists in the Renaissance and the early Modern Age. (Silvia, 7) They opened a whole new world of thought that bedazzled many and was different from their normal Catholic culture. In essence, it challenged the truth of Christian revelation and Aristotelianism/Scholasticism because both were presented as being earlier than Christ, Plato and Aristotle. One of the figures that took this tradition up was Giordano Bruno (1548-1600). He was a syncretizer who thought to harmonize all thought and writings into a coherent package and discover a *philosophia perennis*, which is about finding the core that undergirds all religion and philosophy which must be the same. Because of his studies, he denied many of the fundamental dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church and in turn was arrested by the Church and after copious failed attempts to correct him, finally burned at the stake. He became and still is a martyr of freethinkers, revolutionists, and non-conformists. The ghost of *philosophia pernnis* is what undergirds what is now called the occult sophistries. (This author will not use the term ‘philosophy’ for this. The word ‘occult’ only means hidden.)

Silvia de León-Jones writes:

“The founders of the Rosicrusian and Masonic movements of the seventeenth century studied his [Bruno’s] treatises and syncretized his theories with their own doctrines.” (p. 3)

The basis or foundational thought for Freemasonry and Rosicrusianism is the work of Giordano Bruno, a heretic and a Kabbalist. Bruno travelled extensively throughout Europe and stayed some time in both England and Germany which became hotbeds of esoteric sophistries. Rosicrusianism and Freemasonry became vehicles for the transmission, preservation, and teaching of Hermetic and Kabbala esoteric teachings. Deism, in contradistinction to the Trinitarian dogma of Catholicism, is the central teaching of these movements which mimics Judaism’s strict monotheism.

One of the major bumps in the formation of esotericism and a window into the teachings of Freemasonry is Adam Weisphaut (1748-1830), the founder of the Illuminati branch. In one of his letters he prophesizes about the future of the world:

“Hidden schools of wisdom are the means which will one day free men from their bonds. These have in all ages been the archives of nature, and the rights of men; and by them shall human nature be raised from her fallen state. **Princes and nations shall vanish from the earth. The human race will then become one family**, and the world will be the dwelling of Rational Men.” (Zagami ª)

Princes and monarchies have vanished from the earth. None exist. Next, everyone seems to be working to build this “one family”. This is the “Brotherhood of Man” concept. He also talks of freeing all people from “priests and princes”. “Priests and princes” is Throne and Altar—Western Civilization that is a carryover from the Doric Greek and Roman Republics. His prophecy has come to pass. The goals that Weisphaut present are exactly in line with Jewish Messianic teachings.

This is why it is called Judeo-Masonic-Bolshevism. Freemasonry, in both its religious and atheistic branches, is part of the covert revolution of Western civilization and culture. Marxism, Freemasonry, Illuminism all seek the same goals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Weisphaut’s 6 planks  |  *Communist Manifesto* 10 planks  |
| 1. Abolition of all ordered government. 2. Abolition of inheritance. 3. Abolition of private property. 4. Abolition of patriotism. 5. Abolition of family. 6. Abolition of religion. | 1. Abolition of private property and the application of all rent to public purpose.2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.6. Centralization of the means of communication and transportation in the hands of the State.7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of Industrial armies, especially for agriculture.9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.10. Free education for all children in government schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production. |
|  |  |

What is not included in the *Communist Manifesto* above, are more parallels found elsewhere in his, Marx’s writings. In *German Idealogy* (1845), he had this to say:

"That the abolition of individual economy (the division of labor) is inseparable from **the abolition of the family is self-evident**." ª

It is the same thing Weisphaut advocated. In his book *Adam Weisphaut, A Human Devil*, Gerald Burton (1935) remarks that much of what Marx promoted was championed by Weisphaut earlier.

Freemason C. William Smith published an article in the Scottish Rite Freemasonry magazine, “New Age”, in Sept. 1950; he wrote:

"God's plan is dedicated to the unification of all races, religions and creeds. This plan, dedicated to the new order of things, is to make all things new — a new nation, a new race, a new civilization and a new religion, a nonsectarian religion that has already been recognized and called the religion of "The Great Light." (Freemasonry, 533 ª)

This was exactly what Giordano Bruno was trying to teach and achieve—the Novus Ordo which is on the Great Seal of the US and on the US One Dollar bill.

**Appendix III: Masking**

In the Protagoras section, Socrates states “But they conceal their wisdom…and pretend to be fools.” Almost everybody has laughed and snickered over this statement. It seems almost surreal but there is a definite basis of fact for that situation.

Daniel del Nido quoting Hadot points out that Socrates is purposeful in masking his wisdom. The masking is about concealing his true abilities. Nido writes, “Socrates, appearing strange and foolish, lures those who presume themselves wise into philosophical debate, exploiting their overconfidence, and through skillful argument forces them to admit their ignorance.” (p. 1) He uses this technique to hide his divine disposition from the world at large. Socrates pretends to be ignorant and he pretends to be erotic. Nido points out that Socrates uses his physical appearance, strange mannerisms, faux eroticism and intellectual dumbness as masks. This is purposely done by Socrates. Nido writes that Alcibiades complains about this modus operandi of Socrates.

When he is engaging in a true act of masking then, what Socrates says in the Protagoras is not so idiosyncratic after all. Socrates is again imitating Spartan ways but there may also be something else undergirding this pattern.

Nature. Nature is the mask of God. God is hidden from people thru nature. It is what Nature teaches. Many insects and fish use camouflage. Masking can be said to be part of the philosopher’s repertoire; not only to hide from the world but also as a heuristic device in his missionary activities. In the agon of maieutic workmanship, as physical war is done by concealment and camoflauge, so intellectual war of the philosopher is conducted by masking.

**Appendix IV: Refutation of forgery**

Four things end the claim of forgery against the Protagoras statement and the Seven Sages of Greece being emulators of Sparta: (a) Socrates living by example; (b) Plutarch’s commending Socrates observation of the Spartans intellectualism; (c) Solon’s attempt at implementing mixed government in Athens and (d) the story of the tripod being passed around by the Seven Sages.

The first two cases are covered in this book. The third is discussed in “The Classical definition of a republic” by this author. The fourth is covered in the first paper. The tripod was a cultic implement of Apolline religion and thus a Doric religious totem. It can be surmised that the tripod not only had religious significance but also philosophical and geometrical importance. If the Seven Sages of Greece were not emulators, admirers and disciples of Sparta, what were they doing passing a Doric Greek religious totem amongst themselves? This historical event, from DL, proves that the Seven Sages of Greece being disciples of Sparta is not a forgery. A picture of the tripod appears on the coins of several Doric republics of Crete.

**Appendix V: The Natural Law**

The laws of nature are those things that make up the construction of the cosmos. They are the Constitution, the Politeia, of the cosmos. They are what operates the Natural Order. It is what is inherent in things both material and living. Since the cosmos itself is a combination of things, the Laws of Nature is a combination of two sets of laws; the Laws of Beauty and the Laws of Order.

The real, original natural law is found scattered loosely in Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Empedocles, [Plato](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Plato), Xenophon, and [Aristotle](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Aristotle).

It is to be noted that these laws intersect and overlap each other. They are all interconnected and woven together into a tight fit.

#### Laws of beauty

(1) [Proportion](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php?title=Proportion&action=edit&redlink=1)

subset: The Golden Mean

"Even good, done to the wrong proportion, does evil" ~ Wheeler

(2) [Harmony](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Harmony) a combination of the High and low

"...and a harmony is "such-and-such a combination of high and low;..." (Metaphysics, VIII, ii, 7; 1043a, 10f; Loeb, pg 407-409)

(3) [Symmetry](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Symmetry)

#### Laws of order

(1) First Order: "*Ex uno plures*." (fr. Heraclitus)("Out of One, many". That is the first Natural Law. From the God head on down, that is one law that is very important.)

Second Order: "*E pluribus unum*." ("Out of many, one". This operates in the second order, in the creation of a family or an army; many are made into one. This does not supercede or countermand the first order of "Ex uno plures". Each one operates in a different sphere. One operates on a major theater, and the other in the minor theater. "E pluribus unum" can not reverse the First Order.){Both are from Heraclitus} [[134]](#footnote-134)

(2) Righteousness (fr. Xenophon)(All things are constructed to do one thing.)
(3) Plurality

subset: Natural inequality

(4) Microcosm/Macrocosm (*The Republic*, *The Laws*); Things repeat in all the spheres.

"As above, so below".

subset: the principle of consistency

(5) The [Golden Mean](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Golden_Mean) ("Nothing too much." {Doric Greek, [Delphi](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Delphi)})

subset: All things have limits.

subset: The [Bell Curve](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php?title=Bell_Curve&action=edit&redlink=1) (an example of the Golden mean, the majority of any population falls in the middle of the Bell Curve.)

(6) Structure
(7) Form
(8) Telos (All things have an end/purpose.)
(9) Incrementalism (Aristotle)

subset: Law of gradualism

(10) Cause and effect

subset: Aristotle's four causes; Formal, Efficient, Material, Final

(11) "The Rule of One is Best" (fr. Homer)

subset: "The Head controls the body". (fr. Blogger Snapperhead soup)

subset: "You can't serve two masters" (fr. Jesus Christ)

(12) Dualism
(13) Tripartite Paradigm (Three in One, the family, Trinity, European military structure)

subset: "The beginning, the middle, and the end" (fr. Plato, Aristotle)

(14) "All things are either in Authority or in Subjection". (Aristotle)

subset:Heirarchy (The [Pecking Order](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php?title=Pecking_Order&action=edit&redlink=1))

subset: distinctions of rank

subset: caste system

(15) Rhythm/Cycles

subset: "The beginning, the middle, and the end" (Plato, Aristotle)

subset: "Winter, Spring, Summer, Fall"

(16) Doric Syncretism, The [Combinatorial system](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Combinatorial_system) (also included Tripartite paradigm; Rhythm/Cycles) ([Karl Otfried Müller](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Karl_Otfried_M%C3%BCller); "the combination of different but related parts".)
(17) "Parts make up the whole".
(18) Law of resonance

subset: "Like produces Like" ("Thief knows Thief", "Nail drives out nail")

subset: "Birds of a feather flock together" (fr. Socrates, Plato's Republic)

subset: "Blood is thicker than water". (Parents care for their offspring)

subset: "You can not serve two masters". Jesus Christ. (From time immemorial. The virtue of Loyalty {and Love} is based on this. It is in the Animal kingdom as well.)

(19) Group dynamics (operates in the insect, animal and human spheres)

(A) "sense of belonging" (Pull)

"Birds of a feather flock together".

"Blood is thicker than water".

(B) "volkenhass", racial animosity, racial prejudice, etc. (Push){the two work in tandem which is part of the system of duality, like "ying and yang" or "Push/Pull". You can not have one without the other.}

(20) Strife ("[Life is War](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Life_is_War)")

subset: Tension, Holy Tension

subset: Push/Pull (Wheeler/Shurbin)

subset: "The weak invite attack". 1(Vallicella)

(21) "Bad company corrupts good morals" (fr. Menander, quoted by [St Paul](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php?title=St_Paul&action=edit&redlink=1); "One bad apple destroys the bushel." {Basis of the [Xenelasia](http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Xenelasia)}
(22) "The Good comes thru the Hard." (fr. Plato's Republic)
(23) "Cream rises to the top."
(24) "Throw out nature with a pitchfork, and yet she shall return". (fr. Horace, Epistles I.X.24)

subset: "Nature abhors a vacuum".

(25) "Cone of Darkness" (Albert Pike, *Morals and Dogma* {Light is good, yet it casts shadows. This is the meaning of "Cone of Darkness". It is present in other things as well. A lot of things throw off in small measure, their opposite. Interesting. Light creates darkness.})
(26) "As the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son." (LXX, Ezek. 18.4)
(27) "Iron sharpens Iron".
(28) "To every Rule there is an exception".

From Wikinfo: <http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Natural_Law_by_Wheeler>

**Appendix VI: According to Nature of Principles of Nature**

The American classicist, Paul Shorey is the translator of the *Republic* in Edith Hamilton’s edition of Plato’s Dialogues. He was an accomplished scholar who trained in Germany and Greece. The Greek reads as thus:

*ὅλη σοφὴ ἂν εἴη κατὰ φύσιν οἰκισθεῖσα πόλις: καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς ἔοικε, φύσει*

It literally says “a city established according to nature”.

The phrase “according to nature” appears quite frequently in the Platonic corpus. The beginning of this book was to show that Socrates and Plato copied and imitated Doric philosophy. So, it can be seen that the phrase *κατὰ φύσιν* (according to nature) was the Doric way of expressing what they found and did. This was the language used by the Doric Greeks. No science pops out fully formed. No science begins with its terms fully fleshed out. The Doric Greeks followed, obeyed, imitated the natural law of righteousness, the dictum that all things are constructed to do one thing. By obeying that, they are “according to nature”. But what generally is Righteousness or Homer’s “The Rule of One is Best” or “Birds of a feather flock together” or telos? They are principles— principles of nature. If something is “according to nature”, how is it according to nature? There has to be something specific to copy or imitate or obey. The phrase “according to nature” presupposes “principles of nature”. “According to nature” means copying, imitating obeying principles, laws and patterns found in nature.

*οἰκίζω*is the basis of the word *οἰκισθεῖσα.* It means to “found as a colony”.[[135]](#footnote-135) It could be that Paul Shorey found it hard to link “establish” with “according to nature” so he extrapolated “principles of nature” from “according to nature”.

The idea of the natural law or the metaphysical laws of nature is a new development. It takes time for language to come to grips scientifically with the concept. “According to nature” slowly transformed to “laws of nature” and then to “natural law”. Only when men have grappled and struggled and meditated on the subject through time that a concept can be clarified with better words.

Still, even if future scholarship disproves this, the appellation of ‘wise’ will still pertain to that city. That cannot be taken away. Whether that city is established on “principles of nature” or “according to nature”, it is still wise.

Therefore it should be concluded that the classicist Paul Shorey extrapolated meet and right; “according to nature” can be translated as “principles of nature” in that context, at the very least.
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4. λεγομένην περὶ τὸνσοφὸν διάθεσιν ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐπιδείξας ὅλην τὴν πόλιν **φιλοσοφοῦσαν**, εἰκότως ὑπερῆρε τῇ δόξῃ τοὺς πώποτε πολιτευσαμένους ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησι. Perseus website. ª <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0131%3Achapter%3D31%3Asection%3D2> Bernadotte Perrin translates the word as “love of wisdom” in his translation of Plutarch’s *Lives*; another case of academic dissimulation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Even throughout the internet: here is just one example: “I was talking about Nazis. Since the Nazis were the Spartans, it's hard to find an eloquent Nazi.” From “The Holocaust: a Nazi perspective” Blog: Unqualified Reservations, Reactionary Enlightenment, Mencius Moldbug, posted October 26, 2011. <http://unqualified-reservations.blogspot.com/2011/10/holocaust-nazi-perspective.html> Retrieved 10/31/2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In no way was Crete a monolithic culture nor was it of one race. Many races inhabited Crete. Though, the last major migration to Crete was the Dorians, they only inhabited some of the cities. When the phrase “Doric Greek” is used, it means only those cities controlled by Doric Greeks which were mostly the Northern and Western sides of Crete. There were numerous Doric politieas/ republics on the island. Paula Perlman has written on the subject “Imagining Crete” but this author somewhat disagrees with her conclusions and she does not quote Prof. Müller. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. While all sorts of Athenian and Roman offices and estates are defined in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd Edition, the word “Cosmus” is not rendered. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. "And the cause of this is that they define liberty wrongly (for there are two things that are thought to be defining features of democracy, the sovereignty of the majority and liberty); for justice is supposed to be equality {ed. note; doing away with the caste system}, and equality the sovereignty of whatever may have been decided by the multitude {ed. note; General will}, and liberty doing just what one likes." [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The subjugated people of both Crete and Laconia were able to keep their religion, their practices, marry and carry on a culture of their own. (Müller ) Then, the question should be become, in the face of everybody calling the Spartans, Nazis, who showed more humanity, the people who just subjugated or the people who genocided. Let it be noted that the Hebrews committed some ten different genocides. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. A small river flowing just south of Athens. *The New Century Classical Handbook*. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. ”Xenophon emphasizes Socrates' freedom from the strong appetites for food, drink, sex and physical comfort that dominate other people; his enkrateia or self-mastery is the first of the virtues that Xenophon claims for him (Memorabilia I 2.1). He was notorious for going barefoot even in winter and dressing always in a simple cloak.” [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Burnet has Pythagoras bringing Apollo along with his science from Eastern Hellas. (pg 61, 65) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Athenian comics portrayed the followers of Pythagoras as barefoot and ragged. By inference Pythagoras was the same way. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. (Burnet: 66) “It was precisely its zeal for the reform of human life, and its attempt to set up a Rule of the Saints in the cities of Southern Italy that led to its unpopularity”. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. (Burnet: 58) “It would not, however be true to say that the word [philosophy] had always borne this special sense. At any rate the corresponding verb (had at first a far wider range. For instance, Herodotus (i. 30) makes Croesus say that Solon had travelled far and wide “as a philosopher’ (and it is clear from the context that this refers to that love of travel for the sake of the ‘wonders’ to be seen in strange lands which was so characteristic of the Ionian Greeks in the fifth century B.C.” [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Arête is one word that every classical scholar should know inside and out. Werner Jaeger’s *Paideia* is an excellent study of the word. In order to have ‘arête’, every, and I mean every, piece of the whole has to have arête, in order for the whole to have arête. The whole of Doric culture revolves around arête. “Arete was the central ideal of all Greek culture” (I, 15) “The Odyssey constantly exalts the intellectual ability—especially in its hero, whose courage is usually ranked lower than his cleverness and cunning”. (I, 6) “…their new ideal of human perfection was that character which united nobility of action with nobility of mind”. (I, 8) Homer was read in Sparta, but not in Crete due to their xenelasia.

Second, Arete follows the Natural Law that “parts make up the whole”. The whole does not have arête until all the parts have arête. In this case, mental arête and physical arête must both be achieved for a person to hold arête. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. *Mem*., III, v, 14; Loeb 197. Socrates answers how to recover old virtue; either one finds out the customs of their forefathers or “imitate those who now have the pre-eminence and to practice their customs, and if they are equally careful in observing them, they will be as good as they, and, if more careful, even better”. Socrates was following his own advice and in that he was “careful in observing them”. That imitation is a part of philosophy is covered in the article “Macrocosm/Microcosm in Doric Thought”. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Paul A. Rahe notices that there is “an intimate connection between the emergence of classical republicanism and the birth of philosophy”. (I, 194) [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Phaedrus: “Your project seems to be excellent, Socrates,…” q.v. Burnet: 78-79. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. This is why K. O. Müller’s perplexity over Aristotle’s definition of politeia and the Protagoras section; he had no concept of the Natural Law. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. DL, Book I bio of Thales: §35; “The most beautiful is the universe, for it is God's workmanship.” (Hicks, Wikisource) [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Navia notes that Apollo has a special importance and is referred to as “the god”. (pg. 122) [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Xenophon in his encomium of Agesilaus writes “…to the **divine ordering** of the world”. ª [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. *Phaedrus* §253a-c: “…thus creating in him the closest possible likeness to the god they worship”. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. *Phaedo* §82c: “…may attain to the divine nature”. Xenophon’s *Memorablia*, IV, iii, 14: “Moreover, the soul of man, which more than all else that is human partakes of the divine, reigns manifestly within us, and yet is itself unseen”. Gerson: “One might say that the first principle of Platonic ethics is that one must ‘become like god’.” [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The Hamilton translation of the *Republic* reads “…the old saw of like to like”. In Jowet’s translation of Plato’s *Republic*, it is “Birds of a feather flock together”. (*Republic*: §329a) That is a Natural Law for one sees it in nature, in all the herd animals and in birds. In the *Lysis*, Socrates is quoting from the Odyssey, “Like men, I trow, to like, God ever leads”. (§214a) *Protagoras*: §337d “By nature like is kin to like”. *Cratylus*: §393b “When an animal produces after his kind”. *Republic*: §425c “Does not like ever summon like”. Aristotle, Eudemian Ethics: VII, I, 7; 1235a, 5; Loeb, pg 361) “Mark how God ever brings like men together…, For jackdaw by the side of jackdaw…, And thief knows thief and wolf his fellow wolf.” The translator remarks that the dialect of the proverb about the birds is from a Doric poet in note ‘b’. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. This is not some fantasy of mystics or Socrates. This is exactly why the Spartans had to sacrifice at their borders when they wanted to leave—they had to get permission from Apollo to leave. At the battle of Plataea, the story is that the seer commanded them to drop arms first, so they could get the omen to fight. At all times, the Spartans asked permission to do things from their gods. The same thing with the Spartan mercenaries in Xenophon’s Anabasis. Xenophon always waited for permission to move. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Mem., I, ii, 37: “…you will have to avoid your favourite topic,--the cobblers, builders, and metal workers; for it is already worn to rags by you in my opinion”. To form a shoe, to build and to shape metal and stone requires specific knowledge, i.e. science. Every craft is a science. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Instead Arthur Herman writes this balderdash: “They knew Socrates' real crime had been daring to think for himself and convincing others to do the same.” (pg 4) The first chapter which talks of Socrates is titled: “The First Philosopher”. The man is charging thirty five dollars for 676 pages and already he is off on the wrong foot. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. As the author of light, Apollo demanded clarity. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. I Cor. 1:19. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. (Maritain, 34) “In reality, he [Socrates] he waged against them an unrelenting war and opposed them at every point.” [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. (McCoy, 8) “Not only Plato but also Isocrates and Alcidamas lay claim to the title of philosophy and criticize sophistry.” [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Other occurrences are at: §489b; §490a “the real lover of knowledge”; §490d. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. The Natural Law is push/pull. It is exhibited throughout nature such as centrifugal force and gravity. One pushes and the other pulls thus establishing an equilibrium for planets. The same thing with philosophy; philosophy is drawn toward true being and repelled by falsehood—the push/pull paradigm. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. (Maritain, 33) “They did not seek Truth.” “…an intellectual game of conceptual counters devoid of solid significance. Hence their *sophisms* or quibbles. Their ethics were of a piece. Every law imposed upon man they declared to be an arbitrary convention, and the virtue they taught was in the last resort either the art of success, or what our modern Nietzscheans call *the will to power*.” See also: Navia, 172; McCoy, 124 “...but the sophist is a corruption of the philosopher.” [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. (*Resp*., §475d; Hamilton, 714) “And those who always want to hear some new thing are a very queer lot to be reckoned among philosophers.” There is another phrase in Plato, “sham philosophers”. (*Resp*., §485e; Hamilton, 722) “…if the man is a true and not a sham philosopher.” (*Sophist*, §216c; Hamilton, 959) [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Thrasymachus is a materialist. McCoy, 113-114. “Thrasymachus rejects the abstract use of analogies to characterize the arts. That is, he rejects the very idea of using a universal definition of knowledge that must hold true for all cases, in favor of an empirical look at human motivation and human desire.” [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. The translator uses the word ‘gentlemen’ for the following phrase, “”. The phrase in Greek is much more powerful than the English dour term of ‘gentleman’. The Greek actually means “the beautiful and the good”. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Plato is echoing a proverb: "My friends! This is what I would say to them-God, who as the old saw has it, holds in his hands beginning, end, and middle of all that is, moves through the cycle of nature, straight to his end, and ever at his side walks right, the justicer of them that forsake God's law." (*Laws*, 715 e) Later on, Aristotle would call this “beginning, middle, end” a natural law. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Q.v. Jerry Dell Ehrlich’s *Plato’s Gift to Christianity, The Gentile Preparation For and The Making of the Christian Faith*. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Xenophon *Agesilaus* I.4 “For this reason, while no other government—democracy, oligarchy, despotism or kingdom—can lay claim to an unbroken existence, this kingdom alone stands fast continually.” [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. The modern sense of technology is a little bit different from the ancient sense. Whereas the modern sense is the exclusive use of machines, gadgets and wheels/pulleys, the ancient sense, which would include the modern sense was a little bit more simple: “technê: τέχνη. Combines the meaning of an art and a technique, involving both a knowledge of the relevant principles and an ability to achieve the appropriate results”. (Wheelwright, 328) The Spartan army and the agoge were arts that produced victory on one hand and the training of boys into men who not only grasped manhood and arête, but also wisdom. In the Greek sense of the word, the Cretans and the Spartans had technê. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. LXX, Wisdom, VI, 12, 17-20. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Werner Jaeger observes that discipline is paramount in the pursuit of arête, (I, pg. 21) and that discipline is part of aristocratic culture. Jaeger also points to Xenophon as teaching that “learning discipline” is a part of education. (III, 180) [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. (McCoy, 196) “Plato's dialogues present the philosopher as a person who embodies both humility and love.” [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. In answer to the charges of brutality toward the helots, (this is a long complicated story but to the quick--) this was due to the time of the Peloponnesian War where Athens encouraged rebellion, guerilla warfare and armed escaping helots and gave them sanctuary at Pylos. Pylos and other places were used as sanctuaries and bases of subversive activity which will be explained in a later book. For the importance of leisure q.v. Appendix I. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Prof. Alvin Kernan experiences that affirmative action victim groups were “united perhaps only in its shared dislike of the traditional DWEM (dead white European male) political and educational establishment.” (p. 249) [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. ”The consequences of this crucial decision would prove extremely damaging for Spartan culture as a whole which, after about 600 BC followed a long drawn-out process of decline, despite its powerful military machine and expansive periods of hegemonic rule.” [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. (Arist., Metp., I, i, 17; §931b 35-30; Loeb, 9) “Wisdom is concerned with the primary causes and principles.” [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. It needs repeating: Philosophy is derived from the nature of the universe. (*Timaeus* , §47a-b) [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. They do have the Natural Law of Telos, and Ontology derived from nature but little else. Because the Natural Law is so interconnected with each other, one has to have the totality of the Natural Law in possession in order to do/have philo-sophia. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, IV, vii, 7-8; §1012a 20-15; Loeb, 203: “…the starting-point is from definition; and definition results from the necessity of their meaning something…” [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. (Arist., *Magnia Moralia*, I, xxiv, 1; §1192a 10; Loeb, 523) “Evil takes various forms, where good has only one: health, for example, is a simple thing, but disease is manifold. So too virtue is simple, vice manifold.” (Arist., N. Ethics, II, vi, 14; 1106b 30-35; Loeb, 95) “Goodness is simple, badness manifold”. It seems to be a Pythagorean teaching: evil is a form of the unlimited, and good is the limited. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. (Case interview with Roger Scruton{2014}) “that in the humanities at least disciplines which pursued truth for its own sake have been replaced with disciplines that pursue political conformity. And the indoctrination of a specific worldview which is that of a very small minority, which has, I think, no relation to the way that normal people live.”; “…these closed, ideological sort of concentration camps,…” Keith Burgess-Jackson, an atheist thinker (tenured Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas at Arlington, where he teaches courses in Logic, Ethics, Philosophy of Religion, Philosophy of Law, and Social and Political Philosophy.) “From Today’s *New York Times* 07 Aug 2014” writes: “It's been a long time since college students were taught how to think. Today, in most courses, they're taught what to think. Education has become (progressive) indoctrination.” From his blog: <http://keithburgess-jackson.typepad.com/blog/2014/08/from-todays-new-york-times.html> Retrieved 08/11/2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. The others in Bέchamp’s camp are Günther Enderlein, Claude Bernard, Virginia Livingston-Wheeler and Gaston Naessons. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Pseudo-Aristotelian *Virtues and Vices*, v, 2: "To righteousness it belongs to be ready to distribute according to desert, and to preserve ancestral customs and traditions and the established laws, and to tell the truth when interest is at stake, and to keep agreements. First among the claims of righteousness are our duties to the gods, then our duties to the spirits, then those to country and parents, then those to the departed; and among these claims is piety, which is either a part of righteousness or a concomitant of it. Righteousness is also accompanied by holiness and truth and loyalty and hatred of wickedness".ª [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Quoting from B. Russell’s *A History of Western Philosophy* p. 82. NY: Simon & Shuster, 1945. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Personal experience. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. “…since it is expedient to be in a state of suspense and not to be able to do everything exactly as seems good to one, for liberty to do what ever one likes cannot guard against **the evil that is in every one’s character.**” Aristotle: Politics VI, ii, 4; 1318b 35-1319a 5; Loeb, p. 501. That is Original Sin. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. It is quite amazing that Asian infidels can reach that conclusion but Western Academia can not. In the Chinese produced film, Kung Fu Hustle, toward the end when the evil guy suggests peace, the good character announces to the evil character that “Good can not coexist with evil”. Now, if they can recognize that truism, what the heck is going on in modern academia? The teaching of tolerance and diversity can not override that; it may mask it for awhile, but sooner or later, it will have to come to terms and so erupt into open violence. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Exodus, 15.3. This particular phrase is not in the Septuagint. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. If man is made in the image of God, then what is man supposed to be? The essence of a man is to be a warrior. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Remember above Xenophon’s account of the faithful students of Socrates who were able to “and be ***able to do their duty*** by house and household, and relatives and friends, and city and citizens.”ª Duty is a teaching of philosophy. The one of the core teachings of the Virtue of Righteousness is doing one’s Duty. When young men escape doing their duty and other men accept them in their rebellion, it is the sign of the lack of virtue everywhere concerned. Cowardice is a vice. Bad character and flawed individuals can NOT approach Truth or true knowledge nor can they accept “the condition of that which is”. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Glen Magee in his very first sentence of his book on Hegel states that “Hegel is not a philosopher”. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. The man is channeling Lucifer. Saul Alinsky, communist agitator in Chicago referenced Lucifer as a person to be admired in his dedication to his book, *Rules for Radicals*: "Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgement to the very first radical...the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom--Lucifer." (Agenda, 32:55minute mark) [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. “Until Rousseau, the philosophical world had a certain unity. This has disappeared for the time being…” (Russell, 1945, 790) [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Oxford “Hegelianism”, p. 344. “In the English-speaking world, Hegel survived the attacks of Russell, Moore, and Popper, and remains popular and influential. Hegel’s influence has outlasted anything resembling a Hegelian ‘movement’.” [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Hegel was a “Professor of Philosophy” at the University of Berlin. (Oxford, entry “Hegel”) [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. The Western Diaspora is Australia and New Zealand. One can say that America and Canada is also the Western diaspora but they are in the Western Hemisphere. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Hesiod, Addition to Appendix, 11, 20; Loeb, 627: “…for the common possession of those Hellenes who aspire to be Lovers of the Beautiful”. And again the science of wisdom that Pythagoras passes forward, ‘philosophy’, is “love of wisdom’. Plato uses the phrase “love of knowledge” to describe the people “where we live”. (*Rep*., §435e; Hamilton, 1969, 677) He also describes a philosopher must have a “love of truth”. (*Rep*., §485c; §490b; Hamilton, 1969, 721, 726) It is about Love. Greek culture is about Love. The basis of Western Culture is Love; the love of beauty, the love of wisdom, the love of knowledge, and the love of Truth. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Will Durant concludes the same thing that Hegel “had hatched the socialist eggs”. (p. 278) [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. “Macrocosm/Microcosm in Doric Thought”, last half of the paper. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. Ben Kernan, who is Jewish, tied the Holocaust to Sparta in his book Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. . The connotation of most Westerners when the word ‘Oriental’ is used means China, Japan, Korea. That is not the case here. Here, ‘Oriental’ means just ‘East’ not Asia or the Far East. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. (Mises, 72) “It was a pity that his [Hegel's] language was so ambiguous that it could be interpreted in various ways.” [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. q.v. Thorlief Boman’s book *Hebrew Thought Compared to Greek*. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. (Franks, 19) Lurian Kabbala taught: “Moreover, fourth, human beings had a central role: it was up to human beings, not only to perfect themselves and the world they inhabit but also to perfect the supernal human form in an act of reparation (tikkun) through which alone divinity could fully realize itself.” …”Fifty years later, Elijah Benamozegh employed Idealist resources to defend kabbalah’s most decisive departure from Platonism: its contention that human activity can repair not only the world (tikkun olam) but also divinity itself (yiḥud ha-Shem, unification of the Name).” [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Let it be known that God called the Tower of Babel as evil. It is against the Natural Law which will be explained in a later book. Neither is “fixing the world” even Christian. Nowhere in the Deposit of Faith is this “fixing the world”. None of this is orthodox, traditional Christian teaching. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. (Waton, 100) “The races and the nations will cheerfully submit to the spiritual power of Judaism, and all will become Jews.” [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. (Waton, 206) “The aim of Judaism is to realize this inevitable human society resting on universal communism.” ª [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. It can also be said to be intertwined with Judaism: “Now, if we think of the structural principle of a society which is created and maintained by mutual affection raised to the level of intention, we find that they are principles of equality and freedom. These principles have their origin in the Jewish culture.” (Waton, 190) [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. (Schapiro, p. 204) “[Benjamin] Disraeli [from a Marrano {Jewish} family that emigrated from Spain due to the Inquisition] developed a concept of conservatism that was dynamic, not static. English conservatives were to be in the vanguard of progress by becoming the champions of reforms far more radical than those advocated by the liberals.” The term “conservative” was completely rewritten by Disraeli who held a seat in the English Parliment! He was quite influential. It is he is the founder of Anglo-sphere ideology of “conservatism”. Again, the word “conservative” suffered the same principle of “revolution within the form”. The term “conservative” was coined during the French Revolution of those that tried to preserve Throne and Altar and ***resisted*** democracy/modern republicanism. (Ogg, 485) Loyalists were the conservatives in America at the time of the Revolution. When they were driven out after the war, there were no more conservatives in America. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. (Rose, 23-33) Liberalism “is rather a passive Nihilism”. It is “the neutral breeding-ground of the more advanced stages of Nihilism”. Liberals pick and choose what they want to believe; they don’t accept the totality of what reality has to teach; same goes for Christian Truth, they adopt some of it while rejecting the other. Liberalism teaches “the people” are sovereign and that authority proceeds from below upwards. (p. 28) “In the Liberal world-view, therefore—in its theology, its ethics, its politics, and in other areas we have not examined as well—truth has been weakened, softened, compromised; in all realms truth that was once absolute has become less certain, if not entirely ‘relative’.” (p. 30) [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Thomas Jefferson was not an ideologue or a socialist but a liberal. This is his opinion of the ancient teachings: "the introduction of the new principle of representative democracy has rendered useless almost everything written before on the structure of government; and, in a great measure, relieves our regret, if the political writings of Aristotle or of any other ancient, have been lost, or are unfaithfully rendered or explained to us." (Rahe, 2001) [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. K. O. Müller’s observation of Plato: “But the Athenian and Ionic democracy he [Plato] altogether despises, because that appeared on his principles to be an annihilation of government rather than a government, in which every person, striving to act as much as possible for himself, destroyed that unison and harmony in which each individual exists only as a part of the whole.” (II, 193-194) “Part of the whole” is the Natural Law. The Natural Law guided the Dorians in everything they did. And as they did, Plato, the Athenian, follows. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. From *The Menace of the Herd* under the pseudonym Francis Stuart Campbell, to *Liberty or Equality*, *Leftism*, and finally, *Leftism Revisited*. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. Harry Waton perfectly summarizes Greek and Roman culture: “And now we come to the idea of progress. The notion of progress is totally foreign to the Greek mind and to the Roman mind . For both, the ideal life is stability and permanence, and the idea of perfection is inseparable from the idea of changelessness.” “Progress” is tied to Jewish/Gnostic ideology. It is not Greek, not Roman and not orthodox traditional Christianity. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. In a space of month in July/August 2014, a paper that was read freely on academic.edu, Hodkinson has since removed open reading of this paper from academic.edu. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. McAlvany: “So, in the 1990s, America is plunging rapidly into Antonio Gramsci’s socialist quagmire—not by accident—but by clever, well-orchestrated and well-financed design”. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. "Masonic influences started the war, and Masonic connections tipped the balance toward the Revolutionary side. When the war was finally over, Masonry played the single most important role in creating the new nation." [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. Jews made up a grand majority of the leadership of the Communist Party at the very onset of the Russian Revolution. (Weber) "The Bolshevist revolution in Russia was the work of Jewish brains, of Jewish dissatisfaction, of Jewish planning, whose goal is to create a new order in the world. What was performed in so excellent a way in Russia, thanks to Jewish brains, and because of Jewish dissatisfaction, and by Jewish planning, shall also, through the same Jewish mental and physical forces, become a reality all over the world." - The American Hebrew, September 10, 1920 [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. Buchanan, Patrick, *The Death of the West*, p.89. Yet the term “Cultural Marxism” was used in a slightly different phraseology by the Jewish Marxist Theodore Adorno in his book *Negative Dialectics*. Adorno recognized the corrosive effects of his own ideology upon Germany: “While the Fascists thundered against destructive **cultural Bolshevism**,…” (p. 453) [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. Sven Lunden quotes Hitler who precisely understands what Political Correctness is to do:

"The general pacifistic paralyzation of the national instinct of self preservation, introduced into the circles of the so-called `intelligentsia' by Freemasonry, is transmitted to the great masses, but above all to the bourgeoisie, by the activity of the great press, which today is always Jewish." (Lunden: The Annihilation of Freemasonry) [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. This is what I mean when I say that nobody has the Natural Law. The Natural Law is “Push/Pull”. Empedocles captures this teaching. There is a push/pull dynamic throughout nature, in the material, animate, and metaphysical world. The sense of belonging is the pull and volkenhass is the push. These two things exist in a harmony and are key to group dynamics. It is throughout the animal and insect world. It is also throughout human societies. It is part of the Natural Order. There is no realization of this anywhere in Catholic writings of the Natural Law. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. (Souvarine, 561) “Marxist”, “socialist”, and “communist” were synonyms for Lenin.” (Waton, p. 81) “Marxism is nothing else than our old friends, communism and internationalism, for this is what Marxism endeavors to realize.” Though the economic and sociological theories and practice change amongst them, they are all still idealistic and their culture is the same throughout. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. On top of this Harry Waton recognizes that “It is the truth. Hitler's declaration that the Jewish consciousness is poison to the Aryan races is the deepest insight that the Western world has yet achieved in its own nature; and his capacity to realize this is the proof of his genius as well as the secret of his power and of the curious fascination which his personality exerts....It is the Jewish consciousness which is the enemy, not an organized Jewish army, not even an insurrection of the Jews in Germany. It is the hidden penetration of the Jewish spirit into the Gentile mind that is the danger; and it is a danger because the "Aryan" mind cannot resist it, but must succumb.” (pgs. 199-200) [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. This is also the reason Freemasons went to the camps as well. Ludendorf, Hitler, Goering, Franco, Mussolini, Quisling all had a great hatred of Freemasonry. (Lunden) The Roman Catholic Church condemned the movement in several encyclicals only to be lifted by Pope John XXIII. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. (MacDonald, 197) “One bright spot occurred when the radical Marxist Richard Ohmann acknowledged that the humanities had been revolutionized by the ‘critical legacy of the Sixties’…” [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. Harry Waton teaches that this is exactly the Jewish attitude, “Judaism demands that evil be exterminated, but Christianity rather encourages evil.” (p. 119) Iconoclasm and extermination go hand-in-hand. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. Eric Nelson references Schmitt and Löwith that “modernity is structured around secularized versions of theological ideas”, i.e. “progress is secularized millenarianism”. (p. 142 #8) Secularized millenarianism is “immantizing the eschaton” which is Gnosticism. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
102. The original title of this section was “Cognitive Dissonance” but the analytic thinker, Bill Vallicella, argues that “there is no such thing as cognitive dissonance” because it is an inconsistent pentad. He suggests rather the use of the phrase “doxastic dissonance” for it is beliefs that are dissonant and not cognitions. “Cognitive Dissonance or Doxastic Dissonance” <http://maverickphilosopher.typepad.com/maverick_philosopher/2014/06/cognitive-dissonance-or-doxastic-dissonance.html> Retrieved 07/06/2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
103. For his part, Trotsky defended the massacre [of the Royal family] as a useful and even necessary measure. He wrote: “The decision [to kill the imperial family] was not only expedient but necessary. The severity of this punishment showed everyone that we would continue to fight on mercilessly, stopping at nothing. The execution of the Tsar's family was needed not only in order to frighten, horrify, and instill a sense of hopelessness in the enemy but also to shake up our own ranks, to show that there was no turning back, that ahead lay either total victory or total doom. This Lenin sensed well.” <http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v14/v14n1p-4_Weber.html>

"The whole record of Bolshevism in Russia is indelibly impressed with the stamp of an alien invasion. The murder of the Tsar, deliberately planned by the Jew Sverdlov, and carried out by the Jews Goloshchekin, Syromolotov, Safarov, Voikov, and Yorovsky, is the act not of the Russian people, but of this hostile invader." (Telberg & Wilton; p.392-393). Let it be noted that: Telberg and Wilton were both witnesses inside of Russia and lived the Russian Revolution. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
104. Prof. Nelson quotes at large Thomas Paine who states that “Government by kings was introduced into the world by the Heathens…” and it was the invention of the devil. The Bible, the Old Testament really, does not teach monarchy and so it is a pernicious error. (p. 53) On the other hand, the real, original Natural Law does teach monarchy—“The Rule of One is best”. Also, q.v. Von Kuenhelt-Leddihn’s *Liberty or Equality* for a defense of monarchy. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
105. Theodore Adorno admonishes Erich Fromm with “I would strongly advise him to read Lenin.” (Adorno, MacDonald in *Culture of Critique* p. 158, quoting Wiggershaus 1994, 266) They should know their own history. [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
106. Kevin MacDonald seconds that notion that “Adorno’s philosophical style is virtually impenetrable”. He references still Karl Popper’s (1984) humorous (and valid) dissection of the vacuity and pretentiousness of Adorno’s language and Piccone (1993) who proposed that Adorno’s difficult prose was necessary to camouflage his revolutionary intent.” (p. 203, #4) [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
107. Franklin references J.A. Ferrer Benimeli, *El contubernio judeo-masonico-comunista: del satanismo al escandalo de la P-2*, Madrid, 1982? as Franco’s position. [↑](#footnote-ref-107)
108. In 1876, Archbishop Vaughn of Australia in a speech which was turned into a pamphlet outlined the conflict between Freemasonry and the Church: “The Altar, the Throne, Civil Society as at present constituted, are, under the action of its breath, to melt down into an International Communism, when the impossible equality of all men shall be achieved, when the Almighty God, and, consequently, dogma and Christian morality shall be expunged.” (Franklin) The Archbishop notices that Freemasonry leads into International Communism, some 25 years before the Russian Revolution. Franklin writes disparagingly of “conspiracy theories” and tries to debunk the Masonic threat; Archbishop Vaughn is right—today’s events prove him right—it has all come to pass. [↑](#footnote-ref-108)
109. Interesting factoid, the National Socialists all wanted to return to the most “primitive” form of Teutonic society. Many people and academics have confused this ideology of primitivism with “conservatism” and thus labeled Nazism as right wing; this is wrong. One of the goals of German National Socialism was to strip any Roman heritage from German society. The principle of primitivism is a teaching from the Kabbala. Primitivism is not conservativism. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
110. Zionism is a form of National Socialism. In general, Jews are idealistic, i.e. socialists; then, the reconstituting of their homeland is nationalism. When the Jews say “Never Again” and excoriate anything National Socialism—they are instead practicing what they excoriate. Hypocrisy. [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
111. Other than being the first biographer of Hitler, Konrad Heiden also is the author of *A History of National Socialism*. The man knows what he is talking about. [↑](#footnote-ref-111)
112. This is the thesis of all of all the political science work of Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn. [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
113. This is backed up by MacDonald who also observes the same thing: “Because the movements reviewed here have had an underlying Jewish political agenda, the essential doctrines and the direction of research were developed a priori to conform to those interests.” (Ch. 6, 236) [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
114. MacDonald quoting Altemeyer (1981, 28) “notes that fascist, authoritarian governments are not necessarily hostile toward minorities, as in the case of fascist Italy. Indeed, the role of traditional norms is well-illustrated by this example. Jews were prominent members of early Italian fascist governments and active thereafter (Johnson 1988, 501). Italian society during the period was, however, highly authoritarian, and there was a corporate, highly cohesive group structure to the society as a whole. The government was highly popular, but anti-Semitism was not important until Hitler forced the issue”. (Ch. 5, 188) [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
115. That Sparta never committed a genocide will be laid out in a future book. The LXX recognizes the Hebrew genociding: IV Mcc., 2:19. “...Simeon and Levi for having irrationally slain the **whole** race of the Shechemites…” Q.v. last part of Peter Myers comments in Harry Waton’s book; there is a list of them from the OT. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
116. (Waton, p. 143) “But the communist soul is the soul of Judaism.” When this author attended college in his thirties, the *Communist Manifesto* was required reading for his Western Civilization class in a Bible Belt college no less! [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
117. (Mises, Action, 85) “But they are utterly mistaken in contending that these other races have been guided in their activities by motives other than those which have actuated the white race.” [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
118. (Theory, 47) “…the erroneous theory of the biological equality of all men.” [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
119. To further understand the modality of commonsense q.v. Maritain’s chapter on the subject, pgs. 84-92. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
120. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, I, ii, 1; §932a 5; Loeb 9: “…the wise man knows all things,…” [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
121. This is why women do not belong in politics, or vote. Politics is for men. This is why Marxism and all forms of socialism require female involvement—to water down masculinity and socialist politics are based on feelings—not logic and sound linear thinking. A woman’s thought is grey whereas the masculine mind sees in black-n-white. [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
122. The preceding is another example of commonsense—how things work in the real world. By observing how things are produced in the material world, which commonsense apprehends, is how things are produced in the unseen world. There are two aspects of commonsense: (a) the apprehension of self-evident principles; (b) how things work. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
123. Wiencek, Henry (2012) “The Dark Side of Thomas Jefferson”, *Smithsonian* magazine. <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history-archaeology/The-Little-Known-Dark-Side-of-Thomas-Jefferson-169780996.html#ixzz2dGtuTP4Z>
 [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
124. It does help to know that the founder of the Stoics, Zeno, was a Semite. (Inge, p. 27) [↑](#footnote-ref-124)
125. Aristotle, *Met*., II, i, 5; §993b 20; Loeb, 87: “Moreover, philosophy is rightly called a knowledge of Truth”. º Aristotle, *Met*., IV, ii, 18; §1004b 15; Loeb 155: “…the philosopher’s function [is] to discover truth.” [↑](#footnote-ref-125)
126. (Hamilton, 1963, 47) “Clarity and simplicity of statement, the watchwords of the thinker,…” [↑](#footnote-ref-126)
127. Hugh Tredennick is the translator of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* and he translates the Greek word *συμφωνία* as harmony. [↑](#footnote-ref-127)
128. (Rawson, 86) Recording sayings of Diogenes regarding Sparta: “A less probably authentic remark (also given to Antisthenes) is that to go from Sparta to Athens is to go from the men’s to the women’s rooms in a house.” Ed. note: it should now be reconsidered as being a good analogy. [↑](#footnote-ref-128)
129. 119 Judaism demands that evil be exterminated, but Christianity rather encourages evil. (Waton) [↑](#footnote-ref-129)
130. (Arist., *N. Ethics*, X, ix, 13; §1180a 25; Loeb, 635) “But Sparta appears to be the only or almost the only state in which the lawgiver has paid attention to the nurture and exercises of the citizens; in most states such matters have been entirely neglected, and every man lives as he likes, in Cyclops fashion ‘laying down the law For children and for spouse’.” [↑](#footnote-ref-130)
131. Found here: <http://www.snopes.com/language/document/commrule.asp> [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
132. q.v. “The classical definition of effeminacy” (Wheeler, Wikinfo) Heraclitus is quoted at length. <http://wikinfo.org/w/index.php/Classical_definition_of_effeminacy> [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
133. Q.v. Leon Podles, *The Church Impotent, The Feminization of Christianity* where he talks of the necessity of the masculinizing of boys. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
134. This is a motto on the Great Seal of the US. It has an open and a secret meaning. It is the secret goal for Freemasonry; it is the key to rebuilding the Tower of Babel. Because they use this law to reverse the work of God, their use of it is wrong and evil. [↑](#footnote-ref-134)
135. Perseus: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/morph?l=oi%29kisqei%3Dsa&la=greek&can=oi%29kisqei%3Dsa0&prior=fu/sin&d=Perseus:text:1999.04.0094:book=4:section=428E&i=1> [↑](#footnote-ref-135)