

CHRISTIANITY EXPOSED

An account of how the Jews concocted the Christian Religion to enable them to confuse, manipulate and finally subjugate the White Race.

by

CHRISTINE M. JOHNS

(The author is an Honours Graduate of the University of Newcastle-on-Tyne where she read Philosophy. She has made a special study of the destructive effect that Judeo-Christian beliefs and practices have had, and are having, on the White Race. It is her conviction that Jewish influence, operating through Christianity, is largely responsible for the decline and decadence so evident in the West today.)

PRINTED & PUBLISHED

by

TRUTH ENTERPRISES, PO BOX 229, LONDON E17 6HE.

© 1985 Truth Enterprises

Christianity Exposed

by

Christine M Johns



DEDICATED
TO
THE MEMBERS OF THE TULLE SOCIETY
R.I.P.

See! *Nemesis* by Douglas Reed, page 54.

FOREWORD

Ivor Benson, in his preface to Douglas Reed's *The Controversy of Zion*, gives us these stirring words:

"Scholarship, by its nature, disinclined to militancy, had at length awakened to find itself in the centre of the struggle for the mind and soul of man; scholarship had found itself defending imperilled scholarship; Shockley, Jensen, Butz and many others, its heroes were riding forth to offer battle to the forces of darkness."

This is my contribution to the battle.

CHRISTIANITY EXPOSED

CHRISTIANITY, besides being one of the world's largest religions, is probably the one which has had the most profound effect on mankind. It is generally considered to be an enlightened religion based on reason and love. Compared to the primitive, heathen superstitions which preceded it, Christianity is regarded to have had a beneficial and civilising effect on mankind.

However, Ben Klassen, a former US Senator, completely contradicts these almost universally held beliefs. He asserts that it is not a religion at all but a cruel and subversive system devised by the Jews to befuddle, pervert and enslave the White Race.

Klassen states that from 66 A.D. the Jews were engaged in a fierce war with the Romans which lasted for four years, but after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. when the victorious Romans burnt their temple to the ground, they realised that militarily they were no match for the Romans and so conceived of a more ingenious plan to destroy them – Christianity! As this strategy proved successful, the Jews later applied it to the rest of the world, says Klassen, particularly the White western part, with the same aim.

Klassen informs us that the Jews did this because of their religion. He says the driving force of the Jewish religion is a "terrible and pathological hatred of their hosts" – meaning that they hate the people of any country giving them shelter or in which they settle, even voluntarily, however kind the indigenous peoples might be. The Jews therefore regarded the White Race and particularly the Romans who had subjugated them, as an enemy deserving to be swept from the face of the earth. "They hated Rome", says Klassen, "with an inhuman hatred." They also hated the Babylonians – "The Whore of Babylon" – who had once captured and enslaved them, even though the Babylonians treated them relatively kindly and later released them.

Thus, because of their fanatical hatred of the Romans, Klassen believes the Jews concocted Christianity in order to defeat their opponents by perverting their instincts and muddling their thoughts with ludicrous ideas. He believes that Christianity has had, and continues to have, a catastrophic effect on the White Race, especially in its fight against the Jews and the coloured races.

Klassen tells us that "Christianity despises fact, reasoning, evidence [and] logic", and he believes that to succumb to the Christian philosophy is "to indulge in a cowardly flight from reality . . . to destroy reason and commonsense." Klassen also thinks Christianity prevents Whites, like born-again Christians, from being able to protect their own race, and says: "A born-again Christian is a pervert who has had his instincts warped, his mind unhinged, and his total outlook on life, outlook on sex and on the survival of his kind completely perverted from that, which, as a natural human being, he was originally created by Nature. *He becomes a destroyer of his own race!*" (My emphasis).

THE ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIANITY

Theoretically, Christianity is well-understood. Its characteristic elements are well-known. We are told it was one of the first religions to worship a single God (Jehovah), which it shares with Judaism, and that it is a happy religion, all "Good News and Glad Tidings." It also tells us we are guilty of Original Sin and so after death are doomed to go to a ghastly Hell, where we will suffer eternally, but to save us from that it provides a Messiah called Jesus Christ, who is both the Son of God and also a man. Faith is a main element too, and with faith in Christ we can avoid Hell and go to a lovely place called Heaven.

The Ten Commandments are another important element. They are supposedly moral rules written on a stone tablet and given to Moses on the summit of Mount Sinai by God himself. These Commandments are the basis of our moral values and we know this because it is written in the Bible, another major element and the "Holy Book" of Christianity.



What Christians believe in.

All the teachings of Christianity derive from this Bible especially from the New Testament, which informs us that we have a loving, protective God who will always look after us; that we must forgive our enemies, not judge others and that it is evil to hate. However, Christians can hate war and must disapprove of wealth.

It also instructs us to love everyone, support peace and to be tolerant, humble, obedient and charitable. It strongly supports the equality of races through its tenets that all men are equal in the sight of God and made in the image of Christ, and so opposes any discrimination, but it simultaneously tells us that the Jews are God's "Chosen People" and that Christ was a Jew, a Galilean, as well as the Son of God.

Most Christians believe in the Immaculate Conception; the Virgin Birth, which they celebrate at Christmas; the Resurrection after crucifixion, which they celebrate at Easter; and in angels, devils and miracles. If Catholic they take eucharistic meals, believing that they eat the body of Christ and

drink his blood (bread and wine), support the practise of baptism in order to be saved, and if in holy orders remain celibate. The Christian denominations vary but they are all evangelical, believing that it is a Christian's duty to "spread the word", which is why so many undertook and still undertake missionary work amongst the "Heathen".

JEWISH ORIGINS

The Jews were first heard of around 2,000 B.C. when they migrated from Mesopotamia to Southern Caanan (Palestine) on the borders of Egypt where they eventually settled. However, bands of Jews made constant forays into Egypt and eventually established themselves there in large numbers. But they cruelly exploited the Egyptians who, so enraged by their depre-dations and treachery, expelled them from the country in 1225 B.C. to return to their compatriots in Caanan.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

Klassen says that during this time the Jews discovered the amazing power of religion, both as a weapon of defence and attack. He says that the Old Testament is the weapon used in its defensive form and was concocted by the Jewish religious leaders to unify the aggressive, warring Jews, to give them a binding creed, a sense of purpose and identity. It is Klassen's belief that very early on Jewish leaders discovered that having a common enemy was unifying and that they therefore preached hatred against all the rest of mankind (the *Goyim*), making *hatred* a major tenet of Old Testament writings, and licensed the waging of wars: small and large-scale, financial, political and religious, as well as military against the *Goyim*. This is why the viciousness of the Old Testament with its "eye for an eye" and "tooth for a tooth" philosophy has so often been commented on.

But Klassen tells us that the Old Testament is also a collection of pornographic stories, probably false or exaggerated, "about dirty, whore-mongering Jews" like David, Abraham, Solomon and Lot, many of whom probably did not even exist, but which nevertheless show the cruel, murderous and materialistic nature of the Jews; and how all that is bad by Christian standards is revered by them, clearly shown by the respect given to their filthy and immoral heroes and leaders. Klassen comments further that all the stories of the Old Testament are fantastic, ridiculous and absurd, and he often calls the writers of the Old Testament "Scriptwriters" — obviously with the example of Hollywood in mind! At the same time Klassen refuses to allow Jewish apologists to absolve their fellows for the evil that permeates the Old Testament; for as he rightly points out, the stories contained in it are really "only the reflections of the inmost meanderings of the collective, perverted Jewish mind"!

Klassen refers to the story of King David and Bathsheba. He shows that this King and great Jewish hero was an adulterer and a murderer. David seduced Bathsheba the wife of Uriah, one of his most loyal officers, and

then had him killed by secretly ordering that he be sent out alone into the thick of battle. Klassen then mentions Abraham, the top Jewish patriarch, who lived in a state of incest with his wife Sarah because she was also his half-sister. This Abraham actually acted as a pimp for the Pharaoh by selling Sarah to him as a whore, and failing to mention that they were married. Abraham's son, Isaac, did exactly the same with *his* wife, Rebecca, who with her younger son Jacob, were criminal in their turn when they tried to deceive Isaac into giving his blessing and wealth to Jacob, instead of to Esau, the elder (Genesis 20–27). In addition, Klassen shows that King Solomon, far from being a wise and benevolent ruler was, in fact, just another cruel, treacherous, debauched Jewish murderer who had 700 wives and 300 concubines, and who murdered his own half-brother, Adonijah with all his supporters because he wanted to marry just *one* of Solomon's many women (1 Kings 2).

Then there is the story of Lot, nephew of Abraham, who chose to live with his wife and two daughters in a city of perverts, Sodom, and who, when his homosexual neighbours attacked his house, wanting to abuse his two male guests – supposedly “angels” in disguise – offered them his own daughters! After the destruction of Sodom these girls later committed incest with their sleeping father (Gen. 19).

The incredibility of the stories is highlighted in the one where Abraham's wife, Sarah, becomes pregnant when she is *ninety*, gives birth to Isaac, with Abraham then tricking yet another king, Abimelech of Gerar, and selling to him his ninety-year-old sister/wife as a whore!

In Klassen's opinion this is all trash and he tells us that Egyptian histories which talk of the Jews being a bunch of thieves and cut-throats are nearer the truth. Indeed, Klassen tells us the Jewish name “Hebrew” comes from the Egyptian word “Habiru” which means “cut-throats from across the river”.

Klassen also analyses the *Book of Esther*, which he shows, like so much in the Old Testament, to have no basis in fact, but to be a blue-print, as are the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, for the takeover of a nation and the murder of its governing classes, as happened in Russia this century.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

Klassen further informs us that the Jewish leaders also wrote the New Testament. This work has always been presented as being full of enlightened ideas but he explains that it is not really at all enlightened. Klassen also tells us who Jesus Christ really was and explains what the Apostles and Evangelists of Christianity were – those supposedly unimpeachable witnesses to the truth of Christianity and the existence of Jesus Christ! Lastly he shows where the ideas of the New Testament could have originated from if they were not, as Christians claim, the words of God.

In Klassen's eyes, the ideas of the New Testament could not be further removed from enlightenment. He considers the advice it contains to be complete and utter nonsense and says that its teachings were designed to


divide, confuse and destroy the White Race; to tear apart the fabric of society by setting people not only against their fellows and families, but even against themselves; against their own healthy instincts; so that they became concerned only with saving their own souls. He says that this divisive intent is clearly shown in St. Luke's Gospel (12:51–53) where Christ says:

“Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law”.

And it is hard to see how this *enlightenment* can be anything but confusing when the New Testament, from which is derived the whole Christian creed, is very confusing. The main point of the New Testament is that we can all get to heaven if we accept Christ as our Saviour. However, it tells us that even then we can't get there unless we are Jewish. Klassen says that Christ answers the Woman of Caanan, pleading for her sick daughter by saying: I am not sent but unto the House of Israel, (Matt. 15:24) – i.e. he will only serve the Jews. But there are also many other barriers to heaven. Those who love their parents more than Christ are banned (Matt. 10:37); as are speakers of idle words (Matt. 12:36); cursers of parents (Matt. 15:4); blasphemers of the Holy Ghost (Matt. 12:31); people who do not forgive all trespasses against them (Matt. 18:35); people who remain rich (Luke 6:24) and people who do not believe in Jesus Christ. Well might the disciples have asked him: “Who then can be saved?” (Matt. 19:25).

But this confusion is just one of the many puzzles in the New Testament. There is the puzzle of the Holy Trinity: how there can be three persons in one God; how Christ can be a man yet a God at the same time; and also how he can be his own father, as there is only *one* God. Then there is the

incongruity of a cruel and vengeful God who created Satan and Hell, but who at the same time is supposedly a gentle, loving and protective God. And how can we all be equal in the sight of God, but the Jews be more equal – the Chosen People of God? Moreover, how can every word in the Bible come from God when much of it is contradictory, particularly the New Testament, as Klassen so ably demonstrates? And how can human beings possibly be expected to be humble and forgiving as Christ exhorts us to be, when his own father, God, is depicted in the Old Testament to be vengeful, vindictive and vainglorious?



An artist's attempt to make sense of the “Holy Trinity”

Furthermore, many of Christ's parables are confusing and even subversive, like that of the Prodigal Son, which suggests that the lazy, shiftless, thoughtless, wastrel younger son should be preferred to his hard-working, law-abiding elder brother. Other parables are simply incomprehensible, like that of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16:1-13), punished then rewarded for wasting his master's goods; or idiotic like the parable of the Ten Talents (Matt. 25:14-30) where a servant is punished for not making a profit for his master, although he was not asked to; or nonsensical like that of the parable of the Lost Sheep (Luke. 15:3-7) which recommends endangering or risking the loss of the bulk of one's wealth to search for a small fraction that had been lost.

There is the puzzle, too, of Christ's respect and affection for low-life types like Mary Magdalen and tax-collectors (prostitutes and thieves) and his criminal behaviour in whipping money-lenders from the temple. But the biggest puzzle of all is the Sermon on the Mount, chapters five, six and seven of St. Matthew's Gospel. This "Sermon" gives insane advice which in Klassen's view shows most clearly the destructive intent of the New Testament teachings. He states that the Sermon on the Mount is absolutely full of false statements, damaging advice, idiotic ideas and ludicrous prohibitions, and one must agree with him. He begins by commenting on the fact that, as reported in the Gospels, Christ is supposed to have told us that the meek and humble are the most valuable to God, and indeed to man on earth for St. Matthew's Gospel quotes him as saying (Matt.5): "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" and "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth." But Klassen says we all know this is wrong and that while it is not wise to be too forceful, it is the strong, bold, quick and intelligent who survive and prosper.

Then Klassen mentions the scorn in the New Testament for the rich young man, who has as much chance of getting to heaven "as a camel has of passing through the eye of a needle"! He is told (Matt. 19:21) to "Go and sell all that thou hast and give it to the poor." And the rest of us are told (Matt. 6:19) to "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and thieves break through and steal, but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" - i.e. by giving away all your money!

This advice suggests that it is pointless to be thrifty or industrious: building up a business, providing for one's family or planning a better future for oneself, and advocates that we give away all our wealth (to the Jews?) in order to lay up treasures in heaven for ourselves. This, presumably, means more benefits, status and approval in heaven, but as Klassen shrewdly asks why is it acceptable to lay up treasures in heaven but not on earth?

The authors of the New Testament escape this difficulty by saying that earthly treasures are subject to corruption from moth and rust and at risk from thieves, while heavenly treasures would not suffer these handicaps. This is an example of what Klassen calls the *non sequitur* form of argument from which nothing follows, and which, he says, the Jewish authors of the New Testament use extensively, either to encourage agreement with a nonsensical view or to attack a sensible one.

An example of such a nonsensical view is that of giving charity in secret which the New Testament advises. But why should it be given in secret? Perhaps because the Jewish authors of the New Testament don't want kind White Gentiles to gain the reputation for charity which would probably be theirs if they did not follow this biblical tenet. Significantly, the Jews, who give charity openly, do have a reputation for charitable works, *although their charity is usually only for the benefit of fellow Jews!*

However, there are very many more important tenets than secret charity. One of these is that we should "Resist not evil". So if someone does us or one of ours grave harm, we should just "turn the other cheek" and put up with it and even, perhaps, allow them to repeat it. This advice is clearly ludicrous when you consider what form the evil might be - rape, murder, torture, as well as a host of lesser crimes and offences.

Moreover, what about the exhortation to "love your enemy"? St. Matthew's Gospel reports Christ as saying: "But I say unto you love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you" (Matt. 5:43).

But there is absolutely no reason to do so and Christ justifies this piece of nonsense with another *non sequitur* when he asks: "For if you love them that love you what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans do the same?" (Matt. 5:46). But as Klassen rightly asks, why shouldn't you do as the publicans do who are obviously showing good sense? Why should we change our whole life, instincts, ideas and beliefs just to avoid doing what publicans do? And, in any case, what's wrong with publicans? Perhaps this is the first recorded use of a Jewish "trigger" word, like "extremist" or "Nazi".

Presumably this exhortation to love one's enemy explains why the Sermon on the Mount advocates giving up one's cloak as well to someone who is trying to steal your coat! But why does it advise us to "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; least at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge and the judge deliver thee to the officer and thou be cast into prison" (Matt. 5:25), which disregards all principle, justice and fair play?

Yet more damaging advice is contained in the injunctions: "Take no thought for your life; what ye shall eat . . . drink . . . put on"; (Matt. 6:25) and "Behold the fowls of the air for they sow not neither do they reap, nor gather into barns yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them." (Matt. 6:26). Klassen says this is wicked advice, designed to destroy all sense of responsibility: the individual for himself, the man for his family and the citizen for his country. It is Klassen's belief that this is the advice which caused the disintegration of Rome, just as it attacks our educated classes nowadays, creating hippies and encouraging a cool, unconcerned attitude to life.

Christ continues: "And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow, they toil not neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." (Matt. 6:28).

This advice isn't just questionable, it's completely false. As Klassen again

very shrewdly points out, generally the "beasts of the field" and the "fowls of the air" do take care to think of what they will eat and drink. Even with their limited understanding they devise strategies for acquiring food, to meet present as well as future needs, like squirrels; and most animals work hard for their food by hunting for it every day. They also compete with others of their own species for territory and mates. Even the plants like the lilies, compete for land, water and sun and to get their seeds propagated in as many areas and in as great a number as possible. The injunction about taking no thought for your life is manifestly nonsensical; Nature is all feverish activity and competition even when she seems to be calm and placid.


But Christ goes even further and says even more explicitly: "Take therefore no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself" and "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." (Matt. 6:34) which are simply evil. They forbid prudence, forethought, planning and indeed any self-protective measures, and attack the very basis of survival.

Another false piece of advice, and a very damaging one that is popular with many middle-class liberals is that given against judgements: "Judge not, that ye be not judged." (Matt. 7:1). The word "judgement" has a number of different meanings ranging from an opinion to a condemnation and includes beliefs, choices, deliberations, theories, guesses, assessments, prejudices (unfavourable assessments of someone or something), discriminations and convictions — *all* of which may be valid as long as the *reasons* for the judgement are sound. As Klassen says, the Jews' advice not to judge would create insanity if practised because our biological nature as reasoning beings demands that we make hundreds of judgements on a multitude of subjects every day. Christ says that we must beware of judging others because we will then be judged; but Klassen responds that we will be judged anyway whether we like it or not, and of course, one can see that this is so.

THE MYTHICAL CHRIST

Christ's commands given to the multitude on the Mount of Olives as reported in St. Matthew's Gospel, are repeated throughout the New Testament, especially in the Gospels of Mark, Luke and John. One is therefore left puzzled as to how a supposedly loving and intelligent man like Christ could have given such diabolically bad advice — in view of the fact that he apparently had a direct line to God, the Father. The truth is that in all probability *he never existed*, but was created by the Jewish authors of the New Testament as a fantasy figure for the purpose of persuading gullible Gentiles to accept the revolutionary ideas that would be their undoing. In my view the character of Jesus Christ was developed from a number of sources, one of which may very likely have been the life of Prince Sidhatta Gautma, a wealthy young man who lived in southern India 500 years before Christ's supposed birth. He was called Buddha (the Wise One), and was about twenty-eight years old when he decided to leave his wife and child for a wandering life with his followers. He too formed a religion, Buddhism, and he too gave a sermon, the Sermon of

Benares, where he gave out his Five Principles of Good Living. Buddhism too has a heaven, Nirvana.



Is he a myth?

Although Klassen does not exactly say that Christ is a myth, he does say that there is no historical evidence at all that he existed, and of course, even less that he was a God. My own encyclopaedia confirms this. It says in its opening sentence "*All that we know of Jesus is contained in the four Gospels!*" (My emphasis). So, he is mentioned *nowhere else*, yet we have independent evidence for other historical figures like Julius Caesar, Cicero, Socrates, and Plato, as eminent in their times as Christ must have been in his. They were depicted in sculpted busts and paintings; they had been written and talked about by their contemporaries, yet Christ had not. But Klassen tells us that on his birth, according to the New Testament, the countryside was lit by a great star and that King Herod was so upset he ordered the murder of all new-born babies. Yet despite Christ's highly controversial life and career, no contemporary evidence of his existence can be found, apart from the Gospels. Surely this lack of evidence suggests that he did not exist.

SOURCES OF CHRISTIANITY

Many Christians believe that the Gospels are evidence enough for the existence of Christ even without historical evidence of any kind. But if his existence is uncertain, how much more uncertain must be the existence of his Apostles, and, as we shall see later, even if they did exist it is highly debatable whether they did in fact write the Gospels as "eye-witness" accounts or even at all. In addition, relying on the Gospels as evidence for the existence of Christ overlooks the fact that three of the four Gospel writers were definitely Jewish: i.e. Matthew, Mark and John, and the fourth, Luke, a physician from Syria, was probably a Semite too. He was also "best friend" of the Jew, Saul, later known as St. Paul, after his "miraculous" conversion on the road to Damascus. And Saul was a Pharisee, a member of the tough and cruel sect of Levites who ruled the Jews at that time. Indeed *all*, the principal figures and evangelists of Christianity were Jewish.

If Christ *did* exist he was a Jew, and so were all his disciples, with the possible exception of Luke; and according to Klassen, Christ's mother, Mary, was Jewish as was Joseph, her husband, and so, of course, was "Saint Paul" who was also a major propagandist for Christianity. Furthermore, the basic principles of Christianity, as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, are also Jewish; they must have come from somewhere, and Klassen tells us the source of these ideas, which he considers have done so much damage to White mankind.



The bleeding Sacred Hearts

Though perhaps originally taken from elsewhere, these nonsensical ideas were the product of the Essenes, a Jewish, religious community situated around the Dead Sea, which existed up to the beginning of the Christian era and then, around 100 A.D., inexplicably vanished. We only know about them because of the discovery in a cave some years ago of the Dead Sea Scrolls on which their views are set out. Why they had been hidden no-one knows.

The Essenes were a celibate sect who were extremely pious and high-minded. They practised simple communism (the sharing of all goods) as they considered private property to be evil. They were apparently a revolutionary new movement, a new form of social order: they were pacifists, condemned and abolished slavery and were opposed even to making weapons of war. They were agriculturalists, practised handicrafts and were in fact a new co-operative, communitarian, brotherhood; a religious society, and one of the first to introduce for initiation purposes, the religious rite of baptism, as well as eucharistic meals or communion. Both baptism and communion are main

planks in the Christian ritual! What is more, although the Essenes had no Messiah they did have a "Teacher of Righteousness"! — presumably to give them "good advice" and keep them on the right path, just like Jesus Christ!

Klassen believes that the ideas of the Essenes are the main source of the New Testament and have therefore made a major contribution to Christianity, but the Jewish authors of the Bible also took many ideas from the customs and religions of other races amongst whom they had dwelt; notably the Egyptians and Babylonians. They then asserted these ideas were their own. Klassen says the Jews are a sterile race of liars, thieves and parasites incapable of original ideas and without any innate creativity and he asserts that though they are especially proud of having formulated the concepts of monotheism and a universal religion, they did not do so.

The idea of a single God was developed earlier in Egypt (1367 B.C.) by Pharaoh Ahkhaton, who called it Aton, while the Jews developed their idea only about 500 B.C; and Buddhism 500 B.C. was an earlier universal religion than Christianity.

The Jews also obtained from the Egyptians the concepts of the resurrection of the body after death and a belief in the existence and immortality of the soul and possibly, too, the practise of circumcision and the wearing of their famous skull-caps. The idea of the Ten Commandments written on a stone tablet was also very likely an alien idea adapted by the Jews. For example the Babylonian king, Hammurabi, had written his own code of laws on a number of large stone tablets long before; and the Jews had been captives in Babylon. Then again, the story of Moses in the bulrushes is remarkably similar to the story of Sargon the Elder, King of Assyria, who was also found in bulrushes as a baby. And the Jewish or Christian concept of hell bears a strong resemblance to the ancient Greek concept of Hades, the underworld, where dead souls went. Indeed, the Christian hell, the name perhaps taken from the Norse word *Hel* meaning the underworld, seems to be merely a cruel elaboration of Hades; and if one were to make a thorough analysis, it is probable that many more alien superstitions could be shown to be the basis of "enlightened" Christian ideas.

This is why Klassen says that Christianity is far from being the beneficial and civilised religion of reason which we have always thought it to be, but is in fact merely a jumbled hotch-potch of alien ideas and superstitions assembled by the Jewish leaders into a cruel system of brain-pollution to divide, confuse and destroy White mankind. This is just like its modern counterpart, Communism, which is produced by the same people and with the same aims. No wonder Christianity and Communism seem so similar!

In fact Christianity is a terrible system of beliefs which tells people that they have "original sin" and will be cast into hell unless they have "faith": the completely unreasonable belief that a man called Jesus Christ existed and is their Saviour. In this way, says Klassen, people in earlier times were forced to become Christians because the threat of eternal damnation was so terrifying. Their fear of it nearly drove them mad so that they would do anything to gain salvation. Klassen says Christianity used the "carrot and stick" approach,

threatening people with hell and the loss of their souls while at the same time soothing them with the promise of heaven.

The fact that Christianity *is* nonsense is clearly illustrated by Klassen's amusing reference to his asking a cleric for clarification on a confusing point of Christianity. "Ask a preacher to explain it and he'll give you an hour's worth of double talk and when you come out of there he will have so brow-beaten you, that you think, well he probably has the answer, although you don't understand it. The fact is he doesn't have any answer."

DOUGLAS REED

Those who are amazed at Klassen's attack on Christianity will be further amazed to learn that he is not alone in his views. He is supported by Douglas Reed, in his book *The Controversy of Zion*. Reed was a journalist, formerly Central European Correspondent of *The Times*, an honourable man who resigned from the paper in 1938 when his despatches were censored and later on he became an author who suffered greatly from the suppression of his books as a result of the world-wide influence of Jewry. Yet Reed was a deeply "committed Christian"! who did not hate the Jews even though he thought they were evil.

The Controversy of Zion, one of the books Reed produced when he was prevented from practising as a journalist, is a masterpiece. It is a comprehensive history of the Jews; their origins, development and nature which entirely supports Klassen's views, although it was written in 1956, long before Klassen had written on the subject. Furthermore, Reed would have been very opposed to Klassen's thesis in *Nature's Eternal Religion* (published 1973) that Christianity is absolute nonsense and that there is no such thing as a loving, personal God.

Nevertheless, in the first chapters of his book, Reed confirms Klassen's thesis showing that the Jews are full of hate and trickery, which explains why they went to the lengths Klassen said they did in order to avenge their defeat by the Romans and also how they were so expert in the mind-manipulation of Christianity clearly evident in the bible.

HISTORY AND NATURE OF THE JEWS

Reed tells us that originally the Jews, whom he calls Judahites, were a poor and nasty tribe of Semites. They were greedy and quarrelsome and could not get on with their neighbours, the larger and very much nicer tribe of Israelites (whose name they have stolen in this century). Their only ally was the small tribe of Benjamin which attached itself to them. But then, the Judahites were adopted by a landless tribe of itinerant priests called Levites (tribal name Cohen) which Reed considers to be one of the most momentous events in history.

These Levite priests, says Reed, were even nastier than the Judahites, but because of their learning and intelligence, took control of the Judahites, moulding them with religious lies, trickery, and cruelty into the powerful force they became and are today.

The Levites introduced blood sacrifices like the death of every first-born male Judahite child, and also forced the Judahites (Jews) to follow burdensome religious practices and restrictions which they said God, (Jehovah) demanded. They further asserted that there was only one God and that he spoke only to them.

It is not known when or where the Jews and Levites united, says Reed, but about 1500 years after the migration to Caanan, which may or may not have included the Levites, they *were* united and the first tract from the Jewish leaders was produced. This was *Deuteronomy*, the first-written book of the Old Testament and one of the most vicious. The Jews say that *Genesis* was the first book of the Old Testament (the first five books of which are also called *The Torah*) and that it was written around 1750 B.C. by Moses. In it, they say, Abraham makes the first mention of "The One God". But in fact *Deuteronomy* was written first, completed much later in 621 B.C. and written by the Jewish Levites although they claimed only to have "discovered" it, as * Douglas Reed informs us.

The word "Deuteronomy" means "Second Law", or "Mosaic Law" as the Jews call it, but it was really the first "written" law of the Jews. It told them that they were the Master Race, the "Chosen People" and that God, Jehovah, would favour only them. Reed says it was a law of exclusion; a law of racio-religious intolerance and sanctioned the murder of enemies: "*Kill all that breatheth and opposeth you*". In *Deuteronomy*, says Reed, the Levites said that Jehovah was a god of hatred, racism and revenge; that he was a bargainer who promised territory, treasure and power to the Jews in return for religious obedience: observing the practices and restrictions of Judaism (the religion of the Levites).

This "law" was read out to the Jews in 458 B.C. as they returned from captivity in Babylon. It condemned them, says Reed, to a new captivity: their enslavement to the murderous Mosaic Law of racio-religious hatred.

From constant collective readings in the ghettos and synagogues the Levites indoctrinated the Jews with their ideas. The demands of "The Law" were that Jews must keep themselves apart — no mixed marriages. Any Jews married to Gentiles had to divorce them. The Law also required all Jews to worship Jehovah and it was an essential condition of *proper* worship to live *inside* Palestine; therefore all Jews who lived outside (the majority), even if they chose to do so, had to regard themselves as "captives of the stranger" and were told to "root out", "pull down" and "destroy" their hosts. Thus "The Law" advocated murder, and made Jews the dangerous trouble-makers they have since become, as *destruction*, says Reed, *is the condition of fulfilment of the Judaic Law* i.e.

To be a proper Jew you must worship Jehovah *in* Palestine.

All Jews outside Palestine are "captives"

Duty of Jews to destroy their "captors"

Ergo, constant attacks on and hate for the peoples of the world.

* Douglas Reed — *The Controversy of Zion*, Dolphin Press, Durban, South Africa, 1978, p.13.

No wonder Reed writes of the "fanatical tribalism" of the Jews and says at the end of his book: "*The feeling I had in tracing the story of this ancient superstition was that of contact with a living evil thing.*" A hundred years or so after the first promulgation of the Mosaic Law, its dictates were strictly enforced. Any Jews who were disobedient or ignored the ritualistic demands of the Levite religion were severely punished. Most Jews lived in communities called ghettos which were closed to Gentiles and set up and run by the Levites for the purpose of better controlling their people; and this control was exercised against any rebellious Jews. The Levites would threaten them with excommunication or expulsion from the ghetto, sometimes they would even kill recalcitrant Jews.



Blood-thirsty Jew.

When, after a time, the Jews began again to fraternise with the surrounding tribes and intermarry, the Levites living in Persia, sent a Levite leader called Nehemiah, with Persian soldiers, to deal with them. He reinforced the Separation; dissolved mixed marriages; built a wall around Jericho which became a completely Jewish city and introduced the "New Covenant", an even heavier burden of religious observances. The requirements of the Mosaic Law: Separation and Religious obedience were the key to Levite power then and they wanted to retain it. This power which the Jewish leaders still have over the Jews today has made them the most powerful race on earth.

Reed, then, backs up Klassen because he shows *why* the Jews are so vicious and filled with hate for non-Jews, and how it is they are so adept at trickery and propaganda as to be able to pull-off the great con-trick of Christianity. He shows that this ability came from the Levite priesthood; learned, cunning and cruel, who manipulated the Jews for their own ends and gave them their distorted ideas. And Reed also proves that it is not just a few nasty Jews, but the *whole Jewish race* who are the enemies of mankind, because of their enslavement to the Mosaic Law.

Reed also, quite inadvertently, gives yet more evidence against the existence of Christ; for he quotes him in the New Testament, written, Klassen alleges, by the Jews, as saying: "I am not come to destroy the law [the Law?] but to fulfil." But what law could have been meant? Surely only the cruel Mosaic Law which promised Jews dominion over the world. For if, Christ did exist but was the Jewish Messiah, he could claim to have come to fulfil this "Law", but as a Christian Saviour he could not claim to "fulfil" the law of the land — he could only "uphold" that.

And Reed tells us that it was the Pharisees, the dominant sect of the Levite priesthood in the time when Christ supposedly lived, who introduced the idea of a materialistic Messiah who one day would come to the Jews bringing them all the world's wealth and power and free them from their heavy burden of religious observances — which was considerable. He continues that the Jews were not governed by the State but by "the stern and inexorable regime of

the Levites enforced by the obligation to render unquestioning obedience to the regulations of the ritual." To the Levites non-observance of ritual was the greatest crime and they told transgressors that if they turned from wickedness to observance (of ritual) then the *Goyim* (us) would suffer instead. These observances consisted then and now of thousands of petty rules and restrictions governing the most minute areas of life: from what food to eat, when and where; how to dress, worship, what to read and how to keep clean, to conjugal relations, puberty rites, and women's hygiene — continuing on endlessly. For examples see Leviticus Ch.15 and Numbers Ch.s 28—32. Reed also tells us it was these cruel Levites, particularly the Pharisees, who were the earliest specialists in secret conspiracy as a political science and devised the communist method of spies-checking-on-spies which helped create the dreadful power of Communism.

Further, Reed shows how the Jews have become such facile debaters, not to mention liars. He says that they often practised a game called *Pilpulism*, a form of dialectics, where one Jew has to argue convincingly that anything is legal under "The Law". Pilpulism, says Reed, is "a species of spiritual gymnastics which is frequently practised where men's intellects, menaced with suffocation by the pressures within their communities, find no outlet for creative expression in real life"; and this must have been, and must still be, the case for many male Jews crushed in the ghettos, by the "stern and inexorable regime" of the Levites.

JEWISH PROBLEMS


However, although the Jewish leaders had created Christianity to befuddle the *Goyim*, they had also created a bit of a monster for themselves. If Christ were the Messiah and Jewish, what was to stop Jews from turning wholesale to this new religion?

Douglas Reed, in all his Christian innocence, gives us the answers. He tells us "Everything he [Christ] said was a quiet but direct challenge to the most powerful men of his time and place, and a blow at the foundations of the creed which the sect had built up in the course of centuries." This indicates that the Christ character was deliberately depicted as being opposed to the teachings of the Pharisees to whom all ordinary Jews gave allegiance; and indeed in St. Matthew's Gospel, Christ is shown constantly opposing and insulting them: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" is a frequently repeated phrase, and not only does it sound very unChristian in its vehemence, but also it would certainly prevent Jews from accepting the religion of the man who attacked their masters. Moreover, the Pharisees themselves are depicted as being opposed to Christ and by implication to Christianity. They are shown (Matt. 22:15) constantly trying to trick and trap him with their debating skills, and setting him difficult questions such as asking him if it was lawful for a Jew to pay tribute to Caesar.

In his book Klassen had commented on Jesus Christ, saying that it was significant that the Jewish authors of the New Testament identified him as a full Jew in order to gain advantages for the Jews as a "Holy People"; but for

their fellow Jews they depicted him and his Apostles as only Galileans, a sub-race of Jews who were known, but only to Jews, for their violence and general uncouthness. It was the Galileans who were the most vicious fighters against the Romans during the four year 1st Jewish War. And in St. Matthew's Gospel (4:16) reference is made to Galilee as "Galilee of the Gentiles" – i.e. the place where non-Jews live! This implies, of course, that the Biblical Christ was not a Jew, which Douglas Reed confirms. He says that Jesus was made out to be a Galilean, a member of that "rough breed." This depiction of Christ as an alien would help further to dissuade Jews from becoming Christians.

Further, if the existence of "Christ" is uncertain, how much more so must be the crucifixion? And if it *was* fabricated; casting the Jews as the murderers of Christ would certainly make them feel guilty and prevent them from accepting Christianity, as would the depiction of Judas, the traitor, as the only Apostle who was a full Jew.



A portrait of the non-existent Christ!

Yet another barrier to Jews becoming Christians is the depiction of Christ, in the New Testament, as disobeying the strict dietary laws of the Jewish religion; he picks ears of corn on the Sabbath, when work is forbidden; eats with unwashed hands, and with publicans and sinners. He also, as Reed explains, adapted the Old Testament sayings like: "Love thy neighbour (if he's Jewish) as thyself" to loving *all* men, including the despised Samaritans, to which the Jews would never agree, as they had always been encouraged to hate them. Reed also tells us that Christ refused to play the "nationalist liberator and conqueror of territory" – i.e. the materialistic Messiah for whom the Jews had waited, because he said "my kingdom is not of this world." This again was almost certainly a deliberate move, to keep the money-mad Jews away. But the Jews' main weapon against Christianity was the *Talmud*, the series of books written after the Bible had been compiled in which the Rabbis (another name for the Levite priesthood) expounded on Judaism and preached

hatred against Christians, sanctioning criminal behaviour towards them. In my view this was obviously to keep the Jews from being attracted away by Christianity, the religion of "love" which would otherwise have presented such a delightful contrast to the oppressive regime of Judaism with its heavy burden of ritual laws. As all Jews from the age of 13 study these Talmudic volumes of hate and cruelty against Gentiles this is another reason why they all have the same inimical attitude; which is hate for the powerful White countries of the time; then Rome and Babylonia, now America and Britain and disinterest in and contempt for the rest of mankind.

Nevertheless, the Jews are not the only ones with a problem as regards

Christianity; Klassen has a problem too. He suggests that the White Race should have a religion of its own based on Reason and the laws and forces of Nature, but without a God, which he calls *The Religion of Creativity*. Yet Douglas Reed seems to have believed that such a natural religion would be a frightful step backwards into paganism, presumably because he thought the denial of the existence of God would include the denial of Man's human and spiritual qualities. While Reed's fears may have been exaggerated or even entirely false, it is a bewildering fact that his book mentions a number of organisations, mostly Jewish and revolutionary, such as Communism and the secret societies of Illuminists and Freemasons, which are *all* opposed to organised religion, particularly Christianity, the very religion Klassen alleges, their Jewish masters set-up. They only want a religion of Reason and Nature and they too are opposed to a God, to the idea of a divine power outside man. This is a puzzle indeed. Perhaps they considered that organised religions, especially Christianity, turned out to be too beneficial to the people they wanted to control, giving them moral guidance and protection from manipulation and abuse. Or perhaps their natural religion would be different from Klassen's, or perhaps Klassen is not an honourable man after all and is in fact on their side trying to deceive us. Whatever the reason, it is a fact that Jewish-instituted Freemasonry, Illuminism and Communism want to destroy organised religion and are most vindictive against Christianity. But from Klassen's work we can clearly see that they are then opposed to the source of their own power, as it is only because of the stranglehold Christianity has on the minds of our powerful, educated classes that the White Race has not been able to fight against the Jewish menace before.

THE INTELLIGENTSIA DUPED

Although this is a slight difficulty, it is likely to be sorted out on further analysis. What is a greater difficulty is how we can believe Klassen's thesis that for nearly 2,000 years we have been duped by the Jews in this most cynical manner. One immediately asks what our intellectuals were doing that they did not spot the obvious falsity of the Jews' claim; that they allowed white people to worship a being who never existed; to fear a hideous fate that could never materialise; and permitted the minds and instincts of millions to be befuddled and perverted leaving them utterly confused and pitifully defenceless without even one, 'learned fellow,' saying: "It's all nonsense," as Klassen has done.

Even Douglas Reed was fooled. He, like many, was opposed to the cruel Old Testament, except for the few parts ascribed to the moderate Israelite prophets like Isaiah and Jeremiah which the Jews incorporated into the Old Testament to fill it out; but about the New Testament he was completely fooled. He said: "Even today the sudden fullness of enlightenment in the Sermon on the Mount dazzles the student of the Old Testament". And again he mentions the effect of the "blinding revelation of Christ's teaching."

Reed continues: "What the entire Old Testament taught in hundreds of pages, the Sermon on the Mount confuted in a few words. It opposed love to hatred, mercy to vengeance, charity to malice, neighbourliness to segregation,

justice to discrimination, affirmation/reaffirmation to denial and life to death", and he adds: "the Sermon on the Mount taught that moral [meek?] behaviour, humility, the effort to do right, mercy, purity and peaceableness would be blessed for their own sake and receive spiritual reward."

Reed was a clever and honourable man who was deceived by Christianity; so is it possible that all our other intellectuals could have been so easily duped? Let us take the example of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, (340–397 A.D.) who took the decision to include the vengeful, dirty and vicious Old Testament in with the newly compiled Gospels and the rest of the New Testament. We think, do we not, of a nice, doddering, old soul who simply must have made a mistake when he incorporated two such different books together. But on further investigation we find that "Saint" Ambrose was a very different character. He was not a cleric at all but a lawyer, a member of a sly and scheming profession, and he was still a *layman* when appointed to the very high position of Bishop of Milan in 374 A.D., aged just 34. This seems to imply that Ambrose and many others of his ilk, were simply bought by Jewish money and pushed by powerful Jews into accepting and propagating the new religion. Indeed, Klassen tells us that the Jews were very powerful in the ancient world, the Roman world, controlling all its emperors after Emperor Domitian 81–96 A.D. He also says that this fact is often unrecognised today because Emperor Aurelian, around 270 A.D., burnt the great library at Alexandria, completely destroying all the books, many of which, Klassen believes, mentioned this fact of Jewish power, and perhaps others too which may have disproved Christianity.

This library was the biggest in the ancient world, and almost the only one of any size containing over half a million books. And it is perhaps significant that Alexandria had the largest Jewish population in the world at the time of the burning of the library, and that its daughter library was destroyed by *Christians* in 391 A.D., and that the Christians instituted their own libraries there beginning a strong library tradition which of course would help them in disseminating their views and stifling the opposition. If this is true then it is perfectly understandable how the intellectuals and leading-men throughout the centuries could have been bought, kept in ignorance, or if rebellious, suppressed or killed, for that is precisely what the Jews do today to those who oppose them in our much more sophisticated world.

JESUS: THE EVIDENCE

If anyone doubts the truth of Klassen's claim that Christianity is a Jewish con-trick let him consider the controversial London Weekend Television programme *Jesus: The Evidence*, which, like Douglas Reed's book, completely backs up Klassen. The programme opens in 325 A.D., fifty-five years after the burning of the library, with a scene showing Emperor Constantine (a wife-and-son killer), presiding over a conference of Christians. This conference, known as the Council of Nicea, was convened

by Constantine to settle the Arian Controversy; the vexed question of the Holy Trinity: how Christ could be the Son of God, and therefore a God himself (which the Arians denied), if there were only *one* God.

The three major groups attending this Council were the Jewish Christians, the Roman Christians, and the Gnostics ("left-wing" Christians), who were all in constant dispute with one another. Eventually, however, the Roman Christians prevailed and the Nicene creed of Christianity was formulated; though not by consent or divine inspiration, but as the television programme showed us, under duress: Constantine more or less decided the Creed himself and the delegates had to vote on the matter after Constantine threatened to exile those who disagreed or abstained. The television programme showed also that Constantine and his successors subsidised Christianity and its representatives (palaces for bishops); destroyed the documents belonging to the other two major Christian sects, which might conflict with "Roman" or Catholic Christianity, and put down the many pagan cults, rivals to Christianity, which existed at that time. (And perhaps the Essenes too?) The programme also gave the dates when the Gospels were written, between 66–90 A.D., and the beginning of the 1st Jewish War was 66 A.D.!

As we know, Klassen doubts the existence of Christ and this may seem unbelievable to some, but the television programme supports him. The script says "Historically the multitudes never referred to a Jesus Christ, only generally to a Saviour" and that "what we know about Jesus . . . has to be discovered by *extremely* careful historical scholarship." (My emphasis). And the Jew, Albert Schweitzer, a New Testament commentator, said that "We must be prepared to find that historical knowledge of the personality and life of Jesus will not be a help, but perhaps even an *offence* to religion"! (My emphasis). The views of Rudolph Bultman, another New Testament commentator are really bizarre. Although to him all stories of Jesus Christ were myths, he nevertheless remained a "devout and pious Christian" and the television reported him as saying "Now, no sane person can doubt that Jesus stands as founder of Christianity . . .", and "Historical research could never serve as a basis for faith . . .", and "A picture of the historical Jesus is not necessary for the faith of the Church." Well might this Bultman say he knows his views are "a stumbling block" and a "scandal for rational thinking"! The programme informs us too that although the identity of the Gospel writers is unknown, the Gospels could not have been written by any of the Disciples, and further informs us that the Letters of St. Paul, written in 50 A.D., make no mention at all of a Christ who supposedly died in 33 A.D., and that the name "Jesus" simply means "God Saves" and also that no-one worshipped at Christ's tomb although worshipping at the tombs of the dead was a common Jewish practice, thus implying what Klassen suggests – that Jesus Christ never existed.

Jesus: The Evidence, frequently refers to a major authority for Christianity which both Klassen and Reed ignore. This is Flavius Josephus, a historian who gives evidence for Jesus Christ in his historical works. He mentions Christ and John the Baptist, relating details of their lives, particularly the sad crucifixion of Christ and the cruel persecution he suffered at the hands of Pontius Pilate. But the programme also mentions that Josephus was a Jew and a soldier—“a military commander”—says the television script. But my dictionary says that he was in fact *one of the leaders of the Jews in their rebellion* (my emphasis), that is, he was a military leader of the Jews in the 1st Jewish War of 66-70 A.D. against Rome - and yet it is his word we are asked to accept for the existence of Jesus Christ!

From the works of Klassen, Reed and the contributors to the television programme, it can be seen that all the evidence for the existence of Jesus Christ and the validity of Christianity is Jewish; while there is no independent evidence of any kind.

The television series confirmed what Ben Klassen had said — that Christianity is wholly Jewish! In particular it showed how Klassen was correct in his assessment that the New Testament was written at a later date by the Jewish leaders and not by any “eye-witness” Gospel writers who lived at the same time as Christ supposedly did.

The evidence for this is given by the contributors to the television programme. They confirm incomprehensible inconsistencies in the New Testament, particularly geographical ones. Their sheer number proves the Gospels were not first-hand accounts as does the fact that they refer to the destruction of the Jewish temple in 70 A.D. though written, supposedly, around 30 A.D. It is almost certain they were compiled by the Levitical sciolists in the seminaries and colleges of the Jews far from the places mentioned, in Palestine and the Levant. This was possible as Douglas Reed shows that the leaders of the Jews often lived far from the mass of their people in Persia, Poland and now America, especially New York. The programme also confirms that the New Testament was written first in Aramaic and *then* translated into Greek and not the other way round, as previously claimed. And it gives even more interesting facts such as that details of Christ’s life were common rabbinical sayings or copied from the Old Testament, and that copies of “linking phrases” for joining passages of writing similar to those in the bible were found at Oxyrinchus (Egypt) in 1896; and that a scholar, David Strauss, was dismissed and lost his professorship, after he proved that parts of the Old Testament were copied into the New Testament to fill it out.

Klassen has shown that many elements of “Roman” Christianity were taken from the religions of other races, particularly, the Egyptians; and *Jesus: The Evidence* certainly confirms this.

The programme suggests that the Christian ideas of the Immaculate Conception and the Resurrection of Christ derived from what was merely an Egyptian spring festival where Adonis, divine ruler of regeneration, would be eaten by his mother Ashtarte, after he had died in the autumn and gestate in her womb during the winter to be born again (resurrected) the following spring, having been conceived by an *immaculate conception!*

This festival was also probably the origin of the story of God the Father begetting God the Son and both being each other, and, with the addition of the Holy Ghost, still only one God — i.e. the Trinity. And long before the myth of the Madonna and Child was created, the Egyptian goddess Isis and her *saviour son* Harpocrates were popular objects of worship. Further, myths of divine beings bathed in light were common in Egypt, and major figures of Christianity are often depicted and reported as being seen in that way.

But the television programme showed that other religions and cults have made their contribution to Christian ideas and practices. It informed us that the Egyptian cult which worshipped the Persian bull-god, Mithras, involved “baptisms in blood” after which the person would be “saved”. And the father of Persian Mithras was Sol Invictus (the Sun-God) although himself a Latin deity, who has had a great effect on Christianity. Emperor Constantine created the holy day of Christianity on his day, Sol’s day or Sun-day, probably to placate the army of Sol’s Latin supporters as he was the most widely worshipped Roman deity. And *Jesus: The Evidence* also suggests that the idea of halos for saints stemmed from his cult, but even more importantly tells us that Christ’s birthday, the 25th of December, is the same date as the festival of the rebirth of the sun! After all, if Christ never existed Christmas cannot be a celebration of his birth and the manufacturers of Christianity would have to choose some other important date with popular appeal on which to celebrate their major festival, and Sol’s birthday must have seemed ideal.



The Jewish Prophet wears a long red cap, and his beard is white !

Orifice Fixation

Everyone who has spent much time in the company of Jews has noted the extraordinary degree to which their thoughts and their words dwell “below the belt.” Although the phenomenon varies greatly from Jew to Jew, a genital/anal fixation seems to be a fairly dependable characteristic of the race and is observed in individuals of both sexes and all ages and stations.

National Vanguard No. 102, December 1984.

However, although Christ and Christianity seem to have no validity, Christmas and Father Christmas may have some basis in fact. Although the television programme said nothing about this, Douglas Reed did. He tells us that it was common for Jewish children to hold an annual ceremony, possibly the Jewish festival of Hanakuh held since 165 B.C., when they left out glasses of wine at bedtime for their cruel and *bearded* Old Testament prophet, Elijah, in the hope of receiving presents in return! Hanakuh is celebrated on the *25th of Kislev*, the Jewish *December*, and lasts for eight days.

The television programme also mentioned that there were signs that occult and homosexual practices were connected with stories of Jesus Christ and Christianity, evils which, in some people’s minds are associated with Jews and Jewish institutions.

RALPH PERIER

Another "debunker" of the Christianity myth is Ralph Perier. In his booklet *Christianity: A Religion for Sheep* he gives Buddhism as the probable origin of Christianity's life-denying principles, taken from the Essene ideas, and therefore the origin of the Essene creed too, and suggests that the Christian belief in the eternal conflict between God and Satan, Good and Evil, which led to so many European religious wars, may well have developed from Persian Zoroastrianism. This was a monotheistic religion founded by Zoroastra or Zorathustra around 600 B.C. which also taught the importance of hospitality, philanthropy and benevolence. These are all, of course, Christian precepts as well.

THE MOST GIGANTIC HOAX

If the facts presented by Klassen, Reed, the television programme and Perier are true, then we have all been the victims of the most gigantic hoax ever perpetrated against mankind. And this explains much. There are many puzzling similarities between Catholicism and Judaism. Both Catholic priests and rabbis dress in long black gowns and bishops wear the Jewish skull-cap on the back of the head, while monks used to have the tonsure, the shape of the skull-cap, cut into their hair. A Catholic nun's habit is very like Semitic female dress and Christian women wear a veil when they marry just like Jewish or Arab women. Further, monasteries seem very like




Jewish Garb as worn by Catholic Clergy.

those Essene communities would have been, while a church is very similar to a synagogue in design and basic shape; and the Catholic mass includes a eucharistic meal, involving the veneration of Christ's body and blood; while the Jews are conspicuously blood conscious. They eat kosher (bloodless) meat; have a horror of female bodily functions and have occasionally been accused of ritual murder where the blood of the victim is consumed. According to Douglas Reed, the Levites initially practised blood sacrifices of Jewish first-born males. Also the Rabbis in the Jewish ghettos excommunicated disobedient members just as the Catholic church does. And why should Catholics carry palm leaves on Palm Sunday to celebrate Christ's entry into Jerusalem just as the Jews did in celebration of the Maccabees victory (165 B.C.) against the Syrians if Christianity and Judaism are not closely related?

But Klassen's thesis explains more than these strange similarities. More importantly, it explains the strong media support for Christianity, its evangelical and charitable nature, and much else besides.

It has always been a puzzle to Racial-Nationalists that Christianity has such an easy time with the Jewish-controlled world media, and Klassen gives us the reasons. There are, he tells us, two distinct types of Christians, both of whom, however, are equally damaging to White people — the *Liberal* Christians and the *Fundamental* Christians. The Liberal sort support the idea of the racial equality of man and therefore actively promote



What Christianity promotes!

mongrelisation of the races, while the Fundamentalists believe Christ was a Jew and regard the whole Jewish race as sacred, the Chosen People, who are above suspicion and above criticism. No wonder there is wide and friendly coverage of Christianity in the Jewish-controlled media. If the Jews really hate Christianity why do they give such constantly favourable coverage to it? I, personally, remember being bewildered when the Jew "Lew Grade" produced *Jesus of Nazareth* for television. The Jews would never permit the Christian religion which they profess to despise and "Christ" whom they profess to detest to get a good press from them unless they wished us to support this religion and its figurehead.

Klassen's thesis shows that it is no wonder that Christianity is an *evangelical* religion, always trying to make converts, since every convert to Christianity increases Jewish power and weakens the White Race in its fight for survival against the Jews and the coloured races. Does this explain how a Christian, evangelical magazine like *Plain Truth* gets distributed throughout the world? It is extremely well-produced, well-written but entirely free — so who pays for it and why? Notably, one of the top propagandists for Christianity, "Billy" Graham — thought by some Nationalists to be Jewish (and who finances him?) — said in a television interview that evangelists are against three things: and the one he put first was Racism, belatedly followed by War and Poverty.

And what about charity? Christianity is supposed to be a charitable religion that gives aid to the poor and sick out of kindness. In return church leaders only demanded "obedience". Yet this is really nothing but trickery. Christian leaders are always trying to make ever more people believe in Christian principles on which, according to Klassen, Jewish power is based. They have simply used charity to buy converts. It is not from kindness that their charity is given.

Christianity is not kind; it preaches against hatred of others but hates itself. As Klassen said, it has a hatred of reason and of anyone who questions it too closely, and its members will hate anyone, especially "racists", who dares to dislike aliens or Jews, no matter how justifiably. It preaches "forgiveness" *ad nauseam* but fails to offer it to Racial-Nationalists and does not care that they are persecuted, branded as criminals because of their beliefs, nor that they are denied freedom of speech and assembly, which it does nothing to defend.

Klassen's thesis that Christianity is a Jewish strategy of subversion seems to explain why the Roman Catholic Church always supports the Jews when they are in trouble, and why the Church has always attacked usury, so that financial power fell into the hands of the Jews making them rich and powerful, although there is nothing wrong with lending money at a reasonable rate of interest. It seems, also, to explain why the Vatican was sited in Rome. Italy has always been a volatile and politically unreliable country, not the place for the headquarters of an international organisation on which so many depend. Yet it was sited in Italy, in Rome itself, surely the culmination of the Jewish revenge of Christianity over the Romans? And Klassen's thesis allows us to understand why Catholic churches have usually been built so much larger than the surrounding architecture — not in praise of God but as a boast of dominion and why, as *Jesus: The Evidence* informs us, York Minster cathedral was built on the site of a Roman headquarters. Further, what about church patronage of the Arts?



The editor of Plain Truth.

This has been practised on a massive scale, resulting in a veritable flood of religious art and music, which now seems to be merely another form of propaganda for Christianity. Lastly, Klassen's thesis shows why as Christianity is a Jewish institution there have been allegations of Freemasonry, occultism and crime in the "Holy" Vatican.

Christianity is in fact an atrocious religion and its effects on the White Race over nearly 2,000 years have been disastrous. It has caused many religious wars costing the lives and happiness of millions of people, mainly White, and laid them open to Jewish exploitation as it taught them to bear what they could have resisted. And the idea of celibacy, inflicted on the Roman-Catholic clergy, condemned hundreds and thousands of the best, bravest and most intelligent Whites to lives without physical happiness and condemned thousands of women to nunneries, to be lonely brides of a non-existent Christ. Many more, of both sexes, were lost to the missions, "to help the foreigner!" and those affected were, in the main, very much the powerful middle and upper classes, who could have opposed the Jews.

THE PERNICIOUS EFFECTS OF CHRISTIANITY

However, the pernicious effects of Christianity are as disastrous today even though the power of Christianity is much reduced. Klassen says: "Although becoming a Christian is a matter of degree and very few people take it seriously [most] accede to its domination of our outlook and our society." He believes that everyone is affected by residual Christian teachings which bewilder and confuse them even if they are not practising Christians.

As we know, Klassen believes Christianity distorts thought processes and that Christians cannot think clearly when confronted with difficult questions. This is a result of the New Testament strictures against judgement, which, as we have seen, inhibit the "educated" classes from clear assessments of problems and account for the often repeated plaint of the members of this class that "you cannot generalise". Not only do they not understand what a generalisation is (a statement that *most* members of a group have characteristics in common), they cannot explain why generalising is wrong. They fail to see that if a person cannot generalise then he cannot make any judgements about large groups of people such as races, and cannot protect himself from them should they be unfavourably disposed towards him.

This Christian distortion of thought has had a very bad effect too, in the area of crime and the treatment of criminals. It has inhibited severe punishment of transgressors because Christians oppose the penalties of hanging, castration, flogging and long, tough prison sentences for murder, rape and violent assault, favouring instead treating criminals as merely sick and deserving people who need to be "rehabilitated". They do this on the

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK

CHOSEN by the Rev. H. S. Johnson, Barrow, Lancashire.

But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.

MATTHEW Ch. 5. v. 39

From the Daily Mail, September, 1984

spurious Christian grounds that human life is sacred, which only God can take; and because the other punishments are against the "human dignity" of a criminal, which he has by virtue of the fact that all men are supposedly made in the image of Christ. Their thought being distorted, they do not see how they hurt the innocent victim who is denied the satisfaction of revenge.

Christianity also seems to support homosexuality, which is particularly prevalent within the Anglican church, and regards it as only an "unfortunate handicap" according to Archbishop Runcie; and as we know, the programme *Jesus: The Evidence* mentioned that perversions were connected with Christianity. We also know that Christianity encourages multi-racialism with its "all men are equal" philosophy, thereby hindering the White Race from opposing the Jewish plan of mongrelisation and annihilation; encourages Communism, another Jewish philosophy; condemns war, however justified (Archbishop Runcie and the Falklands) and imperialism, however beneficial to native peoples.

In short, Christianity does nothing but harm, and purveys nothing but lies to deceive, beguile and bewilder the White Race. No wonder Klassen said that to get the White Man's thinking straightened out, that is, de-Christianised, was the most important task.

WARNING

However, we must not allow our understanding to become befuddled again which is precisely what the Jews are attempting to do.

The Jews are cunning enough to realise that the Christian fantasy world they have created is crumbling, not only from the investigations of New Testament commentators and the attacks of people like Klassen and Reed but also because of the sheer disinterest in religion of the White Western World. The current controversies of Christian clerics like the Bishop of Durham who deny strong and long-held Christian beliefs are no more than prudent back-peddalling, trying to slough off as much obvious nonsense as possible while retaining the bulk of the ideology. If that fails, the Jews will try other methods of attack, and Douglas Reed's *The Controversy of Zion* and *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* prove that war on Whites is the Jewish purpose. They have already very successfully used one of their modern weapons and are developing others.

Communism is the modern weapon of the Jews and it is extremely effective. At one and the same time it mentally enslaves the superior classes of the White Race and captures the allegiance of the coloured races by inflaming their biological and racial hatred of Whites while promising them wealth and power that it never intends to give them. No wonder it seems similar to Christianity; it is fully as divisive, confusing and destructive, although much more cruel. But the Jews are supporting Communism with two other weapons: drugs and religious cults.

The massive rise in drug-addiction and the resultant crime and damage to

society is very likely due to the Jews, particularly the Jewish Mafia. The Soviet Union has made allegations against its own Jews in this matter and Iraq has accused Israel of colluding with the drug traffickers from Iran. In addition, the complete absence of a drug problem in Israel and the Levant indicates Jewish control, keeping it out of the territories they have usurped. Also the two countries to which the drug flood is mainly directed are Britain and America, the very same countries which Klassen says, the Jews are out to attack. After all, what better way to subvert a nation than by making its people dependent on drugs?

The second weapon that the Jews deploy is the completely uncontrolled proliferation of powerful but ludicrous cults such as the Moonies, Mormons, Scientologists, Christian Scientists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Hare Krishna; as well as Christian cults like the Charismatics, the Navigators, the L'Abri Fellowship, and even the group: Jews for Jesus! What all these groups have in common is their opposition to the educated classes of the White Race, taking their money and absorbing their energy in "self-exploration" and "spiritual development", thus preventing them from facing reality: the Jewish menace and the grim danger of racial extinction.

Klassen says that if anyone doubts the effectiveness of religion as a weapon they should consider the Mahommedan religion called Islam. Klassen tells us that this religion was fabricated by the Jews just as Christianity was and foisted onto the previously peaceful Arabs around 700 A.D., causing them to rise up and to flood out of Arabia in order to attack Europe which was plunged into a new Dark Age for more than 500 years. Spain, especially, was the victim of this Jewish incitement, and because of Jewish treachery was entirely subjugated, its people enslaved and their race nearly destroyed by mongrelisation with the Arabs, the taint of which, says Klassen, has never been completely eradicated. The Arabs were able to conquer a large part of Europe because they fought with great ferocity and vigour as their religion promised them Paradise if they died in battle.

But this promise of Paradise for a desired mode of behaviour — with Islam — war energy, with Christianity — meekness and humility — is not the only similarity between the two religions. Islam, too, had a figure-head Mahomet — just like Jesus; and this Mahomet underwent a "miraculous conversion" just like "St. Paul." And significantly, aged about forty and just before he inaugurated his religion, Mahomet, an Arab, married a wealthy widow who was Jewish.

That Christianity is an attempt by the Jews to destroy the White Race now seems clear, and this is why Klassen says we need a religion of our own, the racial-religion of Creativity. Klassen founded this religion to protect the White Race by providing a basis for beliefs derived from Nature, Reason and love of race, "the Noble White Race" as he calls it, which cannot easily be undermined. It is therefore necessary for all White

Christians, whether Racial-Nationalists or not, to consider seriously the evidence presented here for the good of their race: its prosperity, security and future.

The Rabbis, who wrote the New Testament said (Matt. 7:15): "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly they are ravening wolves." The Rabbis knew what they were talking about — they and the ordinary Jews are the ravening wolves; Christianity is the false prophet, and the sheep's clothing is the gentle but misguided views of the Essenes, perverted to a terrible use: the spiritual enslavement of the Western world for centuries.

LIST OF BOOKS USED

Nature's Eternal Religion Ben Klassen

The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion ... Edited by
Victor Marsden

The above books are obtainable from Steven Books,
P.O. Box 112, London N22 6AW.

The Controversy of Zion Douglas Reed

Christianity: A Religion for Sheep Ralph Perier

The above books are obtainable from Historical Review Press,
19A Madeira Place, Brighton, Sussex BN2 1TN.

The Bible (Authorised Version) The British & Foreign
Bible Society

The Talmud Available in most good reference libraries

The Modern Encyclopedia