

was not entirely honest. He knew that aggressive warfare is waged with greater vigor when it is called defensive.

The Koran made "holy war" a *commandment*. According to Mohammed, the Angel Gabriel dictated the words: "Fight in the path of god against those who fight against you, but be not the aggressor, for verily god loveth not the aggressors. And slay them wherever you find them, and drive them out of the places where they drove you out, for persecution is worse than slaughter. But if they desist, then verily god is forgiving, merciful."

Then the final carrot was supplied to promote "holy war." It was supplied from the Catholic "authorized" version of the kingdom of heaven. The Koran said that the spirits of those who died for their god would live after death in a place that was ideal — ideal in the master-slave thought pattern of "civilized" people. It went on to say that all who died without following the teachings of the Koran would go to a hell of eternal torment, again in the thought pattern of "civilized" or serpent people, living by mass warfare — those who know what it means to fall into the hands of a mass warfare enemy.

There is no evidence that Mohammed ever saw the salvation that Jesus was offering those who, throughout all known history, had listened to serpent-makers and had lost their individual souls to become "parts" of serpents. Presumably Mohammed had no conception of a world without serpents. That is not unusual. Today the great majority of people look only at the word-created serpent world and have the same word-conditioned blindness to the world of enduring reality.

For a long time it looked as if Mohammed was indeed the last and greatest of the serpent-makers. In a century and a half, Islam "swallowed up" most of the Roman Empire and was also extended in the other direction over much of India.

THE GERMANS

Moral, as used here, means what appears to be most in keeping with the observed, long-range direction of the universal creative intelligence.

In non-human animals, morality, or lack of it, can be seen only after their acts. After thousands of years have established their direction, the morality, or lack of it, in non-verbal animals can be seen in their evolutionary development; some evolve further, some become extinct, others regress — return to an evolutionary stage that had already been surpassed.

Using words, humans have the ability to state their direction

before they act. When humans with such ability see individual efforts at self-expression ridiculed and mocked at by a force-backed word-conditioned group, their frustrated desire for self-expression becomes pent-up violence. Then they act without declaring their direction. This condition is called "anarchy." As night follows day, anarchy follows the fellow-feeling desire to state one's direction, when attempted word control, resulting in word-created confusion, has made all attempts to communicate individual perception appear futile.

When humans come into conflict, either in a state of anarchy or in the word-stimulated mass warfare that characterizes serpents, their actions become horrifyingly incomprehensible to non-verbal animals. Their behavior is not animal; non-verbal animals are unable to perceive the word-conditioned insanity motivating humans. Group-imposed word conditioning, that distorts the innate perception of individuals, is the basic cause of all such worse-than-animal horror.

Unquestionably groups have power to dominate — to control or destroy — individuals. Under demagogues this group power becomes group tyranny. A clearly stated course of action must be one of two things. It must be either: (1) Group support of individual sovereignty, or (2) Group sovereignty imposed on individuals who reject it. Any attempt to compromise the two opposing directions can only result in confusion and horror.

Group sovereignty, forced on individuals by a word-manipulated group, is the way of the serpent. The advocates of such a direction have always claimed that anyone who advocated individual sovereignty was immoral. The Jews, among whom Jesus was born, had a fully documented history of advocating the pseudo-morality of groupism.

Jesus was crucified but his life, death, and teachings proclaimed the morality that individuals should be guided by the holy spirit within them — not by the word-stated pseudo-morality of groupism, not by the law and the prophets. He so lived that the *only accusation* which could be made against him was the fact that he advocated individual sovereignty. Because no other accusation was possible, his crucified figure became a shining light that illuminated his message with unmistakable clarity. Deliberately he chose the final confrontation with groupism, so as to make the ultimate statement of which any individual is capable. He knew that, if the statement he made with his whole being was accepted as a statement of the universal creative intelligence, it could bring salvation to all the group-dominated individuals of the world. Individuals could then

find the necessary confidence in the still, silent voice born within them to resist the blatant, word-expressed pseudo-morality of groupism.

Now we are going to look at a people fully committed to individual sovereignty, a whole people sufficiently great in numbers so that they could have effectively opposed the direction of an encroaching serpent.

When the Roman Empire began encroaching on the people of northern Europe, the native tribes there might be compared to the American Indians as they were when the northern Europeans — after becoming “civilized” — began encroaching on them. The “civilized” Romans called them “utterly immoral barbarians.”

There were differences among the various tribes of northern Europe, as there were among American Indian tribes. Some historians make a distinction between the Teutonic tribes and the Celtic tribes, because of language and because the Celts had some semblance of group-gods. The Celts also had druids (or priests) whom they accepted as spokesmen for their gods. The Teutonic peoples had neither group-gods nor druids. Perhaps the greater difference was simply that the Celts were located in a belt that formed a passage between Rome and the British Isles and were the first to be “civilized.” The Roman armies forced their way through this area and subjugated both the area of passage and the isles of Britain, where there were some more of the same “barbarians.” At the time of maximum Roman power this belt was called Gaul. The area further east was called Germany.

Writers at the time of the Roman Empire called all the northern European people, who had not been subjugated, Germans. The great majority of people now in America, the British Isles, Scandinavia, and Europe are descendants of these German tribes — Angles, Goths, Franks, Saxons, et cetera — but most of the American, British and Scandinavian Germans have fought two wars in this century against a small portion still in the heart of what was originally called Germany. That small remaining portion is all that many now mean by the word German. The word “German” has come to carry the connotation of “foreign enemy.”

The confusion of the word “German” is unavoidable because we cannot talk about the original people without using the word in the way it was used two thousand years ago — as “American Indian” is used in the United States. German, as I am using it, means all German tribes, which includes the ancestors of most people in America, the United Kingdom, present day Europe, Scandinavia, et cetera. However, it is not blood-heredity that provides interest

here; it is the remaining traces of prehistory thought patterns. We are looking at the fork in the road; we are looking at a time when our ancestors had started down the other fork, when they had chosen the direction of individual sovereignty. A point of great interest is that they had chosen their direction with full knowledge of the opposite fork. They were not only consciously rejecting the other fork, they were consciously resisting influences that would press them in the way many others were going. Civilization and non-civilization were not indicators of the two directions. The manufactured products of “civilization” were incidental and not part of the choice. The issue was morality — harmony or lack of harmony with the direction of the universal creative intelligence — individualism or groupism.

The American Indians, at least in most areas, had no knowledge of and no pressures upon them from group semi-organisms. They had no pressures that a word-created pseudo-morality, declaring that killing must be the exclusive prerogative of some group “authority,” should replace their native perception. Our knowledge of the Incas and Aztecs is incomplete and *possibly* they did advocate such a pseudo-morality, but, if so, the pressure did not affect the whole Indian population of the Americas. Most Indian tribes had not been faced with the necessity for choosing at the fork of the road. They had not recognized the dangers of groupism. Tribal cohesiveness was conspicuous. The Indians even called anyone who insisted on living alone instead of with some tribe “crazy man.” However, they were close enough to nature to recognize that it would be madness to say that a human could not retain his innate animal sovereignty as an individual.

Serpent makers try to frighten people with a picture of horror that would result if individuals were not held in check by restricting the use of all force to that ordered by group “authorities.” The horror would doubtless be true if restrictions were lifted suddenly on dense populations that have been word conditioned for centuries. But the horror would result from the word conditioning — not the nature of the human animal. When conscious individual sovereignty has been the articulated morality for centuries, and a fair fight concept — as a way to prevent sneak attacks — has simply been added to extant animal sovereignty in nature, then the opposite is true. Where people not only feel free to do so, but also feel morally obligated, as individuals, to kill off, in a fair fight, any underhanded or unscrupulous persons among themselves, they can feel only strong love and comradeship for those who are left. There is then no need for saying what Jesus found necessary to say to the

Jews: "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you." John 15:12.

However the same evolutionary process that breeds love also breeds competent and courageous warriors. Germans successfully fought against the Roman Empire but, having individual freedom to make their own choices, some became Roman mercenaries and Roman citizens. Even at the time of Christ, as well as before and after, the Roman Emperor depended almost exclusively on German soldiers to protect him from others scheming for his throne. Their oaths of fidelity, the dependability of which was amazing to serpent people, made them one of the Emperor's most significant forces. In the case of Claudius, it even appears that the German guards made their own selection of who would be the next Emperor.

From Caesar and Tacitus, we learn that the Germans pushed back or killed off intruders, but had no thought patterns for "owning" land. In this respect they were like the American Indians, but they carried their rejection of "ownership" still further. The Germans made a point of having their chosen chiefs, or "kings" as Caesar called them, reapportion the land they cultivated every year so they would not become attached to one place. They also did not want to become attached to houses. They built minimal houses which were never in sight of each other.

Caesar and Tacitus, viewing the Germans from a "civilized" perspective, were impressed that they elected "kings" but did not seem to be subservient to them. We can go beyond the "civilized" perspective, and arrive at some understanding, when we remember Lycurgus. This real or imaginary wise-man-ruler of the Greeks refused to allow laws to be reduced to rigid form. Custom was recognized as superior to rigid laws and written laws were considered highly undesirable. Following such thought it becomes apparent that the German "king" was a symbolic figure. He was chosen to publicly personify and symbolize the ideal German, acting in the popularly approved way. The "king" was simply the man chosen to personify the German ideal. The girl chosen each year as Miss America would be a parallel if she were chosen by popular acclaim rather than by commercial interests.

No king and no word-laws ruled the German people. Word-control was not permitted to transgress against the holy spirit within each individual. Without being fully armed and ready to fight, the Germans never met for public discussions. No word-laws, handing "authority" to some "king" or "prime minister" or "senate," were made at a group meeting. It was a meeting to test the remaining tensile strength of old customs and propose new

practices or modifications of the old. Group custom recognized that *power* and *will* had always existed, and should remain, in individuals. In group meetings everyone was free to put his opinions in words. Approval was expressed by the cheering sound of beating swords against resonant shields. The sound made by that approval was the sound of the only power which can claim the manifest approval of the universal creative intelligence — that *willed* by the undistorted voice of the discrete individual's deepest being.

If someone wanted to propose a fight that would require group effort, he stood up in the meeting, stated that he proposed to lead such a fight, then invited all who wanted to participate and accept his leadership to join him. Another way was for someone to point out the necessity for a fight; then those who wanted to participate would elect the best leader among themselves. Those who wanted to add their weight to a leader's effort agreed to obey his orders and stick with him until total victory or death. The fight was always for a specific purpose stated beforehand.

When not participating in such a warrior band, individuals felt free to fight each other, so long as it was a fair fight. With such readiness to fight, all the dastards, and all who tried underhanded methods to gain their ends, were bred out from among the people. Those who remained were so dependably well-behaved that it was the custom to give any stranger who asked for it a night's lodging and share one's food with him.

A contrast can be pointed up by recalling that Jesus found it necessary to advocate love for one's fellow beings among the Jews. The Jews restrained individuals from killing the unscrupulous among themselves; instead, they gave an evolutionary preference to those "whited sepulchers" who used "legal" means — that is to say, *group* force — to destroy individuals who were not legal-minded.

The way of life based on individual sovereignty did not propagate the unlovable. But it also did not propagate fierce fighters exclusively. There were always some who had no fighting temperament, who had a temperament only for gardening, poetry, music, caring for animals, and such things. If they did not try to replace fair fights with word-control — aimed at underhanded scheming for group or "legal" dominance — they were usually shielded by someone ready to protect them from challenges made by the overaggressive. This bred out the overaggressive at the same time that it perpetuated the sensitive — those who lived under the protection of another's shield. Early "civilized" observers remarked about the strangeness of such relationships. The one under whose

shield the sensitive lived did not treat them as "civilized" peoples treated their slaves. Obviously the one shielding others could have called attention to his "authority" over them. Instead, having no "obligation" to protect them, but protecting by personal choice, he treated them as if they were simply additional cherished members of his own family.

A German woman, who usually chose not to fight, balanced a man's ready use of the sword by cherishing and preserving what seemed good to her. Of course, she chose her mate for many varied characteristics but an important one was perception. If the man's perception was evident, then a woman could love and honor her mate, who destroyed what did not seem good in his opinion. A man recognized that a woman's judgment, in what she chose to preserve and cherish, had less pressure on it than his own; and it might therefore be much better. Accordingly, a man listened to and respected the opinions of the woman he loved almost as if she were a goddess.

Families never lived in compact villages; each family always lived out of sight of any other. Because of this the Germans were probably much closer to nature than the American Indians, and looked upon nature with even more reverence.

However, the difference that I want to emphasize between Indians and Germans, who were both close to nature, is this: The Indians had no conscious thought patterns designed to provide a defense against group tyranny. The Germans did. They were close to and fully conscious of the serpent-peoples around the Mediterranean. What the Bible usually speaks of as serpent, they called dragon, serpent, worm, or giant, depending on their attitude toward it. But they would tolerate no encroachment, neither of the semi-organism, nor of the thought patterns that produced and maintained it. The hero-stories which they kept alive dealt with a Siegfried killing dragons. Dragons or serpents were not to be tolerated. One could voluntarily give up individual sovereignty — temporarily — while following a leader in a worthwhile fight, but no German would allow his personal sovereignty to be taken from him.

The thought pattern of the Greeks had come from this source and they had compromised it slowly, bit by bit, while trying to deal with those committed to the ways of the serpent. After centuries of such compromise, the Greeks still had recognized the eternal truth in both the teachings and the life and death of Jesus. They had seen Jesus as a discrete, crystal clear incarnation of the universal creative intelligence.

If the Greeks, after their centuries of compromise, could still recognize the god-aspect of Jesus, then certainly the Germans, who had never compromised, could not fail to recognize it. It might be said that the Germans were Christians before there was a Christ, or it might be said that Christ was a German carrying their message to the Jews. However it is put, the thought patterns were the same.

And so we now look, not at one man, Jesus, in conflict with a serpent-making people, but at a serpent encroaching on a whole, well-established, formidable people, whose way of life was what Jesus advocated.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH PROMOTES JUDAEO-"CHRISTIANITY"

During the life of Jesus, the finest armies of the old Roman Empire tried to invade the heartland of the Germans. They were totally defeated and virtually destroyed. The Germans had recognized the invasion for what it was — an invasion by a dragon, giant, or serpent — a word-controlled semi-organism. The often repeated German stories told about the ability of these semi-organisms to take on various forms, for a giant to turn itself into a dragon or serpent, for instance, or even into something resembling a harmless toad. They could defend themselves against what they recognized. But from out of the "Christianized" Roman Empire, came a new form of serpent which the Germans did not recognize for what it was.

The Catholic Church was evolved from one of the hundred or more sects calling themselves "Christian" — but its objective was not the kingdom of heaven that Jesus had pictured. It was the opposite. Its objective was the creation of a universal serpent. It did not advocate the holy spirit within an individual, as the one thing that must not be transgressed against. It advocated the opposite. It advocated obedience to the *words* of an "authority." Nothing in the life, death, and teachings of Jesus could support such a position, so the Church combined the "New Testament" life of Jesus and the "Old Testament" history, laws, and serpent-making practices of the Jews, into one inseparable "Holy" Bible.

Jesus had described false teachers to whom he would say "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity. I never knew you." But he did not specifically describe what happened when the Jewish serpent-egg, calling itself "Christianity," was hatched in the throne room of the Roman Empire. The son of man was not lifted up to *replace and eternally invalidate* the serpent that Moses lifted up in the wilderness. The Catholic Church lifted up the son of man in an effort *to confirm* that the way of the serpent was "holy." The coin

of the new "Christian" Roman Empire was never minted; but if it had been honestly presented, it would have had, on one side, Jesus hanging on the cross, and, on the other, the serpent lifted up by Moses.

The Pope, and priests whose "authority" derived from the Pope's words, became the new universal serpent makers. Taking as their model the Jewish successes as recited in the Old Testament — they were careful to hide their intentions. They were careful not to show both sides of the new "Christianity" at the same time.

The Roman Emperor had depended on a German guard for centuries and knew that, in the area called Germany, was a power unequalled anywhere else. However, he knew there could be no frontal attack by an army. And he knew that the Germans were not easily fooled. They recognized all the old shapes of the word controlled semi-organisms — the dragon, the serpent, the worm, the giant, even the lone individual posing as a harmless toad. They would fight any encroachment on their individual sovereignty that they recognized. If the Germans were to be made a part of the universal serpent, it would have to be presented to them in a new masquerade that they would not recognize. Jesus, as presented in the kindly words of clever priests, was the form of the Church-serpent's masquerade.

The teachings of Jesus were, of course, seen by the Germans as simply the revered and carefully perpetuated German ideas put into different words. The Germans, like the Greeks, could accept Jesus with full understanding. To them, the story of Jesus was the story of a stranger in a strange land — a stranger advocating German ideals to those who ridiculed, spit upon, and crucified him. And Jesus had died at the hands of these non-understanding people as bravely as any good German could hope to die.

Subsequent followers of Jesus had also been known to face death with similar bravery. It is no surprise that Germans were easily enlisted in the armies of those who would fight on the side of Jesus and his followers against those who opposed and crucified them.

The Franks, listened to the words of the priests. Then the Franks, overran, and took command of the Celts. The Celts had replaced their own gods and druids with the pantheon of Roman gods that had come along with Roman civilization. The multiple-god religion had been one of the customs forced upon them by the armies of the Caesars before the Roman Empire became an Empire controlled by the Pope. The Celts were already accustomed to changing gods. More important they were accustomed to the ways of the serpents — and had come to accept serpent ways as part of

"civilization."

The Franks uprooted the outmoded Roman pantheon in favor of what the Pope called "Christianity;" they stopped the spread of Islam at the Pyrenees; they even went into Spain and destroyed some of those who were spreading Islam over that area. Spain soon became part of the Catholic serpent.

The Pope, however, knew that the real power of Europe was in the heartland of Germany, where the Angles, Saxons, Scandinavians, and other German tribes lived with nature, and had no group-gods, simply to be overthrown and replaced by new ones. These people had never recognized any word orders that an individual would obey, if he had not voluntarily agreed to do so — and voluntarily meant while he was fully armed and had the option of defending the voice in the depths of his being in a fair fight. These people readily accepted the simple story of Jesus. But even the cleverest and most personable priests were having trouble getting most of them to accept the Pope's "authoritative" misinterpretations of the words of Jesus. The opposition to Catholic "Christianity" was that the Germans could accept one side of the coin but not the other.

The Pope sought a strategy for harnessing the enormous power in these people. He looked for a weakness that he could manipulate. He found it. He found a German king committed to the basic morality advocated by Jesus, and ready to promote it — with a fervor that might cloud perception.

The Frankish king, who was helping to create the Roman-"Christian"-serpent, was Charlemagne. We lack full knowledge of Charlemagne's thought patterns but the Pope (obviously using different words from these that present spirit more accurately than bare facts) took him to a high place and pointed out the entire area over which he had command. Then he pointed also to the area of Germany, where the people were unimpressed by mere words. In effect, the Pope said to Charlemagne, "All this will I give you, if you will fall down and worship the Catholic Church and its god, from whom I have absolute authority over the entire earth." Charlemagne was ready to fight for Jesus, but he lacked the wisdom that Jesus had shown in a similar circumstance. Charlemagne fell on his knees, and was crowned "King by the grace of god" over the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation." It was nothing but words.

As a battle leader, Charlemagne had so much on his mind that he had no time for any knowledge of Christianity but the simple picture of Jesus — who no good German would hesitate to advocate

and defend. But those who took time to go into the teachings of the *Church* more fully glimpsed the flip side of the coin. For the direction of their lives, they were given the priest's version of the Ten Commandments of Moses and other "authorized" misinterpretations of the "words of god."

Most of the basic Ten Commandments seemed merely a statement of German thought and custom. The first three were axiomatic if the word "god" was interpreted as meaning the creative intelligence of the universe, instead of the group-god of the Jews. The priest gave that misinterpretation. The fourth, with regard to resting on the Sabbath, was meaningless to a non-slave people; but there was no objection. Honoring father and mother, whether or not worthy of honor, was hard to swallow, but it was largely academic; those unworthy of honor had long ago been bred out by the use of the sword. "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet" were meaningless among people who had no land ownership, built no elaborate houses, and measured a man's stature by his heroism, not by his possessions. As translated into the thought patterns of the Germans "Thou shalt not commit adultery" and "Thou shalt not bear false witness" were axiomatic. But "Thou shalt not kill" was obviously ridiculous. Not to kill would upset the evolution of heroes, and the world would become cluttered with dastards and underhanded schemers. Mohammed had recognized immediately, and Moses had recognized as soon as the Jews were outside Egypt, where there might be some question regarding *which Jews* should be killed, that killing was the basic point in creating a serpent. To create a serpent, the power over life and death had to be tied to a word-trigger — killing had to *ordered* by an "authority." It was on this point that the Germans balked at accepting the other side of the coin. When told that, not the holy spirit within them, but the *voice of the Church speaking in words* would decide who should live and who should die, they rejected a "Christianity" that had such a provision.

On the initial attempt to make people accept a commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (EXCEPT when ordered to kill by words from an "authority) Moses ordered 3,000 killed. On his first attempt to impose the same "Thou shalt not kill" commandment on the Saxons, Charlemagne had 20,000 killed. But that was only the beginning. Such mass killings went on for centuries.

Warriors killing warriors, who refused to abdicate their individual sovereignty, was not the worst part of the killing. And that sort of killing would never have created the Catholic serpent. The power of the serpent is based on word control. Establishing word

control takes time; but the Church was carefully organized to destroy old ideals by gradual perversion.

The hilt of every sword was made into a cross; Jesus was made into a group-god. Fair fight was made into a ridiculous exhibition of two men dueling, while a priest stood by blessing the fight with a prayer "God protect the right." Knights, appointed by an "authority," became a special class, having conspicuous prestige by reason of words spoken by an "authority," and wearing such elaborate armor that they required servants to attend them.

Still worse was to come.

After a few centuries, during which leaders, holding a position of king, duke, mayor, et cetera, "by the grace of god," killed off everyone who would not accept a commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (EXCEPT when ordered to kill by words from an "authority) word control had become sufficiently effective for the priests to make that control absolute.

The priests developed systems for *dramatically demonstrating* that the Church alone held the keys to what would be bound and loosed. The Church now claimed to have such keys not only from Jesus, via Peter, but also from the holy spirit.

The Church set out to control the innermost thoughts of every individual. The priests interpreted the holy spirit as a sort of vague third part of a three part complex — god, son, and holy spirit. The kingdom of god and the whole complex was presented as something external; *nothing* came from within the depths of one's being. Obedience to the holy spirit was presented to the people as obedience to *words* written in a *book* and interpreted by those having "authority" to interpret. Babies were required to be baptized as "parts" of the growing Church-serpent as soon as born. Church schools were set up to teach children *what words must replace their innate thoughts*. The spirit within any individual who questioned the words and thoughts "authorized" by the Church was branded "an evil spirit."

After a few generations, most people dared not have a thought that had not come to them in "authorized" words. Other thoughts were called superstitious "heresy."

Contrary to the teachings of Jesus, who declared that transgression against the holy spirit within the individual, and that only, could result in damnation, Catholic "Christianity" declared that the "heresy" of listening to that inner voice was the one unforgivable sin.

All were taught that it was "sinful" not to report any suspicion of such "heresy" and, based on suspicion, the priests held inquisi-

tions for the accused. Those who defended the suspected heretic were, for that reason, also deemed heretics.

Torture to gain confession was unbelievably cruel. Punishments were usually public burnings as warnings to others. But the most burning punishment was the confusion of tortured thoughts in the minds of the living — those who really believed the words of the priests.

By the time America was discovered, the power of this sort of “Christianity” was so great that no one even thought of listening to a holy spirit within. No one dared think of anything except how to interpret the words of the Bible — a Christian Bible and a Jewish Bible in diametrical opposition, all combined into one book — and presented as *words* that overruled the holy spirit within.

The entire world of Europe, England, and Scandinavia was a literal hell, “where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Mark 9:48.

THE FIRST BREAKING APART OF THE CHURCH SERPENT

In the early part of the sixteenth century the “authority” of the Pope was challenged and broken in two places. Henry VIII of England defied the Pope, broke away from the Church of Rome, and set up a separate Church of England. Martin Luther, in the heartland of ancient Germany, defied the Pope, and set up a following of those who insisted on reading the Bible for themselves. Neither of these breaks resulted in immediate improvement. Perception had already been mutilated almost to total destruction.

It had been centuries since anyone had dared to have a thought that was not words quoted from the self-contradicting Judaeo-Christian Bible, as interpreted by the priest. For sufficient contribution to the church the priest would promise to get the souls of the dead out of purgatory and into heaven, but living individuals had lost their souls. Forced away from their pre-history commitment to individualism, the great majority of all descendants of the Germans and related people had come to think of themselves as “parts” of the Catholic serpent. If some were separated from the “whole,” as was now happening, they had been pre-conditioned to look for a new “authority.” From the pattern set by the Greek serpent, a faint hint that “civil authority” was different from “church authority” had continued all along. The civil now seemed like a possible path for escaping the tyranny of the churches.

However the civil, as all had been conditioned to think of it, was another serpent, and the distinction was mostly words. It seemed

different only because words had become all important. People had come to live in a world of words; the civil-church word distinction had been perpetuated all along because it was an expedient used to camouflage realities. In the inquisitions, the priests turned the heretics over to civil “authorities” to be burned after the church had called them guilty. Anyone who refused to carry out the church’s orders was burned as a heretic; so the church exercised full “authority” over the civil. The civil dared not take other than previously “authorized” routine actions; all *significant* matters were designated “religious.”

Still something was happening. Without wishing to do so, the church was teaching the “civil authorities” the serpent-making ways as used by the church. The subordinate civil administrators, holding their positions only “by the grace of god,” became serpent makers themselves. They began maneuvering against popes and priests. They had learned the serpent way so thoroughly that it seemed the only way. Sometimes the state serpent became dominate over the church serpent.

What was now happening was simply that the universal church serpent had begun to divide and become civil and church, civil and civil, church and church. The distinctions were not significant. All were similar centers of “authority” over individuals who had been word-conditioned. Individuals had come to think of themselves as “parts” of some semi-organism. Whatever the source of “authority,” all individuals now required words to direct their actions. The way of serpents had become the only way of life. All resistance to the serpent way had been fully destroyed.

Those in positions of “authority” had come to like the power and false prestige that went with simply using words to control a semi-organism. And the cell-like “parts,” called “citizens” in the state serpent, had come to look for an “authority” — for something outside themselves to “preserve order.” They had been brainwashed by priests to denounce the three billion year old order of the universe as immoral.

Among these brainwashed people, there was no revolt against the serpent-pseudo-morality, no revolt against the false morality that the individual should be subordinated to the “good of the group.” There was no longer any thought of individual sovereignty. Speaking Biblical language, the serpent had been held up instead of the son of man. Speaking German traditions, no one now thought of fighting the dragon.

Even as words had taken over thought, new meanings for words had taken over old meanings, and changed stories had taken over

the old remembered stories. Some of the "authorized" interpretations often destroyed or completely reversed the meaning of ancient words. The church that had decreed an individual's reverence for the holy spirit within oneself was "heresy," had also made the Jewish advocacy of serpent ways a part of the "Christian" Bible and taught people that the ways of the serpent were "holy." This had required abandoning the use of the word "serpent" as a symbol for "body politic" and giving new interpretations of the word in various passages of the Bible. In places it meant interpreting "serpent" as referring to a strangely magical biological reptile but, where necessary, even that had been done.

Also the word "dragon" had been dealt with so as to effectively destroy the meaning of the word, itself, along with the thought pattern which had been associated with that meaning. The hypocritical method that had been used for doing this is now familiar because everyone now knows the story of Joan of Arc, whom the church had burned for sorcery in 1431 and then made into a saint in 1920. The similar dragon story, which follows, is less familiar and will stand retelling, because it includes the total reversal of a word meaning.

About three hundred years after Jesus there were a hundred or more groups, all calling themselves "Christian," who were strongly opposing each other. Some of these groups — including the one that became the Catholic Church — were turning the words of Jesus into a serpent-making religion, and competing with each other for the Emperor's approval. Others were fighting against such corruption of Christianity — fighting against serpents or dragons no matter what their facade. Among these was a soldier named George, who was strongly Christian. George gained a wide reputation as the "Dragon Slayer." In 303 AD he was captured, tortured, and killed by the Emperor Diocletian. After the details on which George's reputation rested had been thoroughly twisted or obscured, the Catholic Church, which had become the "authorized Christian Church," led peoples to believe that all early Christians, including George, had been Catholic. It then gave out the "authorized" interpretation that "dragon" meant "the evil that opposes the church." Since it would have been "heresy" to insist on the original meaning of dragon, the church simply claimed a folk hero; it made George into "Saint George the Dragon Slayer." In time, word conditioned people forgot that real flesh-and-blood soldiers never fight against fairy tale dragons or abstracts. When words can twist how conditioned people see realities, it is no problem to twist how they see words.

The people, who could now read the Bible for themselves, had been fully pre-conditioned to misinterpret it. The teachings of Jesus, that had been readily accepted as being in full agreement with the people's Saxon-forest-heritage, had been deprived of their clear meaning. Any clarified understanding would now have to come from within.

But the inquisitions had done their work. Very few now remained who, with any confidence, could accept the holy spirit within themselves.

A FURTHER BREAK FROM THE SERPENT

A century after King Henry VIII and Martin Luther had made successful breaks from the "authority" of the Pope, many new religious sects developed, but the matters on which they differed from the Catholic Church did not go to the heart of things; none dared make the necessary break between the New Testament, upholding the son of man, and the Old Testament, upholding the serpent. Like the Catholic Church, the new sects were serpent-making groups, each jealous of other serpent-making groups, and each controlled by a leader, giving an "authoritative" interpretation of the self-contradicting Bible for the direction of the group.

Some of these people began to seek a new life in America, where the native Indians, although lacking the conscious commitment to individual sovereignty that the colonist's ancestors had known in the Saxon forests, were fairly close to the holy spirit within themselves; at least no deliberately organized word-conditioning was separating them from natural reality. Certainly the Indians were in much closer touch with the spirit within them than were the northern European immigrants. These immigrants, who were our ancestors, were just beginning to look for a way back through the word labyrinth laid down by centuries of the thought conditioning to which they had been subjected. The effectiveness of that conditioning was glaringly evident in their actions. No longer remembering what had been done to their own ancestors, they did substantially the same thing to the native Indians.

To dwell on how the word-conditioned northern Europeans now tried to impose their own conditioning on the native Indians would simply be to retell a story very similar to the European version. The main difference was this: The Romans had recognized the German tribes as the greatest power in Europe. The invading colonists saw the Indian tribes as being a much lesser power than the invaders, themselves. They felt that trying to make use of the Indians would be more trouble than destroying them. So the "civilized" butcher-

ing of "barbarians," who would not accept a commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (EXCEPT when ordered to do so by an "authority"), was so similar to what had happened to their own ancestors in Europe that no significant new aspects developed. The colonist's lack of perception would be an almost unbelievable thing to contemplate, if the same lack of perception did not still exist in plentiful evidence. They were destroying in others the very thing they were floundering to rediscover in themselves — when they could, instead, have relearned from the Indians something about the holy spirit which in themselves had, for many generations, been buried under the words of priests.

Even while they were killing the Indians, an unrecognized help for them was being provided by those they were killing. Because the Indians had always treated it with reverence, the natural world in America was still in harmony with the universal creative intelligence. It was this that helped the colonists recover their bearings.

The voice within themselves had been silenced, but the voice of manifest reality spoke with the same clear, profound eloquence that humans had listened to before human words had drowned out its message — before words had become all that held their attention and filled their thoughts. The colonists from Europe, like people removed from an insane asylum and set down in a natural wilderness, began to show the human animal's recuperative powers. During the first hundred and fifty years there were some indications that the contact with nature might fit them to lead the whole human species back to sanity.

One of the first significant advances was made by Roger Williams. As a perceptive individual, Williams demonstrated the meaning of the symbolic keys given Peter by Jesus; he declared that every individual's view about the universal creative intelligence was a matter of conscience. He proclaimed that no one could have any position of "authority" over what another "should" believe. He established the first Baptist church within the area that was later to be designated the United States.

Each individual Baptist church was conceived as being composed simply of those with like beliefs who voluntarily came together; the church had no "authority" over its individual members; the pastor of each had no "authority"; he was chosen and/or "ordained" by those who wanted him to conduct the services; there was no infant baptism; membership in the church was a voluntary decision of those old enough to think for themselves and make their own decisions. This would become the non-Catholic church that was chosen

by the greatest number of people in what would be called the United States — first, those descended from the tribes of Germany, and later, also, those descended from the tribes of Africa.

Sometime later, in the British Isles, John Wesley would start a society advocating similar freedom of individual conscience. The Wesleyan society would evolve into what would be called the Methodist church, with the second largest non-Catholic membership in the area called the United States.

Roger William's declaration stands as the first monument, marking the way back to individual sovereignty. He proclaimed again the eternal truth that nothing must be allowed to overrule the holy spirit of the universal creative intelligence in each individual.

The next monument to the sacredness of individual integrity was set by Thomas Jefferson about a hundred years later. In the *Declaration of Independence*, he proclaimed the individual's freedom of *action*. He proclaimed it to be self-evident that all are created free and equal (all are born sovereign individuals) and that it is the right, and duty, of individuals to alter or abolish any government that ceases to promote every individual's innate freedom.

Unlike the Jews, who for three thousand years had been celebrating with pride their serpent-making skills as displayed in Egypt — and, unlike the officials of the Catholic Church, who rose to positions of power by demonstrating their skills in serpent making — most of the colonists had no more comprehension of the ways of serpent makers than the American Indians. For a thousand years they had been nothing but pawns in the hands of organized manipulators. Even the basic words by which they had once communicated their thoughts had been mutilated and made meaningless. Their "mythology" had been either twisted backwards or fully destroyed. They no longer consciously recognized that the basis of all tyranny is word control. They no longer recognized that the power of a tyrannical king is always based on a word-controlled potential mob. They no longer even had a clearly understood descriptive word for the word-controlled semi-organism that tyrannizes over individuals.

But they did recognize the ultimate product of word control when it had become active tyranny. They rallied against a clear and present tyranny, and broke away from their European ties.

Then, floundering away from a tyranny that they did recognize, they set up a civil semi-organism, after the Greek model, with the same illusions that the Greeks had never dispelled. However, it contained one highly significant improvement.

Like the freedom of conscience declared by Roger Williams, and like the freedom of action declared by Jefferson, the Constitution of the United States became a clear monument to individual sovereignty when the Bill of Rights was attached to it. The Bill of Rights protected individuals from the government, itself — from the serpent.

Roger Williams and Thomas Jefferson had set up the highest monuments to the worth of the individual since the life, death, and teachings of Jesus. The colonists had shown their understanding, they had accepted the monuments as marking the path they were groping for, and, by insisting that the Bill of Rights be attached to the Constitution, they had set up another monument — one that said to the serpent: "This far shall you go and no farther." By doing this, they showed that their heritage from the Saxon forest was still not entirely destroyed; a trace of the word-mutilated thought and behavior pattern still persisted.

The resurfacing of these long-buried thought patterns enabled them to hear the word-overruled voice of the holy spirit within themselves clearly enough to choose the Jesus side of the coin the priests had passed on to them — and to become at least a little suspicious of the side with the serpent on it. Thomas Jefferson was so clear on his position that he wanted to go farther than cutting the Old Testament away from the teachings of Jesus; he saw the writings of Paul as a corrupting influence; he wanted to detach them and let the teachings of Jesus stand alone in their full, unconfused significance.

THE STRANGE PHENOMENON OF "MONEY-MAD" AMERICANS

When, two or three centuries ago, men like Roger Williams and Thomas Jefferson were not being tortured and killed by serpent makers — when, instead, they were being cheered by millions, it might be expected that Americans had clearly taken the road toward individualism, and the way of the serpent would be discarded by now. Not so.

No new monuments have been set. The first three monuments, marking the way to individualism, stand on paths that have ceased to be used. The revered memory of them is subjected to the degradation of hypocritical oratory by serpent makers, who try to use them as instruments of word control. Such serpent makers have always tried to make use of everything the people cherished. It is their way. It is to be expected. The strange thing is that millions of people who are repulsed by the condition have tolerated it. That

puzzle has to have an answer.

There had been cheering for the words of Williams and Jefferson, but the Saxon forest sounds of individual sovereigns clanging swords against shields to approve proposed action seemed far off to those who only cheered brave words with empty hands. For too many centuries they had been conditioned to think of themselves as "parts" of a word controlled group. Most of them would no longer have been sufficiently in tune with the holy spirit within themselves to have acted wisely as sovereign individuals, even if they had thought it was desirable. The labyrinth of word conditioning would need to be examined before it could be known well enough to be removed, before remembered words no longer stopped the voice within from coming through in full clarity. But time did not allow for full examination. In America things moved too fast.

Even before the old was removed, a new labyrinth of word control was being thrown up. A bureaucratic serpent — a sort of Frankenstein monster — would replace the word control of the Catholic serpent.

From the very beginning, new serpent makers began to take over the civil government called the United States. The old Greek system of government, giving a few in elected positions the "authority" to make laws binding on everyone else, was an open invitation for serpent makers to seek those positions. They got them. They made laws in such profusion that individuals became bogged down in the "legal" morass. Individuals even had to depend on "authorities" to *interpret* the confused word garbage called "law." Tocqueville pointed out that tyranny was equally oppressive whether the tyrannical yoke being placed on the individual was held out by a lone monarch or the million hands of a majority. Yet the people did not revolt.

If two hundred years ago, circumstances had required the colonists to face the problem they had created, it might have been easily solved; the serpent had not grown to monstrous size. At that time it would have been necessary only to make unmistakably clear the command to the serpent: This far you go and no farther. But it was left alone and allowed to grow.

The new breed of serpent makers were inexperienced. At first, they were very cautious. The tyranny of the word-manipulated majority was slow in developing. Also there were two things which distracted the people's attention from what was happening: (1) Open land, and, (2) an illusion regarding the function of money that required more careful examination than eager pioneers had time for.

The most easily understandable distraction was open land. If one did not like what was happening, he could "go west." In the expanse of forest, rivers, broad plains, and mountains — all having only a few scattered humans — one could feel a direct relationship being rebuilt between oneself and the total universe. One could even become lonely for, seek, and love one's neighbors. In that expanse of undisturbed nature one could believe that he truly lived in a land of the free and a home of the brave.

Money, which contained the other distraction, is a difficult thing to talk about with any clarity. The very word "money" is almost as difficult to use as the word "god." Like the meaning of the word "god," the meaning of the word "money" has also been deliberately distorted by serpent makers.

Because "money," the word itself, is not considered sacred, as the very word "god" is considered sacred by millions of people, much discussion has gone on regarding the point where money ceases to be a medium of exchange — where it becomes something radically different. The word "capital" suggests money that is not a simple medium of exchange, but that word has been given various confused and confusing definitions — and has been used with emotional connotations by serpent makers, who combine the term "capitalistic society" with a tirade of shibboleths and meaningless jargon. The word "capital" continues to have meaning in the sense that it is used by accountants; otherwise it cannot be used for intelligent discussion.

Because money that functions as a medium of exchange is physically indistinguishable from money that is not a simple medium of exchange, I prefer to use the one word when talking of money's two different aspects. However, I will try to distinguish the aspects by using modifiers.

Money is a physical thing, usually a piece of paper, that represents a measurable quantity of: (1) *Some specific tangible thing* having intrinsic value, or (2) the *power to commandeer*, by taxation, tangible things having intrinsic value.

The power to commandeer ties money to the way of the serpent — to "authority." The two aspects of money are indistinguishable in money as a physical thing. The physical money is an order, generally accepted at face value when presented by any anonymous bearer. *The anonymity of the bearer is a highly significant factor.*

As most people deal with it, money is a simple medium of exchange. It saves moving bulky items around for barter, and it can be used to get work performed or have services rendered without considering the specific items involved in the barter.

Money — that is physically indistinguishable from that used as a medium of exchange — can be measurable quantity of a serpent's word-created "authority." Because the physical money has no *obvious* connection to word-control, it provides a method for secretly using an existing serpent's power without the purpose or results being identified with the manipulator.

Money *secretly* used to control or promote recognized serpents (including the enemies of those whose "tax-money" is being used), money used to create new serpents in *secret*, or money *secretly* used to promote obscure existing ones until they suddenly show their power — these are the "authority" aspects of money that concern us. Money is no longer a simple medium of exchange when it is *secretly* combined with serpent practices — when it has an *undercover connection with word control*.

Money, which is *openly* identified with the "authority" using it, is a simple medium of exchange. The Roman Emperor depended on German soldiers — called mercenaries — who were paid with money. All nation-states pay their soldiers and call them "professionals." It is not this open use of paid soldiers, whatever they are called, that is the use of money as "authority." The out-in-the-open "authority" dominates the "authority" of money to the point where the "authority" aspect of money is insignificant.

When military organizations are visible, "authority" is clearly defined, carefully measured, and *identified with its source*. The stripes of a corporal or sergeant, the bars of a lieutenant or captain, the eagle of a colonel, and the stars of a general are openly displayed *measures* of "authority." When the military organization is visible, the ultimate source of "authority" is the identified serpent having word control. It can be seen and judged as a thing out in the open.

Measured amounts of money can become the camouflaged emblems of "authority" for a secret detachment of "soldiers" who wear no identifying uniforms. Money can replace openly displayed stripes, bars, eagles and stars with hundreds, thousands, millions, billions of dollars that are never seen. Or, if the physical money is seen, the "authority" is still camouflaged, because the money is the same physical thing that is used as a simple medium of exchange.

Nation-states allow no one with great quantities of money *openly* to maintain a private army. However serpents, organized on the "authority" of money, can infiltrate, exist within, or completely take over, an openly identified semi-organism. The existence of some of these is known; others are created and operate in total secrecy, or fully camouflaged by a facade that appears harmless.

In the minds of present day American people, the "Mafia" is such a hidden serpent. Whether it actually exists or does not exist and, if it does exist, how big and powerful it may be, is not a point to dwell on here. For the purpose of example, it is enough that the "Mafia" is a commonly held idea. The Mafia-idea illustrates the fact that money makes possible an unseen serpent of enormous power.

However, the most dangerous unseen serpents operate under some "legal" facade. Under such a facade, they easily tie in with direct word control, and the line between "legal" and "not legal" becomes a constantly shifting one. The unseen serpent-makers use the "authority" of money to turn "legal" into "not legal" — and "not legal" into "legal." As used by already existing serpents operating under cover, or by the makers of new serpents, the "authority" of money not only defeats law enforcement, it makes laws and removes laws.

"Laws" were originally thought of as coming from a group-god. Jesus condemned the elaborate laws, and the hair-splitting law interpretations that characterized the Jews. He chose to do this without giving them sufficient reasons to crucify him, until he decided that the time was right. The Jews, who have always known and used the serpent-making aspect of money, tried to get Jesus to tangle himself up in a discussion of money as "authority," but he avoided their efforts in that direction. One of his followers did say that "the love of money is the root of all evil." 1 Timothy 6:10. But Timothy did not elaborate on the "evil" of money; he just implied that it was a distraction. He seems to have been concerned with the distracting products of "civilization" for which money can be exchanged, not with the distraction in money itself.

In America there was, and still is, a distraction in money, itself. This distraction results from failure to examine closely the "authority" aspect of money. It is obvious that hundreds, thousands, millions, billions of dollars can function as the stripes, bars, eagles, and stars of a secret army. It, therefore, seems logical to assume that *enough money* can function as sovereignty. The question that busy pioneers did not have time to fully examine was: What kind of sovereignty?

The descendants of the northern Europeans who settled America were trying to get away from the "government" — from a synthetic group-sovereignty. Some simply went "out west." Others had the illusion that they could regain their *individual* sovereignty through money — gold, land, or whatever. They chased money with the illusion that enough money could have a value — other

than a medium of exchange — that it cannot have.

Freedom cannot be bought by money that is a medium of exchange. And individual freedom is something which money as "authority" cannot insure. Money as "authority" is useful only for secret serpent making. The illusion that its "authority" could bring individual freedom was a distraction that blinded many to what the serpent makers were doing. Many hugged the pleasant illusion that building an individual fortune was regaining individual sovereignty. Hugging that illusion, they failed to look at what was happening to themselves, who were successfully piling up "wealth," as well as to everyone else.

We still have a long way to go before we regain the wisdom that was buried along with our ancient "dragon mythology."

Our ancestors, the early northern Europeans, refused to use money. We do not know whether they remembered from past experiences their reasons for this or were just following an ancient taboo; we simply know the facts are true. The "taboo" was known to have existed in Europe in prehistory times.

Lycurgus, the real or fictional first ruler of the Greeks, insisted that money be made of bulky material for two reasons: (1) No one would want to accumulate much of it; and, (2) it could not be moved about without the movement becoming conspicuous. This prehistory European attitude toward money has come down to us in detail through the writings of Plutarch.

When clearly seen, when one is not hugging a pleasant illusion, the "authority" aspect of money is "loved" only by serpent makers — legal, illegal, church, or civil.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Money beyond one's needs can be used to make more money. Most of those, who were following the illusion that making money was regaining individual freedom, used their excess money to make still more, to aid their families or friends, or to help what they called "worthwhile charities." This "good" use of money inadvertently served as a smoke screen for the use of money as "authority" by serpent makers. At least it served as a smoke screen for those close enough to be impressed by this "good" use.

Those outside the United States, looking at the "moat" in their brother's eye, while a "beam" was in their own, saw the people of the United States pursuing money with what appeared to be a frantic, single-minded purpose. Great expanses of land and mineral wealth were up for grabs and the activity was unquestionably frantic. From distant shores, it was difficult to distinguish between: (1)

Those trying to get away from the serpent, (2) those chasing money with the illusion that it could restore individual freedom, and (3) those reaching for the serpent-making "authority" that exists in money.

The initial semi-organism of the United States was created by those with a tradition of individual freedom, but for a thousand years the Catholic Church had been brainwashing them to submit to church "authority." The pseudo-morality of groupism had been forced upon them by the inquisitions. Without taking time to explore the basis for the church-imposed pseudo-morality, they merely reacted to church dominance by following the Greek example of creating a clearly man-made civil "authority." Initially synthesizing "law" from a conglomerate of human "wills," they left the way open for unlimited additional laws. Such a semi-organism is not only open to elected serpent-makers; it is also wide open to control by hidden serpents or secret serpent makers using money as "authority."

"Pork-barrel politics" — the appropriation of money accumulated by general taxation in a way that will buy votes — was conspicuous from a very early time. Legislators, who participated in "money authority" schemes — that were much less conspicuous than standard pork-barrel politics — made so many laws, to favor so many undercover interests, that money to hire lawyers, or whole groups of lawyers, soon became the biggest factor in "legal" contests. It could win the contest or cause an indefinite delay that was tantamount to winning. Unscrupulous schemers had an open field to twist existing laws or simply pay to have new laws made as they wanted them.

As competition among secret interests stiffened, serpent makers began moving into direct word control. Ostentatiously displaying a facade of aid to "free enterprise," advertising "agencies" evolved advertising into a highly sophisticated "discipline" of word-control, with the control often coming from camouflaged, or totally hidden sources. Politicians and bureaucracies became proficient in publicly proclaiming one thing, while promoting its opposite with tax money, and with complicated laws, carefully designed to confuse. Conspicuous examples are almost infinite. Their great number effectively serves to distract attention from, and to divide opposition to, the system, itself.

To avoid distracting attention from the fact that the system, itself, is the problem, I want to cite no more details than necessary to serve as examples of word manipulation. The word "freedom" originally meant *freedom to act*, but the *group's increased power*

over individuals is praised as providing individuals with *freedom from want, freedom from fear*, et cetera, even while new restrictive laws, or new interpretations of old laws, are depriving the individual of *freedom to act* for himself. A cabinet post, ostensibly established to promote construction of housing, is used to prevent individuals, and builders with the "wrong politics," from building "non-standard" housing — when "non-standard" is, of course, a term subject to arbitrary interpretation by the bureaucracies having "authority." In the name of aid to small businesses, a Small Business Bureau helps to selectively destroy small businesses by tangling them in red tape. A tax-supported National Endowment for the Arts propagandizes in favor of artistic freedom, while it secretly promotes control over art by those in government "positions." A branch of it, set up to aid small book publishers and small magazines, is used to discredit and help put some of them out of business. In the name of free speech and free press, the serpent-making "authority" of money, itself, is given a voice loud enough to drown out the voice of every ordinary individual. Hypocritical proclamations on national television networks — praising freedom of speech — drown out individual voices, and promote a system that requires millions of dollars to elect a candidate to a "position of authority," or to contest unconstitutional laws enforced by bureaucrats.

The undercover use of money as "authority" has now become a standard American way of life. A great number of fully functioning or embryonic undercover serpents, using money as "authority," are now competing for control of the United States. Newspapers, magazines, book publishing, movie-making, radio, and television are often chosen as their "legal" facades. These choices serve the undercover serpent-makers in two ways: (1) They provide the "legal" facades. (2) They give direct word control into the hands of the hidden serpents. Schools and colleges are the basic tools of word control over which undercover serpents, using money, compete for surreptitious dominance. Money as "authority" has become so fully accepted in the United States that the distinction between "legal" and "not legal" has virtually disappeared.

Insane asylums are sometimes called snake pits. The term is appropriate. Individual insanity is the result of living in this sort of breeding ground for the group-semi-organisms called serpents. As long as there was sparsely settled land, those who came to America seeking to regain their individual sovereignty, kept pushing across the continent, in an attempt to keep ahead of the fast-following ser-

pent culture.

Before the continent was fully settled, what they were looking for had emerged as an ideal of heroic stature — heroic but hazy. It was that of the lone cowboy walking with slow, watchful, nerve-ready alertness into an unscrupulous gang of underhanded schemers, commonly called “sidewinders.” There was a gun on his hip, and a will of his own was evident in his steady eyes. The whole world saw and admired. Everywhere the image awakened a long forgotten self. It was the American dream of freedom and human integrity personified. But the meaning of the heroic figure never reached full consciousness. The dream figure, born from the subconsciously remembered heritage of individual sovereignty, is now only twenty-one inches high on a big screen television.

THE GERMAN REICH

Money, as evolved from word control, and as a tool of word control, distracts attention from basic reality. In the basic contest, whether between serpents and serpents, or between serpents and sovereign individuals, money is not a power of itself. The individual human will is the basic power. The way of the serpent is to confuse that will, so as to make it subject to manipulation by words from an “authority.”

History as ordinarily written is the history of serpents, of nations, of fictitious entities. This is a different kind of history. The natural person, the basic source of human will, and the manipulation of that will, is human history as we are now looking at it.

For untold centuries, the ancestors of the American colonists — the German tribes of northern Europe — had consciously opposed the way of the dragon or serpent. They were never overcome by a force outside themselves; they were tricked by clever priests into letting a camouflaged version of the serpent into their own thoughts. The verbal-serpent-eggs grew to produce serpents.

The snake-pit developed other serpents than the Catholic Church. Gradually overthrowing the word-control exercised by the Pope, the German tribes in most areas formed state-serpents — Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, the United States, Canada, et cetera.

The last hold out was in the original heartland of the German tribes — roughly the area that is now called Germany. There the people resisted the control of each person’s individual will by the “authority” of words to the last. When they could no longer hope to survive as individuals, they formed small local semi-organisms. The Church tried to mold these into a single unit, but, before the

job was fully accomplished, the “Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation” became a name without “authority.”

The cities insisted on local autonomy. Autonomous agricultural groups were formed around fortified castles. Small military groups protected local areas resisting amalgamation. Well into the eighteenth century there were over seventeen hundred independent units. The United States had broken away from England, been divided by civil war, and subsequently reunited, before the independent units in the heartland of ancient Germany — holding out for local autonomy as the next best thing to individualism — were finally united into a single semi-organism — the Reich.

The word “Reich” is significant. Unquestionably the semi-organism was the same sort of serpent or dragon against which Beowulf and Siegfried of legend had tried to offer an individual’s defense — as the steady-eyed American cowboy had tried to stand against gangs that to him seemed evil. But “Reich” carried a cargo of connotations.

Literally “Reich” simply translates into English as “rich.” But the richness is not that of money. It is the memory of life in the forests, when coins were valued only for the engraved horse-drawn chariot on the mint stamp, and a goblet of gold was valued no higher than a good earthen vessel. Then there had been no law but the holy spirit within the individual. When the Hebrew commandment, against taking what Hebrew law said belonged to another, was imposed on the Germans by the priests, it could not be translated into the language of a people who had no property laws. It was translated: Thou shalt not steal — take by stealth.

Stealth in human relations the Germans abhorred. “Blood and iron” was the phrase used to designate the open, above-board opposition to unscrupulous schemers, that traditionally had bred out underhanded dastards, and created the rich life, where only those who loved their neighbors as themselves survived. Those who survived also shared a love of all nature equal to, or even greater than, love of human neighbors. Communion with nature had been to them communion with the creative intelligence of the universe. The priests had confused them and they fumbled for a new clarity.

“Blood and iron” was the slogan of Bismarck, who brought together those who wanted to protect their richly remembered past — their Reich. To those for whom it recalled a time before the concept of ownership was introduced, Reich, although sometimes translated as “realm,” spoke with more emotional power than could ever be suggested by “my own, my native land.” “Reich” signified values that could no longer be expressed in any words or

stories still available to the people.

But in Germany, as in America, there were some who preferred to use underhanded methods to gain power over the wills of individuals — to manipulate people without bringing their ultimate objectives into the open.

Concurrently with Bismarck's efforts to bring this last hold-out for local autonomy into a single power, there was another will at work in the same area. There was a Jew named Karl Marx, who had other plans for the Germans among whom he was born. Marx had other than German memories, and these other memories had been kept fresh by the Feast of the Passover, memories of workers poisoning the Pharaoh's cattle and then, after clever undercover planning, poisoning the first born in every Egyptian household. He wanted to gain power by inciting one portion of the Germans to sabotage the efforts of another portion, as Moses had turned the Jews against the Egyptians. But there was a problem.

The German agricultural workers, or serfs, did not hate the prince in the castle who protected them; they had a rich tradition of a leader rising in an open assembly and asking who would follow him in a needed fight. They saw their prince as an admirable leader. The same problem existed elsewhere. In the independent cities, the workmen formed guilds and were proud of their craftsmanship. The guild emblems were crafted of beautifully wrought metal to display the workers' pride. The craftsmen were not a people of slave temperament hating a Pharaoh's power because they had no concept of leadership. It was their tradition that leaders led only after clearly announcing an objective, and that those who followed did so of their own free will. There was no word-created "position of leadership" — to be coveted because the "position" appeared prestigious. Therefore there was no ready made group of people who thought of themselves as "slaves" hating "masters." Marx set out to change things.

Marx set out to create — by the use of words — the sort of situation celebrated in the Passover Feasts. He gathered around himself a following of workers incited to revolt against the "oppression" of their leaders.

His efforts to sabotage the Reich were quickly discovered. Marx was exiled from the German area and also exiled from France. In London, with the editorial assistance of Friedrich Engels, he wrote *The Communist Manifesto*. It was a manual for international revolution, in which he called the international Pharaoh-type class the "bourgeoisie," and the international workers, that he wanted to lead as Moses had led the Jews, the "proletariat." He followed

this with another book called *Capital*, in which, by a ridiculous misinterpretation of the meaning of money, he changed the names of the classes he had *invented* from "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" to "capital" and "labor."

Judaeo-Communism was designed to secretly promote revolution, so that an undercover serpent, following the prototype of the Jews in Egypt, could swallow up all other embryonic serpents emerging during a revolutionary chaos. The pseudo-morality of communism was one hundred percent Jewish: The group would be everything; the individual would be "morally" obligated to submit to the group, "morally" obligated to become a mere "part," having no will other than the "good" of the group *as a group*. The fact that Judaeo-Communism was diametrically opposed to the connotations of "Reich" can be seen from the language of the *Communist Manifesto* that speaks of "rescuing" people from the "idiocy of rural life."

It was over twenty years after the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* before the German Reich came into being in 1871. At that time, the followers of Karl Marx in Germany did not stage an open revolt. However, along with the Catholic Church, they continued to oppose the Reich. They waited for the time of planned chaos that would give them an opportunity to take over.

In Germany before the first world war, there were three clear cut political parties: (1) A slightly modified communist party. (2) A party dominated by the Catholic Church. (3) A party dominated by the military. This third party was trying to preserve traditional individual freedom against the groupism of the communists and the Catholic Church.

The identity of the military and individualism in Germany needs to be understood. Military organization is openly based on suspension of individualism for the duration of a fight and while in preparatory training for a fight. It is formal, carefully-planned *action* control. This action control differs radically from surreptitious *thought* control by words. Military action *openly* states the purpose to be accomplished; after that, *action* control has no criterion but efficacy in accomplishing the stated purpose.

In Germany, at the time of World War I, the military was supporting the ideal of traditional individual sovereignty against the Catholic Church and against communism. However, the Americans were shown pictures of their German-speaking cousins marching in precise columns and told that these last people to relinquish their individual sovereignty were *innately* committed to the sort of group-pseudo-morality they were actually fighting. Within

historical times, we all had the same ancestors; but the demagogues loudly proclaimed that the Germans were a peculiar "race" — radically different from freedom loving peoples. The propaganda said that the Germans — as a "race" — had to be beaten into submission "to make the world safe for democracy."

THE WORLD PICTURE AFTER WORLD WAR I

Like the Indian tribes of America, the German tribes, scattered over the world, destroyed their original way of life by their inability to see exactly what was happening — and by fighting each other. The misunderstandings and fights between German-speaking Germans and their Scandinavian and English-speaking cousins, were, of course, intensified when all had accepted the way of serpents. Then the new serpent-makers used words to bury — still more deeply than the Catholic Church had already buried it — the innate-morality-become-custom that had once been the common heritage of all.

The remaining traces of the old thought patterns, which the new serpent-makers could not completely bury, they distorted into division-creating sophistries. During World War I, they wove words about monarchy and democracy into a garbled caricature of the real issue between groupism and individualism. Their purpose of creating a confusion, that could be manipulated into a word-designated division, was fully accomplished.

The real issue has not yet been allowed to surface. It is not between serpent and serpent. It is between all serpents and all humans. All serpent-makers are trying to destroy all individuality. All who want no part in the serpent game are making fumbling attempts to survive as individuals.

In order to give real examples of the two possible directions for word-using humans, to show the two directions at the fork in the road, we contrasted the individual-subordinated-to-the-group pseudo-morality, advocated and practiced by the Jews, to the morality of individual sovereignty, as set forth in the teachings of Jesus and originally practiced by the German tribes. We were looking at diametrically opposing directions and the *thought patterns* from which they originated. We were looking at direction setting *ideas*. The view of Germans and Jews as separate *races* is a word-division advocated by serpent-makers; all of us are individual humans with serpent-makers interspersed among us. Now that the way of the serpent dominates the entire world, let us focus on the more comprehensive picture. Let us focus on all peoples as individual humans.

Humans are moral animals, and morality is the issue that sets direction. The serpent-making pseudo-morality of groupism opposes, not only the teachings of Jesus; it also opposes the direction indicated by the universal creative intelligence in the language of objective reality. Morality, as manifest in objective reality, is clear and uncontested, but serpent-makers use words to overrule perception and prevent individuals from acknowledging to themselves what they see.

In the world of objective reality we see herd animals — sheep, buffalo, lemmings, et cetera — and the herd practices can be seen as having some survival values that might recommend groupism. These group-survival-values are emphasized by the serpent makers, and presented as evidence in support of their pseudo-morality. If that was all we had to base our judgments on there might be some question. However reality perpetuates a clear history of many blind alleys of evolution; one of these displays the *long-range* effect of groupism. That one illuminates what might otherwise be questionable. Because it is history written in the pages of extant reality, it cannot be twisted by words. It stands there for all to see — and its meaning is clear.

Certain bees and ants provide the ultimate history of groupism. That history shows that when a group moves toward becoming an organism, then sex — which, among other aspects, obviously functions as a prohibition against groupism — has to be perverted. The mentioned bees and ants have gone all the way — to total groupism. The result is total biological destruction of sex in worker-bees and worker-ants. Individual bees and ants are physically still discrete objects, but they are no longer "parts" — with the word in quotation marks. They are parts that have passed the point of no return. They have actually become biological parts. The *semi-organism* has become one organism — in full actuality. The parts have become fully dependent on the whole; they cannot survive when separated. The parts, although still discrete objects, function as asexual cells in the group-whole. The group-whole functions as a single asexual organism. The significance of sex has been lost beyond hope of recovery.

The fact that this, unmistakably, is regression — when considering the direction of overall evolution — is clear evidence that the real language of the universal creative intelligence is saying that the pseudo-morality of groupism is immoral.

For people who have an objective, analytical way of thinking, religion has to be derived from objective knowledge. For them, religion must be a concept of the cause, reality, and direction of the

universe, and a conscious attempt to attain harmony with that reality and conform to that direction. The concept must be derived from waking observation. Their morality has to be formed by looking at the long range direction of evolution as its only indisputable criterion. When looking objectively at all living things, morality has to be read as choosing the long range direction being travelled by the advance echelon of evolution; the immoral has to be read as the regressive direction. Total groupism, the ultimate result of what we have been calling "the way of the serpent," opposes the real world's direction. Therefore, the way of the serpent must be called immoral in a religion based on scientific analysis of observed reality.

Groupism, then, is condemned in two ways that have been recited. Jesus pointed out the immorality of groupism by the whole meaning of his life, death, and teachings. And groupism must be viewed as immoral from the long range perspective of manifest reality.

But those who merely look at what immediately surrounds them, and see nothing but the serpent game, are persuaded to accept that game as "the way things are." They dismiss both admonitions — "choose the kingdom of heaven instead of the things of this world" and "choose enduring reality instead of the group-controlling game" — because no conspicuous society is now going in the recommended direction. They accept the game that treats individuals as human clones — and dismiss the admonition that when they function as clones, they are destroying something of great value. Some even try to word-glorify the obvious opposition of "the way things are" to the direction of the universal creative intelligence as manifest in enduring reality; they are nearing the point of no return when they have become word-conditioned to view their attempt to perfect the regressive way of the serpent as an attempt to "achieve victory over nature."

The clear evidence that total groupism totally destroys sex suggests that the tie-in between sex and individualism is highly significant, and examination bears this out. Each supports the other. Without the free expression of individual will there is no deep perception of the differences between sexual temperaments, and no intimate yes-saying between one individual who creates by selective destruction and a radically different one who creates by selecting and cherishing. Without basic sexual perception, the finely tuned but more broadly focused perception that values radically different individuals is also destroyed; it has no impulse to perpetuate and sustain it.

Sex has given the advance echelon of life its balance for 600 million years; but no longer is there a conspicuous human society where sex is still accepted as the balance obviously advocated by the universal creative intelligence. All attempts by game players to replace the reality of individual-based sex-balance with group-oriented ideas or with "laws," enforced by group power, have been crude and bungling.

In India, the attempt was made to express the meaning of sex by artfully created gods representing life's balancing wills as abstracts. This, of course, perverted perception. Modern students of science, who pride themselves on ignoring "religious conditioning," have been led to focus objectively on the reproductive aspect of sex and to consider life by a formula that contains no perceptive will in its equation. They have accepted dogmas about sex that preclude an unbiased look at its meaning. Such dogmas are the raw stuff for making group-gods, and "science" can serve as a group-god, if it is used as such. As a serpent-making weapon for obscuring the significance of sex, currently practiced "sex education" is fully as destructive of perception as the older "sexual taboos."

The pressure of "the way things are" tends to crowd out those who are able to sluff off dogmas and listen to what the voice within themselves says of sex. It tends to crowd out those who take a sufficiently perceptive look at enduring reality to discover that sex is not an abstract characteristic of life — yet, neither is it merely a reproductive process. It tends to crowd out those who recognize that sex is inseparably integrated into each individual's being as part of that one individual's innate perception and that two sexes provide life with a perceivable long-range balance. Yet all unconditioned humans I have ever known have understood sex and understood each other. From what I see, all big conflicts in our world originate from serpent makers. The conflict between all serpents and all individuals is the one that here concerns us.

Although there can be no reasoned support for groupism, individualism, the other fork in the road, is no longer something to which we can point. With the formation of the German Reich, the way of the serpent had at last been fully accepted by the last hold-out which might effectively have opposed the history-old serpent way in the broad arena of world affairs.

The Reich had been in existence less than fifty years when it was reduced to total chaos by World War I. In that chaos the beginnings of the ultimate battle to determine the direction of the human species could have been seen. But, because seventeen hundred years of brainwashing had been so effective, what was happening was not

clearly evident throughout the world. It is not publicly recognized yet. It cannot be seen as long as humans continue to think of themselves as "parts" of various semi-organisms— and never look at the human species as a whole. It cannot be seen as long as humans look only at unreal group-gods, who are jealous of other unreal group-gods.

— Or should I now change to a different language?

In an effort to aid clarity, it might be well to change the language used when referring to the Bible. As we have moved forward in history, some of the language we needed in the beginning has become inappropriate. Definitely, we now need to include acknowledged atheists as serpent makers, and it approaches the absurd to talk of atheists believing in, or advocating, group-gods. So it might be well to look again at the primary example of people advocating a group-god — the Jews.

Jesus made it clear that the group-god of the Jews was not the universal creative intelligence. Moses obviously recognized that many who had been in Egypt remembered all too well what "god" had caused the widespread deaths among the Egyptians. He had those killed who openly acknowledged the fictional character of the group-god he was presenting. Most Jews now acknowledge the fictional character of that god. According to Arthur Koestler, who, having Jewish heritage, has been able to explore the question extensively; the majority of present day Jews are atheists or agnostics. However, they remain a cohesive group, giving top priority to what is "good" for the Nomadic Jewish Nation with as complete a disregard for "outsiders" as if they were blindly following the lead of a jealous group-god. In this respect, they have led a trend in present day serpent making. Judaeo-Communism is openly atheistic. Most state-serpents give lip service to separation between state and religion, even though the Greeks long ago discovered that it cannot be done effectively. The Jews never tried it. From the beginning the Jews have always viewed religion as a political tool; from the beginning their god was a front for gaining the tolerance of deeply religious people. And down through the centuries their elaborate "religious" ceremonies have been mere rituals for reaffirming group unity. Now, predominately atheists or agnostics, they are clearly committed, not to a god but, to a voluntary grouping that aids Jews to the disregard of everyone outside their group. Looking at the Jews clarifies the total serpent picture.

Commitment to a nation-state, founded on a groupism pseudo-morality, *functions* in exactly the same way as commitment to a group-god. The state is viewed by present day people in exactly the

same way that more primitive people viewed a group-god . "Our state" and "we, who are god's chosen people" are the same sort of words saying "we are parts of a cohesive group and will act as a group."

In a world of many atheists, who think themselves too sophisticated for group-god beliefs, clarity requires us to update the wording of the laws Moses got the Jews to accept — in exactly the same way the communists got communism accepted in Russia — by killing off the opposition. To bring the laws of Moses into current thought patterns, they would need only be changed to read: "You shall love your state with all your soul, mind, and strength — for your own is a jealous state that will surely kill unbelievers."

State-serpent makers use a reshuffled version of the old Catholic sophistry to promote confusion and obscure what is happening. When the Pope had full control of the "Holy Roman Empire" all *significant* questions were called "religious" and therefore under the Pope's jurisdiction. To serpent makers *significant* questions are those where words effectively control human will. Now that civil serpents dominate, "religious freedom" is sometimes allowed — provided all *significant* actions willed by individuals are tied by words to *state* "authority" — and religions confine themselves to passive "faiths." Yet the simplest logic cries out that if individual integrity is advocated, separation between religion and individual will can be nothing but sophistry. It is now the states that promote the *significant* serpent-making pseudo-morality that the individual is merely a "part" and the unit having priority in willed action is the group. It is therefore the states that now promote the primitive group-god pseudo-morality and actively defy the manifest morality of the universal creative intelligence.

The present world condition may determine whether or not the human species gives up its place in the advance echelon of evolution. The question now becomes: Can there any longer be anything but state against state, serpent against serpent? Has the individual already lost every chance of survival as an individual?

THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The beginning focal point of the ultimate world conflict was in the chaos of Germany following the first World War. The factors were clearly apparent, but were not publicly identified. The publicly identified results of the First World War are these:

(1) In North America "German" became a hated word; it came to refer only to the German-speaking-people of the Reich, who had been our wartime enemy. Popular history in America was distorted

to obscure the fact that most Americans are of German heritage; popular history perpetuated the wartime viewpoint of the Germans as an "enemy" people.

(2) In Russia the war provided the chaos for which the Communists had spent fifty years preparing. They took full advantage of it, shot the existing rulers, tore down the altars of other group-gods, and gave the old commandment an up to date expression: "You shall love Communism with all your soul, mind, and strength, for Communism is the one and only true way, and the name of Communism is jealous."

(3) The conditions imposed on the Reich, by the United States and others who defeated the "Germans," resulted in a chaos from which would come the still bigger World War II — still another conflict between states jealous of other states.

In America the Second World War is remembered for the single fact that Hitler ordered the killing of about six million Jews, who were not in uniform and were not carrying the arms and flag of an enemy state. This fact needs to be put in perspective if the total reality — of what was and is happening to the whole human species — is to be seen. War, as a gentlemen's sporting event, existed only in some areas of the world, and that kind of war existed only for a short time in world history. Before, during, and after the mass killings that were contrary to the "gentlemen's" war, there were similar and even more atrocious things done by others, including the Jews, themselves, as recited in their Bible. But that does not make the knowledge that six million people were gassed and their corpses burned less awe inspiring. Hitler's avowed objective of keeping impure blood from polluting pure blood was ridiculous, but to dismiss Hitler and the whole German people as more insane than the rest of the human species is to refuse to look at realities. The whole human species is in this thing together. What happened in Germany needs to be seen from a perspective embracing all humanity.

What happened in Germany needs to be seen, not as a conflict of Germans and Jews, but as a conflict of one group-semi-organism with another group-semi-organism. Germans versus Jews was a word-created division of humans — just as Marx's "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" was a word-created division of humans. But this condition cannot be brushed aside with the statement "let's just all love each other." That admonition ignores a significance that reality will not ignore. Reality presents every individual human with a command that cannot be escaped: "Choose! Do you commit to individual sovereignty? Or do you commit to group sovereignty over

the individual?"

How many similar examples must be looked at before that choice can be seen as the only one there is?

If we use serpent-language and speak of a nation as having an enemy, if we use serpent-language and speak of the German Reich as if it were a real thing, if we speak of it as a "nation," about fifty years old, then, unquestionably, the Nomadic Jewish Nation, about three thousand years old, was Germany's major enemy. It was an enemy on three counts:

(1) The flip side of the coin, which the Catholic Church had tried to pass off as Christianity, was fashioned from the Jewish Bible.

(2) The ideology and objectives of the Communists, standing armed at the German borders, were Jewish: Communism was evolved from Jewish traditions and advocated the Jewish pseudo-morality.

(3) The flesh and blood people, who were committed to the Nomadic Jewish Nation while living in Germany, were actively and effectively gaining word-control over the native Germans. They were using the underhanded methods celebrated in the Passover Feast, as further developed by more than two thousand years of living in a parasitic relationship with various host nations. Seventy-eight percent of the lawyers in Austria were Jews. The Jewish House of Ullstein was the biggest publisher of books and periodicals in Germany; this Jewish family dominated the media.

Using serpent-language, no people ever had a more clearly defined enemy than the German people had in the Jewish people.

But this is not the usual sort of history about peoples against peoples, nations against nations, serpents against serpents. It is not focusing on fictitious entities. This is a history of word-controlled humans — and the realities are human *individuals*.

We first looked at the Jews, who built their serpent in secret. Now we look at the Germans. They operated in the open and can be clearly seen. Also the events are recent enough for all details to be known.

Never on earth has there been a more spectacular and impressive assembly of highly disciplined, and tightly regimented, human individuals than those who responded to the word control of Adolf Hitler. The speaker stood and addressed the assembly. The speaker's words, and the heils that came from the armed men, stirred memories of sovereigns beating swords against their shields in the Saxon forests. In the Saxon forests the sound had been both applause and commitment to a leader who dared a noble fight and asked for brave men to join him. The cherished memory was

magnified to unspeakable grandeur by the staged spectacle; the response of brave men was the response to a vague subconscious memory.

In that assembly, an innate knowledge, once consciously articulated, but now confused by a thousand years of word-control, stirred as a vague impulsive response to a leader asking men to remember something that had long been buried in the deepest depths of their beings. The *deflection* of a valid impulse is the point that needs attention.

The Jews had originally been word controlled under the laws of leaders who set themselves up as gods knowing a good and evil different from that manifest by the universal creative intelligence. The Jews had been word controlled for three thousand years; the Germans for much less time — they still had an impulse to revolt against the serpent. The *way* of the serpent is immoral. The impulse was valid. Bringing the language of the two peoples together, the serpent had come into the Saxon forest, and the Germans had not originally recognized the Jewish serpent as the dragon, which German tradition warned against. Now — half consciously — they did.

But Hitler was no Siegfried fighting a dragon; he was a dragon maker as surely as Moses was a serpent maker.

Dragon, serpent, state, nation, reich, fatherland, body politic — all are words for something that as yet has no reality among humans. However these fictitious things can become realities. The possibility is a real and present danger for the entire human species. This same evolutionary regression has been “accomplished” by ants and certain species of bees. It is the danger ancient German mythology warned against.

If Hitler had shown himself to be the Siegfried that he apparently visualized himself to be, then the “Heil Hitler” of brave men in uniformed columns would have been taken up by brave men throughout the world. Since Thomas Jefferson wrote the *Declaration of Independence*, and the mythological American cowboy became a twenty-one inch shadow, no clear eyed leader has stood up among sovereign individuals and voiced the objective for which brave men — who remain discrete individuals — still stand ready to fight.

What would Hitler have said if he had been such a clear eyed leader? What would he have said if he had not been a demagog, trying to promote the same idea of a chosen people that three thousand years before had been promoted by those he now called enemy?

He would have proclaimed the eternal truth, which was silenced

by mass murder, individual torture, and priestly inquisitions in the Saxon forests. He would have proclaimed the eternal truth voiced by Jesus, Roger Williams, and Thomas Jefferson. The time was ripe. The stage was set. And he was speaking to the people who had held out longest for individual freedom. A Hitler with the soul of a Siegfried might have said:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all humans are created sovereign individuals, that every individual has all the rights and powers that the word-perversers of reality have said belong to a group-god or to a ‘sovereign state.’ We, who support these truths, now face a conflict with those who seek to pervert them.

“Two thousand years ago the armies of Julius Caesar tried to press the sovereignty of a man-created “authority” on the German people — a people fully aware that we inherited our own creative intelligence, as discrete human beings, from the aboriginal creative intelligence of the universe. We refused to recognize any man-created “authority.” We effectively resisted the armies of Caesar. As free sovereign individuals, voluntarily committing ourselves temporarily to the strategic planning of the most able leaders in our midst, we fought and retained our individual freedom — the freedom which the dragon sought to take from us. We have always retained that freedom, always, since unrecorded times when memories dissolve into mythology.

“We defeated the armies of Caesar. But then came the priests. They were kindly old men, who told us of Jesus. They said that Jesus had tried to tell others what we have always accepted as axiomatic. They quoted Jesus as saying, ‘You can disobey the gods people create and that may cause trouble, however gods made by men are something you can safely transgress against; but if you disobey the holy spirit within you, you are in danger of eternal damnation.’ The priests told us that Jesus was crucified by his own people, the Jews, for telling them this obvious truth, and that Jesus had died as a brave man should. We recognized that Jesus was more than a hero; we recognized that he was a god — he was expressing with his total being what we considered to be the one significant truth on which human salvation depends. We allowed the priests to tell the story of Jesus to our children.

“But the priests were underhanded schemers. When we were not there, they told our children about the miraculous ways of the outside world. Like pimps, making use of beautiful young women, they set up Catholic schools, and charmed the children into believing that ‘authoritative’ *words* should overrule native perception —

perception both of the inner voice and perception of external reality. Too late we discovered that it was not Jesus, but the very group-god of the Jews who had crucified Jesus, for whom our children were being taught reverence.

“Those children, conditioned by false words, grew up to become brainwashed leaders of brainwashed followers. On instructions from the Pope, they obeyed exactly the same orders given to the sons of Levi by Moses, when he said: ‘Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor.’ They killed individuals who would not accept ‘authority’ expressed in words. As soon as the priests had the protection of brainwashed men, they devised unbelievable tortures for all who *obeyed the spirit within themselves*.

“We have now had a thousand years of confusion, caused by those priests. We still have the slyly injected words of this Jewish group-god permeating our thoughts. The confusion has become a part of our literature. It will be generations before we can return to natural relations between individuals, and to natural relations between each individual and the creative intelligence of the universe. That is our own problem; that is the problem of Germans, who have been duped. We know what has to be done. It is up to us to remove the obstruction from our own eyes.

“However there are two further problems.

“The problem of next closest intimacy exists because we have allowed the Jews, themselves, to live among us, while they were still committed to a direction opposing ours. Now we all speak the same language, we have many of the same customs, and we have intermarried to such an extent that biological heritage cannot be distinguished by appearance in a high proportion of individuals. The problem exists because the great majority of those who have any faint trace of Jewish heritage commit themselves to Jewish traditions, and to the direction implicit in those traditions.

“While living among us, the Jews have acted cohesively, in accordance with the traditions and direction they perpetuate among themselves. Most of them have shown by their acts that their first allegiance is to the Nomadic Jewish Nation, that they are presenting a false front as citizens of the German Reich. This is not a passive cohesiveness.

“The majority of lawyers in Austria are Jews. The Jews substantially control the media in Germany. Grain by grain they insert their own ideas in small doses, which they can ‘legally’ defend. The total underhanded activity gradually weights the ideology of

books in libraries and schools toward Jewish pseudo-morality. Jewish pseudo-morality diametrically opposes the morality of the Germans.

“Jewish traditions promote the pseudo-morality that the welfare of the Jews *as a group* is the only valid objective. They teach that individuals within the group have value only to the extent that they contribute to the group’s welfare. They set forth no concept of sex but for the purpose of reproduction, for formation of ties that promote Jewish traditions, and for sensual “lust.” They ignore the very reality of the sexual love that recognizes — and glories in — the wonder of the sexual balance devised by the universal creative intelligence.

“We, Germans, see individual humans — with sex as a balance between two essential creative functions — as the advance echelon of evolution and the direction pointed by the universal creative intelligence. We, therefore, recognize that the traditions, the pseudo-morality, and the direction of the Jews are totally unreconcilable with the traditions, morality, and direction of the Germans.

“The universal creative intelligence obviously tolerates regression, all the way back to asexuality, in ants and bees. But those who regress become a separate species. As of now there is no separate species among humans, resulting from group pseudo-morality; but the direction is clear. Jews and Germans cannot exist together while pursuing opposite directions.

“The Jews among us, who want to abandon the Jewish serpent and make an unequivocal commitment to individualism, are welcome to remain. Those who want to continue in the Jewish direction must leave. If they stay without a formal commitment — without a formal commitment ratified by subsequent behavior — they will be considered as spies and saboteurs, holding citizenship in an enemy nation, while living under a false front as citizens of the Reich. They will be executed.

“We have a third problem, which makes it too precarious for us to tolerate known saboteurs in our midst. Now we must fight Judaeo-Communism for our very survival. An enemy — born of Jewish tradition — now stands fully armed at our Russian border. The Jewish pseudo-morality of making the individual nothing, and the ‘good’ of the group the only objective, is clearly manifest in Communism. In the Soviet Union, this Judaeo-Communism has replaced Judaeo-Catholicism, as the opiate of the masses; it is based on the same practice of placing words above reality. Communism is the Jewish serpent turned into the Judaeo-Communist dragon. The ways of the serpent have often been too underhanded

for immediate recognition — but the dragon we recognize and know how to fight.

“We fight a war on three fronts. We fight on three fronts against those who call individual sovereignty immoral. On two of these three fronts we must fight alone. On the third front — where the enemy is clearly visible — we now face the Jewish serpent become the Communist dragon. Judaeo-Communism has a clear objective of total world control. We appeal to all who have sufficiently overcome the pseudo-morality that has mutilated our German heritage, and has confused the teachings of Jesus for two thousand years, to join us. The future direction of the human species hangs on the outcome of the war for which battle lines are now forming on Germany’s eastern front.”

If Hitler had used his oratorical skill to put such opposition to group semi-organisms — Jewish and otherwise — into the kind of words that the occasion called for, he might have found individuals in great numbers everywhere ready to fight against groups trying to destroy them. But the sincerity that gives power to oratory would have required a different man. Hitler was not a Siegfried.

However, Hitler was sincere. It was the sincere voice of a confident leader, ready to fight and die for what he believed, that stirred memories of that long ago Saxon forest.

The memories of that almost forgotten Saxon forest still cry out for the attention of waking consciousness. Those memories cry out that we need to recognize, with our full consciousness, what was wrong with the situation signified by the life and death of Hitler. That conscious recognition is of vital importance to the future of the whole human species.

In the forest, where individual sovereignty held sway, there had been two equal sexes. The male’s will, to create by selective destruction, had been evenly balanced by the female’s will, to create by selecting what she willed to preserve and cherish. In the Saxon forest each man, who saw himself as a sovereign individual, also saw himself balanced by a woman equally sovereign. In all significant matters he consulted her as an equal. Two thousand years ago, impressed observers from other areas did not say “as an equal” but “as a goddess.” The observation was a valid one. *Reverence* for the sexual balance, designed by the universal creative intelligence, was basic to the concept of individual sovereignty. This reverence for woman — as that portion of the voice of the universal creative intelligence which was only a faint whisper in the depths of man’s being — this reverence was a consciously accepted control over masculine aggressiveness.

Only one side of the richly remembered past in the forest had been so magnified as to present the highly disciplined men of the German Reich in awe inspiring grandeur.

When Hitler rose as their leader to address the most spectacular group of fighting men ever assembled on earth, Eva Braun — in an apartment, deliberately obscured from public view by the Fuhrer — was attempting suicide; she was attempting suicide because she was alone and ashamed of her very existence — an existence that had been deprived of all purpose in the grand spectacle around her.

When Hitler rose to point out the Jews as the world’s greatest enemy, his battle cry was not: We must regain and preserve the individual sovereignty lost to us when clever priests, passing off Jewish group-making commandments as the teachings of Jesus, infiltrated the Saxon forests. Hitler was a brainwashed product of the very thing he professed to be fighting. He was raised a Catholic; he was enormously impressed by the serpent ceremonies of the Catholic Church; he seriously considered becoming a Catholic priest; the swastika was adopted from an engraving on the gate of a Catholic monastery that, as a child, he passed every day. He was committed to the flip side of the Catholic coin — the group serpent advocated by the Jews.

Although his biological roots went back to the forests where the teachings of Jesus were accepted as axiomatic, Hitler was the opposite of Jesus. If he had been a Jew, he could have been cheered by the Jews as the sort of messiah for which — after crucifying Jesus — they still waited. He had been brainwashed into accepting Jewish traditions. Like Moses, he was holding up a serpent; he was saying that all who are bitten by other serpents, and fail to look on this one, shall surely die. Like Moses he cried out: We are a people chosen to dominate the rest of the world because of the ancestral blood in our veins.

There is no record of a voice by the River Rhine saying: Repent those words and be baptized into the human species. The admonition of Jesus to first remove the obstruction from one’s own eye, before trying to treat a brother, was rejected by Hitler, as it was by the Jews. It conflicts with the craft of serpent makers.

The second World War was groups fighting groups. Jesus, or a ghost from the ancient Saxon forests, or anyone else advocating individual freedom, would have been a voice crying in the wilderness of rattling drums and marching feet. Such an advocate of individualism might have been crucified by a patriotic mob. Certainly such a one would have been sneered at, and spit upon — by allies and enemies alike — because he was “unpatriotic.” That is the

significant thing that had happened to the whole human species. No longer did any people, great enough to carry weight in the world arena, uphold the morality of individualism. The way of the serpent had finally come to dominate the entire world.

The Germans fenced the Jews in concentration camps and the Americans fenced the Japanese in concentration camps. When the war was being lost, the Germans killed the captive Jews. When the "patriotic" mob hysteria quieted after the war, the Americans released the Japanese.

In a bunker, Hitler and Eva Braun committed suicide together. The Romeo-Juliet situation is overshadowed by a fitting epitaph that comes to mind, as Hitler might have spoken it. With truth and sincerity, he could have said: I have been a poor caricature of a man, and I have been a worse lover, but, to the very end, I have been a patriot.

Had he made such a statement, he would doubtless have been proud of the self-appraisal. And no one could disagree with it. It would be difficult to find a more selfless, single-minded patriot than Adolf Hitler. Of such is the kingdom of serpents.

THE PRESENT WORLD CONDITION

Whether a serpent is made up of Germans or Jews, whether it is called "civil" or "religious," whether it is manipulated by a conspicuous dictator or an entrenched bureaucracy is not the problem. The whole human species is now in one common snake pit. The way of the serpent can lead only to extinction of the human species, or — what to me appears far worse — human regression. The problem is: How can individual integrity be restored?

We have talked of the spread of the history-old way of the serpent everywhere except in the Far East. There it has been slightly different.

The Japanese — like the German tribes before Catholic "Christianity" — originally saw the universal creative intelligence, expressed in nature, as being "the word of god;" they found "tongues in trees, books in running brooks, sermons in stone, and good in everything." Unlike the concepts of the early German tribes, that were blotted from history by priests, patient monks twisting "mythology," and the tortures of the inquisitions — Shinto, the religion of the Japanese, has survived. In it can be seen the essence of all religions, such as true Christianity, that are based upon and refer to observations of nature. Those who study nature can only conclude that all living things are direct descendants of the aboriginal creative intelligence; and that thoughtful humans are

distinguished from other living things only because more fully conscious, and because they have a language — which they misuse.

Shinto was subtly perverted with words because the Japanese Emperor wanted "authority." To give him "authority" the perception recited in Shinto was slightly deflected from its original concept — the concept that every living thing is a discrete descendant of god. It was modified to state the *partial* concept that "the Emperor is a descendant of god." By failing to mention all others, it implied that the divine heritage belonged exclusively to the emperor. The corollary to the implication was that others should obey his words.

Just where the Japanese will fit into World War III, now shaping up, is not easy to guess at this time. The exact direction of the Chinese is even harder to predict.

The Chinese have been close enough to the soil to let family evolve into serpent, or dragon, only within the area occupied by the Chinese people. Genghis Khan almost overran all Europe but, on the whole, the Chinese have not, in the past, aimed at universality. Now they have adopted Communism as their word-control system, and adopted the Marxist objective that communism must become the only international power. However Judaeo-Communism may undergo some modification in China. This is because the Chinese were not previously word controlled by Catholic Judaeo-"Christianity," as were the Russians.

Islam dominates the mideast and all of Africa. Mexico and South America continue Catholic.

The serpents or dragons of the world are now moving toward an all-out, world-wide contest. Total atomic war that destroys most of the people in the world appears almost inevitable. Whether it comes or not, the same question faces the human species — those now living or any few who survive. The question is this: Will there continue to be nothing but group-semi-organisms, which can only result in ultimate human regression, a regression that removes humans from the advance echelon of evolution? Or will we humans recover from our brainwashing and choose the way that has been pointed by the universal creative intelligence for three billion years — individual sovereignty?

Where do we look for an answer? The way of the serpent had enslaved most of the human species even before the dawn of history. Now it enslaves all.

Where do we look for a power that is both capable of controlling serpents and has the will to do so? Even if such an organization as the United Nations ever developed the capability, such an organiza-