

Was early Christianity Hijacked by Jews? And Islam Invented by Jews?

© Rerevisionist 2016, 2017, 2018 v. 14 Dec 2018

Quick Summary of this Article's 2000-Year Span:—

- Modern-day unremitting pushing by Jews worldwide for the fraud of 'Holocaustianity' suggests the same process may have been used in ancient times to push another Jewish fraud, 'Christianity'.
- Early Christian opinions are not known; or perhaps were/are hidden. It is possible their views were similar to 'white nationalists' now, in view of Rome being increasingly invaded by alien races, and the vast extension of the 'citizen of Rome' legalism to include non-Romans. I've seen a suggestion that a Welsh system was introduced to Rome. It is possible their opinions may have included opposition to Jews. And it is possible Jews reacted by taking over or corralling early Christianity.
- It must be understood that 'Christianity' originally was a Greek expression, probably NOTHING to do with the Jewish 'Yeshua' fiction. Most of the documents relating to the period were destroyed; critics attributed the destruction to Christians, but destruction is a Jewish modus operandi.
- Palestine is geographically near Greece, and Greek colonies in Asia Minor (now Turkey).
- The attempt to insert crude Jewish literary junk into Greek areas, civilised for centuries, failed.
- Whenever possible (Egypt; Babylon; some aspects of Rome; Europe; modern Germany, modern Iraq ...) Jews malign and destroy with complete disregard for truth. For this reason, serious historians must separate out the influence of Jews—for example, Nero vs rich Romans, Turkey (Google says '... cultural connections to ancient Greek, Persian, Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman empires'—omitting Jews), the 'black legend' of Spain, the 'glorious Revolution' in England, Napoleon moving east, Holland and Britain moving west, India, the opium wars, both world wars ...) if they are to have any hope of understanding events.
- The forced conversion of Rome took centuries; helped by the fraud of the Donation of Constantine.
- In the words of Bertrand Russell; '... the most important of Christian doctrines was 'we ought to obey God rather than man.' ... a precept to which nothing analogous had previously existed, except among the Jews.' This introduces the contrast between individual conscience, and the medium of the Church. Obviously, if Jews can persuade people they are official experts on God, they can infiltrate their own beliefs and manipulations.
- 'God' in Jewish writings is an irascible superior doing his circuits, and turning up unexpectedly. Maybe the word is mistranslated, and ought to be more like 'Lord'. The story of 'God', knocking up a 13-year old Jewish virgin, whose offspring is claimed to be the 'son of God', makes more sense than the absurd miraculous account.
- About a century later, Augustine's City of God was published. I've seen it suggested plausibly that the book was aimed at non-Jew populations, to try to reconcile them to Jewish taxation, ruin, opening of gates, and imposition of Christianity. Perhaps analogously to 'Puritanism' and vernacular Bible translations.
- One might speculate that Cohen, Kahan, Khan, Kuhn... were opposed to Caesars, Kaisers, Tsars...
- Islam appears to have been invented by Jews, who by then were at their last gasp, having sucked Rome dry.
- Islam was probably designed to convert indolent Arab masses into a force of thugs. Jews used them and manipulated them to suck parts of the Roman empire (such as Spain) and also to attack east though there were geographical obstacles.
- Particularly for US readers, Will Durant (next generation after Wells' Outline of History), was interested in Jews and Islam, and their invasions and damage.
- It's a possibility that Islam from the start was manufactured (by making secret promises to both sides) as two rival groups, Sunni and Shi-ite, for divide-and-rule purposes. Offering support to one or other depending on the situation later and their attitudes to Jews.
- Khazaria seems to have been targetted by colonisation, or conversion, or both, for Jew alliances.

- The Roman Church was heavily Jew-influenced and Symbiotic with Jews—both were largely parasitic, and had analogous parasitic attitudes. Jews called whites 'Christians' until very recently. Probably (1) the idea of Jews hating Yeshua was inserted to pretend the Church was a defence against Jews; (2) the supposed attack on usury was probably joint action by Church and Jews to keep the monopoly in lending to Jews, and away from Christians; (3) burnings of the Talmud, reported fairly often, were probably designed to remove the Talmud from inspection; (4) the Church propagandised poor people to damp down criticism of Jews; (5) the Church often aided Jews—possibly the reason Jews in the USA propagandise 'sanctuaries'; (6) it's possible the insistence on priestly celibacy was intended to keep out intelligence from priests—perhaps based on observation; (7) the Roman Church was far harsher and cruel than many people can easily understand now.

- Jews probably had a centuries-old hatred for Byzantine Christianity, culminating in its invasion and massacres by Muslim thugs. Much of the manoeuvring of alliances, weapons, and so on must be viewed as Jew-controlled.

jews in china

- Jews may have a folk belief in the excellence of the Middle Ages since they took over the western Church, had a large influence in Islam, and embarked on a series of invasions—think of (for example) Venice, events in Poland, and the invasion of Britain. This is not an attitude natural to westerners, and may help explain the zest of 'Jews' in harming the west. See below: Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Aristocrats

- Lorenzo Valla 'On the Donation of Constantine' (15th century) is usually treated simply as a discoverer of a fake, but it could well be that the time was considered ripe for an attack, and other material resurfaced. Many debunkings occur when vested interests shift.

- The words 'Jews' in Britain is relatively recent, coinciding more or less with the invention of printing in England. Probably much the same remark applies to other languages.

- 19th-20th century westerners were influenced to an almost infantile level by Biblical Jewish nonsense, leading to disasters such as the US Civil War, and the World Wars in Europe and elsewhere.

- Despite perpetual 'Jewish' lies, large numbers of people know by now that 'Communism' as installed in Russia in the Jewish Coup was 'Jewish'.

- Many 19th-20th century writers, not understanding Jews, believed tolerance of Jews to be a mark of enlightenment, which is why they were unable to understand the threat of Islam. They thought Islam was a tolerant religion, because it was thought to be fairly kind to Jews—without understanding that Islam had been set up by Jews, with the Quran as a military-style manual.

- New to me is the idea that 'Chinese Communism' was yet another Jew fix-up. I'm not sure I would have noticed if they'd chosen a Chinese name; however, rereading some of Joan Robinson, an economics professor at Cambridge of complete unintelligence and unoriginality, made it obvious enough. See Chronology of Jews (scroll down to sidebar)

Below: Importance of the Greeks as Target

Below: Consequences, including Islam.

Below: Variations on the theme - Joseph Atwill and Rome. And Greece.

Below: Extreme Slowness of Spread of Christianity

Below: Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Aristocracies

Below: United Nations as A Jew 'Religion'

This is an idea new to me, and perhaps genuinely new.

Here are a few starting-point puzzles –

Why did the Bible, when it was finally printed, include the 'Old Testament'? Why not just have Christian material? (I'm agnostic about the Latin (Roman Catholic) and presumably Greek (Byzantine) versions; for all I know the 'Old Testament' might have been treated as inferior, or consisted of different books).

Early Christianity seems to have been named after the Greek word meaning 'illuminated' or 'golden', in a similar sense to 'the light of the world' or 'bright spirit'. It may also mean 'anointed' or treated with 'holy oil'—as in chrism, sometimes modified to 'charisma'. The chi-rho and fish symbol is supposed to symbolise 'chr'.

The importance of the Greek Empire in early Christianity

The Romans appear to have had the idea of amalgamating and collecting together parts of extant religions from their part of the world, with the intention of psychologically unifying their unstable empire. Sensible enough, and perhaps a precursor to the idea of 'conversion', which must have seemed a new outlook to tribal peoples.

Constantine's genuine or supposed conversion in 312 A.D. is of course about three centuries after the supposed birth of 'Jesus Christ'

Evidence of such things as the faked 'Holocaust' and faked attribution of the 9/11 demolitions is impressive proof that Jews are persistent liars; they will never stop lying.

Evidence shows Jews have no scruples in manufacturing or destroying evidence.

Evidence shows Jews may claim to have invented or originated anything considered desirable. Modern evidence shows Jews, if they lied to claim to have taken part in establishing Christianity, will lie more, claiming progressively more influence over the past.

Whether ancient 'Jews' are related to modern 'Jews' is a controversial question; but the same written 'laws' and stories can reasonably be supposed to affect populations subject to them in similar ways. Ancient 'Jews' must therefore be suspected of being persistent liars, too.

A popular religion, perhaps Roman-slave-based, or perhaps more generally based, which professed to enlighten people, might reasonably be expected to include elements from Roman, perhaps with other tribal and national elements. There might (for example) have been books of Persian beliefs, of Babylonian beliefs, of Egyptian beliefs, and other long-established written sources. No doubt with Christian material showing why they were wrong or obsolete or unenlightened.

I'd like to suggest there may have been a process, over several centuries, in which Jews made up their own stories about 'Yeshua', also known as 'the Christ', or 'Jesus Christ', and insisted upon them in their Jewish group way, redefining 0 A.D. as a starting-point for their own purposes. Three centuries is about the length of time taken for Jews to take over England, then the USA, and invent and promote bogus histories, so the time scale seems plausible enough.

In short, I suspect the 'Old Testament' progressively was forced into Christianity, despite having no connection whatever with the origins of Christianity. And the 'New Testament' itself was Judaised, replacing genuine early Christian works.

The idea is reinforced by plenty of examples of bogus religions fostered by Jews, including many aspects of the Reformation, Quakers, Mormonism, and Christian Science.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE GREEK EMPIRE TO EARLY CHRISTIANITY

It's important to understand that early Jewish efforts seems to have been directed to Greece, not Rome. Latin Christianity was accidental, dependant on Constantine's victory. Consider that:

The 'Christos' idea, 'ichthyos' etc are Greek words. 'Episkopi' (bishops) are overseers in Greek. 'Peter' is a Greek word, for 'rock' And so on.

The Gospels were written in Greek; not Latin, Aramaic, Hebrew.

The Greek Testament is the original form of the books that make up the New Testament as they appeared in Koine [i.e. popular] Greek. To quote Wikipedia.

For two or three centuries, Greek was the language of the Roman church.

Greek (or 'Attic') cities dotted the coastline and interior in all the areas north and northwest of Palestine, including in what the Greeks called 'Asia Minor' (now Turkey). (See map). In other words, the area would be relatively familiar to them. Thessalonians were in a region of Greece. Corinth was a Greek city.

Greek cities in Asia Minor (what's now Turkey) continued to be important to Christianity: Nicaea, for example, Ephesus, and of course Byzantium. Note that there is some confusion over names: there are several of Alexandria; several Antiocheia (one of these being Tarsus).

Greek was the official language of the Roman Church during the first two or three centuries.

—Greek influence in about 1 BC.—

Black dots = Greek cities founded <336 BC

Green dots: Greek cities founded 336-1BC

Yellow dots: Non-Greek Hellenised cities

—Greek influence: Byzantine Empire about 1000— AD.

Blue: Greek Orthodox

Green: Slavonic Orthodox

Grey: Georgian Orthodox

Red: Latin Christendom.

Last Supper

REPRISE... same idea, different wording

After a few tests, I realise many people can't understand the new view of the New Testament I'm making. So I'll retry...

[1] Bear in mind that Jesus NEVER EXISTED; see abundant material on this point. The 'Acts' are not a historical record. The 'Gospels' are self-contradictory and ridiculous.

Put this together with

[2] Jews, today, TELL LIES ALL THE TIME. These are joint, collective lies, which persist over long stretches of time. And clearly have intention behind them. Motives include promoting wars, getting the Fed for Jews, changing propaganda schemes to face new enemies or to work for new wars for Jews, continual statistical lies on e.g. black crime, retrospective lies for example on the history of the Soviet Union, and the history of science, with a view towards skewing things to what they evidently think are Jewish interests.

So we have hypothesis

[3] I'm saying the NT was just another set of Jewish lies. Not stories, not history, not an honest attempt at a record. But purely for Jewish aim(s). Perhaps heading off an early religion in the Roman Empire, which looked likely to form a new composite religion. I won't name it, as that will confuse people.

Jews may have seen this, and thought "Oy vey, we can make money from this" or "Oy veh, God chose us to lead these stupid goyim" or "Oh vey, papyrus is cheap these days & we'll hire Greek scribes to write out our stories" or "We are the experts in official religion, so we're entitled to tell lies" or all four. So they wrote a whole set of stories, based around 'Yeshua', almost as Spielberg composed his absurd films, Weisel orated his lies for a lifetime, or Jewish 'historians' of the holohoax orchestrate and embroider their lies. The main point was to get them out, published, available to be forced onto people; further detail could come after. After a few centuries of intimidation and/or repetition and/or bribery and/or selection of fake leaders, they added the OT to the NT to reinforce their claims. This time frame is similar to e.g. forcing Jewish history over whites for the last four centuries or so.

I've seen the argument that US Jewish-controlled 'Universities' now all accept the Bible as reliable 'proof'—since even Marxists accept this! But of course if the whole thing was just a Jewish set of stories, like the 'mainstream media', Marxists would be likely to support it, whatever the evidence, just as Jews would.

NOTE THAT it doesn't even matter if there was a genuine, new, morally original figure, for example Lucius Calpurnius Piso. All they had to do was put forward their own lies and—provided there was sufficient promotional push and destruction of opposition—Piso would be forgotten. Jews often do this; for example, the leading physicist over the last few centuries was Newton, so Einstein was manufactured as a Jewish substitute leader. To take a totally different example, the Beatles were one of the most influential music groups of the 20th century. If Jews started a promotional myth that 'The Bagels' were the best ever, with their famous 'Abbey Schul' and 'Light Blue Album' achievements, who can tell whether this would be accepted in 300 years' time?

NOTE ALSO that the Bible uses many techniques which show in Jewish films. For example, scene-setting and opinion-setting. Many Jewish films start with fictional stuff on how actress X is the most beautiful woman in the world, collecting her beauty award, and gasped at by big crowds. In the same way, the 'Jesus' figure is supported by miracles, impossible events, epigrams supposed to suggest wisdom, marvels, scatterings of enemies, etc etc. Rather oddly, this feature seems to be the basis of many people's reaction, which is that the Bible is full of reliable and accurate material—something like the opposite of the truth.

AND NOTE that the Catholic Church of course was fronted by non-Jews, most of the time, but they had their own views on what mattered, leading to interminable cryptic disputes. No doubt the Roman Empire's collapse was helped by such rented people diverting assets away from the state, and from ordinary people. A situation recognisably similar to the present day.

If you see my point, I'd welcome serious comments. I'd particularly welcome comment on Churches post- about 500 AD, and interactions between Jews and non-Jews, and on e.g. money - Gold? Silver? paper money promotion? And the invention of Islam, and the Khazar issue. And of course promotion of wars and invasions, as parallels with modern times. Discoveries of new territories and the corresponding increases in ease of travel. Venice? Trade routes? William the Conqueror, Cromwell, Napoleon, the Reformation, Renaissance, Thirty Years War, 20th century Any insights, based on the idea that the Bible was a Jewish promo job; what were they trying to promote, in different eras? There may well be insights waiting to be seen and outed! [Added 21 Sept 2016)

ANOTHER NOTE: The New Testament does not mention Christianity at all—understandably, as the Church did not exist at the time. Only the fictional Jesus/Yeshua. So if some other religion (say, Mithraism, or Gnosticism, or RomanEmpirism, or Anythingism, or pan-Paganism, or revivedBabylonism) had emerged, the NT could be used against them, so Jews could muscle in. They

may have prepared stories, later dropped, to plan for these eventualities—in the same way modern 'Jews' prepare media campaigns against Germans, Vietnamese, whites, Iraqis, Moslems etc. [Added 22 Sept 2016]

SECOND REPRISE... same ideas, reworded

Here's a review of a little-known but forceful small book on Jesus as a myth.

A longer and more detailed book is Prof. G A Wells' *The Historical Evidence for Jesus* (1982; published by Prometheus Books in the USA). Neither of these authors, Robertson or Wells, has any concept of 'Kosher' forces which successfully agitated for, then imposed, 'Jesus Christ' on top of early Christianity, which, if it even existed as a genuine non-Jewish movement, had no place for a 'Yeshua'. Prometheus Books is an arm of the 'skeptics', US people funded by Jews; Wells would not have been published, had he been Jew-aware.

archibald-robertson-jesus Review of Archibald Robertson: *Jesus: Myth or History?*

Valuable, Condensed, Thorough, and Little-known Measured Criticism of 'Jesus' Considered as a Genuine Personage. Helps Pave the Way for Future Understanding. Review by Rerevisionist, Jan 7th, 2017 I have a copy of this book, in the original small-format red hardback of the 'Thinker's Library'. First printed 1946, second edition 1949. Most Thinker's Library volumes were bound in brown, with black printing, and with a one-colour on white dust-jacket in their Watts & Co. house style. There are other editions, some, I think, more or less pirated; or perhaps the copyright situation isn't clear. Whether these are accurate, I don't know; for interested readers I'd recommend an original copy, just in case.

The contents are more or less chronological, with Chapter 1 containing Christian writings, Chapter 2 writings by everyone else—with some overlap—and Chapter 3 leaping forward to post-Reformation times, no doubt because criticism of the Bible in the Middle Ages is difficult to find. I'd guess Robertson—British son of a theologian in Durham, and impeccably public-schooled and degreed—absorbed much of the material in his father's house. I haven't found any supposed texts showing the existence of Jesus, not found in Robertson. (The book has a fairly detailed helpful index).

My view is that, at the time of the various commentators, nobody influential appreciated the fact the Jews, who were, presumably, behind the Jesus promotion, seem to have a genetic tendency to lie—something which may go back to the days when language was still developing, in the remotest depths of time. Much as visual camouflage would not have evolved until sight had developed, modes of use of language could not predate speech. It's now clear that Jews have an exceptional tendency to lie—this may be compared to some creatures which lie [pun not really intended!] rather than fly, when in danger. Before the days of technological aids, such as writing, and, now, photographs and fingerprints and videos etc etc etc, convincing liars must have been hard to detect. It's now plausible that Jews made up the 'New Testament' as a Jewish fantasy, or film script, or advertisement, or promotion of a Jewish 'hero' aimed at gullible goyim. It's what they do. People who describe Christianity as a 'Jewish Trojan horse' are no doubt correct.

The idea that there was a ferment of religious ideas in the Roman Empire may also be untrue. It's now known that Jewish strategies include defaming and subverting and critiquing rival societies; it's entirely likely the supposed unease leading to religious change was a Jewish manufacture.

The remaining problem is how Jews could have done this; they didn't have the Federal Reserve to print them endless money. They may have had the ear of prominent Romans. They may have used unreliable, dysfunctional, disgruntled people to spread the word, much as non-Jewish 'Marxists' now, and in the past, often fit this description, and often co-operate in treachery which is mildly profitable to them.

A modern question which may occur to the reader is why a Jew-based publishing house should risk subverting their racial group with a serious presentation of the idea of the non-existence of 'Yeshua'. There have been alternations in self-images of Christians, and I'd guess their feeling was that Christians in 1945 were a bit too independent. The story of Jewish collaborators through the centuries hasn't begun to be described yet.

CONSEQUENCES AND POSSIBILITIES

Fairly modern map; the Aral Sea was once larger. Showing likely areas of religious takeovers by Jews.

Very roughly (places & names change):

UA=Ukraine, AM=Armenia. R=Rome. C=Constantinople. J=Jerusalem. M=Medina.

Arabs occupied a large area, and were well positioned to take over the remains of the Roman Empire, much of it around the Mediterranean Sea. Note: 'The established presence of Islam in the region that now constitutes modern Turkey dates back to the latter half of the 11th century, when the Seljuks started expanding into eastern Anatolia' says Wikipedia. Note: a silk route between Europe and China went north of the Khazar enclave, marked K. The Khazars had mountain and water barriers to the south, and were well-positioned to act with (or against) Silk Route merchants—and Huns, and Mongols, and the Chinese. And the Kaifeng Jews, visually indistinguishable from Chinese as a result of interbreeding.

K: the Khazar area is often spoken of as a 'buffer', e.g. by Koestler. But it is NE of the Byzantine Empire, and N of Islam.

- ISLAM can convincingly be claimed to have been a Jewish invention. This is written up at Jews, Christianity, Abrahamic and I won't repeat it here, but it is entirely possible Islam was assembled, over a long time, by people who could write, and who wanted to marshal the bands of miscellaneous desert dwellers and traders into a violent unintelligent force, for theft, conquest, and subjugation. Hence the difference in style between Christian and Islamic writings—they were designed for different purposes, like romantic movies vs violent movies. Various Hadiths might be compared to Judaic commentaries and Gospels and Apocrypha—extra writings regarded as supplementing the 'holy' texts, and of course allowing insertion of later updates or changes or policies.

- Before Islam It was widely accepted the region was weakened by endless futile wars. As an example, here's H G Wells: ... the almost incessant, dreary and futile wars of Byzantine and Sassanids [i.e. Persians; the then-spelling] that devastated Asia Minor for three centuries ... suffer[ed] effacement by ... Islam. How much of this was due to Jews is not known to me, but it's a likely hypothesis that they were involved.

A Jewish motive for inventing and passing off a new religion to Semites would have been to take over what's now Turkey, using allies less clever than Greeks; see the notes above. This of course happened after Mohammed. At the present day, bear this in mind when looking at Russia (hated by Jews) and Islamic invasion.

Here are just a few suggestive comments on 'Islamic Revisionism', modified from a Wikipedia article—

- The new [revisionist] movement originated at SOAS, University of London [School of Oriental and African Studies] in 1977 and 1978. SOAS has a similar origin to the LSE, notorious of course for Jew funding and supremacism.
- Islam did not rise among polytheistic pagans in the desert, but ... where Jewish and Christian texts were well-known.
- The connection of Muslims and Jews was very close in the early times of Islam. Also Jews were called "believers" and were part of the Umma. Antisemitic [sic] texts as e.g. the slaughtering of the Jewish tribe of the Banu Qurayza came into being long after Muhammad when Islam separated from Judaism.

The existence of Muhammad is debated, like the existence of Jesus. Note an important differences between Christianity and Islam: Islam was headed by families, in a way which didn't happen (or wasn't successful, or was not understood, or was national) with Christianity. Here's Jews and Muslims - Very Similar Violent Parasitical Tribal Cults though it was written before I understood the precedence of Jews.

On historiography of Islam for about a century, in the English-speaking world:—

- 1844 perhaps worth knowing Baha'i seems to have been invented about this time, with no doubt fake roots in Palestine and Persia/Iran. It appears to be a tamed version of Islam, which was secretly encouraged by Britain.
- 1910/11 Encyclopædia Britannica 'Islam' refers immediately to Mahomet, article by David Samuel Margoliouth. Mahomet is regarded as a one-man founder, in the same manner as 'Jesus Christ' is regarded as a one-man founder. Mahomet's early history is presented as an impoverished man, accumulating followers secretly, while also marrying into Jewish money. Probably all this is an establishing myth, since there must have been organisation. Violence, rape and theft are not particularly deprecated. It's typical of most presentations of Islam (and Christianity, and Judaism) that there is no attempt to indicate whether the world would have been better without it.
- Wells' Outline of History 1920-25 is full-blooded 'Arabian Nights' description, 'great religion', 'brilliant campaigns' 'stoning in the street', 'favourite wife', largely taken from contemporary books. 'Islam prevailed because it was the best social and political order the times could offer. .. everywhere it found ... peoples robbed, oppressed, bullied, uneducated, and unorganized, and ... selfish and unsound governments ...' Well, maybe. Jews had considerable media power in Wells's time, and this attitude must have had Jewish approval at the time.
- Joseph McCabe's The Splendour of Moorish Spain 1935 must have been part of the Jewish propaganda push against Christianity, which it must have felt was displaying unseemly insight into Jews. From verbal testimonies I'm fairly sure this book was regarded as a discovery of a past golden age. And as support for Jews in the so-called Spanish Civil War.
- William & Ariel Durant The Story of Civilization Volume IV 1950 shows a greater realism about Islam, including the little-known Muslim invasions of India. Possibly the experiences of two world wars, and of Jews in the USSR, prompted this angle on Islam; maybe the wars between India and the newly-invented Pakistan contributed.
- 1976 New Encyclopædia Britannica Islām, article by Fazlur Rahman of University of Chicago, and Islām, History of, by John Alden Williams, University of Texas, have little on early Islam—just as early Christianity is, or is made to seem, mysterious. There is also nothing much on the US and North Africa, Turkey and Jews, Indonesia and African penetration, Saudi Arabia, and all modern issues in general such as Fatwah. All this must be part of Jewish control over publications.

- Karen Armstrong's Islam 2000 in which several wheels have come full circle. Here's my review Karen Armstrong: Islam. There has been, under Jewish control, a whole school of similar competence to the Jewish publicity for supposed black invention and creativity.

[A few notes from Durant's Story of Civilization Vol 1, Chapter 16, taken from Internet. His sources here were:

Mountstuart Elphinstone, History of India (2 vols, 1841)

V A Smith, Oxford History of India (Oxford, 1919) including a Moslem chronicler, Tabaqat-i-Nasiri; and extracts from Ibn Batuta

Ernest Binfield Havell, History of Aryan Rule in India, from the earliest times to the death of Akbar (1918). (Includes Buddha and Asoka).

It's worth quoting the Durants: The Mohammedan Conquest of India is probably the bloodiest story in history. It is a discouraging tale, for its evident moral is that civilization is a precarious thing, whose delicate complex of order and liberty, culture and peace may at any time be overthrown by barbarians invading from without or multiplying within. Mrs Durant seems to have been Jewish; so she had the motive to understand Jewish influences, on Muslims and Christians, and suppress them in Jewish fashion. Anyway; here are a few passages, not specifically on the Hindu Kush:–

Six years later he sacked another opulent city of northern India, Somnath, killed all its fifty thousand inhabitants, and dragged its wealth to Ghazni. In the end he became, perhaps, the richest king that history has ever known. Sometimes he spared the population of the ravaged cities, and took them home to be sold as slaves; but so great was the number of such captives that after some years no one could be found to offer more than a few shillings for a slave. Before every important engagement Mahmud knelt in prayer, and asked the blessing of God upon his arms. He reigned for a third of a century; and when he died, full of years and honours, Moslem historians ranked him as the greatest monarch of his time, and one of the greatest sovereigns of any age.

Seeing the canonization that success had brought to this magnificent thief, other Moslem rulers profited by his example, though none succeeded in bettering his instruction. In 1186 the Ghuri, a Turkish tribe of Afghanistan, invaded India, captured the city of Delhi, destroyed its temples, confiscated its wealth, and settled down in its palaces to establish the Sultanate of Delhi—an alien despotism fastened upon northern India for three centuries, and checked only by assassination and revolt. The first of these bloody sultans, Kutb-ud-Din Aibak, was a normal specimen of his kind—fanatical, ferocious and merciless. His gifts, as the Mohammedan historian tells us, “were bestowed by hundreds of thousands, and his slaughters likewise were by hundreds of thousands.” In one victory of this warrior (who had been purchased as a slave), “fifty thousand men came under the collar of slavery, and the plain became black as pitch with Hindus.”

Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlak acquired the throne by murdering his father, became a great scholar and an elegant writer, dabbled in mathematics, physics and Greek philosophy, surpassed his predecessors in bloodshed and brutality, fed the flesh of a rebel nephew to the rebel's wife and children, ruined the country with reckless inflation, and laid it waste with pillage and murder till the inhabitants fled to the jungle. He killed so many Hindus that, in the words of a Moslem historian, “there was constantly in front of his royal pavilion and his Civil Court a mound of dead bodies and a heap of corpses, while the sweepers and executioners were wearied out by their work of dragging” the victims “and putting them to death in crowds.”

The Moslem historians were almost as numerous as the generals, and yielded nothing to them in the enjoyment of bloodshed and war. The Sultans drew from the people every rupee of tribute that could be exacted by the ancient art of taxation, as well as by straightforward robbery; but they stayed in India, spent their spoils in India, and thereby turned them back into India's economic life. Nevertheless, their terrorism and exploitation advanced that weakening of Hindu physique and morale, which had been begun by an exhausting climate, an inadequate diet, political disunity, and pessimistic religions. The usual policy of the Sultans was clearly sketched by Ala-ud-din, who required his advisers to draw up "rules and regulations for grinding down the Hindus, and for depriving them of that wealth and property which fosters disaffection and rebellion."

Half of the gross produce of the soil was collected by the government; native rulers had taken one-sixth. "No Hindu," says a Moslem historian, "could hold up his head, and in their houses no sign of gold or silver... or of any superfluity was to be seen. ... Blows, confinement in the stocks, imprisonment and chains, were all employed to enforce payment." When one of his own advisers protested against this policy, Ala-ud-din answered: "Oh, Doctor, thou art a learned man, but thou hast no experience; I am an unlettered man, but I have a great deal. Be assured, then, that the Hindus will never become submissive and obedient till they are reduced to poverty. I have therefore given orders that just sufficient shall be left to them from year to year of corn, milk and curds, but that they shall not be allowed to accumulate any property."]

- On CHINA and Mongolia and the Far East, note the fact that the Khazar area, on the extreme east of Europe, was along a route to/from China. It may have developed, as another Jewish enclave, to control that route, or as a half-way safe territory, or tax point.

- In EUROPE, cities may have been partly under Jewish influence. Jews have a tradition of living in ghettos in cities, probably a genetic inheritance from millennia of city parasitism. There is a relation between cities and cathedrals; and between smaller towns and parish churches. It's tempting to suggest that Christian parasitism was packaged out—Cathedrals and Bishops in cities providing protection for Jew monopolists; with country land ownership going to the Church, and country-dwellers still thought of as pagans.

There are astonishing numbers of churches in Europe, and it's possible they absorbed labour, skill, and materials in a similar way to the pyramids, or to modern arms and bases: productivity arranged under the control of elites, which preferred waste and impressiveness to anything useful to ordinary people.

Are Christians in any way sincere about their beliefs? Briefly, I'd suggest not. There have of course been creeds and Councils; and Heretics. But at times of important change, influence and money trumps beliefs, with The Vicar of Bray as the English exemplar. The Great Schism was regarded at the time as important; but most Catholics have no clue what the points at issue were. During the Reformation in England, almost all the clergy changed sides, apart from a handful of recusants, though Henry VIII's treatment of the Pilgrimage of Grace must have discouraged the others from not converting. During the entire 19th century, the English clergy must have had lives easier than ever before, with guaranteed livings in numerous parishes all around the country. They might have raised questions about Jews; they might have probed into such events as the Opium Wars; but almost all did nothing to help civilisation. They contributed nothing to the understanding of both world wars. They resembled the BBC, but before radio and recordings were invented. Now, they promote immigration, without the slightest understanding of its effects, and they continue to say nothing about wars.

On Wars, Christendom, since 1914, has been a dead letter, probably because Jews split it very successfully and very disastrously. When Rome, then the Roman Empire, became officially Christian,

they fought wars until exhaustion, very likely for the reason the USA has wars now, at the instigation of Jews. Jews switched to Islam, making it very warlike (with peaceful bits—as with Christianity, all options were covered). Muslims became the new model thug armies. The way to examine history since Christianity is to assume it was covertly Jewish, and wars would have been covertly pro-Jew, just like modern wars. Possibly the Vikings et al did not wish to pay a percentage to Jews and/or the Church; certainly they seem to have combined trading with anti-Church violence. People influenced by Victorian historical teaching regard Alfred as uniting England under Roman Catholicism (he learned Latin) and fighting Vikings, seem to forget that 150 years or so later William the Bastard of Normandy was funded for his own Christian invasion. Many people by now realise wars and civil wars with Holland, Spain, England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Russia and endless more cannot be understood without the Jewish covert operations. Wars between Christians (including of course 'wars of religion') have been common enough, though they seem to have not been examined as a separate category, probably because of the difficult issues raised.

[Back to top of this page]

VARIATIONS ON THE THEME. JOSEPH ATWILL AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE

- Joseph Atwill is the author of 'Caesar's Messiah: The Roman Conspiracy to Invent Jesus' (2005 1st edition). It's described as 'speculative non-fiction'. His other books and broadcast aren't (in my view) very impressive. He seems to have been a journalistic-style author, but his back-up researchers seem weighty enough. I had not heard of him; my personal desktop search reveals nothing. His surname is possibly Jewish; his book may indeed be a diversion from the attribution of fakery to Jews. The following notes I think are more or less correct, though the chronology needs adjustment:—

- His working model is that, as far as Jews/Israelites/whatever were concerned, the thirty-plus years assigned to Jesus were wartime, a time of wars with Rome. The Gospels/ Acts and so on were circulated at the end of that period, as though written about forty years earlier, and ignoring war actions. Any prophecies within them could accurately 'predict' such events as a Roman wall around Jerusalem, and destruction of the Temple—they had already happened!

[Propaganda often ignores wars, however obvious they were to people at the time: Elizabethan England is presented as a merry time, despite a huge war with Spain. The Second World War is presented by propagandists as the 'finest hour', 'good war'].

- Copying of symbols and stories (as many anthropologists and others have noted) by Christianity are frequent. The ascension to heaven, the virgin birth, vague ethical ideas, death of a God, are examples. Christian symbols include the anchor, boat, fish, olive branch, and star—and these were symbols on Flavian dynasty coins. Atwill's etymology of 'Christ' is not from the Greek.

- Atwill says the Maccabean dynasty was ended by the Herods. And he says the Flavian emperors of Rome replaced the previous dynasty, which ended with Nero. After these replacements, rich and influential families included the Flavians, the Herods and the Alexanders.

[Atwill seems to accept the blackwashing of Nero, and seems unaware of the possibility that Nero was a reformer, somewhat like Hitler, who was removed and denigrated by the Flavians and their supporters after their coup].

- Titus Flavius Vespasianus (son of Vespasian) though emperor for only a few years is central to Atwill's revision. Vespasian had been advertised as a God, Titus therefore being the Son of God. Josephus (renamed Titus Flavius Josephus) wrote his Jewish Wars history, essentially under Roman

patronage; how much (if any) is true, is not known to me, but Josephus and the Flavians must have presented a unified view—if they were on good terms.

- Atwill uses the word 'typology' to cover stereotyped stories, with sequential passages copied with modifications into a 'new' work, relying on an 'idealised prototype'. A rather clumsy expression. One example is Matthew, which is taken from the Moses story, with about ten sequential parallel passages linked by unimportant material. Or so Atwill maintains. There is of course plenty of scope for linguistic problems, abbreviations and incomprehensible words, puns, jokes, double meanings, and long-disused expressions familiar at the time.

But TheZOG of theZOG.info November 7, 2018

Joseph Atwill is a Jewish fraud and very likely a C.I.A. agent. His conspiracy theory about the origin of Christianity is 100% false and implausible on its face. Atwill also doesn't have the qualifications to write or speak about this subject. He doesn't even know Greek, and his entire conspiracy theory depends on textual parallels between Josephus and the NT gospels, which are both written in Greek! Richard Carrier wrote a blog article dissecting Atwill's conspiracy theory several years ago. You can find it on his website. (Also note how Atwill's conspiracy theory conveniently blames Romans for the invention of Christianity, when in fact it was Jews who invented it. [... I know Christianity was invented by Jews is because the New Testament and all 41,000 separate sects of Christianity say it was. ... The Roman ruling elite regarded Judaism and Christianity as weird Middle Eastern superstitions (which of course they were, and are)...]

If you're interested in the Jesus myth theory and the origins of Christianity, I would stick with Richard Carrier, Robert Price, and Earl Doherty (the source of Carrier's Jesus myth theory). Carrier and Price both have relevant PhD's. Doherty doesn't have a PhD, but he's a knowledgeable amateur (unlike Atwill).

[Fomenko uses a technique of analysing lengths of reigns to suggest a lot of dynastic history was simply made up to conform to a known, or believed, pattern. And computerised examination of texts and their structures and vocabularies has been tried, I hope with genuine texts.]

[Back to top of this page]

Christianity's slow spread in Europe

EXTREME SLOWNESS OF SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY

- Contrary to what most westerners seem to believe, Christianity spread with painful slowness over Europe and Russia, and other areas. Probably it is embarrassing for its acolytes to admit this. And in fact it's even slower than might be imagined, since the conversion or swearing an oath by a leader often failed to penetrate other members of their groups.

To this day Estonians are aware their country was forced into Catholicism. The last European country to convert nominally was Lithuania in the 14th century!

- This map was downloaded, and judging by the typography and other cartographical clues was drawn up in the 1920s or 1930s. Some areas are vague, very likely because borders of countries, and their names and identities, fluctuated widely .

[Back to top of this page]

JEWES, CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, ARISTOCRACIES

There is still considerable hostility between the various brands of Christianity. As awareness of traditional Jew behaviour expands, there ought to be suspicions or discoveries relating to what after all appears to be just another Jewish propaganda trick. I've selected two specimen bits of writing to illustrate how this process may work itself out. The first is from Miles Mathis's paper, [england.pdf](#) Miles Mathis, June 15th, 2016, on three-way war between Jews, Catholics, and Protestants: ... let us pause to look at Catherine de' Medici. She was Queen of France from 1547 to 1559. Note the first date, and the number 47. King Henry II died in mysterious circumstances in 1559, at age 40. ... [But] that story looks manufactured. ... we find Catherine wouldn't let anyone see the King on his sick bed, so there was no way to confirm this diagnosis or cause of death. All she would have had to do is pay off a doctor. The King [Henry II of France] was more likely poisoned. We have already seen several rumors of poisoning from these families, and it was a common ploy at the time. For more evidence the story is false, we find a strange reaction from Montgomery, who had up to that time been savagely repressing Huguenots in the Scotch Guard: he joined them and waged war against France. I suggest he was chosen as a scapegoat for the King's death and didn't appreciate it. I also suggest that with the murder of his King, he became aware of what the Medici faction was up to: it had just performed a successful coup through the Queen. So Montgomery's war wasn't against France, it was against the Medicis. He should be seen as a hero.

This means the religious wars of that period have been sold to us under a false pretext. We are told it was between the Catholics and the Protestants. But seeing that Paris was ruled by the Jewish Medicis, we see it was a war of the Medicis against the Christian Church more broadly. Catherine ordered the rich Huguenots murdered in the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre not because they were Protestant, but because they were prominent aristocrats and Christian. Also, at Wikipedia we are told

Throughout Europe, it “printed on Protestant minds the indelible conviction that Catholicism was a bloody and treacherous religion”.

That's convenient for the Medicis, right? We see that these religious wars did double duty:

- 1) getting rid of rich aristocrats whose properties could then be seized,
- 2) blackwashing Catholicism by making Catholics look like the bad guys. But we have just seen it wasn't really Catholics ordering the Huguenot genocide: it was the Medicis. The history of France has been rewritten by Jewish “scholars”. And a comment from me, Rerevisionist, 3 Nov 2017 posted to The Occidental Observer's piece on Agobard of Lyon, but disallowed, presumably by a moderator, and not published.

It seems to be impossible to get Catholics, or at least Roman Catholics, to understand that Jews invented the whole fantasy of Jesus etc and then, holohoax-style, repeated their lies for centuries until they managed to insert their invention and get it established as a money-maker. The ‘Reformation’ was largely a Jewish-funded thing; but so was the ‘French Revolution’. Most Roman Catholics don't understand the simplest dynamics of their ‘Faith’ and can't be expected to oppose Jews in any effective way—as of course Jews are perfectly aware as they toy with it. The same sort of comment applies to Protestants too, obviously. You're [someone hoping increase in 'Faith' would go with decrease in Jew influence] trying to build a house, not on sand, but on carefully-compacted rubbish.

[Back to top of this page]

THE UNITED NATIONS AS ANOTHER JEWISH POLITICAL RELIGION

This idea occurred to me as I wrote a review of Alex Comfort's *Authority and Delinquency* (1950; 1970)

Comfort's introduction begins: In 1948 the Beirut conference of UNESCO initiated a large-scale international research team ... on the causes of international and intranational hatreds and tensions. ... [including] a study of the methods by which Fascism was established, and ... the presence of psychopathic or criminal elements in the government of states. ... followed by the inevitable unfocussed discursive comments on research, psychiatry, criminology, and the 'Unesco Tensions Project'.

Note Comfort's assumption that 'Fascism' involved psychopaths or criminals, the omission of Jews, and the conference site, in Lebanon in 1948, where Jews were starting wars—as usual. The UN deserves study; and of course has an intimate connection with Jews—Ashley Montagu, real name Israel Ehrenberg, in effect a founder of 'anti-racialism', building on the pseudoscience of the Jew Franz Boas, being a typical specimen. 'Anti-racialism', obviously something Jews never believed in, was a plank of the UN, in effect part of its new religion, intended to appeal to all races, except perhaps whites and Asians. My book reviews include Gunnar Dahlberg (*Race, Reason, Rubbish*) and Martin Gardner as just two writers of the 'anti-racialist' dogma; Gunnar Myrdal was another, and Joan Robinson and Richard Dawkins were later.

But as with other religions, Jewish control was never complete, and the equivalents of heretics and reformations and national orthodox variations would be expected.