

ROME AGAINST ETRURIA

Is the singular, unexplainable violence with which ancient Rome destroyed the centres of Etruscan power, almost so far as to obliterate any trace of the civilisation and of the language of that mysterious people, an accidental fact, or does it conceal a profound meaning? Is it a mere war episode, or does it hide the conflict between two antithetical civilisations, the imperative for one of them to destroy, not only spiritually, also materially, the other [in order to assert itself.]?

This problem is not devoid of interest even outside the narrow field of scholars: it even acquires a special importance in the context of the current racial research. It is well known that, until recently, the continuity of civilisation between Rome and Etruria was a commonplace of the usual stereotyped history. The Romans, as such, were described more or less as barbarians, who owed to the Etruscans many of the rudiments of their civilisation. This is not the way things appear from a less superficial point of view. Firstly, [and for those who have been following our writings it is almost unnecessary to insert this reminder,] the concept of the 'barbarism' of early Romans is to be considered with caution.

Here, one witnesses the mistake of confusing genuine civilisation with the acquisition of civilised refinements in a urban, literary ['aesthetic' instead of 'literary'], formalistic, sense. A race can be the bearer of a clear, solid and virile style of life and of a direct awareness of spiritual forces (this is what amounts to a true civilisation to us), with or without these exterior forms of refinement, erudition and culture, which are almost always a prelude to decadence.

This is our view of the beginnings of Rome, as well as, besides, of those of Greece and of [any Aryan civilisation, as well as of] Middle Ages themselves.

Certainly, the Roman civilisation resumed various elements of the Etruscan civilisation. However, this does not solve our problem, since we must decide whether these elements constitute within Romanity an integral component or an alien and adulterating [, not to say infecting,] residue. Thus, we arrive at the plane to which the question is to be actually referred: it is not the plane of the exterior and so-called 'positive' testimonies, because these are like the letters of the alphabet : the same ones can be found in sentences which, nevertheless, have different meanings. It is rather the plane of a metaphysic of history, that is to say of a consideration which seeks in the first place to grasp the soul of a civilisation and of a race in order to interpret accordingly each of its aspects.

The thesis of the antiromanity of the Etruscan civilisation, besides, is not new. It was already expressed by a Swiss philologist and archeologist of genius, Bachofen, in 1870 ; [it was posed by Michelet and] it was

reassumed by the French Piganiol in 1917 ; it forms the basis of the recent and much discussed work of Grünwedel and now influences the main interpretations made in Germany, including Alfred Rosenberg's, of our history on a racial basis. ["; in some of its aspects, it reappears also in Italian writers, such as de Sanctis and Mosso, and, curiously, it is rather toyed with today by various reinterpretations of our history which adopt the 'racist' basis. What's more, this thesis seems to act suggestively also outside the technical field, in the literary one. A recent interesting novel of the Austrian writer Franz Spunda, "Romolo", meant to dramatise the - so to speak - inner history of Roman origins, is based precisely on the antithesis between the symbols of the eagle and the wolf peculiar to the forces of the creator of Romanity, and those of the Etruscan world of the Mothers, to which Romulus belonged, but from which he would have separated by asserting a higher principle" instead of "and now influences the main interpretations made in Germany, including Alfred Rosenberg's, of our history on a racial basis".]

What would be, specifically, the terms of the opposition between Rome and Etruria considered as symbols of civilisation?

1. The Etruscan civilisation has a fatalistic tone. It is true that the Etruscans, besides the gods of nature[and earth - to which previous researchers thought to be able to refer on the whole the Etruscan religious horizon], knew a world of celestial divinities, with Tinia as master. These very celestial divinities - dii consentes - do not possess any true autonomy, they are like shadows, from which hangs a loathsome occult power with its steadfast law, that of the dii superiores et involuti. All this is in opposition to the practically heroic conception of life peculiar to Romanity. The Etruscans felt the power of destiny so far as to foresee [gloomily] the end of their own nation. The Romans believed in the eternity of their imperium and in the irresistible fulfillment of everything that they had firmly decided.

[If it can be objected that the Greeks too believed in a destiny to which the Olympians themselves were compelled and that in the Hellenisation of their civilisation Romans espoused similar ideas, with this we only shift the emphasis of the problem. Greek history on the contrary develops through antitheses which are similar to those presented by the Roman history. What the Etruscans represented towards Rome was represented, towards the Dorico-Achaean conquerors and their spirituality, by the substratum of the conceptions and of the cults of pre-Hellenic aborigines, mainly Pelasgians. It is to that substratum that are to be referred elements which appeared in the whole of Greek civilisation, but are not Greek and acted in a sense of alteration on the original, that is to say Dorico-Achaean, Greek spirit]

2.The Romans had a clear and aristocratic vision of the beyond, very closely akin to the spirituality of the 'Olympian' type, common to the cycle of all the great Indo-European civilisations[among which the best known is precisely the Dorico-Achaean one of the Homeric and pre-Homeric period]. They did not fear death. They imagined, for the great and the heroes, the privilege of a divinised and bright immortality[conception of the dei semoni], and, for others, of the mute but not painful [and fearful] passing in the larval existence of Hades

['Erebus' instead of 'Hades'] [or in the mystical impersonal forces of the life of a given stock (lares, penates)]. They had a clear system of rites, which in a virile manner regulated the relations between men and gods [, once again, without terrors or slavish prostrations]. On the contrary, among the Etruscans, it is the sense of the demonic which prevails - "The terror of the underworld is expressed in figurations imitating the terrible demons of the ghoulish imaginations of the Middle Ages, such as the horrible monster Tuchulcha". [the puteal (1) of the consus altar (2), conceived of as a dreadful opening point of subterranean forces, within which a Telluric demon waited for the blood shed in the Circus games, reminds us often of the Etruscan altar].

3. Here there was an opposition between the Roman rituals and the Etruscans', between Roman augurs and Etruscan aurspices. We cannot elaborate on this point, because we would have to enter too technical a field. [what is already significant is the legend according to which the Etruscan discipline, that is the science of aurspices, far from having 'celestial' origins, had been revealed by a demon of the earth, Tages. Besides, this discipline, whose books, according to a Roman testimony, filled with "horror and fear", shows the strictest analogy with Chaldean sacerdotal science, itself more or less fatalistic and lunar-mathematical, far from the solar and heroic form of spirituality that Egypt itself presented]. On the whole, in this respect, the Etruscan type would be opposed to the Roman type, just as the exorcist priest is to the sacred patrician, to the warrior or spiritualised pater familias. [the Etruscan princes themselves, the Lucumoni, claimed to be 'Sons of the earth'.]

4. A further opposition is the preponderant part that the woman had among Etruscans, sometimes amounting to a true primacy. There are Etruscan remnants of matriarchal customs, designations of the son with the name of the mother rather than with the name of the father [or, in the first place, with the name of the mother], according to the use of the Pelasgians, the Mediterraneo[-Asian] pre-Hellenic and pre-Aryan populations, which have also in common with the Etruscans a placing in the woman of religious authority (Mosso) [and a special dignification of the woman.]. In sharp contrast with this, there is the rigid Roman system of the paternal right, of the patria potestas. The dignity and the influence which the 'matrona' had in Rome would according to this view be not so much an authentically Roman character as a mark of a previous and different civilisation [to which is also peculiar the legend of Tanaquil, an Etruscan legend whose deepest meaning is that the royal dignity itself is mediated by a feminine principle.]

5. Finally, [to some people] the new symbol of the West would have incarnated in Rome, whereas the Etruscans, along with other [Italic pre-Roman] races, would have been dominated by the symbol of Asia. [this thesis, however, is doubtful or, to put it in a better way, one-sided.] There is no doubt that there were affinities between aspects of the Asiatico-Mediterranean, Pelasgian and Hittite civilisations. The most wide-spread tradition of the imperial era is precisely the one which ascribes to the Etruscans an Asiatic origin, summed up in Seneca's word : Tuscos Asia Sibi Indicat. [But, here, 'Asia' remains a vague designation, and, as we know, from the ethnic and philological point of view, the problem of Etruscan origins remains, despite so many researches, wrapped in mystery. What is on the contrary possible is to speak of a whole cycle of Mediterraneo-Meridional civilisations, spreading from the ancient Columns of Hercules to Syria, resuming the ancient Iberic civilisations, a part of the Italic ones, the pre-Hellenic-Pelasgian ones, and so on ; and to oppose to this group new civilisations, bearers of the specifically Indo-European spirit, to which Rome and Greece belonged.]

On this basis, the thesis of anti-Etruscan Rome has the right to appear among the hypotheses which can best lead to a suggestive reconstruction of the inner, spiritual side of Roman history. [This history appears as everything but linear]. This history ["Rome" instead of "This history"] expresses a new principle [embodies - we could say - a revolutionary force], which, to assert itself, had to gradually eradicate an antithetical civilisation. The story of the Monarchic period is that of a seesawing struggle between warlike Roman aristocracy and the hegemonistic attempts of Etruscan and sacerdotal elements or similar forces. Externally destroyed, the Etruscan element crept into the inner life of Rome.[Basically, it is Etruria which is at work behind the Sybilline Books which are responsible for the most serious alterations of Roman spirituality.] Basically, it is a type of Etruscan priest who, in the moment of panic of the punic wars, opens the doors of Rome to the first exotic [Asian] cult, [characteristically topped by a feminine figure] : the cult of Cybele. [Also Etruscans are the Tarquins, significantly connected with feminine figures and themselves the anti-aristocratic partisans of the plebs]. Also Etruscans are the Aruspices who, out of hatred for Rome, want the statue of Horace Cochlite to be buried ; but when it is, on the contrary, placed in the highest honor, fortunate events follow for Rome, contrary to the predictions of the Aruspices, who, accused of treason, confess their malign intent and are executed. More examples could be adduced, which lead us to think that the heterogeneous and hostile anti-Aryan element weakened the true Roman civilisation more than it strengthened it.

Profound and dramatic forces struggled in silence behind the facade of these external vicissitudes and gradually gave shape to our ancient greatness and to Rome as the essential symbol of the virile civilisation of the West. ["To conclude these notes, necessarily brief, we would like to point out that considerations of this kind do not form part of a dead historical science. If today the symbols of Rome once again live and gather power, too few care to specify the contents of these symbols by means of a dynamic conception of their development, which is to say by means of a conception which, leaving behind the usual two-dimensional, pseudo-positivistic views, acknowledges the diversity of the formative components of the symbols and accounts distinctly for the appearance, ascendancy, decline, and disappearance into what is above and beyond history of those who bore the Roman virtues in their pure state, who formed the royal bloodstream of Romanity in such a way that it would persist for ever as an inheritance with a distinct physiognomy throughout the centuries" instead of "Profound and dramatic forces struggled in silence behind the facade of these external vicissitudes and gradually gave shape to our ancient greatness and to Rome as the essential symbol of the virile civilisation of the West"]

Julius EVOLA

1) PU'TEAL properly means the enclosure surrounding the opening of a well, to protect persons from falling into it. It was either round or square, and seems usually to have been of the height of three or four feet from the ground. There is a round one in the British Museum, made of marble, which was found among the ruins of one of Tiberius's villas in Capreae; it exhibits five groups of fauns and bacchanalian nymphs; and around the edge at the top may be seen the marks of the ropes used in drawing up water from the well. Such putealia

seem to have been common in the Roman villas: the putealia signata, which Cicero (ad Att. 1.10) wanted for his Tusculan villa, must have been of the same kind as the one in the British Museum; the signata refers to its being adorned with figures. It was the practice in some cases to surround a sacred place with an enclosure open at the top, and such enclosures from the great similarity they bore to Putealia were called by this name. There was a Puteal of this kind at Rome, called Puteal Scribonianum or Puteal Libonis, which is often exhibited on coins of the Scribonia gens, and of which a specimen is given below. The puteal is on the reverse of the coin adorned with garlands and two lyres. It is generally stated that there were two putealia in the Roman forum; but C. F. Hermann, who has carefully examined all the passages in the ancient writers relating to this matter (Ind. Lect. Marburg. 1840), comes to the conclusion that there was only one such puteal at Rome. It was in the forum, near the Arcus Fabianus, and was dedicated in very ancient times either on account of the whetstone of the Augur Navius (cf. Liv. i.36), or because the spot had been struck by lightning. It was subsequently repaired and re-dedicated by Scribonius Libo, who had been commanded to examine the state of the sacred places (Festus, s.v. Scribonianum). Libo erected in its neighbourhood a tribunal for the praetor, in consequence of which the place was, of course, frequented by persons who had law-suits, such as money-lenders and the like (cf. Hor. Sat. ii.6.35, Epist. i.19.8; Ov. Remed. Amor. 561; Cic. pro Sex. 8; C.F. Hermann, l.c.). (William Smith, D.C.L., LL.D.: A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, John Murray, London, 1875)

(2) In Roman mythology, the god Consus oversaw the storing of grain underneath the ground. His altar was also placed beneath the ground near the Circus Maximus in Rome. The altar was unearthed only during the Consualia, his festival which took place on August 21 and December 15. Mule races were the main event of the festival because the mule was his sacred animal. He also became a god associated with secret conferences. (www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia)

Disraeli the Jew and the Empire of the Shopkeepers

[Home](#) | [Introduction](#) | [Previously Unpublished Texts in English](#) | [\(Previously Unpublished\) Texts in French](#) | ['Heathen Imperialism' And Other Publications](#) | [Copyrights](#) | [Previously Unpublished Texts in Norwegian](#) | [forum](#)

evola_gauleiter.jpg

In 1066, the Jews arrived in England in the retinue of William of Normandy, the so-called 'Conqueror'. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, a wave of anti-Semitism struck England. Accused among other things of ritual murder, the Jews were forced to wear the yellow star. In 1290, Edward I expelled them by main force. In 1655, Cromwell, at the urging of Rabbi Menasseh Ben Israel of Amsterdam, permitted the Jews to return to England. This readmission merely sealed the alliance which had developed between the British monarchy and various Jewish groups under Henry VIII's reign, after the latter had sent his secret agent Richard Crooke to Venice to consult with various Rabbis and a Kabbalist regarding his demand that the Pope permit him to divorce and re-marry. In the second half of the sixteenth century, John Dee, astrologer, alchemist, and secret agent of Queen Elizabeth I, initiated members of the English upper classes into the secrets of the Kabbalah, and invented the doctrine of 'British Israelite Identity' as a justification for the British Empire ; Francis Bacon imbibed this doctrine from him, under the influence of the Rosicrucian Order. Founded in 1694, the Bank of England laid the foundations for the financial domination of the world by the Jewry encysted within the City of London.

The pinnacle of the alliance between the British plutocracy and Judaism, Benjamin Disraeli in 1837 became the first Jew to be elected to the British parliament, and then, a few years later, the first Jewish Prime Minister in the history of the country. A novelist in his spare time, as a politician he was required to put into practice one of the points of the Judeo-Masonic programme for world domination which he so imprudently exposed in his novels : the construction of an 'Empire of the Shopkeepers'. The 'British Empire', in fact, was never anything more than an 'Empire of the Shopkeepers' ; this 'Empire of the Shopkeepers' no longer exists today ; the shopkeepers are still there, but the 'Empire', created by Jewry to serve certain ends of theirs, was destroyed by the same Jewry once these ends had been attained. Everything leads us to believe that we have entered since the end of the nineteenth century into a new phase within the process described by the 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion'. It seems now clear that from that time onwards, Anglo-Saxon Jewry began to use London, which had become the Promised Land for all sorts of Islamists, to construct, on the basis of the famous Masonic sect, the Muslim Brotherhood, what has become known as 'Islamic Fundamentalism'. It is therefore interesting to return with Julius Evola to a historical figure whom it is not impossible was at the source of this instrumentalisation, insofar as it was precisely during his 'reign' that England laid its hands on Egypt, the cynosure of the Muslim Brothers. In this context, Evola invites us to distrust the apparent opposition between zionism and anti-zionism which is held out so artificially by a certain type of 'media' for the attention of the naïve.

L'Ebreo Disraeli e la costruzione dell'impero dei mercanti" ('Disraeli the Jew and the Empire of the Shopkeepers') was published in September 1940 in Vita Italiana. Like the two other articles by Evola on Judaism which appear on this site, it is also included in the anthology "Il "Genio d'Israele" - L'Azione distruttrice dell'Ebraismo" ('The Genius of Israel - The Destructive Action of Hebraism') (Il Cinabro, 1992).

Disraeli the Jew and the Empire of the Shopkeepers

In a short article published in this journal during the period of the sanctions (November 1935), we tried to explain the nature of the 'British Empire' from the point of view of the typology of forms of civilisation.

On that occasion, we showed that it is nothing but a travesty and a contradiction of a real Empire. An Empire worthy of the name is a supra-national organisation based upon heroic, aristocratic, and spiritual values. There is nothing of this sort in the 'British Empire'. All normal hierarchical relations are on the contrary subjected to a veritable inversion. England possesses a monarchy, an almost feudal nobility, and a military caste which, at least up until very recent years, showed remarkable qualities of character and of sang-froid. But all this is mere appearance. The real centre of the 'Empire' is elsewhere ; it is, if we may put it this way, within the caste of merchants in the most general sense, of which the modern forms are plutocratic oligarchy, finance, and industrial and commercial monopoly. The 'Shopkeeper' is the veritable master of Britain ; the unscrupulous and cynical spirit of the merchant, his economic interests, his desire to gain possession to the greatest possible extent of all the world's riches, these are the bases of English 'Imperial' politics, and the real driving forces of English life, beneath the monarchical, conservative appearances.

We know that, wherever economic interests predominate, the Jew rapidly rises and accedes to the commanding positions. The penetration of Judaism into England is not a thing of recent days alone. It was the English Revolution and Protestantism which threw open England's doors. The Jews, who had been expelled by Edward I in 1290, were readmitted to England as a result of a Petition accepted by Cromwell and finally approved by Charles II in 1649. From this time forward, the Jews, and above all the Spanish Jews (the Sephardim) began to immigrate en masse to England, bringing with them the riches which they had acquired by more or less dubious means, and it was these riches, as we have just explained, which allowed them to accede to the centres of command within English life, to the aristocracy and to positions very close to the Crown. Less than a century after their re-admission, the Jews were so sure of themselves that they demanded to be naturalised, that is to say, to be granted British citizenship. This had a very interesting result : the Law, or Bill, naturalising the Jews was approved in 1740. Most of its supporters were members of the upper classes or high dignitaries within the Protestant Church, which shows us the extent to which these elements had already become Judaised or corrupted by Jewish gold. The reaction came not from the English upper classes, but from the people. The Law of 1740 provoked such outrage and disorder among the populace that it was abrogated in 1753.

The Jews now resorted to another tactic : they abandoned their synagogues and converted, nominally, to Christianity. Thus the obstacle was circumvented and their work of penetration proceeded at an accelerated pace. What mattered to the Jews was to keep their positions of command and to eliminate the religious arguments on which the opposition of that period principally rested ; everything else was secondary, since the

converted Jew remains, in his instincts, his mentality, and his manner of action, entirely Jewish, as is shown by one striking example among many others : the extremely influential Jewish banker Sampson Gideon, despite having converted, continued to support the Jewish community and was buried in a Jewish cemetery. His money bought for his son an enormous property and the title of Baronet.

This was the preferred tactic of the rich Jews of England from the eighteenth century on : they supplanted the English feudal nobility by acquiring their properties and titles, and thus mixing themselves with the aristocracy, by the nature of the British representative system, they came closer and closer to the government, with the natural consequence of a progressive Judaification of the English political mentality.

In addition, from 1745 to 1749, Sampson Gideon financed the British government from capital which he had multiplied in a dubious manner : by speculating on the Seven Years' War, more or less as Rothschild did when he made a killing on stocks while only he knew from his own agents the outcome of the battle of Waterloo.

At the same time, in order to increase their influence, the Jews systematically allied themselves to the nobility ; the fact that in 1772 it was felt to be necessary to prevent the marriage of members of the British royal family to Jews by means of the Royal Marriages Act, should give us some idea of extent of the Jewish penetration.

By these two means there was brought about a convergence of interests which became more and more apparent between British imperialism and British capitalism, which was itself tied by more and more indissoluble and complex knots to Jewish capitalism.

Yet, from the inception of imperialism on the large scale, what was less apparent was that the 'British Empire' was a creature of Judaism, which a Jew had given as a present to the British Royal Crown.

This Jew was Benjamin Disraeli, Queen Victoria's Prime Minister, enobled under the title, Lord Beaconsfield. This development was remarkably interesting. Until that time, it had occurred to no-one to associate with the dignity of Empire an idea of riches like that which attaches to colonial possessions. Even after the Ghibelline Middle Ages, all traditional spirits would have seen this as a real extravagance and a caricature, since the Imperial idea had always had a sacred aura connected to a higher function of domination and civilisation and to a right which was in a certain sense transcendent. Only one Jew could have conceived the idea of 'reforming' the conception of Empire and making of it something plutocratic and transforming it into imperialistic materialism. This Jew was Disraeli - 'Dizzy' as he was known. It was he who made of Queen Victoria an 'Empress', a colonial Empress, the Empress of India. This indefatigable proponent of the English 'Imperial' idea modelled his conception upon the Jewish Messianic-imperial idea, the idea of a people whose power consists in the riches of others, over which they take power, and which they cynically exploit and control. Disraeli always

attacked very violently those who wished to separate England from her overseas territories, within which, as a Jewish historian has pointed out, Jews were the pioneers. Disraeli knew who it was that sustained this England which in turn was to dominate the riches of the world ; it is possible that he was among those initiates who knew that it was more than a simple British-Jewish plutocracy which was pulling the strings. One recalls those often-quoted words of Disraeli : "The world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."

"What an actor the man is! And yet, the first impression that he gives us is of absolute sincerity. Some think of him as a foreigner. Does England belong to him, or does he belong to England? Is he conservative or liberal? All this doubtless matters not at all to him. The power of Venice, the imperial republic on which the sun never set, this is the vision that fascinates him. England is the Israel of his imagination and if fortune is with him he will be the Prime Minister of the Empire."

The critic who wrote these words of Disraeli, when he was merely the leader of the Conservative Party, showed himself thereby to have been possessed of a genuine prophetic spirit. His words capture the true spirit of 'Dizzy' in action. The reference to Venice, in material terms, derives from the fact that Disraeli's family, originally from Cento, near Ferrara, had sought its fortunes in Venice before setting off for England ; it was also because of his family that Dizzy would have recalled the 'imperial' Venetian idea, to the level of which, in strict connection with the Jewish idea, he wished to raise England. There also was found the imperial idea of the merchant, of the power of a bourgeois oligarchy built upon gold, commerce, overseas possessions, and trade. All others would serve as means and instruments to this end. But to realise this 'Venetian' ideal, given that Venice itself was at least nominally a free republic, it was necessary to rob England of whatever in her organisation had retained the ancient traditional spirit. Here we have another characteristic feature of Disraeli's activity.

We cannot provide here a profound exposé of the party-political conflicts of England in Disraeli's time. However, most of our readers will know of the battles between the Tories, the partisans of the monarch, conservative and mostly Catholic, and the Whigs, a Lutheran aristocracy jealous of its independence and favourable to new liberal ideas. Disraeli's master-stroke was to by-pass to some extent this opposition by becoming the leader of a new party, to be called, in a restricted sense, 'Conservative', which would become a powerful enough instrument for the application of his ideas to neutralise whatever was still good in each of these parties by means of the assistance offered by the other. To put this differently, in Disraeli's 'Conservative Party', the true conservatives became liberals and the liberals, conversely, became at least to some extent conservatives, since it was easy to show them by means of the utilitarian ideas which they already possessed that their interests and those of their adversaries coincided. Having thus realised, with his new party, the 'quid medium', Disraeli turned England into a simple oligarchical republic. His 'Conservative Party' was in reality a sort of clique, held together by common class interests but divided internally, seized with liberalism, and utterly lacking in ideals. Naturally, Jewish and Masonic influences predominated in it.

It seems nevertheless that Disraeli saw even further than this. This becomes apparent from his novel cycle, 'The New England'. 'Sybil, or The Two Nations' reflects exactly the ideological tactic which Freemasonry had already employed to prepare the French Revolution. Disraeli does not conceal his enthusiasm for the lower classes of society, stating that it is they who will create the future when they are guided by their natural leaders, a new enlightened elite which will have surmounted the prejudices of the past. Such ideas enthused the younger generation of the English nobility, which dreamed of playing this leading rôle of new 'enlightened' aristocrats, thereby digging their own grave. In the other novel of the same cycle, 'Coningsby', the central character is a mysterious Jew of Spanish origin, Sidonia - "a mixture of Disraeli and Rothschild, or rather, of what Disraeli would have liked to be and what he would have liked Rothschild to be" (Maurois). This Sidonia transmits to Coningsby, the symbol of the new England, the doctrine of 'heroic ambition' ; here, again, we find the pseudo-conservative ideal of Disraeli. Sidonia's solution is a government with conservative ideas but liberal practices. In the final analysis, once the English Tory aristocracy had become liberal, and its ideas had become no more than simple 'principles' without practical consequences, all that remained was to flatter their ambitions, in order that they should play the rôle of 'leaders of the people' - destined, naturally, to be made victims of in the subsequent phase of the subversion, just as had happened to the French aristocrats who had cherished such new ideas. On this subject, in addition to what we find exposed in these books, we should note that it was Disraeli who introduced universal suffrage into Britain, at least in the rudimentary form of the suffrage of all property-owning heads of households, which he skilfully presented as a compromise acceptable to Tories as well as Whigs. But the destructive labours of Disraeli did not confine themselves to politics ; they extended also to the domain of religion. It is here that the Jew simply throws away his mask. It was necessary for him to undermine the elements of English society in their most interior foundation, which was the Christian religion, and, above all, the Catholic religion. To this end, Disraeli propounded his famous theory of the convergence and reciprocal integration of Judaism and Catholicism. Here is what he wrote in 'Sybil' : "Christianity without Judaism is incomprehensible, in the same way that Judaism without Catholicism is incomplete." In 'Tancred' he adds to this, claiming that the task of the Church is to defend, in a materialistic society, the fundamental principles, of Jewish origin, which are found in the two Testaments. This thesis was so extreme that Carlyle declared the "Jewish insolence" of 'Dizzy' insupportable, and asked "For how much longer shall John Bull allow this absurd monkey to dance upon his stomach?"

But in the matter of Judaism, Disraeli, who, because he had been baptised, declared himself to be a Christian, was both intransigent and ready for anything. By any and every means, without caring about possible scandal, he maintained the thesis of the alliance between the 'conservatives', now weakened in the manner we have discussed, and the Jews. To persecute the Jews would be the gravest error possible for the conservative party to commit, because it would turn them into chiefs of the revolutionary movements. There was also the moral question. "You teach your children the history of the Jews," said Disraeli in his famous speech to the House of Commons, "and on your holy days you read at the tops of your voices the exploits of the Jews ; on Sundays, if you wish to sing the praises of the Most High or to console yourselves in your misfortunes, you search among the songs of the Jewish poets for an expression of your feelings. In exact proportion to the sincerity of your faith you must accomplish this great act of natural justice ... as a Christian (?) I will not take the terrible responsibility of excluding those who follow the religion in which my Lord and Saviour was born."

He could have gone no further in impudence. In fact, this declaration caused a scandal among the 'conservatives', but one without consequences. The prudent and noiseless penetration of Jewry into the English upper classes and into the government itself continued. It was Disraeli who performed the coup upon Egypt in 1875 - with whose help? Rothschild. In 1875, the Khedive had financial worries and Disraeli managed to learn that he was willing to sell 177,000 shares of Suez Canal stock. This was a magnificent opportunity to gain certain control of the route to the Indies. The government hesitated. Rothschild did not. Here is the record of the historic conversation between Disraeli and Rothschild (Disraeli had asked him for four million pounds sterling) : "What guarantee can you offer me?" "The British government." "You shall have five million tomorrow." The interest on the loan was 'extremely low' ; naturally, the real and important interest of the Jewish clique lay on another and less visible plane ...

Disraeli did not fail to make more convenient to the Jews of England their ritual observance. A little-known fact is that the 'English Saturday' is nothing other than the Jewish Sabbath, the ritual day of rest of the Jews. It was suitably Disraeli who introduced it to England, under an adequate social pretext.

Thus, as the Judaification of old feudal England was accomplished by diverse means, and as the old aristocracy gradually decomposed and underwent inoculation with ideas which would make it an easy prey for the material and spiritual influences of Judaism and Freemasonry, Disraeli did not forget his other task, that of augmenting and reinforcing the power of the new 'Empire of Shopkeepers', the new 'Imperial Venice', the reborn Israel of the Promise. This he did in a manner which was just as characteristically Jewish. Disraeli was one of the principal instigators of that sad and cynical English foreign policy by means of 'protected' third parties and the use of blackmail, which it pushes to the most extreme consequences. The most striking case is that of the Russo-Turkish War. Disraeli did not hesitate to betray the ancient cause of European solidarity, by placing Turkey under British protection. Turkey, defeated, was saved by Britain ; by use of the well-known 'English' method of threats and sanctions, Disraeli was able to paralyse the Slavic advance to the South without a single shot being fired, and a grateful Turkey made him a present of Cyprus. At the Congress of Berlin, the Russian ambassador, Gortshakov, was unable to restrain himself from crying dolorously : "To have sacrificed a hundred thousand soldiers and a hundred million of money, and for nothing!" (*) There is a factor even more serious, from a higher point of view. By virtue of this situation, brought about by Disraeli, Turkey was admitted into the community of the European nations protected by so-called 'International Justice'. We say 'so-called' because, until that time, far from being held to be valid for all the peoples of the world, this justice was held to be valid uniquely among the group of the European nations ; it was a form of recourse and of internal law for Europeans. With the admission of Turkey, a new phase of international law began, and this was truly the phase in which 'justice' became a mask and its 'international' character became a ruse of 'democracy', for it was simply an instrument in the service of Anglo-Jewry, and subsequently of the French also. This development led to the League of Nations, to crisis, and to actual war.

The last years of Disraeli's life were nevertheless agitated ones. The misdeeds of the plutocracy and the pseudo-conservative cliques began to be felt when they brought about a general financial crisis, agricultural and even colonial, in the Empire of which Disraeli had dreamed and which had become a reality : there followed the

Afghan Revolt, the Zulu War, and the prelude to the Boer War. The aged Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield and favourite of Queen Victoria, ended up losing his position. He was replaced by Gladstone. In spite of everything, this was a mere changing of the guard. The cabals, the 'systems', the directives of international imperialist politics, the false conservatism, the Jewish mentality which more and more destroyed the remains of the old ethic of the gentleman and of fair play in favour of a bottomless hypocrisy and materialism, all this survived and developed, in the form of the 'British Empire', from the time of Disraeli onwards, and always retained the mark of its author. Until today.

Tradition requires that each year the merchants of the City of London, home of the Anglo-Jewish plutocracy, invite the Lord Mayor to a banquet and receive the confidences and expressions of trust of the Prime Minister in a speech which he makes at this event. The last speech of this sort that Disraeli gave was another expression of the 'imperialist' faith. "For the English, to be patriots means to maintain the Empire, and in maintaining the Empire lies their liberty." However, one should say that, in the obstinate and hopeless war which England actually conducts, it is the spirit of the Jew Disraeli which lives on. If the English, by following this spirit, bring about the ruin of their 'Empire', and of their nation, it is to this champion of the Chosen People that they must be grateful.

Julius EVOLA

(*) Many will find it strange today that a friendship sprang up at the Congress of Berlin between the Jew Disraeli and Bismarck, the 'Iron Chancellor', a Prussian and an Aryan. They got along marvellously. "The old Jew, he's the man!" said Bismarck of Disraeli. There will be less cause for astonishment after reading de Poncins and Malynski's 'The Occult War', recently translated by Evola (ed. Hoepli), which clarifies certain aspects of Bismarck's activity, which, seen from a traditional and genuinely conservative point of view, are highly negative.

Copyright © 2004 Thompkins & Cariou