

How British Are the British?

by Prof. Revilo P. Oliver

It would be otiose to recapitulate here what everyone knows about the ethnic composition of the population of the British Isles. It will suffice to note that if we refuse to run a gauntlet of anthropologists to arrive at some opinion about the Picts, we can say that, with the one possible exception, the inhabitants of the British Isles, beginning with the builders of Stonehenge and similar monuments and continuing with the successive invasions by Celts, Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Danes, and Normans, were all Aryans by race. We shall here concern ourselves only with the introduction of an Asiatic strain into the population that considers itself, and is generally considered by others, to be British.

Some Jews undoubtedly entered Britain very early. As the geographer Strabo reported, and the Jew Josephus boasted, by the first century B.C. the Jews had infiltrated every region of the world in which there was money to be made from the natives. We have no means of estimating their numbers, probably small, before 1066, when we have record of an influx that followed the Normans, undoubtedly attracted by the opportunity to exploit both conquerors and conquered during the social upheavals that were caused by the imposition of Norman rule.

Everyone knows that Edward I tried to rid England of the Jews in 1290, but he is said to have expelled only 16,000 of them, chiefly usurers, receivers of stolen goods, and other parasites whose depredations and exactions were especially burdensome to the common people. It is likely that some in less offensive occupations, particularly physicians, were not disturbed, and after a few years, some Jews must have crawled back into England, for in 1376 we hear of their operations in the commodity-markets of London. After 1493, there was a steady trickle of Jewish immigrants from Spain and Holland, including, in the following century, the Lopez who became the personal physician of Queen Eliabeth and tried to poison her. The number of such immigrants must have been small, and, what is more important, they were obviously aliens and, so far as we know, made

no pretense that they were not.

What no one knows, or can even estimate, is how many Jews remained in England after 1290 by the simple expedient of having themselves sprinkled with holy water and masquerading under English names. Given the Christians' faith in the magic powers of holy water, we have only a few scattered bits of information that come to us by chance. For example, we know that Sir Edward Brampton, who adhered to the House of York and was appointed Governor of Guernsey, was a Jew, but we know that only because he at one time employed or protected a fellow Jew or half-Jew named Peter Osbeck or Werbecque, more commonly known as Perkin Warbeck, who, in 1491, impudently impersonated the dead son of Edward IV and proclaimed himself King of England.¹ Had he not attained such meteoric notoriety, no one would have recorded his race or that of an "English" knight with whom he had been connected.

You are therefore free to follow your inclinations in guessing how many Jews thus blended themselves into the English population, and in guessing what percentage of the number you thus set secretly perpetuated their race instead of contracting marriages with the English. And you may speculate to your heart's desire about the extent to which crypto-Jews and Jewish blood in English families contributed to the rise of the Puritan sect, fanatics whose brains were so steeped in the "Old Testament" and whose minds were so swayed by fear of the terrible Jewish god that some of their contemporaries refused to consider them Christians at all. We may think it likely that the nests of Jews secretly planted in London labored to foment the Civil War

¹ Perkin was so adroit in his impersonation that he imposed on the King of Scotland and was able to marry Catherine Gordon, daughter of the Earl of Huntley, by whom he had two children. On his second attempt to invade England, however, he deserted his gullible followers when he despaired of the battle, was soon captured and executed after he had confessed; and his career was diligently investigated to ascertain the identity of the Englishmen who had sponsored the impersonation. Hence our complete record.

between Charles I and the Parliament, but, so far as I know, we have no proof that they did more than spy on the King for Parliament and spy on Parliament for the King, collecting, of course, from both sides.

With the triumph of the Parliamentary faction under Cromwell, England was again opened to God's People and they flocked in, with full money bags in one hand and bags to be filled in the other. It was not long before the financial power of the international race gave them what was virtually a strangle-hold on all subsequent English governments. Their policies and political intrigues do not concern us here.

We have reached a period at which a courageous and persevering demographer could find enough evidence to permit a rough estimate of when and how widely the Jews began to penetrate the English population by using large dowries as bait to induce greedy or necessitous Englishmen to marry Jewesses. It is especially desirable that we ascertain the extent of this practice in the middle class; some men of means or professional standing in law or medicine did congratulate themselves on having brought into the family a proportionally large sum of money by marrying a son to a Jewess,² but no one, to my knowledge, has collected data from parish records that would indicate how common or uncommon such a practice was.

We are somewhat better informed about the aristocracy, which began to practice such racial *mésalliances* by 1747 and probably much earlier. Dowries were important at all levels of society, but most of all in landed families. Deep in their hearts, despite religious dogma and social change, men retained the old Roman feeling that what made a marriage really legal was the bride's dowry, and in the upper classes a marriage was as much an alliance between families as a sexual union of a man and a woman.³ But while such considerations inhibited

² Before we think *too* harshly of such men, we should remember that, first, they were strongly influenced by the silly Zoroastrian (and Christian) notion that human beings can be magically transformed by a religious doctrine in which they profess belief, and, second, that they were ignorant of even the most elementary facts of genetics. It would take a long discourse to trace the persistence, in both medical theory and popular belief, of the notion that females merely provided an organ for the nourishment and growth of a fetus that developed from male sperm.

³ The Roman conception of marriage was, of course, based on Aryan instincts, but had its own legal forms. Marriage by

the taking of alien brides, economic considerations were always important and sometimes urgent. It was an elder son's duty to maintain and, if possible, augment the estate he would transmit to his heir. Younger sons usually had some income secured to them by their mother's marriage contract, but their advancement in life depended largely on their own efforts, and a financially brilliant marriage was the easiest way. And as the old standards of heredity and personal worth were supplanted by the omnipotence of money, wealthy Jews automatically became more respectable and their daughters' eligibility for marriage in titled families became proportional to the dowries with which they were equipped. And Jews who had acquired the superficial attainments of culture did not seem much different from *nouveaux riches* who had jumped up from the lower classes by enriching themselves through commerce or manufacturing, as became increasingly common after the middle of the Eighteenth Century.⁴ Given the sup-

confarreatio, limited to patricians, was partly religious and produced an almost indissoluble marriage; *coemptio* was a legal act that had the effect of transferring the bride's property to her husband; *usus* required no ceremony whatever, so that its only guarantee was the dowry, which the husband would have to return in the event of a divorce, and a simple precaution enabled a woman married in this way to retain ownership of all the property she might have when entering into the marriage or subsequently inherit. With the rise of the independence and influence of women in the Roman world, *usus* became the only form of marriage among the upper classes (except for the few patricians whose sense of duty required them to provide for the succession to certain quasi-religious offices) until late into the decadence when the Christians, or rather one of their numerous sects, acquired the power to influence law. As everyone knows, in Christian countries, until sometime in the Nineteenth Century (differing from country to country) marriage had the legal effect of *coemptio*, i.e., the husband entered into possession of the woman's property during the marriage, but his right to dispose of it could be limited by a marriage contract. There remained, however, in men's minds something of the sentiment of *usus*, as well as the Roman standard that a marriage was an alliance between families and, as such, imposed specific duties on the members of both families.

⁴ There is much unconsidered talk about "snobbishness," but we should remember there was a moral distinction. A tradesman is constantly tempted to make as much profit as he can on every transaction, and he was not held to the standards of honor that gentlemen were expected to observe. The curious reader will profit from a study of the underlying assumptions in Wilkie Collins's *Basil* and note the slight changes between the texts of 1852 and 1862. The young hero is an infatuated ass who tries our patience, but the social foundations of contemporary society (which thought itself liberal) are delineated with great clarity.

pleness and subtlety of Jewish character, Jews often seemed more civilized and cultured than Aryan *parvenus*.

Thus did Asiatic blood at first seep and soon spurt into the great families of England, who should have been the foremost and most vigilant custodians of their national and racial heritage. But the Jews seemed to be a white race; an Englishman, ignorant of ethnology and entranced by liquid capital, could tell himself they were no more different from him than Italians; their race has always had in its upper class a chameleon-like ability to simulate the manners and even the culture of whatever people they have chosen as hosts and with whom they find it expedient to ingratiate themselves in the early stages of their infiltration; and gold hath charms to soothe a noble breast. Every example of such seemingly innocuous miscegenation made the lucrative practice more respectable, and constant intermarriage with the relatively narrow circle of landed families soon made hybridism general and prevalent.

So quickly was Jewish blood thus injected into the British aristocracy that Hilaire Belloc, in his eminently kind and conciliatory book, *The Jews*,⁵ observed that “with the opening of the twentieth century those of the great territorial English families in which there was no Jewish blood were the exception. In nearly all of them was the strain more or less marked, in some of them so strong that though the name was still an English name . . . the physique and character had become wholly Jewish.” He was speaking, of course, only of families that claimed to represent the hereditary nobility and gentry of Britain, excluding, of course, the undisguised Jews, such as Rufus Isaacs, who had recently been given British titles. A partial list of supposedly English noblemen who are at least partly Jewish, from the Duke of St. Albans (whose dukedom goes back to 1684 and whose descent is supposedly from King

⁵ *The Jews* (London, 1922 = Hollywood, California, *s.a.* [1965?]) p. 223. Belloc wrote with great forbearance and tried to understand and present the Jews’ attitude fairly; moreover, as an ardent Catholic, he was consciously charitable and retained the Christians’ awe of a race for which (according to their Holy Book) their God had committed so many crimes. Belloc, nevertheless, is denounced as “anti-Semitic,” and his book is on the list of works that well-trained Aryans must never see. When the Jews have attained control, nothing will content them short of a dog’s slavish adulation of his master.

Charles II!) and the Duke of Richmond (who bears the Norman name of a kinsman of William the Conqueror!) and numerous Earls, Viscounts, and Barons to many Baronets and simple Knights, and of many others who are closely associated with Jews through family ties, may be found in six columns of small type in the *Congressional Record*, in which a report on the Judaization of the British peerage was inserted by Congressman Thorkelson of Montana on Tuesday, 20 August 1940. The list of names is undoubtedly far from complete, for, as its compiler remarks, *Debrett’s Peerage*, which the British aristocracy regards as its standard genealogical record, was published by Jews, and the celebrated *Dictionary of National Biography* was edited by Jews, who certainly had no interest in disclosing the extent of their races’ matrimonial capture of a once proud nation.

Dukes do not represent the highest level of the genetic invasion of England’s nobility. *The Jewish Chronicle* (London), 6 March 1981, asserts that Prince Charles, the heir to the throne, is at least one sixty-fourth Jew, but is uncertain whether his wife is blessed with any of the divine blood. A geneticist will think it unlikely that a mere sixty-fourth infusion of divine ichor in his veins could account for the markedly Judaic cast of the future king’s features, and may remember that Frank Harris⁶ said of King Edward VII, “his accent in French and English was rather like a Bavarian’s with an indefinable tang of the Jews.” Harris, who had known Edward well and later tries to account for the King’s hostility toward Germany, hurriedly added, “I don’t put forward the usual scandalous explanation; I merely note the fact.” The usual “explanation” purported to identify the real father of Prince-Consort Albert, but other explanations are possible. As for the genealogy of the Battenbergs and other ancestors of

⁶ Frank Harris, *My Life and Loves*, Vol. III, Chapter 14; in the one-volume edition published in New York by the Grove Press, *s.a.* [1964?], p. 725. Harris’s lack of reticence about his erotic adventures is objectionable for several reasons, but it served as a pretext for attacks on him motivated by his opposition to the First World War, first in England and then in the United States, where he became the editor of *Pearson’s Magazine*. Wilson had been ordered to get the United States into the war as soon as possible, so the magazine was ruined by his Postmaster General, Burleson, who had the issues delayed in the mails until they were long out-of-date. It is a safe rule that in a “democracy” the criminal activities of politicians are directly proportional to the “ideals” they spout in public.

Prince Charles, I do not know what research might disclose, if someone should think it worthwhile.

No one seems to have tried to estimate the adulteration of the upper middle-class families of Britain through Jewesses dowered in proportion to the husband's status.

The biological effects of the large infusion of Jewish genes into the leading families of Britain are obvious. As the compilers of the list in the *Congressional Record* remarked, "The effect of even a slight mixture of Jewish blood in an Aryan family is often very great. It alters the political outlook of the individual because it alters the instincts themselves." In this, they agree with the learned Dr. Nossig, who, it will be remembered, claimed that "even a drop" of the blood of his race would alter the brain-cells of descendants through many generations.

There is another consideration that is relevant to the rapid crumbling of the Britain that once was great, although Belloc was too polite or too Christian to mention it. He marvels that the British aristocracy, with all its traditional and even haughty pride of race and family, could have been so completely penetrated and adulterated in the short space of two generations. And since the great landed families were not subjected to economic pressure until the middle of the Nineteenth Century, and were not reduced to relative poverty by taxation before the First World War, it does seem unlikely that mere greed was the only cause. Strong as is the *auri sacra fames*, which is simply omnipotent in the United States today, it could not easily have overcome an inflexible pride of lineage which, strange and even iniquitous as it may seem to rootless and dispossessed Americans, regarded with abhorrence a marriage between the scion of an ancient family and a woman whose family had but recently emerged from obscurity, however respectable and racially pure she might be. Such pride of ancestry may be stigmatized as "prejudice" and "vanity," but it was deeply, and one would have thought ineradicably, fixed in the minds of the nobility and the landed gentry. We must not overlook a force that *may* have been prepollent and even decisive in effecting or at least accelerating the sudden change.

The Heroines

Everyone knows the myth of Esther, of which a condensed version appears in the ordinary Christian Bible and a fuller version is given in the Sep-

tuagint.⁷ There is, of course, no historical basis for the tale, which was obviously composed at a late date, after the Jews had adopted monotheism⁸ and so long after Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire that only vague recollections of it lingered in the folk-traditions of the uneducated. Needless to say, there never was a Persian king named Asuerus or Ahasuerus, and although the Septuagint

⁷ The Septuagint is a translation into *koine* Greek of the Jews' holy books, made from the Hebrew and Aramaic texts that were current around the end of the second century B.C. It is introduced—naturally!—by a hoax, a forged letter purportedly written by a Greek at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus between 275 and 270 B.C. The Greek official (who must have been a drop-out from his grammar school) expatiates on the vast wealth and august nobility of the Jews he saw in Jerusalem, and on their wonderful piety in worshipping their god, whom he identifies with Zeus. He then asseverates that seventy-two learned rabbis each made his own translation into Greek, and that it was found that the seventy-two independent translations were absolutely identical, thus proving that they were made under the personal supervision of Yahweh-Zeus, as was further proved by the fact that one rabbi mistranslated one word and was punished by God with a fit of insanity that lasted for thirty days. The writer does not explain why God neglected to correct the rabbis' slovenly Greek. The hoax, obviously, must have been perpetrated long after the pretended date, but some of the translations, which are by various hands, may be older than the hoax. Fragments of some portions of the "Old testament" have been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. For a convenient illustration of the differences between the Dead Sea texts, the Septuagint (with which they often agree), and the Hebrew texts that were later revised and more or less standardized by rabbis, see John Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (2d ed., Penguin Books, 1964), pp. 68–79.

⁸ As everyone knows, in most of the "Old Testament" the Jews are henotheists, who have made a bargain with a particular god, who will make them his Chosen People and help them in the depredations against other nations, even beating up other gods who may try to help the victims; the Jews, in turn, please him by sexually mutilating their male children, urinating and defecating in the way he likes to watch, observing strange dietary and other taboos, dealing with each other by a moral code that will enhance their tribal solidarity and encourage them to prey on other peoples rather than swindle each other, and honoring him (Yahweh) above all other gods. When the Jews came into contact with Graeco-Roman Stoicism, which had evolved a theory that there was only one supreme god, who was the mind of the universe (*animus mundi*) and Providence (since that mind foresees and ordains all that happens), they had the happy inspiration to promote their tribal deity to such supremacy, whence it follows, of course, that by the deal he made with them, he must deliver to them the entire world, rather than just a few small countries. Such a conception of divinity naturally had powerful appeal to an international people that had dispersed itself throughout the civilized world and planted its colonies in many different nations.

tries to attain greater verisimilitude by calling him Artaxerxes, the name of three Persian kings who ruled between 484 and 337 B.C., it too exhibits such ignorance of historical Persia and the court of Persian kings that its Artaxerxes is clearly an analogue of the Haroun al-Rashid who appears in the *Arabian Nights*. The Jewish tale, however, was not composed for amusement: it is partly an aetiological myth and, even more, an exemplary apologue to illustrate the moral obligations of Jewish women, who even today recognize it as such, since they have given the heroine's name to their largest racial organization.

The tale, as told in the two principal versions, may be summarized as follows, disregarding the many variations in personal names and ancillary details.⁹

The Myth of Esther

Once upon a time there was an Aryan King of Persia, whose empire of 127 provinces spanned the world from east to west. He got drunk one night and wanted to exhibit the Queen to the men who were carousing with him. The Queen, who had an Aryan woman's self-respect, refused to be shown off nude* to a bunch of drunks. The king consulted his oddly named counsellors or princes or viceroys, who must have been Semites, since they opined that he would have to get rid of the Queen, whose example might encourage females to have minds of their own, so that wives might question the orders of their lords and masters. He accordingly confiscated the Queen's property and had her killed.* He then had his governors assemble a collection of 400 † choice virgins so that he could try them out in turn.

A wealthy Jew, named Mordecai or something similar, who, for one reason or another, was hanging around the royal court, saw his opportunity. He had a niece or cousin whose real name was Hadassah, although she assumed the distinctively non-Jewish name of Esther, a variant of Ishtar, the Graeco-Roman mother goddess. Instructing her to let no

one guess that she was a Jewess, and doubtless giving her tips on how to infatuate Aryan nitwits, he sent her in to become one of the virgins who would eventually become the King's concubines for a night. When her turn came, she so fascinated the susceptible Aryan that he married her and crowned her Queen of Persia.

Two eunuchs of the court conspired against the King and Mordecai found out their plans, either by eavesdropping or because one of them had a Jewish servant, who naturally betrayed his master. Mordecai either instructed Esther to inform the King or did so himself, † to win the King's favor and condign rewards.

One of the King's officers or counsellors or noblemen, called Haman or something similar, for motives that are variously reported, reached the conclusion that has been reached by statesmen in every nation that has been deeply penetrated by the Jews: that they were "the enemies of all mankind," † and, having dispersed themselves throughout the inhabited world, they undermined or evaded the laws of whatever country they were in, were always disloyal to it, and had noxious customs. The King accordingly resolved to exterminate the Jews in all of his 127 provinces and issued orders to be carried out on a specified date.

Mordecai now played his trump card and ordered Esther to use her charms to fascinate the King. She does so, although, as she explains to God, † she really hates the King, for she abhors sexual intercourse with an uncircumcized man, and she so detests the golden crown he gave her that as soon as she is alone, she jerks it off and casts it aside as though it were a rag stained with menstrual blood. † When she goes to him, however, she, by her own wiles or with the help of God who tampers with the King's mind, † charms and flatters him, evidently continuing to conceal her race, until he is so besotted that he offers her half of his kingdom!

Esther invites the King to a banquet in her palace and, after plying him with wine for two days, succeeds in making him hate Haman, adroitly using a clever trick that makes the stupid King think Haman was trying to rape her or calling angels to impersonate Haman's sons and destroy the King's favorite trees* or otherwise manipulating him. The King has Haman and his ten sons hanged or crucified. Then Esther, who either disclosed her race just before she entrapped Haman or now tells the King

⁹ The revised Hebrew text, whence the form of the story in the Christian Bible, is further explained by a *targum*, a paraphrase and elucidation in Aramaic. The story is also given in Josephus (*Antiq. Iud.*, XI, vi. 184–296), who probably had a version differing in some details from the earlier Septuagint. In the following summary, I have marked the sources of important details by three sigla, thus:

* Explicitly stated in the *targum*.

† In the Septuagint.

‡ So stated by Josephus.

she is a Jewess, begs for her people the privilege of killing all their “enemies.” The royal idiot accordingly issues orders that everywhere throughout his 127 provinces the local Jews may kill whomsoever they wish on an appointed day or days. His subjects cower and many of them, smitten with fear of the Jews, have themselves circumcized, hoping thus to placate the aliens, who are dancing in glee in anticipation of the fun. When the great day or days come, the Jews get down to work and slaughter all of the nasty people who don’t love them, and they go on slaughtering until they have butchered 76,300 of them or some such number. It is not explained why the total is so small.

Mordecai was naturally made surpassing rich and elevated to the highest rank in the empire below the King, who continued to venerate the Jews, who are the children of the most high and mighty god, † and continued to be guided by Mordecai and Esther in all things. And so they lived happily ever after.

The tale is obviously an aetiological myth, devised to explain the annual festivity of Purim, when the Jews rejoice and exult that they turned the tables on the *goyim* and slaughtered them by getting control of their government. The Hebrew text derives *purim* from a (Babylonian) word that means ‘lot,’ i.e., portion or status in life that the gods allot to men.¹⁰ The Septuagint explains that this means that God has allotted one status to the Jews and another to the *goyim*. But the story, above all, teaches Jewesses their duty to their race, which they must always serve, even sacrificing themselves, if need be, by marrying nasty, uncircumcized Aryans to manipulate them in the interests of God’s People.

So we return to our crucial but unanswerable question. How many of the Jewesses who married into the British nobility and landed gentry were heroines like Esther?

The Jews, as everyone knows and they themselves boast, are a unique race, unlike any other that has ever appeared on this planet. Considering their history during the past two and one-half millennia, and their survival and increase of power while the great nations into whose territories they penetrated perished in memorable catastrophes and

¹⁰ The reference in *Esther*, 3.7, to a casting of the lots (i.e., sortilege, cleromancy) to determine the lucky day is an irrelevancy that may confuse some readers.

left no identifiable descendants, an objective observer must consider the possibility, perhaps even the probability, that their species is biologically superior to our own and will endure after ours has perished.

The racial peculiarity that makes the Jews, in Max Dimont’s term, “indestructible,”¹¹ is one that is almost impossible for our race to understand. The race itself seems to form a superorganism for which there is no parallel among other mammals, so that the nearest analogy that we can draw is to certain species of insects, ants, termites, and bees, that form hives or “hills,” with a collective life and a collective intelligence, so that the polymorphic individuals with their specialized functions are, in a sense, merely detached organs or cells of a composite body.¹² If we can bring our minds to look for evidence of what seems to us impossible *a priori*, we shall find indications of that fact in almost all Jewish myths and other writings, which we previously misunderstood. The fact has also been candidly stated by a number of highly intelligent Jews, notably Maurice Samuel, whose singularly lucid and frank attempt to explain the biological differences between his race and ours must be pondered by anyone who intends to speak reasonably on that subject.¹³ The race’s superorganism is not the product of their religion, for intellectual Jews, who, of course, do not believe the childish tales in the “Old Testament,” retain the racial instinct. “The feeling in the Jew, even in the free-thinking Jew like myself,” Samuel tells us, “is that to be one with his people is to be thereby admitted to the power of enjoying the infinite.”

¹¹ Max I. Dimont, *The Indestructible Jew* (New American [sic] Library, 1971). The author believes that his race, by virtue of its inherent superiority, has a “manifest destiny” to govern the whole globe and impose “brotherhood” on the lower races by titillating “the universal hope of mankind.”

¹² The comparison is not pejorative. Seidenberg, in his *Anatomy of the Future* (University of North Carolina Press, 1961), regards termites as the “most advanced” form of life and foresees a glorious future in which all human species (except a Master Race of “administrators”) will progress to the same perfection, their capacity for thought and even their consciousness having been extirpated, so that billions and billions of them will crawl mindlessly over the globe, happily unaware of even their own existence. The “administrators” will thus avert the wholesale massacres that will otherwise be continuously necessary after A.D. 2000 to keep the earth habitable.

¹³ Maurice Samuel, *You Gentiles* (New York, Harcourt Brace, 1924).

The same fact was most recently stated, in somewhat different terms, by Dr. Michael Wyschogrod, Professor of Philosophy in the City University of New York, who, according to the press, told the National Conference of Christians and Jews, apropos of the "Holocaust," that "Hitler was right in understanding the significance of Jewish identity . . . [and] in understanding its primacy. . . . I am first a member of the Jewish people, and only secondarily Michael Wyschogrod."¹⁴ An Aryan can understand that statement only as a fact about a mentality totally alien to his own. Members of our race are, by their innate nature, individuals, and while they may feel loyalty to, or a duty towards, their class or nation, they can do so *only as individuals*. Even the strongest effort of the imagination will not enable you to picture yourself as having to your race the relation that a member of your body bears to the whole. We cannot even conceive of a human being who is only secondarily himself.

Jews automatically and instinctively act on behalf of the superorganism of which they are a part.

[*Liberty Bell*; August 1994]

¹⁴ His statement to the press was reported in *Christian News*, 30 April 1981, p. 15. Cf. my *Enemy of Our Enemies*, p. 109, n. 55.