

VOLUME 1



DECODING THE DELUGE

and finding the path for civilization

By David
Huttner



DECODING THE DELUGE

And Finding the Path for Civilization

Volume I of Three Volumes

by

David Huttner

Version 26.1; Release date: January 1, 2024
Copyright 2024, by David Huttner
Cover by A. Watson, Chen W. and D. Huttner

The English language book rights to this work, both the digital and the hardcopy book rights, are in the public domain. You may copy, print and sell it, in English, royalty free. Email your comments, questions and suggestions to me, David Huttner, at drhuttner@gmail.com.

Other Works by David Huttner, soon to be Available Autographed and in Hardcopy at <http://www.DavidHuttnerBooks.com>, Include:

*Decoding the Deluge and finding the path for
civilization, Volumes 2 & 3*
Irish Mythology passageway to prehistory
Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution
The First Christmas (a short play)
Making the Subjective and Objective Worlds One
Just Say No to Latent Homosexual Crusades
Social Harmony as Measured by Music (a lecture)
*What the Non-Chinese Peoples Must Do to Compete and End
P(l)andemics*
The Selected Works of David Huttner, Volumes 1, 2 and 3
Heaven Sent
Converting the World to English

*This work is dedicated to Robert Teyema,
a Chicago policeman. He adopted a baby girl
that had been left with the church,
and he left me his pen when he died.*

*It is dedicated also to Beatrice Bugni
who helped me learn what Grandpa couldn't put into words.*

FOREWORD TO VERSION 23 AND LATER

Shortly after my 1989 discovery of the underlying meaning of the world's flood myths, I realized that these underlying events, the "Deluge" events, were – by far – the greatest trauma in the life of our species. *Decoding the Deluge*, which started out as a thirty-page essay, kept growing as I continued to discover new aspects of this greatest of all traumas. I realized early on that the literal flood is a cover for the underlying trauma; but I assumed, as do most paleontologists and antiquaries today, that there was no one flood in particular that traumatized our ancestors. *I was wrong. Only a few weeks ago, as I was researching the aboriginal African Americans, I discovered the Great Flood, the second biggest trauma in the life of our species. It became a cover for the greatest trauma because most of our ancestors assumed that the "Gods" who were the victims of the first and worst trauma sent the second one. In their minds, the two traumas became fused. Because the second was viewed as punishment for the first, the first became taboo to even think about. Both became everywhere subsumed in exaggerated flood myths.* The literal, Great Flood continues to terrify us even more than the underlying and symbolic "Deluge" due to having been more recent. These traumas have rendered us all very crazy, fearful, divided, uncooperative and under-achieving.

Developing the solidarity we need to cooperate and realize our potentials for love, happiness, progress and longevity, to stop just dreaming about heaven and to start turning our one and only world into one requires us to overcome these traumas, to learn the truth about our ancestors and ourselves, to take responsibility for who we really are and the way we live. If we can do this, change will come about automatically because we will all see the necessity of adopting and codifying into law basic changes in the way we live and relate to one another. These are the goals that this basic biography of man intends to set in motion.

Please do not be afraid to read this unprecedentedly open and revealing work. There is nothing unchangeable about us that is not OK. We are entirely capable of making the changes to which I refer, and they are to everyone's benefit. *The changes that we need to undergo are the changes that will remove the sources of fear from our lives, and it is every bit as true today as it was in 1933 that we have nothing to fear but fear itself.*

--David Huttner, May 2015

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An important influence upon me over many years was the late Dr. Martin Weissman. Martin Weissman directed the counseling center at the University of California at Berkeley and was a practicing psychologist for over fifty years. I met him and his late wife Isabel when their son Jeffrey invited me to stay at the Weissman home during a college break. In Martin and Isabel, I met two successful people, relatively free of the self-hatred and alienation in which our modern world abounds. Martin has been a role model for me ever since, and he and Isabel contributed valuable advice and criticism to this work.

I wish to express special thanks to William A. Turnbaugh, formerly of the University of Rhode Island (an archaeologist who taught sociology and anthropology), for his unselfish advice and consultation.

Special thanks are also owed to my late friend, Colonel Cornelius Smith of Riverside, California (retired, USMC and Officer of The Day in charge of base security at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941). His intimations as to which of his combat experiences did and didn't become repressed enabled me to better understand the social part of the process by which religious myths and rituals were formed, a process that is completely analogous to the development of the dream.

My ex-wife Maria; son, Daniel; and daughter, Beatrice, tolerated for thirteen years the presence in their home of a sleepless, self-absorbed and inconsiderate stranger. I am thankful for them, for my two loving parents, several surrogate parents and many outstanding teachers who have helped me.

Needless to say, all mistakes and shortcomings are my own. None of the other authors mentioned herein bear any responsibility for the way in which I have creatively arranged their ideas.

Finally, I want to thank you for supporting the public libraries with your tax monies. This indigent author conducted most of his research at, or with materials from, the New York and the Queens public libraries. Please continue to cherish and support them.

--David Huttner, September 2008

PREFACE

*So, I stood with my shield outstretched
And both were safe in its sight
And I would not that either should triumph
When the triumph was not with right
--Solon*

In April of 1990, a legendary and innovative giant of the publishing industry and at that time senior editor at Random House, Jason Epstein, got into my taxi. I told Jason that all our social problems are rooted in our lack of population control and equal opportunity, that to civilize our world we must rationalize our genetic competition. I got the better of the ensuing argument. He then told me to get off the taxi seat and into the library to develop and submit the manuscript. He promised to read it, so I took his advice. I cut my taxi driving down to just the weekends and began to research broadly.

Soon my ardor to complete *The Modern Malaise and the Way Out* became dampened by the responses that I received from some of my weekend taxi passengers. To my surprise, the worst reactions did not all come from the expected quarter. Some of the people toward the top of society with respect to influence and income agreed with me. To be sure, many of the elites are still sequestering themselves within the lifelong, sumptuous ball that Tom Wolf so aptly described in *Bonfire of the Vanities*. But others increasingly realize that the world outside their ballroom is rapidly deteriorating. We are destroying every province of our own habitat. We are depleting usable resources faster than other animals, plants and natural forces can re-concentrate them. We are turning Earth into a garbage dump. Our civilization is on a suicide course. Given this deterioration of the environment and the human economy, the failure of governments and outbreaks of anarchy can be expected with increased frequency and violence. These failures and outbreaks should wake up even the most inveterate ostriches.

Even one of the world's richest men conversed with me quite rationally about strict limits upon inheritance and gifts to individuals, global ownership of mineral resources, equal educational opportunity and eliminating nepotism and cronyism from public companies and government -- so long as these proposals included population reduction and control, private ownership and market competition -- a context of class compromise, of give and take.

Unfortunately, I found religious fanatics, of all social strata, to be not as rational. Many of these people go totally bananas whenever the subject of

population control is broached. The wealthy and powerful individuals among these fanatics can be extremely dangerous. They are inclined toward every sort of crime and fascist political activity whenever interests sanctioned by their “God” conflict with our constitution and democratic principles. From talking with some of these people, I realized what to expect from them were my book to be published. I would have to publicly defend it from their attacks. I would have to debate them. To debate them effectively, I would have to know them better than they know themselves.

I had to try to learn at least as much about religion and psychoanalysis as anyone else had ever done. I systematically set out to do so. I had already studied psychoanalysis and religion sporadically over many years. This time, as I started my study, I asked myself, “Why hasn't anyone discovered the meaning of the Deluge (flood) myths?”

People from literally every part of the world, except for Australia (where, as you'll see, most of their rituals describe what underlies “the flood”), have a myth like that of Noah and the ark. Typically, these myths tell of a terrible flood that was survived by only one or several people from whom all of us descend. They tend to appear right behind the creation myths in the primitive mythology and modern religions of all peoples.

Science contradicts the literal believers and those who would commercially exploit the religious naiveté of others. Scientists have known since the early 1970s that there never was a flood big enough to cover even the better part of the Tigris and Euphrates River Valley. Core samples of the relevant geological horizons of the Mid-East reveal no telltale layer of silt left by floodwaters. For the most part, the flood myths are not literally true. Yet I reasoned that the flood myths had to be symbolic of some other kind of universal event in our prehistory.

I knew that the mind is, to some extent, a multi-processing computer. The unconscious mind can independently undertake its own operations or carry on a dialogue as we consciously do something else. Knowing this, as I started to systematically and intensively study religion and psychoanalysis, I programmed my unconscious mind.¹ I planted and periodically repeated the instruction, “Filter all your reading for the meaning of Noah's Ark.”

¹ Some writers, arguing that everything known to the mind is potentially conscious, prefer “subconscious” to “unconscious.” Yet the exclusive use of “subconscious” would fail to distinguish between that which is only slightly beneath the threshold of awareness and that which is heavily repressed. To use both terms could mistakenly suggest two qualitatively different phenomena. For want of an ideal solution, where either term would suffice, I have opted for Freud's “unconscious.”

Months later I was suddenly interrupted in my reading. A light went on. Some part of me involuntarily screamed, "Bingo." The answer was simple. I had an uncanny feeling that I had known it all along. Yet I didn't know it from having overheard it explained on radio or from having read it anywhere. Subsequent research confirmed that a rational, unified interpretation for these myths has continued to elude social scientists from Plato's time to the present moment.

This discovery directed the entire course of my subsequent research. Picking up the thread of what I could readily see to be the symbols for the prehistoric events underlying the Deluge, I began to pull on it. I first followed it through the Deluge research of Ignatius Donnelly, the author of *Atlantis: The Antediluvian World*. Then I followed it through the world's various bodies of religious myth and ritual --in much the same manner that you will follow it below. To my amazement, pulling this thread unraveled the whole bizarre skein of religious mysteries. It enabled me to pick up where Frazer and Freud left off, to correct some widely-held misconceptions, to answer questions never posed and to comprehend the meaning of all our ancestors' universal religious symbols, sacred myths, rites and sacrifices. It enabled me to answer the questions that have always confounded anthropologists and archaeologists, to define a new psychoanalytic complex and to develop many and fascinating insights into our prehistory.

All this was possible because "the Deluge" is a metaphor for the most violent, important and decisive events in the life of Man.

In sharing these discoveries, I intend to show you that our primitive ancestors were unable to cope with the violence, emotional trauma (shock) and guilt of the prehistoric events that underlie "the Deluge." These events formed the largest subgroup of the cultural and psychological scars that continue to be passed from generation to generation. The Deluge events impacted our species as do traumatic events upon young children. Locked within the unconscious mind (the collectively unconscious culture), they uncontrollably and continually motivate us to say and do inappropriate things. They continue to energize man's religious obsessions and to "validate" his maladaptive beliefs and savagery.

The creation myths symbolize another great trauma in our prehistory, the killing of the primordial fathers. We shall review Freud's analysis of them and discover that their importance pales in comparison to that of the Deluge myths. The Deluge is --by far --the basic stuff of Man's prehistory and his sacred myths and rituals.

Even in China, where the creation/*original sin* and the Deluge/*second sin* were relatively un-traumatic, we shall see that the Deluge was the more violent of the two great prehistoric traumas. Chinese scholars note that the dragon, the traditional symbol for the Chinese emperors and nation, is a composite of their most common totem animals. We will discover that several of these animals were universal symbols for the victims of “the Deluge.” Moreover, the principal Chinese holiday, the New Year Celebration, celebrates the chasing of a dragon, a “*Guanian Monster*,” northward and out of China. We will discover this also to be an obvious symbol for “the Deluge.”

The myths and rituals about a flood are only a small part of this species of myth and ritual. The Deluge events formed an ugly paradigm for responding to fraternal conflict. This paradigm became the nucleus of a pervasive social and mental illness.

We are still struggling to overcome this illness. To do so, we must acquire the more profound understanding that this book develops and undertake the fundamental changes that *The Modern Malaise and the Way Out* was to advocate. We must, the world over, maximize population control and equal opportunity. We must carry out sweeping domestic and international reforms that codify equal opportunity and population control as the principles most basic to our civilization and redirect the resources of government to enforce them.

As I’ll show you, the *lack* of equal opportunity and population control are the root causes of all our problems. They are in a positive feedback loop (of negative results) along with fundamentalism, (dysfunctional) monogamy, homophobia and latent homosexuality. (An increase in any loop element tends to increase all the other loop elements. In the male-dominated West, militarism is included in the loop. In the female-dominated East, dishonesty is in the loop.) Breaking this loop, freeing civilization from its downward spiral, begins with public education, especially with the book you are about to read. --Spring, 2010

ILLUSTRATIONS AND DRAWINGS

[Figure 1a: The African vs. the Australian route to the Americas](#)

[Figure 1b: Female sculptures and figurines](#)

[Figure 2a: An aboriginal, Tierra del Fuego man](#)

[Figure 2b: Academia's proposed routes to the Americas](#)

[Figure 2c: Upper Paleolithic tools](#)

[Figure 3: Lower Paleolithic tools](#)

[Figure 4: Barbed and tanged arrowhead](#)

[Figure 5: Spear thrower or "atlatl"](#)

[Figure 6: Very thin, upper Paleolithic untanged and unbarbed points](#)

[Figure 7: Walking stick/Baton de commandement/Arrow-straightener](#)

[Figure 8: Graph of hominid cranial capacity over time](#)

[Figure 9: Comparison of *Homo sapiens* with near relatives](#)

[Figure 10a: Near atmosphere CO² ppmv over the last 400 ky](#)

[Figure 10b: Near atmosphere temperature over the last 400 ky](#)

[Figure 11: Comparison of *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens* skulls](#)

[Figure 12: Short term auditory, visual and kinesthetic memory banks](#)

[Figure 13: Prefrontal cortex](#)

[Figure 14: Main language areas](#)

[Figure 15: Pleistocene land bridges over Mediterranean Sea](#)

[Figure 16a: Archaeological evidence of *Homo erectus*](#)

[Figure 16b: Carlo Ranzi's Neanderthal \(Western *Homo erectus*\)](#)

[Figures 17-21: *Walam Olum*, Part I, glyphs 20-24](#)

[Figures 22-37: *Walam Olum*, Part II, glyphs III1-III16](#)

[Figure 38: The strung Korean bow](#)

[Figures 38a-38t: *Walam Olum*, Part III, glyph III1-III20](#)

[Figures 38i-38xxxx: *Walam Olum*, Part IV, glyph IV1-IV61](#)

[Figure 39a-c: Maps of the Persian, Greek and Roman Empires](#)

[Figures 40a-d: Clay figurines from al Ubaid](#)

[Figure 41: The "Standard" from al Ubaid](#)

[Figure 42a-b: Dairy Scene and plaques from a lyre \(al Ubaid\)](#)

[Figure 43A-E: One bronze door from Balawat Temple](#)

[Figure 43F-I: Other bronze door from Balawat Temple](#)

[Figures 44 & 45: Thor's hammer, v2-21; with bow and arrow over it, v2](#)

[Figure 46a: Changes in sea level over the past 130,000 years, p. v2](#)

[Figure 46b: New Guinea warriors in outrigger canoe, c. 1919, p. v2](#)

[Figure 46c: Arriving at a potlatch \(unknown artist\), v2](#)

[Figure 46d: Kwakiutl Wild Man emerging from the woods, v2](#)

[Figure 47: Whale House post, Kluckwan, Alaska \(Tinglit\), v2](#)

[Figure 48: House post of Raven, the transformer, Kluckwan, v2](#)

[Figure 49: The alphabets, v2](#)

[Figure 50: Maya flat-heads, stucco bass-relief, Palenque Palace, v2](#)

[Figure 51: Chinook flathead, v2](#)

[Figure 52a: Peruvian flathead, v2](#)

[Figure 52b: NASA's space archaeology sites as of 3/2015, v2](#)

[Figure 52c: Compared alphabets & glyphs of Africa & America, v2](#)

[Figure 53: Moche Empire's *Huaca del Sol* \(Pyramid of the Sun\), v2](#)

Figure 54: Pre-ceramic Platform with Storage Rooms at El Paraiso, Peru, v2
 Figure 55: Embroidered image of *Ccoa*, forerunner of the Viracocha, v2
 Figure 56: Nazca geoglyphs of animals, lines (*Ceques*) and clearings, v2
 Figure 57: Fertility god on Paracas Textile, v2
 Figure 58: Andean peaks: sanctuaries of sacrificed Inca children, v2
 Figure 59: Mummified victim of Inca mountaintop sacrifice, v2
 Figure 60a: Mosque and prayer tower of classic design, v2
 Figure 60b: Temple of Athena Parthenos, atop the Acropolis, v2
 Figure 60c: Woodcut of the Uppsala Temple, v2
 Figure 60d: Dosojin, Japan Fire Festival, v2
 Figure 61: Topographical map of Italy's Phlegraean (fiery) Plain, v2
 Figure 62a: Cerne Abbas Giant, v2
 Figure 62b: Fintann, Irish patron of historians and poets, v2
 Figure 62c: Jeremiah and Alma Cardell Curtin, v2
 Figure 63a: Maya, Hindu Goddess of Illusions, v2
 Figure 63aii: Oceanic Topography, v2
 Figure 63b: Olmec Head that is obviously African, v2
 Figure 63c: Mesoamerican Culture Map, v2
 Figure 63d: Xipes Olmec (forerunner of Xipe Totec) on Mayan Shard v2
 Figure 63e: Avenue of the Dead at Teotihuacan, v2
 Figure 63f: Ancient Aztec Image of Quetzalcoatl (from Durán), v2
 Figure 63g: Ancient Aztec Image of Huitzilopochtli (from Durán), v2
 Figure 63h: Ancient Aztec Image of Toci (from Durán), v2
 Figure 63i: Ruins of Tula, the Toltec capital, v2
 Figure 63j: Unknown Artist's Conception of Pre-Conquest Tenochtitlan, v2
 Figure 63k: Early, Sumerian grain gods and goddess, v3
 Figure 64a & b: Polynesian Triangle, v3
 Figure 65: Wooden statue of Moai *Kavakava*, Polynesian primal father, v3
 Figure 66: Old moai stone statue from Easter Island, v3
 Figure 67: Moai from Ra'ivavae, a Cook Island, v3
 Figure 68: Easter Island *marae* platform, new style moai, v3
 Figure 69a: Buccaneer John Davis (Robert Searle), v3
 Figure 69b: Typical "Birdman," Orongo Village, Easter Island, v3
 Figure 70a: Birdman Cult's pirate ship with (divine) turtle anchor, v3
 Figure 70b: Graph of Climbing CO₂ Levels, v3
 Figure 70c: The Baby Supply for 2011 and 2013, v3
 Figure 70d & e: Carnival in Rio de Janeiro, v3
 Figure 71: Ice Age Australia, v3
 Figures 72 & 73: Wooden and Stone *Churingas*, v3
 Figure 74: Zervan Akarana, the "God of Boundless Time," v3
 Figure 75a: Rock face drawings, the earliest Australian art, v3
 Figure 75b: Emily Gap, near Alice Springs, Australia, v3
 Figure 76: Ilpintira of the Emu Totem, v3
 Figure 77: *Impichiuma* of the Hakea Flower Totem, v3
 Figure 78: Old cannibals in search of their killers, v3
 Figure 79a: Aerial view of Egypt, v3
 Figure 79b: Map of Ancient Egypt, v3

Figure 79c: Coffin panel with hieratic text, v3
Figure 80: Orthodox (Heliopolis) divine Egyptian cladogram, v3
Figure 81: Osiris/Abydos, cosmic flower or primeval lotus, v3
Figure 82: Sito, the primeval serpent, v3
Figure 83: Representations of the Primeval (Egyptian) Mound, v3
Figure 84: Khoprer, the divine beetle and her egg, v3
Figure 85: The eye of Atum/Ra or Horus, v3
Figure 86: Shu holding up Nut (the sky), v3
Figure 87a: Ubiquitous crowns of ancient Egypt, v3
Figure 87b: Giza pyramids, v3
Figure 87c: Topographical Map of Egypt, v3
Figure 88a: Map showing most of the world's megaliths, v3
Figure 88b: European stone worshippers, v3
Figure 89: Typical dolmen, v3
Figure 90: Map of European & Mediterranean chamber-tombs, v3
Figure 91: Map of Central Asian chamber-tombs, v3
Figure 92: Map of Oriental chamber-tombs, v3
Figure 93: Chamber-tomb or tumulus with court, v3
Figure 94: Floor plan of court-type tumulus, v3
Figure 95: Europe's most famous chamber-tomb, New Grange, v3
Figure 96a: Floor plans of typical passage tombs, v3
Figure 96b: Wiltshire's antiquities, v3
Figure 96c & d: West Kennet Long Barrow, v3
Figure 97: Cup and ring markings, v3
Figure 98: Ring markings on unrestored New Grange entrance, v3
Figure 99: Solar Ship (with Sail?) from New Grange, v3
Figure 100: Solar Ship from Locmariaker, Brittany, v3
Figure 101: Solar Ship from Hallande, Sweden, v3
Figure 102: The traditional curragh, v3
Figure 103: Stone alignment or avenue, v3
Figure 104: British Beakers over time, v3
Figure 105a: Copper, tin and gold sources in Europe, v3
Figure 105b: Europe circa 10,900 ya during the Younger Dryas, v3
Figure 105c: Temperature and ice chart for the last 18 ky, v3
Figure 105d: Cornwall tin mining areas, v3
Figure 106: An early cromlech (stone circle or ring monument), v3
Figure 107: Aerial view of Stonehenge and Heel Stone, v3
Figure 108: Stonehenge I and Aubrey Holes, v3
Figure 109: Hawkins' Astronomical Axes, v3
Figure 110: Woodhenge, a Fraternal cromlech, v3
Figure 111: The forerunners of the Christian cross, v3
Figure 112: Stonehenge II, v3
Figure 113: Stonehenge III, v3
Figure 114: Goddess Urnanche, v3
Figure 115: Odysseus, v3
Figure 116a: Mithra slaying the Mithraic bull, v3
Figure 116b: Topographical map of the Trojan plain, v3

Figure 116c: Devil’s Dyke in Cambridgeshire, v3
 Figure 116d: Fleam Dyke, v3
 Figure 116e: Likely lines for the invaders of Troy to establish, v3
 Figure 116f: Devil’s Dyke in West Sussex, v3
 Figure 116g: Some People Worth Remembering, v3
 Figure 117a: Wandlebury Ring, Middle & Best-Preserved Center of What Once was Troy, v3
 Figure 117b: Ruins of the Palace at Knossos, v3
 Figure 117c: Palace at Knossos at it looked before 1450 BC, v3
 Figure 117d: Throne Room at the Palace at Knossos, v3
 Figure 118: An Ogham stone, v3
 Figure 119: The Ogham cipher, v3
 Figure 120a: North Atlantic Ice Age areas above sea level, v3
 Figure 120b: Europe and the glacier at the LGM (last glacial max), v3
 Figures 120c&d: Glacial lakes Agassiz and Missoula, v3
 Figures 121 & 122: Portrait busts of Socrates and Plato, v3
 Figure 123a: Cahokia newspaper article w. C.M. Russell painting, v3
 Figure 123b: Niède Guidon and *Serra da Capivara* Park, Brazil, v3
 Figure 123c: Topographical map of northwest African coast, v3
 Figure 123d: Nile Location of all Sudanese Pyramids, v3
 Figure 123e: Topographical map of Morocco, v3
 Figure 123f: The Great Serpent Effigy Mound, Adams County, Ohio, v3
 Figure 123g: A Classical Chacmool, this one from Tula, v3
 Figure 123h: Pipe with a Paleolithic, Owl Chacmool ornament, v3
 Figure 123i: North American Sacrificial Knives, v3
 Figure 123j: “Birdman,” on copper, from the Etowah Mound, v3
 Figure 123k: One of two Woodhenges near the Cahokia Mound, v3
 Figure 123l: The Hopeton Enclosures, Ross County, Ohio, v3
 Figure 124: North American point types, v3
 Figure 125a: Southeastern North America fishtail point distribution, v3
 Figure 125b: The typical Amazonian Blowpipe, v3
 Figure 125c: Beringia circa 13,500 BPE, v3
 Figure 125d: Smithsonian’s Map of North American Mounds, after Cyrus Thomas, v3
 Figure 126: Aerial view of Cahokia Mound’s platform top, v3
 Figure 127: Silbury Hill, a typical conical mound, v3
 Figure 128: Poverty Point, Louisiana, v3
 Figure 129a&b: Ocean maximum/last glacial maximum maps, v3
 Figure 130a: Figure 10b with fatal date circled, v3
 Figure 130b: The Southern Mayan Area, v3
 Figure 131: The author (David Huttner), v3

LIST OF TABLES

[Table 1. A Broad Chronology of Mesopotamia](#)

Table 2: Words That Survived Global Migration, v2

Table 3: Biblical numbers Indicating Repressed Fraternal Hostility, v2

Table 4: Words Equivalent to “Old” of Modern English, v3

Table 5: Chronology of Ancient Egypt, v3-177-178 (v3 footnote 65).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD TO VERSION 23 AND LATER
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, PREFACE, FIGURES & TABLES
INTRODUCTION

PART I: THE BACKGROUND

1. DELUGE MYTHOLOGY
2. IGNATIUS DONNELLY:
DELUGE MYTHOGRAPHER EXTRAORDINAIRE
3. FRAZER AND MAGIC
4. FREUD, PSYCHOANALYSIS, SPIRITS AND TOTEMS
5. FROM SPIRITS AND TOTEMS TO PAGAN GODS
6. MATRIARCHY, IN MYTH AND IN REALITY
7. BLOODLESS SACRIFICE, MONOTHEISM AND DYS-
FUNCTIONAL MONOGAMY: THE MIXED BLESSINGS
OF MODERN RELIGIONS
8. ON AGGRESSION
9. CANNIBALISM
10. MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL EVIDENCE
11. YOU GUESSED IT!

PART II: DECODING THE DELUGE MYTHS

12. MANU AND VISNU: *HOMO SAPIENS*
GATHER STRENGTH
13. KUNG KUNG AND YAO: “WE STAYED ALOOF”
14. THE DELAWARE TELL IT AS IT WAS
15. SCANDINAVIANS, MASTERS OF WISHFUL THINKING
16. DEUCALION AND FERTILITY GODS
17. ATLANTIS: THE OVERVIEW
18. A NEW WINDOW ON THE ARK
19. MESOPOTAMIA: THE MOTHER OF ALL BATTLES

PART III: WHODUNIT

20. THE BIBLE: NEVER PLAY POKER WITH A PRIEST
ABOUT THE AUTHOR
CONNECT WITH DAVE

VOLUME 2

21. SCANDINAVIAN (GERMANIC) MYTHOLOGY
22. NEW GUINEA TEES
23. POTLATCHES OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND

OTHER NORTH AMERICAN NOTES

24. DONNELLY TO THE RESCUE
25. WITHIN THE BROAD OUTLINE OF
GREEK MYTHOLOGY
26. LULLABY OF LLAMALAND
27. PAGAN EUROPE GOES CHRISTIAN
28. THE CORN SPIRITS
29. THE FIRE FESTIVALS
30. THE BIG PICTURE
31. IRISH MYTHOLOGY: EVERYTHING YOU EVER
WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT THE DELUGE
32. AN IRISH MYTH-TALE
33. HALLELUIAH FOR THE HINDUS
34. OAK TREES, SNAKES, SUN GODS AND OTHER
SACRED SYMBOLS
35. MÉXICO SANGRIENTO

VOLUME 3

36. DIGGING UP THE SUMERIAN GARDEN
37. THE POLYNESIANS, EASTER ISLAND AND
THE PROPHETS OF CARGO

CONCLUSION

APPENDIXES

- A. THE ROMAN SATURNALIA: A SECOND SIN RITE
 - B. OLD WINE--AUSTRALIAN BOTTLES
 - C. OSIRIS IN THE UNDERWORLD: EGYPT IN A NUTSHELL
 - D. STONEHENGE AND OTHER ROCK MONUMENTS
AROUND THE WORLD
 - E. THE COMMON CORE TO THE WORLD'S EARLIEST
"HEROIC" LITERATURES
 - F. IMAN WILKENS FINDS TROY
BUT FAILS TO UNDERSTAND RELIGION
 - G. UNDERSTANDING THE ICE CYCLE AS WE MUST TO
INTERPRET WHAT REMAINS OF PLATO'S ATLANTIS
AND PIN DOWN THE START OF THE NEOLITHIC
 - H. UNCOVERING THE FIRST AMERICANS
- LIST OF WORKS REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT

INTRODUCTION

You don't have to be in Who's Who, to know what's what. --Sam Levinson

You and I both know the underlying meaning of Noah's Ark (or whatever deluge myth your culture taught you). Yet we differ in that I am conscious of that meaning, and you are not. You only know it *unconsciously*.

Were I to tell you, straight out, what these myths refer to, you would undergo a violent psychological reaction. The message would radically conflict with your ideal notions about "mankind," your own ancestors and you. Any formal religious beliefs that you might have are a part of this system of ideals, of inculcated role models, an agency of the mind that we shall (after Freud) refer to as the superego. Your superego, your ideal self, would interpret my message about the "Deluge" as an attack upon itself.² It would violently turn upon your ego (the operating system that mediates between the demands of the outer world, inculcated demands of the superego and bodily demands of the id). Under threat of superego punishment, your ego would be forced to deny or defend against my message. You would defend against that message. You would reject it automatically, without being conscious of your own motivations and without regard for the falsity or one-sidedness of your arguments. This process that I have just described is called *resistance*.

For you to make conscious what you already know unconsciously, we are going to have to dismantle your resistance. We are going to have to break it down one over-generalization or fuzzy, religious metaphor at a time in a relentless quest for the truth --a quest that is totally intolerant of all wishful thinking and cover-up.

That is what this book starts out to accomplish. It is, in the first place, an effort to help you become conscious of what you already know, to decode the Deluge. But the most important learning occurs en route to that decoding, and the real fireworks begin after the decoding.

We'll discover that sacred myths and rituals are, for the most part, what remains of our grossly distorted oral (or pre-) history. We'll discover that most of the characters in these myths and rituals symbolize two (and later three) groups of prehistoric ancestors and relatives. They are groups toward whom our ancestors were strongly and consciously ambivalent, toward whom

² I shall refer to the literal flood as the "Great Flood" and the protracted and even more horrific trauma that it screens -- or both -- as the "Deluge."

they had mixed emotions. We'll discover how every generation of men project "spirits" due to their unconscious ambivalence toward two ongoing groups of ancestors and relatives. We'll discover that gods and demons were born (and *are* reborn in every generation of men) when these consciously ambivalent and prehistoric characters were (mythological characters *are*) falsely identified with these "spirits" of the ongoing characters.

We'll discover that the five groups of ancestors and relatives, or *elements of the godhead*, relate to the most difficult and seemingly irresolvable (tabu) problems in our lives, past and present. Our religions deal with them metaphorically. We'll do so rationally and analytically.

Picking up the thread of what the Deluge represents, we will follow it through the myths and rituals of many peoples until –amazingly --we have unraveled the whole bizarre skein of religious mysteries. All this understanding will change your life. It will change your view of the past, the present and your hopes for the future. You'll acquire a basic outline of our prehistory. You'll learn how our ancestors lived at various stages of their development. You'll learn that the transition to the Neolithic was more difficult than has been understood and occurred in at least two stages. It gave birth to Stone Age agriculture by design, and class society, dysfunctional monogamy, greatly-increased homophobia and latent homosexuality and the Great Flood by accident. You'll learn what determines our sexual orientations, homophobia and the Orwellian personalities of the most homophobic (*latent* homosexual) people. You'll discover that the class struggle and the Deluge events are the ongoing and prehistoric components of a psychological complex that I refer to as the Fraternal Complex. Understanding the Fraternal Complex will enable us to develop ideal scenarios for the past and political direction for the future. You'll understand that solving any of our problems and civilizing our world requires us to minimize the class struggle by maximizing equal opportunity and population control.

"Wait just a minute," some of you are surely saying. "I know exactly what changed my life and what is needed for a better world. We need to bring God into our lives."

But the vast majority of men are and always have been religious. They have believed literally in religious myths and rituals. I also have the great respect for our sacred mythologies and religions, for our sacred myths and rituals. I have learned that they are partially true. But their truths are of a highly symbolic and figurative nature. They are not literally true. Moreover, despite what we shall discover to be the universal uniformity of elements or objects (persons) represented in the godhead ("God" and "Devil") and

religious subject matter, our religions have failed to provide solutions to any of our problems. Common crime, war, inflation, unemployment, business cycles, drug abuse, suicidal and homicidal behavior of all kinds, environmental destruction and the specter of catastrophic population collapse still afflict our world. The *literal* belief in religion perpetuates our problems by forbidding even the theoretical consideration of their necessary solutions. But for religion, we would see ourselves and our leaders as the savages we are!

More specifically, the plan of the book is as follows. In Part I, I introduce you to a few of the Deluge myths and Ignatius Donnelly, an extraordinary man who collected them and provided us with some important insights. Next, with able help from James George Frazer and Sigmund Freud, I provide you with some analytical tools and an outline of the evolution of religion. We'll review Michael Harner's work on cannibalism and some of the basic but hard-won discoveries of many physical anthropologists, archaeologists and a few geneticists. All this education will enable you to make conscious some simple proof by contradiction logic. This logic, in combination with whatever deluge myth your culture has taught you, has already unconsciously informed you of the meaning of the Deluge.

In Part II, we'll be able to use cultural anthropology, the archaeological record and the psychoanalysis of religion to decode the Deluge myths and prove that formerly-unconscious logic that unveils their general meaning. This time, we'll be able to read them not as fairy tales but as dramatic and often tragic glimpses into our prehistory. These glimpses will sum up to an outline of our prehistory.

In Part III, you'll see also that there is a second series of logical steps by which you may have already, unconsciously determined the meaning of the Deluge myths. This second series of steps, this second logical process, is like the first one in reverse. It begins by recognizing mass murders and asks, Whodunit. In Part III, we'll play at being homicide detectives as we try to prove whodunit. We'll draw upon other religious myths and rituals and various customs from around the world to verify our Part II findings. This reliance upon other clues will prevent our admittedly circular argument from becoming needlessly repetitious.

"Is it really worth it," you ask, "to practically undergo psychotherapy and learn arcane facts of physical anthropology just to understand some silly myths?" Absolutely! Sacred myths and rituals, our religions, deal symbolically with the most problematic and seemingly-irresolvable contradictions in our lives. This work is a revolutionary attempt to deal

openly and honestly with all our taboo subjects. All great art, visual and literary, also deals symbolically with these same taboo subjects --but in piecemeal fashion. After decoding our religions and discovering their great truths, you will agree that the future of civilization depends upon our ability to deal openly and honestly with these taboo subjects, to see our ancestors and us as we truly were and are. *The first step in solving any problem is to recognize it honestly.*

The larger part of the great truths that are encoded within our religions concern our prehistory. Religious stories, myths, contain kernels of prehistoric truth that are encased within a chaff of wishful distortions. The vast majority of men, including most religious leaders, have believed literally in myths and rituals. Like babies, they have preferred cartoons to reality. They have irresponsibly valued the chaff and discarded the inner kernels of prehistoric truth.

Because we have written history of only the last 5,000 years and because we cannot wisely go forward without knowing where we've been, our political leaders have had to depend upon and be inseparable from these irresponsible religious leaders. This is a dependency that wishful thinking and the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the U.S Constitution have not been able to alter. We can only end our dependence upon fundamentalists by improving upon their understanding of religion, by learning to recognize symbols as symbols, by setting aside the cartoon coverings of our religions and discovering the ongoing truths and conscious history that is contained within them. Naturally, whatever we ultimately accept as historical truth must comport with the fragmentary record that archaeology and the other sciences provide. (The sciences and compromised oral history are different views of the one and only material world.)

Once we do determine the way forward, once we do commit ourselves, as individuals or as a society, to new rules to live by, rules that will enable us to become happier and more civilized and long-lived, then a second retrospection becomes necessary. We must retrospect to acknowledge and publicly renounce all the past savagery that was inconsistent with our new standards. For if we are indeed committed to and serious about self-improvement, then we want to cleanse ourselves. We want to assure everyone who has known us to be otherwise that, "This (savage that imitated the worst aspects of his ancestors) was another me, a person whom I now renounce and shall never be again." The commitment and the cleansing are each necessary to the improvement process. All the uncomplimentary, painful and shocking

savagery that this book dredges up must be exposed to assist us in both the commitment and the cleansing that we must someday undertake.

In Part III, in the process of proving whodunit, in the process of proving who committed the genocide that we have hypothetically identified as “the Deluge,” we’ll make many other unexpected but profound discoveries about our prehistory and discover virtually everything you would ever want to know about religion. We’ll discover the meaning of all our ancestors’ most important and sacred myths, rituals, symbols and sacrifices. We’ll discover who the original giants and witches were and why wolves, lions, horses, birds, bears, serpents and hard-wood trees were so universally sacred. We’ll discover the answers to every major scientific question about religion that has remained unanswered; and, as is often the case with research, we’ll discover many things --quite by accident --that have only a tangential relationship to religion.

We’ll discover the meaning of the primitive potlatch ceremonies that among the Pacific Northwest Coast Peoples continued into modern times. These potlatches have confounded anthropologists for as long as there have been anthropologists. We’ll be able to understand why the Pacific Northwest potlatches seem so different from other rituals of gift exchange (e. g. the pig tee and the moka in the Malay Archipelago).

We’ll discover that East-West differences began with the Deluge and are fundamentally a matter of female (F) or male (M) domination of society, respectively. These female and male dominations closely and respectively correlate with R and K, extreme, reproductive strategies, strategies that best describe the class struggle. (R is the quantity strategy of the small animals and the poor. K is the quality strategy of the large animals and the rich.) Accordingly, we will speak of MK and FR societal extremes, extremes that have their origin in geography and prehistory but are reinforced by differences in language, law, social customs and --of course --religion:

In the East, the gods are much more elemental,
Less human and much more like the powers of nature.
- Joseph Campbell (videotape)

We’ll understand the transition from pagan to modern religion better than previous experts. We’ll discover who the first Brahman priests were and the unique and dispassionate conditions under which they developed Hinduism, the first major eastern religion. We’ll discover the meaning of all the most important passages of the Hebrew Pentateuch (the first five books of

the Old Testament). We'll discover that the wellspring of Jewish guilt and persecution is far different and deeper than Freud believed it to be. We'll know why the mythical Jesus had to be a Jew. We'll discover who "Jesus" symbolizes and how the "Apostle" Paul created the Christian myth by combining and improving upon elements of the Babylonian Creation Epic and the myths of Gilgamesh and Mithra. We'll discover why modern religion (i. e. Islam) could take root in Mesopotamia only by fiat, the "believe or else" authoritarianism that characterizes the Muslim world.

We'll discover the major cause of the pervasive but insane belief that we are not animals, that we can be independent of the rest of nature and indefinitely frustrate our need for love with impunity. This illusion that we are not animals is a neurosis that resulted from the Deluge, from the series of events that is the prehistoric aspect of the Fraternal Complex. Freud insisted that the Oedipal Complex (the unresolved relationship with the father) is the nucleus of all neuroses. Nonsense! The Fraternal Complex is at least as problematic and contributed three of the five universal elements of the godhead. (As I suggest in *Stage II of the Revolution*, a sequel to this book, whenever we are ready to civilize our world; we must resolve both complexes simultaneously.) Our animal alienation and the male domination of western society are subtly reflected in the Genesis creation myth:

Then God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and the cattle, and over all the wild animals and all the creatures that crawl on the ground." God created man in *his image; in the divine image, he created him*; male and female he created them. God blessed them, saying: "Be fertile and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it."

Genesis 1:26-28

[*H* Emphasis mine, bracketed text preceded by "*H*" is from author, David Huttner.]

We'll be able to liberate the energy within ourselves that we devote to resisting all awareness that threatens to expose the violent and painful history that underlies the Deluge myths and related, ongoing, antisocial impulses. This resistance and its inward side, repression, enervate and paralyze us. They consume energy that could otherwise be devoted to ongoing needs and problem solving.

We'll discover that the Deluge events motivated our ancestors to sacrifice countless people. The victims were mostly innocent people, often children (such as the Inca children entombed in mountain-top sanctuaries). But for mass obsessional neurosis, most of these people didn't have to die when they did; and they died in vain.

We'll discover that the Deluge events gave rise not only to myths but also to bizarre customs and holidays that have long outlived all comprehension of their origins.

Our advanced understanding of man's universal (Oedipal and Fraternal) complexes and of psychoanalysis will enable us to analyze and understand all religions and everything connected with them. Easter Island statues, for example, will be no challenge. We'll leverage that information with the archaeological record and the obsessions of the Birdman Cult. All this will enable us to complete the scenario of the two-hundred-year population collapse on Easter Island and to identify the circa-1890 A.D.-event that precipitated it.

After I summarize all the basics in the conclusion, in the appendixes, we'll deal with the more peripheral aspects of "the Deluge" and the flood myths that subsumed and covered it. Most of you will be as engrossed by the appendixes as by the preceding chapters. Appendixes A and C distinguish between the true creation or *original sin* aspect of myths and rituals and the Deluge or *second sin* aspect. Chapters 15, 21, 25, 36 and Appendix C show how some of our ancestors continued to distinguish between the two by appending them in epic narratives. Appendix C also deciphers the whole corpus of one of our most bizarre mythologies, Egyptian mythology, and shows it to be mostly driven by a composite of the three great prehistoric traumas and one ongoing fear. Appendix B will dissolve the mystery and wonder surrounding the Australian Aborigines. We'll be able to view these Stone Age people not as refugees from another planet but as the most basic, stick-figure representations of ourselves. They will confirm our new understanding of religion and show us the form in which most -- if not all -- of the world's mythologies existed in Pleistocene (Ice Age) times.

Our new understanding will enable us to solve other mysteries in the appendixes that follow. We'll discover the meaning of Stonehenge and the world's other primitive megaliths: the stone alignments or avenues, dolmen (stone shelters), collective chamber tombs (tumuli), cromlechs (stone circles) and the curious spiral and ship designs commonly appearing on tumuli.

We'll discover that the designation of constellations was a sort of collective Rorschach test. Test results were determined by the same ongoing

obsessions and prehistoric traumata that caused our ancestors to create their customs, sporting games, mythologies and religions.

We'll discover that the Deluge dominated our ancestors' oral traditions and provided the substratum for the earliest, heroic literatures. We shall be able to understand Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Wagner's *Ring Cycle* (the *Volsunga Saga*) and other classics of antiquity as no other modern men have done.

We'll decode myths collected by Jeremiah Curtin in the north and the west of Ireland in the late nineteenth century and discover that they confirm Iman Wilkens' brilliant discovery of *Where Troy Once Stood*. (The original Troy, Homer's Troy, was *not* the latter-day Troy of northwestern Turkey that Heinrich Schliemann might have excavated.)

We'll discover that the *Picts* (aka the Picti, Pretini, Pritani or Cruthin) were not the first modern men to settle in the British Isles as has long been believed. Britons (known in Ireland as *Builg*, *Fir Bolg* or *Érainn* and related to the *Belgae* of the continent) settled in Britain and Ireland tens of thousands of years before the Picts. We'll decipher much of the fabulous lost history of these ancestors within Irish mythology.

In Appendix H, our analysis of America's pre-Columbian monuments, Amerindian mythology and a penetrating insight into Egyptian religion will enable us to confirm a theory that has been slowly winning support since Constantine Rafinesque announced it (and paid for it with his career in the 1830s) and Ivan van Sertima reissued it in 1976: *the earliest (aboriginal) Americans came directly from North Africa*. [Archaeologists now admit that all the earliest North and South American skulls are Negroid in morphology (shape). However, archaeologists are still compromising with racist, white wishful thinking by suggesting that the aboriginal Americans came here via Australia! Other compromisers say that the African-shaped skulls are from people who came from Asia via Beringia and evolved *in a warmer climate* to have the brachycephalic (broad and round-shaped, *cold-weather adapted*) skulls of modern Amerindians! ³]

Our investigations of prehistoric America will also uncover the Great Flood, the original identity of Irish Fintann, the etiology of the Deucalion myth and a new and deeper understanding of the Neolithic.

As we make these discoveries, we'll overturn or modify several current theories in anthropology and psychoanalysis. One of these theories is

³ See, respectively, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h2EU6HuTixA>, a BBC video that largely follows Hubbe *et al.* and the Chatters *et al.* article.

naturism. Naturism attempted to scientifically explain religion as arising from man's experience in the natural world. The proponents of this theory simply failed to identify the ancestors and relatives whom the gods represent. They could only conclude that our ancestors *invented* gods for the awe-inspiring forces of nature that they sought to control. This theory has long been a source of merriment within the scientific community. It implies that religious fundamentalists, literal believers in "God" or "Devil," are psychotic.

We shall disagree. We shall discover that all the pagan and modern gods have been derived from conscious ambivalence toward three groups of prehistoric ancestors and relatives and unconscious ambivalence toward two groups of ongoing ancestors and relatives. Religious fundamentalists are not psychotic but only neurotic. With respect to the Fraternal Complex and its two universal components of the godhead, the Deluge victims and our ongoing genetic competitors, they have been little if any more neurotic than any of the rest of us -- Freud included.⁴ This is so because of the yet semi-civilized condition of mankind, because of our failure to minimize the Fraternal Complex and the lack of political awareness of what that means.

Our new understanding of the godhead --as consisting not of two universal components, as Freud believed, but of five universal components -- will make the scientific analysis of modern religions easy. For example, defining Paul's "Jesus" will be no challenge. Defining the "Holy Ghost" or the "Holy Spirit," the "Spirit" or "Ruach" in the Old Testament or "Pneuma" of the New Testament or the "Great Spirit" of earlier religions will be even easier.⁵

We'll discover how the Deluge victims and our ancestors' ambivalence toward them and murder of them provide the historical model for the ongoing ambivalence that we feel toward our genetically competing associates. Together, this ongoing and historical ambivalence form the complex that I call the Fraternal Complex. The Fraternal Complex and Freud's Oedipal Complex (ambivalence toward the primordial father and the parent of the same sex) fuse into the image that all people, especially westerners, develop of "God" and "Devil." We shall then reaffirm Freud's analysis of all religious myths and rituals as compromise formations, neurotic symptoms of --not just the Oedipal, but --the Oedipal and the Fraternal Complexes.

⁴ By "godhead" I mean the loving "God" and the hateful "Devil" or pagan gods and demons.

⁵ For modern believers, the modern, monotheistic creeds are "true religions" and their pagan predecessors are (fictional) "mythologies" or "legends." Although I often follow this convention out of sheer habit, man's religious beliefs developed as an unbroken chain. This true-false distinction is a prejudice that is not supportable.

I realize that many of these terms and concepts must seem vague and incomprehensible. Don't worry if you don't yet understand them. You will. After a careful reading of this work, little if anything about our primitive ancestors and their archaeological record will remain unintelligible to you. You needn't be intimidated by any of the material in this book. There's absolutely nothing in it that average laymen cannot understand. You see, I'm not smart enough to make things difficult. I have no post-graduate degrees. I've never even written a post-graduate thesis.⁶ For most of my adult life, I have worked as a New York City taxi-driver. Nobody ever accused any of us of being rocket scientists.

“How in the world,” many of you must surely be asking, “can you expect us to accept these ideas from a taxi-driver, ideas that have no currency among the leading lights of academe?”

Well, as you'll see, I am able to logically and consistently demonstrate many things that continue to confound the experts. Once more, all *my* theories fit together like the pieces of a Swiss watch; and I have mythology, highly compromised sacred oral history, that decodes to support each of these theories.

Furthermore, this is hardly the first time that revolutionary discoveries have been made by a maverick outside of the “fields” in question. Read Alfred North Whitehead's *Process Reality*, Buckminster Fuller's *Education Automation* or Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of the Scientific Revolution*; and you will understand why so many of the most important discoveries are made by people outside of the relevant “fields.” Due to overpopulation and the ever-greater oversupply of candidates for scarce academic “positions,” academics are forced to be ever narrower in the scope of their investigations. You must be “in a department” so that you can publish in one of the department journals, be compared with other department people, advance department models and honor department demigods. The problem with all this is that the models or paradigms, though necessary and initially helpful, quickly become over-generalized. Individuals lose the ability to apprehend the world that overlaps or falls between the shrines. More generally, academia emphasizes testing and grading, thereby selecting for people who are adept at learning from others. Learning from others is what I call


⁶ While this work was in progress, I went through law school and passed the New York State Bar Exam. I've also been a licensed realtor and stockbroker. I also have a continuing education diploma in computer programming. So, although it might be somewhat misleading to suggest that I have no formal higher education, my credentials are non-esoteric and well within the grasp of other ordinary people of ordinary ability.

Learning-II, as opposed to *Learning-I*, discovering new knowledge and inventing new technologies. *Learning-II* people are skilled at listening, imitating and remembering. *But Learning-I requires the opposite habits of mind!* It requires tuning out the world to pursue your own curiosity, conduct your own inner dialog and create your own mental images. It requires exploring and experimenting with alternatives; and clearing your mind to zero, forgetting all information unrelated to the goal and archiving the rest. The modern economy values *Learning-II* people ever less because they are the easiest to replace with machines, computers, robots and calculators. It's harder to replace *Learning-I* people. I shall show you that these learning differences result from language differences, East and West. Karl Marx, confined life-long to Western Europe, knew nothing of them. Worst of all is the pressure put upon academia by the most "successful" savages, who in savage K and R society tend to all be masked, homophobic, latent homosexuals who associate change with the removal of their masks and therefore fear it.

That's enough. Hey, don't accept my word on any of these braggadocios. As the gerund in my title suggests, I'm inviting you to retrace my footsteps, to actively decode the data as I did. To do so, those of you who become my first readers will have to demand *brutal honesty* of yourselves. You will tend to demand the same honesty of a dishonest world. This higher standard will separate you first readers of this work from our contemporaries; but it will also help you to become (or remain) truly critical thinkers, to share in the joy of discovery, to better know yourselves and our ancestors and to envision a more positive future. ***(If at any time between here and Chapter 11 you tire of the effort to identify "the Deluge" or "the Deluge victims," jump ahead to Chapter 11. Read it, and then return to where you were.)*** For the first of you who enter here, life will lose much of its mystery and wonder but gain in meaning. Undoing repression will also raise your IQ!

So, if you're brave enough, come into the cab for a whirlwind tour of the prehistoric world. Come see for yourself. Turn the page.

PART I: THE BACKGROUND



CHAPTER 1: DELUGE MYTHOLOGY

*What is wanted is not the will-to-believe but the wish to find out,
Which is its exact opposite. --Bertrand Russell*

A flood annihilated mankind except for a few persons from whom everyone alive today is descended. So say the Flood or Deluge myths. Ignatius Donnelly observed that every culture appears to have had, and most of them still retain, elaborate details of at least one deluge myth. He drew worldwide attention to them with his 1882 book, *Atlantis*.

Atlantis, an alleged lost continent that sank beneath the sea, was described first and in detail by Plato. (Plato's detailed Atlantis account concludes this chapter.) Donnelly was convinced that all the flood myths were deficient versions of Plato's Atlantis tale, which Donnelly accepted as historical truth.

Interest in *Atlantis* has ebbed and flowed with each underwater archaeological discovery. There have been many such discoveries, and there are many more to come. We now know that the sea level rises and falls inversely with ice accumulation at Earth's polar extremities and mountain tops. The last major ice cycle of the Pleistocene Era, the popular "Ice Age," lasted between roughly 110 and 12 kya (thousand years ago). The glacial maximum was 22 kya, at which time, the sea was 120 meters or 394 feet lower than today. If global warming from the greenhouse effect continues and all the ice melts, then the sea level will be 216 feet above its level now. This yields a range of at least 610 feet or 186 meters. To see how the sea level max coastlines and the 110-meter minimum coastlines of 22 kya compare with the present coastlines, browse respectively to two dramatic maps: <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2013/09/rising-seas/if-ice-melted-map> and <http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/topo/pictures/GLOBALsealeveldrop110m.jpg>. The second map does not show the glaciers that covered most of North America, much of upper Eurasia, the Andes and the Alps. There is little rain and much desertification during an ice age. The populations of men and other animals plummet and become concentrated near fresh water lakes and within the tropics.

Since the 1960s, multibeam sonar has been steadily improved. Multibeam, echo-sounding sonar can now make very clear images of the ocean floor. It is enabling marine archaeologists to extract Ice Age secrets

from the sea and will fascinate us for many years to come. *But nowhere is there anything remotely like a continent down there. Even as a symbol for the Great Flood, the second greatest trauma in the life of our species, which was first revealed to the world in Edition 23 of this work, "Atlantis" is an exaggeration and can't possibly correspond to a flood that killed all but a few people from whom everyone alive today descends. "The Deluge" must symbolize something else, something even worse than the Great Flood. What?*

Here is a brief introduction to some of the myths we'll be analyzing. This is just a small but representative sample. There are scores of fragmentary flood myths from the Philippines, Polynesian islands, Southeast Asia, China and the Americas that are too numerous and redundant to mention. (See *The Flood Myth*, ed. by Dundes for some of these.) I'll hold back the best myth material for our analyses in Parts II and III. I'll release it as you are ready to understand it.

NOAH'S ARK (PALESTINE / ISRAEL)

Most of you are familiar only with the most dramatic core of the Noah's Ark myth (Genesis 9: 11-19). It describes how God, dissatisfied with the wickedness of men, decided to destroy mankind with a flood and to save and use the righteous Noah and his family to repopulate the earth. So, God instructed Noah to build an ark and to take into it his wife and three sons and their wives and at least one male and one female of every animal. God then sends a great flood, lasting forty days; and when it recedes, Noah and his crew, the only survivors, repopulate the earth.

For us, the details of this dramatic core will prove to be much more enlightening. My source, *The New American Bible*, tells us:

Origin of the Nephilim (Prehistoric giants of Palestine)

When men began to multiply on earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of heaven saw how beautiful the daughters of man were, and so they took for their wives as many of them as they chose. Then the Lord said, "My spirit shall not remain in man forever, since he is but flesh. His days shall comprise one hundred and twenty years" (Genesis 9: 1-3).

At that time, the Nephilim appeared on earth (as well as later), after the sons of heaven had intercourse with the daughters of man, who bore them sons. They were the heroes of old, the men of renown (Genesis 9: 4).

Warning of the Flood

When the Lord saw how great was man's wickedness on earth and how no desire that his heart conceived was ever anything but evil, he regretted that he had made man on the earth, and his heart was grieved (Genesis 6: 1-6).

When the alleged flood ends, “God” makes the following covenant or pledge to Noah and his progeny, to mankind:

Covenant with Noah

God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them: “Be fertile and multiply and fill the earth. Dread fear of you shall come upon all the animals of the earth and all the birds of the air, upon all the creatures that move about on the ground and all the fishes of the sea; into your power they are delivered. Every creature that is alive shall be yours to eat; I give them all to you as I did the green plants. Only flesh with its lifeblood still in it you shall not eat. For your own lifeblood, too, I shall demand an accounting: from every animal I shall demand it, and from man regarding his fellow man I shall demand an accounting for human life... I will establish my covenant with you, that never again shall all bodily creatures be destroyed by the waters of a flood: there shall not be another flood to devastate the earth.” And to remind himself of this covenant to man, God established his bow, the rainbow, in the sky (Genesis 9: 1-17).

GILGAMESH (MESOPOTAMIA)

Long before “the flood” of Genesis was composed, it had counterparts in the lands of Mesopotamia. Epic Babylonian myths of both the middle (1000-1600 B.C.) and old (1600-2000 B.C.) periods told of a flood. The earliest group appears to be transcriptions based upon Sumerian tales from the third

millennium and earlier. They told of mighty king Gilgamesh and his wild and hairy friend Enkidu who lived on the plain, at one with the animals. The Sumerians, Akkadians, Hittites, Assyrians and the neo-Babylonian-Semites all possessed versions of the Gilgamesh Epic. See Table I.

TABLE I: A Broad Chronology of Mesopotamia

LOWER VALLEY	UPPER VALLEY
(Includes once-great empire of Babylon originally divided into Akkad in the north and Sumer in the south)	(Includes once-great empire of Assyria, centered at Assur)
7000 B.C., Prehistoric Cultures	
Ubaidean Culture begins to irrigate lower valley	
5000-4000 B.C.	
4500 BC Sumer develops around Uruk	Gawra Culture
3500 BC Late Uruk Period (3500-3100)	Northern Late Uruk Culture
3400 BC Sumerians begin to scratch and then press phonetic letters into clay tablets with wedge-shaped (cuneiform) tools	
3100 BC First Sumerian Dynasty at Ur (3100-2500)	Ninevite 5 Culture
2500 BC Sumerian City-states fight over land & water. Sargon founds Akkadian Kingdom at Agade (still not located) (2350-2200). Gutian barbarians from the north invade (2200-2150). Neo-Sumerian Period, Third Dynasty of Ur, valley unified by Ur-Nammu (2150-2000).	
2000 BC Amorites invade Lower Valley, Ur sacked by Elamites,	Assyrians take over eastern Upper Valley.
Old Babylonian Period	Old Assyrian Period
Hammurabi (1848-1806)	
Kassites conquer Babylon without leaving any lasting influence (1550-1100)	Mitannian Kingdom (1500-1350) of Hurrite farmers from Syria and SE Turkey

1000 B.C.	Neo-Assyrian Empire at Nineveh (900-612)
Meades and Semitic Chaldean confederation founds Neo-Babylonian Empire (625-539)	
Persian (Achaemenid) Empire (550-331) (Cyrus the Great c. 539)	
Alexander the Great (331-323)	
Greek Period or Seleucid Empire (305-364)	
Parthian (Arsacid, Iranian) Empire (126-227 AD)	
Irrigation collapses due to salinization (140 BC)	
Sasanian (Iranian) Empire (226-651 AD)	
Modern, Islamic era 636 AD--	

We are indebted to archaeologists for these myths. They have been discovering them on cuneiform tablets and fragments of tablets since about the middle of the 19th Century. They have succeeded in assembling the most modern version, a 12-tablet tale, by combining parts of the various, unearthed recensions.

In this most elaborate, recent and complete, “Standard,” new Akkadian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, tablet XI tells of how the flood was decreed by an assembly of the gods.⁷ Even though all the others evidently approved of it, Enki, the god of wisdom and the benefactor of humanity, secretly opposed the decree. Enki decided to save at least his favorite, Utnapishtim (“he found life”), Sumerian Noah, whose earlier Akkadian and Sumerian counterparts were Atarhasis (“exceedingly wise”) and Ziûsudra (“life of long days”). Accordingly, Enki informed Utnapishtim of the purpose of the gods and imparted to him a plan of escaping the impending fate of mankind. (*Cf.* Heidel, p. 197.)

In the eight earliest known, independent, Sumerian, Gilgamesh tales, there is no indication that the gods are displeased with man’s morals and behavior. Their cataclysm comes not as punishment but as caprice. Only in later versions is a motive introduced for the sending of the flood. In one of

⁷ Here the word Akkadian indicates not just the pre-Babylonian city of Akkad in the upper part of the lower valley but all the Semites of Mesopotamia. The languages of Babylonia and Assyria were fundamentally identical.

these, Anu, the father of the gods, places *seven* gods at Nergal's disposal and tells this god of pestilence, this god of the burning and the winter sun,⁸

When the tumult of the people of the earth has become (too) painful for thee and thy heart moves thee to set the snare, to kill the black-headed (people), to lay low the beast of the plain, (then) let these be thy raging weapons and let them go at thy sides (Op. cit.: 226).

The motive of quieting the raucous mob is repeated in later, Akkadian, and especially Babylonian, recensions. Later recensions do more than provide the gods with a motive. They eliminate the element of surprise in the way the gods spring the Deluge upon offending humanity. They also give humanity a chance to correct its ways.

In the more recent of the two Babylonian texts, Utnapishtim, Babylonian Noah, asks Enlil to spare humanity. Enlil first tries to reform the raucous and ever-multiplying people with famine, birth failure and pestilence. They are subsequently reduced to cannibalism but remain unrepentant, forcing Enlil to destroy them (Op. cit.: 231-2).

These later myths have immortality being granted to the survivors and, like Genesis, carry a promise (albeit implicit) that the Deluge will never be repeated. (Cf. *op. cit.*: 256-7.) Heidel reasoned that this promise precluded the possibility of "the Deluge" having involved punishment because behavior could only be influenced by a threat of repetition.

This paradox derived from "the Deluge" crime not being repeatable.

Heidel also noticed that the details of these myths became more filled in with each new version. The authors had known of earlier versions and were applying their imaginations to the task. The later Hebraic Flood shares with them the same skeleton, "but the flesh and blood and, above all, the animating spirit are different..." (Op. cit.: 184).

This, as we shall see, was because the primary function of the Flood myths was to administer to peoples' traumatization, to help them overcome their fear and forget, without completely obliterating every trace of the prehistoric truth. They also needed to interpret events in a way that might

⁸ Henceforth, throughout this work, every apparently random, non-ordinate occurrence of the number *seven* will be italicized. My purpose in doing this is to show you that the obsession with the number *seven* is symptomatic of the Fraternal Complex. Try to figure out the reason for this before I explain it in a later chapter.

secure the gods' favor. These difficult tasks made the myths an ongoing work in progress.

Finally, thought Heidel, morality could not have been the motive for whatever "the Deluge" represents because the earliest myths make no reference to moral offence and the gods appear to act capriciously.

Heidel's attempt to solve the flood riddle failed for at least five reasons. First, ethical reciprocity, the golden rule, was not as firmly inculcated in these little children as it is in us. The transition to modernity will not be complete until this ethos of the modern era is extended to the most important sphere of human life (reproductive competition), until the K and R class struggle is minimized by maximizing, respectively, equal opportunity and population control. The denizens of the civilized future, who end our hypocrisy and make our subjective and objective worlds one, *will view us as savage little children*. Second, for a very long time, Mesopotamian descendants of the Sumerians who starred in the *opening* scenes of "the Deluge" did not feel ashamed of their ancestors' role in it. Third, the alleged perpetrators of the flood differed from the chroniclers in their motives. Fourth, traumatized children don't always dare to say what they really think; and fifth, repeated punishment wasn't possible.

DEUCALION (GREECE)

Turning to the Greeks, we find two more deluge myths. If you were to assume that Greek mythology is a homegrown, unified product, you would probably also assume that these two "Greek" myths refer to two different floods. You'd be wrong on both counts. Langdon knew that "Greek" mythology is a *potpourri* of myths from various peoples. He suspected that Deucalion (the less fragmented Greek flood myth) had been borrowed from another people. Lucian, he says, got it from the northern (Aramaeans) Semites. This would seem likely because a temple at Heliopolis, a major tourist and pilgrim attraction in its day, was built on top of a cavern into which the waters of the Deucalion deluge were said to have drained (Langdon: 38).

Be the origin as it may, in this Thessalian (Aramaeans) legend, Zeus (Adad) seeks to destroy men whom scholars (e. g. Donnelly, Campbell and Graves) identified as the weapons-makers and warriors of the Bronze Age. These weapons-makers were allegedly destroyed to put an end to their cruelty and violent crimes. We'll discover these victims to be of a much earlier vintage.

Acting on the advice of his father, Prometheus, Deucalion, the wise and pious Noah of the Greeks, constructs a coffer in which he takes refuge with his wife, Pyrrha. According to the Aramaeans, also aboard are all the animals in couples. The Deluge comes; the two of them survive; they offer sacrifice to their god and repopulate the world by throwing behind them *the bones of the earth, namely, stones that change into men*. (Cf. Donnelly: 90.)

MANU AND VISHNU (INDIA)

An illuminating Deluge myth first translated by Max Müller is in the Hindu *Satapatha Brahmana*. It is the most popular and interesting of many flood myths to come out of India:

One morning, water for washing was brought to Manu, and when he had washed himself, a fish remained in his hands, and it addressed these words to him:

“Protect me, and I shall save thee.”

“From what wilt thou save me?”

“A deluge will sweep all creatures away; it is from that I shall save thee.”

“How shall I protect thee?”

The fish replied, “While we are small, we run great dangers, for fish swallow fish. Keep me at first in a vase; when I become too large for it, dig a basin to put me into. When I shall have grown still more, throw me into the ocean; then I shall be preserved from destruction.”

Soon it grew a large fish. It said to Manu, “The very year I shall have reached my full growth the Deluge will happen. Then build a vessel and worship me. When the waters rise, enter the vessel, and I shall save thee...” (Donnelly: 87, quoting the *Satapatha Brahmana*).

Manu cared for it in this way and carried it down to the ocean. And in the very year that the fish had indicated, he built a ship and came to him, and when the flood had risen, he entered the ship. The fish swam up to him, and he fastened the rope of the ship to the horn of the fish, and with it he sailed through to the northern mountain.

“I have saved you,” said the fish. “Fasten the ship to a tree, but do not let the water cut you off when you are on the mountain; as the water subsides, keep following it down.”

And he kept following it down, in this way, and so that slope of the northern mountain is known as Manu's Descent. The flood swept away all other creatures, and Manu alone remained here (O’Flaherty: 180-181, continuing that text).

In the *Satapatha Brahmana*, the little fish is “Vishnu,” the Hindu preserver. When the flood comes, Vishnu resumes the form of a big fish and pulls a boat containing Manu and others to safety. But it is most important to realize, as Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty points out in her classic book the *Hindu Myths*, that the myth of the fish and the flood is not originally associated with Vishnu and that this and all other flood myths are of very great antiquity (O’Flaherty: 179-180).

In interpreting this myth, we shall identify Manu and Vishnu and discover a perfect allegory for the earliest preservation of our species.

KUNG KUNG AND YAO (CHINA)

From China, we inherit at least three deluge myths, two of them are, in my opinion, meaningful. The best one tells of Nuwa and Fushi escaping the floodwaters in a large gourd that floated into China. Once the waters receded, they proceeded to propagate the race (Sanders: 133). The most elaborate version that I have uncovered appears to be distorted beyond recognition by the products of some creative writer's imagination. I shall not detail it for you. Nor will I bore you with a host of other myths that are also too fragmentary and particular to reveal a primeval origin and a connection with the covert but common theme.

Most Chinese deluge myths have been subjected to a “forest of pencils” since Confucian times (551- 478 BP). Almost nothing valuable survived. Of all these myths, Campbell noted, “[I]f gems or jades are to be found among them from the actual mythologies of Yang-shao, Lungshan, Shang or even Chou (anything earlier, that is to say, than Shis Huang Li's burning of the books, 213 B.C.), we must realize that they have been lifted from their primitive and remounted carefully in a late, highly sophisticated setting, like an old Egyptian scarab mounted as a ring for some fine lady's hand” (Campbell, 1962: 380).

We shall discover, in a later chapter, why oral history could not be preserved well in the Far East. Nevertheless, we shall indeed find some gems among the myths that Campbell found in the works of Swedish Sinologist, Dr. Bernhard Karlgren. Karlgren reconstructed them as he believed them to have been, “before the scholiasts of the Han period, 202 B.C.-220 A.D., began to apply their own brand of learning to the inheritance” (*Ibid.*: 380). I shall assume, with Campbell and Karlgren, that the princely houses of the Chou period, 1027-221 B.C., issued these ancestral legends. Yet in addition to wholly inventing ancestral legends, families would have cast their ancestors in the starring roles of sacred myths that were of anonymous, tribal and Paleolithic origin. Don’t assume that the presence of ancestral tales marks a myth as worthless.

Notice, after Campbell, the lack of creation stories here. The Chinese were obviously less traumatized than Westerners by the primal deed. (See [this page and following pages](#).) These Chinese myths describe a world already underfoot. Their major concern is with the building of China.

The first subgroup of these myths appears to be more authentic than the other subgroups listed by Campbell and Karlgren. The first subgroup describes the “Period of the Earliest Men”:

1. The Lords of the Birds' Nests. People in those days lived in birds' nests made in trees, to avoid the dangers threatening them on the ground.

2. The Lords, the Fire Drillers. Eating raw food, the people were ruining their stomachs. Some sages invented the fire drill and taught them how to cook.

3. The Deluge of Kung. After the time of the Fire Drillers, when Kung was king, the waters occupied *seven* tenths and the dry land three tenths of the earth. He availed himself of the natural conditions and in the constrained space ruled the empire. -
-Campbell, 1962: 381, quoting Karlgren: 218-219, citing Kuan Tzu.

Of course, we are interested primarily in “3,” the Deluge myth; but I have included “1” and “2” so you can verify that, compared to the other subgroups that Campbell accurately describes as adulterated, this set is relatively primitive and authentic. Number “1” says that early people had to live in trees to avoid the wild animals. Number “2” mentions the fire drill, a small bow with a loose cord wrapped snugly around a pointed wooden rod.

The rod is held upright between two objects and rotated by the bow to produce a spark of fire. Number “2” is correct in placing this instrument in a very primitive context. We know that *Homo erectus* had fire, and he probably invented the fire drill. (*Homo erectus* was a more primitive subspecies of man from which *Homo sapiens* [hominids like us] branched. We’ll learn much more about *Homo erectus* later.) Together, the first two myths also imply something that is left out: fire enabled us to sleep on the ground at night, safe from the other animals. We shall decode “3” with the other deluge myths later.

After describing a group of myths that have nothing left to them but the names of primeval heroes, Campbell and Karlgren introduce ten myths about the “Golden Age of China,” the age when the empire was supposedly being built. Ten emperors are listed here, ten who supposedly preceded the Deluge. The Sumerians also listed ten antediluvian kings, so this may be a transmutation of the old Sumerian king list. The one that is a gem for us is that of Yao, king number eight:

Examining into antiquity... we find Divine Yao, who, naturally and without effort, was reverential, intelligent, accomplished, thoughtful, sincerely courteous and obliging. Moreover, the bright influence of these qualities was felt through the four quarters and reached both above and beneath. He distinguished the able and the virtuous, thence providing a loving consideration of all in the nine classes of his kindred, who thereby became harmonious. He regulated and clarified the people, who all became luminously intelligent. He united and harmonized the many states. *And the black-haired people thus were transformed.* The result was universal accord (*H emphasis mine*)⁹ (Campbell, 1962: 385, quoting Shu Ching 1.1 and following James Legge, 1899: 32-33).

However, despite his great virtue and the cosmic influence of his sagely character, all was not quite perfect in the period of Yao; for there were a terrible spate of inundations, that no one seemed able to repair. The Minister of Works, having promised much... -
-Campbell, 1962: 385.

⁹ Parenthetical remarks preceded by “H” are mine and not those of the quoted author.

The description of Yao as the wise and benevolent peacemaker sounds very much like one of Hammurabi that you will read in Chapter 19. Much of the form and the content of this legend may have been imported, as Campbell suggested. Also, note that the myth refers to river inundations. These did plague the Chinese throughout several periods of their history. It seems that the dominant and conscious intent is not to describe a deluge that destroys all humanity.

Nevertheless, a gem's in there. It's the emboldened passage. As you'll see, the reference to "black-haired people" is so close to salient deluge references from the Mid-East, references to the "black-headed people," as to leave no doubt as to whom it refers. It refers to people of a far greater antiquity than that suggested by the rest of the passage.

Somehow, this reference survived the "forest of pencils" that has been applied to these myths since Confucian times. It is still within but only barely within its original context of the Deluge. Probably, later editors had no idea who "the black-haired people" were. They probably thought they were the Chinese Han people themselves, whose hair is almost invariably jet-black. But we don't find the Chinese people referred to as "the black-haired people" outside of this deluge context. They are just "the people" or "the Chinese people." Indeed, what is normal, standard or unchanging (e. g. one's own or one's group's set of personal attributes) is not noticed. Only differences are noticed. That is the way we are wired perceptually.

As you will see, another group more fully fits this description. Some later editor apparently found this fragmentary, greatly compromised and unintelligible deluge myth. It seemed to best fit the text of this Yao legend about river inundations, so he plugged it in. Notice too that the original Chinese author of this deluge myth would probably not have borrowed the Mesopotamian expression, "black-haired people" unless he knew to whom it referred. You'll know to whom it refers shortly.

THE SONS OF BORR (SCANDINAVIA)

An unusual variation of a deluge myth comes from Scandinavia and is mentioned by Frazer and Donnelly. It combines the Deluge with a cosmogonic (creation) myth. Often the creation and the Deluge myths are either combined or, as is more common, they follow one another in the Biblical order. This universal association and sequence provide us with a clue. It suggests that the events underlying the Deluge are prehistoric but more recent than the events underlying "creation."

The three sons of Borr, Othin, Wili and We, are grandsons of Buri, the first man. They slay Ymir, the father of the Hrimthursar, the ice giants. They construct the world with Ymir's body. Enough blood flows from his wounds to drown all the race of giants except Bergelmir, who saves himself and his wife in a boat and reproduces the race.

THE DELAWARE (SIBERIA AND NORTH AMERICA)

Let's move on to the Americas and chants of the Delaware. The Delaware called themselves the Lenni Lenape ("Original People"). Until European Americans displaced them, they lived along the Delaware River in what are now parts of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware. These chants, or songs, are part of what the Delaware called the *Walam Olum*, the "Red Score" or "Painted Record."

Several North American peoples preserved their genealogy and sacred stories with the aid of pictographs that were either written on buffalo hides or carved on sticks. (See for example the essay by Erminie Voegelin in the *Walam Olum* [b].) Although none of the actual painted sticks of the Delaware survived, the *Walam Olum* is the record of the glyphs that were on those sticks. They were preserved through the efforts of several antiquaries and one remarkable naturalist.


The *Walam Olum* is the only pre-Columbian epic tale of North Americans outside of Mexico. It probably predates all the Mexican records and is the Delaware's Bible. That a work this important and unique survived is a virtual miracle that warrants retelling.

By 1820, the painted sticks had fallen into the hands of "Dr. Ward of Indiana," who received them as a fee for medical services and who has been identified in recent decades as Dr. Malthus A. Ward. Prior to this time, the *Walam Olum* had many scrapes with oblivion. Like most "Indian" peoples, especially those living on the interface with the European civilization, by 1820 the Delaware had become decimated and demoralized. Between the sporadic and futile attempts of the more militant Indians to rise up against their conquerors, they attempted to reestablish their nation on reservations. But whiskey, disease, suicide, low birth rates and perpetual encroachment by the landless and burgeoning white population generally turned Indian towns and reservations into ghost towns. The government would periodically consolidate these towns (unilaterally with force) and relocate them further west. Their only alternative was to quickly and thoroughly adopt the culture of their conquerors. But to simply erase their intimate religion, their more

conscious awareness of the prehistoric past, and replace it with a more highly-symbolic and abstract religion was neither possible nor --from the Indians' point of view --desirable.

European Americans annihilated the Mongoloid Americans. Were it not for the devoted and heroic labors of a few intelligent men (some of whom we'll meet below), European Americans would have totally obliterated every trace of America's primitive languages and religions. One of these heroic giants of ethnography, Jeremiah Curtin, realized that the basic outline of primitive religion is (was) everywhere the same. *It is owing to these heroes and our much-abused aboriginal relatives that you will now discover that outline, understand our own prehistory and our own, otherwise-impossibly-confused religion.*

As suggested in the Introduction and as we'll confirm in Appendix H of Volume 3, Twenty-First Century archaeologists are concluding that all the oldest American skulls are Negroid in shape. Most of the men of the Negroid people were exterminated and women and children absorbed by the later-arriving Amerindians whom the Europeans exterminated. But the archaeologists of official academia who dare to upset racist, white, wishful thinking by saying that these skulls corresponded to Negroes (Hubbe et al.) are saying that the Negroid, aboriginal Americans came here from Australia! How likely is that, given that the route from West Africa is 4 or 5 times shorter, direct and not one that requires a tropical people to navigate frigid Antarctic waters? See Figure 1a, below; and note that the alleged Australian route is even longer than the one I show in red. They're suggesting that Australian seafarers came from Northern Queensland where a Paleolithic rock drawing of a boat with prows has been found. Return now to the Walam Olum.



In 1822, two years after he received the painted sticks (*The Walam Olum*), Dr. Ward delivered them to another antiquarian hero, Constantine Rafinesque, one of the most enlightened men of his day. Rafinesque was a professor of Botany and Natural History at Transylvania University in Lexington, Kentucky. He was a man who devoted his life to science. Rafinesque transcribed the fragile Painted Record by carving the glyphs onto linoleum. Two years later, from another and unknown individual, he secured “the songs annexed thereto in the original language” (*Walam Olum* [b]: IX). Rafinesque then proceeded to learn the Lenni Lenape language and translated the songs of the *Walam Olum* into English.

Rafinesque was a prolific writer whose works include over 900 titles spanning many fields of endeavor. The members of the Indiana Historical Society tell us that, “throughout the past one hundred years Rafinesque’s stature as a scientist has been steadily growing. Among his many contributions to the natural sciences was his articulation (a generation before Darwin) of the general theory of evolution. Rafinesque also championed the principle of natural botanical classification, which became universally adopted. In the field of botany alone, Harvard University and the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia have recognized his genius and are re-examining his contributions to that science. In like spirit the Indiana Historical Society is re-examining his contributions to prehistory.”¹⁰

¹⁰ For a biography of Constantine Rafinesque, the Indiana Historical Society recommends Call, Richard Ellsworth and Fitzpatrick. But the trouble with biographies is that they’re all

The reason why the survival of the *Walam Olum* was not forever secured by this enlightened man and his estate and the reason why his genius is so late in being recognized is that he was – and remains – highly controversial due to his probing into taboo subjects: the Species War and aboriginal Black Americans. The Indiana Historical Society notes that he fell out of favor at Lexington's Transylvania University. Transylvania University was the first university west of the Allegheny Mountains. It turned Lexington, Kentucky into the “Athens of the West”; but its flowering was short-lived. The advent of the steamboat on the Ohio River caused inland Lexington to decline. Moreover, Rafinesque’s individual fate at Transylvania State appears to have been sealed because, “The chaotic condition of the state’s finances and the hostility of religious factions in the Kentucky legislature were contributing factors to the decline of the university” (*Walam Olum* [b]: 256). This Society comment grossly understates the reality: slave owners and other white racists were terrified of the man. He quit teaching and died a pauper.

Fortunately, the various families and individuals who exchanged Rafinesque’s manuscript of the *Walam Olum* until 1884, proved to be worthy custodians. In 1884, it was acquired by Daniel G. Brinton, and was until recently in the Brinton Memorial Library of the University Museum at the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia.¹¹

At least four different individuals or institutions have published new and allegedly improved translations of Rafinesque’s original. We shall be working with the translations of Daniel Brinton, Joe Napora, the Indiana Historical Society and Rafinesque. Napora adds an interesting observation or two. The Society contributed informative research on Amerindian traditions and the glyphic traditions of various peoples. For this and the Society’s publication, we can especially thank Eli Lilly and academicians Charles “Carl” Voegelin, his wife, Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin and Frank Speck.

But in this researcher's opinion, based on my understanding of parts I, II, III and IV (the Delaware's creation myths, Deluge myths, migration to North America and struggle to secure a bountiful territory within the new land, respectively) Rafinesque’s translation is generally superior to any of the more

just hearsay evidence. I prefer to go directly to a man’s works and form my own opinion of him.

¹¹ I journeyed to Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania in 1995 just to examine the MS. As with several of the friends and colleagues who had worked with me or were likely to assist in the publication of this work, the MS and the Daniel G. Brinton Memorial Library in which it was housed --had *disappeared!* Administrators were unable or unwilling to admit that the library had ever existed.

recent “improved” translations. I suspect that the superiority of Rafinesque’s translation is mainly due to two factors: 1) the scientist’s relative lack of literal and conflicting religious beliefs and 2) the great instability of the Delaware’ spoken language between 1825 (Rafinesque’s acquisition of it) and the present day. Apparently, language does not become fixed --to any degree --until the population that uses it acquires written language and, especially, the printing press. (You must appreciate this if you are to appreciate the work of Iman Wilkens, which we will review later. This also explains why, in the brief period spanning the introduction of writing and the widespread dissemination of newspapers, European languages all tend to have passed through very different Old and Middle forms.) Not only did the Delaware not have newspapers in their own language, but they were also bombarded with English (and French for those in Canada). They were also herded onto reservations where a variety of different Indian languages were spoken. So, it is not surprising that the modern (circa 1954) bilingual Delaware informants of the Society failed on about two out of every five glyphs to offer even a single association with the original Algonquin language of the *Walam Olum*.

Part II of the *Walam Olum*, the Deluge myth, is too long to include in this chapter. You’ll see Parts II and III --with their glyphs --when we interpret them in Chapter 14, below. But here (after Rafinesque and Donnelly) are the lines introducing the flood. It starts after the “creation” (the killing of the primordial father) in Part I of the *Walam Olum*:

All were willingly pleased, all were easy- thinking, and all were well-happified [sic]. But after a while a snake-priest (*Powako*) brings on earth secretly the snake-worship (*Initako*) of the god of the snakes (*Wakon*). And there came wickedness, crime and unhappiness. And bad weather was coming, distemper was coming, with death was coming. All this happened very long ago, at the first land (*Netamaki*), beyond the great ocean (*Kitahikau*).

ATLANTIS (GREECE AND PLACES YET TO BE DETERMINED)

Our first known accounts of an entire island continent that “sank beneath the sea” come from Plato, the classical Greek philosopher. Some say that Plato created Atlantis as a doom saying metaphor for Athens. Others say

Atlantis is a metaphor for Persia, the great empire that was locked in struggle with the Greeks as of circa 500 B.C. and finally conquered by Alexander circa 350 B.C. Still others have claimed it is a garbled memory of the Minoan culture of Crete. Luce and others theorize that Crete was partially destroyed by a tidal wave caused by a major volcano that formed the Island of Thera (Santorini) some 110 km north of Crete. But even Luce, the foremost proponent of this volcano theory, admits that any tidal wave would not have affected Knossos, the capital city of Crete, which *did* burn to the ground in 1375. Moreover, everyone knows that volcanoes don't *sink* islands; they *create* them. Personally, this taxi-driver doesn't buy any of these explanations.

At first glance, one might easily guess *Atlantis* to be a [condensation](#) containing various elements. As our discussion at the top of this chapter suggests, these elements would include but not be limited to the submersion of Ice Age settlements during the Great Flood and at the beginning of the Holocene, the warm, interglacial period we're in now. Much became submersed beneath the Mediterranean and the Black Seas. However, I will show you that many of the most prosperous, classical Greeks came from a distant region famous for its mythology and from a people who, unlike the Chinese, prided themselves on maintaining the least compromised mythology, the most historically accurate oral history. If I am correct, then, *for the classical Greeks*, *Atlantis* is a condensation of four prehistoric events in three different places. Crete is one of those places and one of two places where there was much submersion. To keep you in suspense and to give you a chance to make the realizations on your own, we'll uncover all of these events before linking them with "Atlantis" in Appendix G. One by one they'll confirm our convictions of from whence the disjoint and exotic *Atlantis* details derived.

In Chapter 17, you will be able to understand how most of the myth developed spontaneously over thousands of years in the minds of agrarian Greek peoples, peoples that lacked a written language. Prehistory was distorted even more rapidly than is history. And as Plato notes in the *Critias*, most of us are unable to be objective about our ancestors and ourselves and to tolerate criticism. Similarly, in both the pagan religions of tribal groups and the national religions that peoples develop as accessories to the modern religions, the creed must assure believers that they enjoy the gods' (or respectively, God's) providence and favored status. The inevitability of warfare between savage, K and R class societies forces kindred people to believe this in order to unite against potential enemies. *Accordingly, all that is base or unflattering about their history and prehistory gets turned* 180

degrees. As we'll see, the classical Greeks of Plato's time had a dire need to unite and severe prehistoric impediments to their unification. "Atlantis," Greek national religion, was deliberately renovated, by the Athenians, for the purpose of uniting Greek city-states.

The tale is in Plato's Dialogues *Timaeus* and *Critias* and was reviewed by Donnelly, his pages 5-21. Here is the text. You may want to skim over it for now. I will improve upon our overview of it in Chapter 17. In Appendix G, I'll interpret the myth line by line, linking the details to three places and four events.

Plato attributed "Atlantis" to the great Athenian law-giver Solon who was a close friend of Plato's great, great, great, great grandfather. Solon supposedly learned of Atlantis while in the Nile delta city of Sais, where an old Egyptian priest allegedly said:

Many great and wonderful deeds are recorded of your State in our most ancient histories, but one of them exceeds all the rest in greatness and valor, "for these histories tell of a mighty power that was aggressing wantonly against the whole of Europe and Asia and to which your city put an end.

This power came forth out of the Atlantic Ocean, for in those days the Atlantic was navigable, and there was an island situated in front of the straits that you call the Columns of Heracles; the island was larger than Libya and Asia put together and was the way to other islands and from the islands you might pass through the whole of the opposite continent, which surrounded the true ocean, for this sea that is within the Straits of Heracles is only a harbor having a narrow entrance, but that other is a real sea, and the surrounding land may be most truly called a continent.

Now, in the island of Atlantis there was a great and wonderful empire that had rule over the whole island and several others, as well as over parts of the continent, and, besides these, they subjected the parts of Libya within the Columns of Heracles as far as Egypt and of Europe as far as Tyrrhenia. The vast power thus gathered into one, endeavored to subdue at one blow our country and yours and the whole of the land that was within the straits, and then, Solon, your country shone forth in the excellence of her virtue and strength among all mankind, for she was the first in courage and military skill and was the leader of the Hellenes. And when the rest fell off from her, being

compelled to stand alone, after having undergone the very extremity of danger, she defeated and triumphed over the invaders and preserved from slavery those who were not yet subjected and freely liberated all the others who dwelt within the limits of Heracles.

But afterward there occurred violent earthquakes and floods, and in a single day and night of rain, all your warlike men in a body sunk into the earth, and the island of Atlantis in like manner disappeared and was sunk beneath the sea. And that is the reason why the sea in those parts is impassable and impenetrable because there is such a quantity of shallow mud in the way, and this was caused by the subsidence of the island..." (Donnelly, 1985: 10-11; quoting Plato's Dialogues, ii, 517, *Timaeus*.)

"Let me begin by observing that nine thousand was the sum of years that had elapsed since the war that was said to have taken place between all those who dwelt outside the Pillars of Heracles and those who dwelt within them; this war I am now to describe.

Of the combatants on the one side, the city of Athens was reported to have been the ruler and to have directed the contest; the combatants on the other side were led by the kings of the islands of Atlantis, which, as I was saying, once had an extent greater than that of Libya and Asia and, when afterward sunk by an earthquake, became an impassable barrier of mud to voyagers sailing from hence to the ocean. The progress of the history will unfold the various tribes of barbarians and Hellenes that then existed, as they successively appear on the scene, but I must begin by describing, the Athenians as they were in that day and their enemies who fought with them, and I shall have to tell of the power and form of government of both. Let us give the precedence to Athens...

Many great deluges have taken place during the nine thousand years, for that is the number of years that have elapsed since the time of which I am speaking; and in all the ages and changes of things there has never been any settlement of the earth flowing down from the mountains, as in other places, which is worth speaking of; it has always been carried round in a circle and disappeared in the depths below. The consequence is that, in comparison of what then was, there are remaining in small islets

only the bones of the wasted body, as they may be called, all the richer and softer parts of the soil having fallen away and the mere skeleton of the country being left...

And next, if I have not forgotten what I heard when I was a child, I will impart to you the character and origin of their adversaries, for friends should not keep their stories to themselves but have them in common. Yet, before proceeding farther in the narrative, I ought to warn you that you [*H Solon*] must not be surprised if you should hear Hellenic names given to foreigners. I will tell you the reason of this: Solon, who was intending to use the tale for his poem, made an investigation into the meaning of the names and found that the early Egyptians, in writing them down, had translated them into their own language, and he recovered the meaning of the several names and retranslated them and copied them out again in our [*H Greek*] language...

I have before remarked, in speaking of the allotments of the gods, that they distributed the whole earth into portions differing in extent and made themselves temples and sacrifices. And Poseidon, receiving for his lot the island of Atlantis, begot children by a mortal woman and settled them in a part of the island that I shall proceed to describe.

On the side toward the sea and in the center of the whole island, there was a plain that is said to have been the fairest of all plains and very fertile. Near the plain again and in the center of the island, at a distance of about fifty stadia...

Stop! Here is a strange but very important word. The Oxford English Dictionary defines stadia as, "Of obscure history, probably derived from 'stadium.'" But "stade" is the simpler and probably the original singular form of "stadia." OE is unable to tell us anything about the unit of measurement or from what country this unit is derived. Rev. R.G. Bury, who translated the Harvard University Press and the earlier William Heinemann editions of Plato's *Critias*, tells us (ff p.285) that the *plethron* was about 100 feet and the *stade* was 6 plethra or about 600 feet. Francis Godolphin, editor of *The Greek Historians*, tells us in her appendix on measures and distances that the itinerary stade was 164 yards; and the Attic stade was 214.5 yards; but even she offers nothing as to the origin of this unit of measurement.

Without knowing anything about prehistoric or early Greek measurements but being able to surmise a bit about prehistory, I can assure you that Rev. Bury is correct. “Stadiums” everywhere were so named because they were constructed to have their longest dimension enclose one stade or approximately 600 feet. Instruct your own unconscious mind to find the reason for this. See if the light turns on as you come across the reason in a coming chapter. Continuing:

[T]here was a mountain, not very high on any side. In this mountain there dwelt one of the earth-born primeval men of that country, whose name was Evenor, and he had a wife named Leucippe, and they had an only daughter, who was named Cleito. The maiden was growing up to womanhood when her father and mother died; Poseidon fell in love with her and had intercourse with her and, breaking the ground, enclosed the hill in which she dwelt all round, making alternate zones of sea and land, larger and smaller, encircling one another; there were two of land and three of water, which he turned as with a lathe out of the center of the island, equidistant every way, so that no man could get to the island, for ships and voyages were not heard of” (*Ibid.*: 11-14).

He himself, as he was a god, found no difficulty in making special arrangements for the center island, bringing two streams of water under the earth, which he caused to ascend as springs, one of warm water and the other of cold, and making every variety of food to spring up abundantly in the earth. He also begot and brought up five pairs of male children, dividing the island of Atlantis into ten portions: he gave to the first-born of the eldest pair his mother's dwelling and the surrounding allotment, which was the largest and best and made him king over the rest; the others he made princes and gave them rule over many men and a large territory. And he named them all: the eldest, who was king, he named Atlas, and from him the whole island and the ocean received the name of Atlantic. To his twin-brother, who was born after him, and obtained as his lot the extremity of the island toward the Pillars of Heracles, as far as the country that is still called the region of Gades in that part of the world, he gave the name that in the Hellenic language is Eumelus, in the language of the country that is named after him, Gadeirus. Of the second pair of twins, he called one Ampheres and the other

Evaemon. To the third pair of twins, he gave the name Mneseus to the elder and Autochthon to the one who followed him. Of the fourth pair of twins, he called the elder Elasippus and the younger Nestor. And of the fifth pair he gave to the elder the name of Azaes and to the younger Diaprepes.

All these and their descendants were the inhabitants and rulers of diverse islands in the open sea, and, as has been already said, they held sway in the other direction over the country within the Pillars as far as Egypt and Tyrrhenia.

Now Atlas had a numerous and honorable family, and his eldest branch always retained the kingdom, which the eldest son handed on to his eldest for many generations, and they had such an amount of wealth as was never before possessed by kings and potentates and is not likely ever to be again, and they were furnished with everything that they could have, both in city and country, for, because of the greatness of their empire, many things were brought to them from foreign countries, and the island itself provided much of what was required by them for the uses of life.

In the first place, they dug out of the earth whatever was to be found there, mineral as well as metal and that which is now only a name and was then something more than a name -- *orichalcum*...

Let's stop again to scrutinize this word. OE defines this word as referring to some yellow ore or alloy of copper, highly prized by the ancients. They suggest *brass* (copper and zinc).

They're making a semi-educated guess. The Greek word, *chalko-*, is the combining form of *chalkós* (copper). So, "orichalcum" literally means "an ore of copper," an alloy of copper. A better guess than brass or zinc would be tin, which is needed to make *bronze* (10% tin and 90% copper).

[Orichalcum] was dug out of the earth in many parts of the island and, except for gold, was esteemed the most precious of metals among the men of those days.

So far, our "tin" guess is right on the money. Tin was, during the Bronze Age, what oil is today. It was vital to their most profitable industries, especially tool and weapons-making.

There was an abundance of wood for carpenters' work and sufficient maintenance for tame and wild animals...

Moreover, there were many elephants on the island, and there was provision for animals of every kind, both for those that live in lakes and marshes and rivers and for those that live in mountains and on plains and therefore for the animal that is the largest and most voracious of them. Also, whatever fragrant things there are in the earth, whether roots or herbage or woods or distilling drops of flowers or fruits, grew and thrived in that land, and again, the cultivated fruit of the earth, both the dry edible fruit and other species of food that we call by the general name of legumes and the fruits having a hard rind, affording drinks and meats and ointments and good store of chestnuts and the like, which may be used to play with and are fruits which spoil with keeping -- and the pleasant kinds of dessert that console us after dinner when we are full and tired of eating --all these that sacred island lying beneath the sun brought forth fair and wondrous in infinite abundance. All these things they received from the earth, and they employed themselves in constructing their temples and palaces and harbors and docks, and they arranged the whole country in the following manner:

First, they bridged over the zones of sea that surrounded the ancient metropolis and made a passage into and out of the royal palace, and then they began to build the palace in the habitation of the god and of their ancestors. This they continued to ornament in successive generations, every king surpassing the one who came before him to the utmost of his power, until they made the building a marvel to behold for size and for beauty. And, beginning from the sea, they dug a canal three hundred feet in width and one hundred feet in depth and fifty stadia in length, which they carried through to the outermost zone, making a passage from the sea up to this, which became a harbor and leaving an opening sufficient to enable the largest vessels to find ingress. Moreover, they divided the zones of land that parted the zones of sea, constructing bridges of such a width as would leave a passage for a single trireme to pass out of one into another, and roofed them over; and there was a way underneath for the ships, for the banks of the zones were raised considerably above the

water. Now the largest of the zones into which a passage was cut from the sea was three stadia in breadth and the zone of land which came next of equal breadth, but the next two, as well the zone of water as of land, were two stadia, and the one that surrounded the central island was a stadium only in width. The island in which the palace was situated had a diameter of five stadia. This and the zones and the bridge, which was the sixth part of a stadium in width, they surrounded by a stone wall, on either side placing towers and gates on the bridges where the sea passed in. The stone that was used in the work they quarried from underneath the center island and from underneath the zones, on the outer as well as the inner side. One kind of stone was white, another black and a third red, and as they quarried, they at the same time hollowed out docks double within, having roofs formed out of the native rock. Some of their buildings were simple, but in others they put together different stones, which they intermingled for the sake of ornament, to be a natural source of delight. The entire circuit of the wall that went around the outermost one they covered with a coating of brass, and the circuit of the next wall they coated with tin and the third, which encompassed the citadel, flashed with the red light of orichalcum.

Here, Plato or the authors of the myth are denying that “orichalcum,” the alloy of copper over which, as we’ll see, the war between “Atlantis” and “Athens” was fought, could have been bronze or the tin needed to make bronze. Their thinking and the origins of “orichalcum” are now crystal clear to me. I shall show you that after the tin war, to which this *Atlantis* refers, a war that ended the Bronze Age and ushered in the Iron Age in western Europe; bronze and tin slowly became relatively useless and cheap. By Plato’s time, it was hard for anyone to believe that a western world war had been fought over tin. (Only Iman Wilkens and I and our readers remember this today; but, as we’ll see, it had.) So, the hypothetical “orichalcum” expresses the popular, ancient-world belief that the war with “Atlantis” had been fought over some other, more-precious alloy of copper. *“The red light of orichalcum” symbolizes human blood and expresses the understanding that the goal of those who monopolize resources has never been the resources themselves but the opportunity to oppress and humiliate other human beings. We must socially own and manage the land and everything under it.*

The palaces in the interior of the citadel were constructed in this wise: in the center was a holy temple dedicated to Cleito and Poseidon, which remained inaccessible and was surrounded by an enclosure of gold; this was the spot in which they originally begot the race of the ten princes, and thither they annually brought the fruits of the earth in their season from all the ten portions and performed sacrifices to each of them. Here too was Poseidon's own temple, of a stadium in length and half a stadium in width and of a proportionate height, having a sort of barbaric splendor. All the outside of the temple, except for the pinnacles, they covered with silver and the pinnacles with gold. In the interior of the temple, the roof was of ivory, adorned everywhere with gold and silver and orichalcum; all the other parts of the walls and pillars and floor they lined with orichalcum. In the temple, they placed statues of gold: there was the god himself standing in a chariot -- the charioteer of six winged horses --and of such a size that he touched the roof of the building with his head: around him there were a hundred Nereids riding on dolphins, for such was thought to be the number of them in that day. There were also in the interior of the temple other images that had been dedicated by private individuals. And around the temple on the outside were placed statues of gold of all the ten kings and of their wives; and there were many other great offerings, both of kings and of private individuals, coming both from the city itself and the foreign cities over which they held sway. There was an altar too, which in size and workmanship corresponded to the rest of the work, and there were palaces in like manner that answered to the greatness of the kingdom and the glory of the temple.

In the next place, they used fountains both of cold and hot springs; these were very abundant and both kinds wonderfully adapted to use because of the sweetness and excellence of their waters. They constructed buildings about them and planted suitable trees, also cisterns, some open to the heaven, others that they roofed over, to be used in winter as warm baths: there were the king's baths and the baths of private persons, which were kept apart, also separate baths for women and others again for horses and cattle, and they adorned them suitably. The water that ran off

they carried, some to the grove of Poseidon, where were growing all manner of trees of wonderful height and beauty, owing to the excellence of the soil; the remainder was conveyed by aqueducts that passed over the bridges to the outer circles, and there were many temples built and dedicated to many gods, also gardens and places of exercise, some for men and some set apart for horses, in both of the two islands formed by the zones, and in the center of the larger of the two there was a race-course of a stadium in width and in length allowed to extend all-round the island, for horses to race in. Also, there were guard-houses at intervals for the body-guard, the more trusted of whom had their duties appointed to them in the lesser zone, which was nearer the Acropolis, while the most trusted of all had houses given them within the citadel and about the persons of the kings. The docks were full of triremes and naval stores, and all things were quite ready for use. Enough of the plan of the royal palace. Crossing the outer harbors, which were three in number, you would come to a wall that began at the sea and went all round: this was everywhere distant fifty stadia from the largest zone and harbor and enclosed the whole, meeting at the mouth of the channel toward the sea. The entire area was densely crowded with habitation, and the canal and the largest of the harbors were full of vessels and merchants coming from all parts, who, from their numbers, kept up a multitudinous sound of human voices and din of all sorts night and day. I have repeated his descriptions of the city and the parts about the ancient palace nearly as he gave them, and now I must endeavor to describe the nature and arrangement of the rest of the country.

The whole country was described as being very lofty and precipitous on the side of the sea, but the country immediately about and surrounding the city was a level plain, itself surrounded by mountains that descended toward the sea; it was smooth and even, but of an oblong shape, extending in one direction three thousand stadia and going up the country from the sea through the center of the island two thousand stadia; the whole region of the island lies toward the south and is sheltered from the north. The surrounding mountains they celebrated for their number and size and beauty, in which they exceeded all that are now to be seen anywhere, having in them also many wealthy

inhabited villages and rivers and lakes and meadows supplying food enough for every animal, wild or tame, and wood of various sorts, abundant for every kind of work.

I will now describe the plain, which had been cultivated during many ages by many generations of kings. It was rectangular and for the most part a straight line followed the line of the circular ditch. The depth and width and length of this ditch were incredible and gave the impression that such a work, in addition to so many other works, could hardly have been wrought by the hand of man. But I must say what I have heard. It was excavated to the depth of a hundred feet, and its breadth was a stadium everywhere; it was carried round the whole of the plain and was ten thousand stadia in length. It received the streams that came down from the mountains and winding round the plain and touching the city at various points was there let off into the sea. From above, likewise, straight canals of a hundred feet in width were cut in the plain and again let off into the ditch toward the sea; these canals were at intervals of a hundred stadia, and by them they brought down the wood from the mountains to the city and conveyed the fruits of the earth in ships, cutting transverse passages from one canal into another and to the city. Twice in the year they gathered the fruits of the earth --in winter having the benefit of the rains and in summer introducing the water of the canals.

As to the population, each of the lots in the plain had an appointed chief of men who were fit for military service, and the size of the lot was to be a square of ten stadia each way, and the total number of all the lots was sixty thousand. And of the inhabitants of the mountains and of the rest of the country there was also a vast multitude having leaders, to whom they were assigned according to their dwellings and villages. The leader was required to furnish for the war the sixth portion of a war-chariot, to make up a total of ten thousand chariots, also two horses and riders upon them and a light chariot without a seat, accompanied by a fighting man on foot carrying a small shield and having a charioteer mounted to guide the horse; also, he was bound to furnish two heavy-armed men, two archers, two slingers, three stone- shooters and three javelin men, who were skirmishers, and four sailors to make up a complement of twelve

hundred ships. Such was the order of war in the royal city --that of the other nine governments was different in each of them and would be wearisome to narrate.

As to offices and honors, the following was the arrangement from the first: each of the ten kings, in his own division and in his own city, had the absolute control of the citizens and in many cases of the laws, punishing and slaying whomsoever he would.

Now the relations of their governments to one another were regulated by the injunctions of Poseidon as the law had a column of orichalcum, which was situated in the middle of the island, at the temple of Poseidon, whither the people were gathered together every fifth and sixth years alternately, thus giving equal honor to the odd and to the even number. And when they were gathered together they consulted about public affairs and inquired if anyone had transgressed in anything and passed judgment on him accordingly --and before they passed judgment they gave their pledges to one another in this wise: there were bulls who had the range of the temple of Poseidon, and the ten who were left alone in the temple, after they had offered prayers to the gods that they might take the sacrifices that were acceptable to them, hunted the bulls without weapons but with staves and nooses, and the bull that they caught they led up to the column; the victim was then struck on the head by them and slain over the sacred inscription. Now on the column, besides the law, there was inscribed an oath invoking mighty curses on the disobedient. When, therefore, after offering sacrifice according to their customs, they had burnt the limbs of the bull, they mingled a cup and cast in a clot of blood for each of them; the rest of the victim they took to the fire, after having made a purification of the column all round. Then they drew from the cup in golden vessels, and, pouring a libation on the fire, they swore that they would judge according to the laws on the column and would punish anyone who had previously transgressed and that for the future they would not, if they could help, transgress any of the inscriptions and would not command or obey any ruler who commanded them to act otherwise than according to the laws of their father Poseidon. This was the prayer that each of them offered up for himself and for his family, at the same time drinking and dedicating the vessel in the temple of the god, and,

after spending some necessary time at supper, when darkness came on and the fire about the sacrifice was cool, all put on most beautiful azure robes, and, sitting on the ground at night heard the embers of the sacrifices on which they had sworn and extinguishing all the fire about the temple, they received and gave judgment, if any of them had any accusation to bring against any one, and, when they had given judgment, at daybreak they wrote down their sentences on a golden tablet and deposited them as memorials with their robes. There were many special laws that the several kings had inscribed about the temples, but the most important was the following: they were not to take up arms against one another, and they were all to come to the rescue if anyone in any city attempted to overthrow the royal house. Like their ancestors, they deliberated in common about war and other matters, giving the supremacy to the family of Atlas, and the king was not to have the power of life and death over any of his kinsmen, unless he had the assent of much of the ten kings.

Such was the vast power that the god settled in the lost island of Atlantis, and this he afterward directed against our land on the following pretext, as traditions tell: for many generations, as long as the divine nature lasted in them, they were obedient to the laws and affectionate toward the gods, who were their kinsmen, for they possessed true and, in every way, great spirits, practicing gentleness and wisdom in the various chances of life and in their intercourse with one another. They despised everything but virtue, not caring for their present state of life and thinking lightly on the possession of gold and other property, which seemed only a burden to them; neither were they intoxicated by luxury; nor did wealth deprive them of their self-control, but they were sober and saw clearly that all these goods are increased by virtuous friendship with one another and that by excessive zeal for them and honor of them the good of them is lost, and friendship perishes with them.

By such reflections, and by the continuance in them of a divine nature, all that which we have described waxed and increased in them, but when this divine portion began to fade away in them and became diluted too often and the human nature got the upper-hand, then, they being unable to bear their fortune, became unseemly, and to him who had an eye to see, they began

to appear base and had lost the fairest of their precious gifts, but to those who had no eye to see the true happiness, they were filled with unrighteous avarice and power. Zeus, the god of gods who rules with law and is able to see into such things, perceiving that an honorable race was in a most wretched state and wanting to inflict punishment on them that they might be chastened and improved, collected all the gods into his most holy habitation, which, being placed in the center of the world, sees all things that partake of generation. And when he had called them together, he spoke as follows: (End of story.)

If Plato or Solon had composed *Atlantis* as a doom-saying metaphor for Athens, he would have expounded at length on Atlantis' internal problems -- not just upon its earlier power and unity. Nor is it, as one popular author suggested, a good metaphor for the volcano that, c. 1500 B.C., formed the island of Thera (Santorini), 110 km north of Crete, possibly rocking it with tidal waves. Warfare references are too emphatic to permit of this explanation. Nor can Atlantis be Persia because the Greeks had every reason to boast of their Persian victories. There was no need to cover Persian War history with a cryptic, [screen-memory myth](#).

Atlantis seems bizarre and has been misunderstood until now for at least four reasons. First, it describes at least three places and four events. Three of the events and two of the places are remote from each other. Second, all four of the events that *Atlantis* describes were prehistoric and were preserved exclusively in oral myths. Third, this tale, which, as Plato states, was as central to Greek religion as the Homeric works, was largely composed by the Athenians mainly in an effort to falsify their ancestry. They forced Plato, one of their most honorable citizens to sell their lies to the rest of the world. Socrates, Plato's teacher, preferred to drink hemlock rather than poison his reputation. Plato accepted the job after wringing concessions from them. Fourth, we have failed to understand *Atlantis* because we westerners identify too closely with the Greeks to assess them realistically.

The various deluge myths that we have reviewed above are but a sample of the many deluge myths that have come down to us from cultures all over the globe. Ignatius Donnelly did a commendable job of collecting them for his famous (1882) book *Atlantis*, which has been reprinted many times and was a bestseller for at least a decade. We turn now to the lay scholar himself. Despite the falsity of his literal belief in the myth, Donnelly served us brilliantly as a mythographer. He made penetrating and important insights,

and he lived a life that was a modern Deluge phenomenon in microcosm. In any work dealing with the Deluge, he deserves more than just an honorable mention; and his life story will provide us with some interesting insights.

CHAPTER 2: IGNATIUS DONNELLY: DELUGE MYTHOGRAPHER EXTRAORDINAIRE

Suffer fools gladly; they may be right. --Holbrook Jackson

Ignatius Donnelly fervently believed in Atlantis. He saw “the lost continent” behind every other deluge myth. All the same, he was not naiver than most people of his day. “Among the famous men and women who wrote to Donnelly, none expressed warmer appreciation for his work than did the British Prime Minister and scholar, William E. Gladstone...” (Paul M. Allen’s introduction to *Atlantis*). Nor were Donnelly and Gladstone alone in their beliefs. “In the last three hundred years, thousands of books and articles on Atlantis have been written, giving it a geography, fauna (including elephants), a flora, a past and a future --even airplanes, far beyond Plato’s elaborate descriptions” (Hill).

Moreover, despite the unanimity of opinion among archaeologists that geological strata of the Tigris and Euphrates River Valley show no evidence of a catastrophic, valley-encompassing flood, only a few years ago, another costly expedition to Mt. Ararat produced a popular book heralding the mountaintop imprint of Noah’s ark. So, let no one think that I’m ridiculing the naiveté of this gentleman of the last century, here and in a later chapter, if I get inside his head a little bit.

Ignatius Donnelly was a second generation Irish-American. His Irish-immigrant father worked his way through medical school and died shortly after receiving his medical license. Ignatius, born in Philadelphia, was still a boy at the time. He became a lawyer, married and earned his living by helping to arrange for the settlement of immigrants in Minnesota. Soon he moved his own family there, bought a tract of land in partnership with others and engaged full-time in real estate speculation. He edited a newspaper that painted rosy pictures of the west for people back east and (along with plenty of competitors) practically dragged people off the train. As the publisher’s introduction to one of his Atlantis editions informs, “The *modus operandi* was to obtain cheap land (recently taken from you know whom), prepare subdivision maps complete with imaginary streets, sell suckers the deeds to lots covered with effusive predictions and pressure railroads and state government to locate their development projects nearby.”

But in mid-life, Ignatius Donnelly underwent a metamorphosis. The political opportunist became a champion of the little guy. “Something must have happened during the middle period of Donnelly’s life... for in his later

years a very different Ignatius Donnelly was to be met with in Minnesota. This was an Ignatius Donnelly who quite consciously allied himself with small populist groups that he knew had no chance of winning; a man who, as state senator, did his best to break the milling, mining, lumbering and railroad monopolies and devoted his life to improving the lot of the common man. From an agile performer on the political trampoline, he had become a universally respected statesman.” (*Atlantis*, intro. by E.F. Bleiler, p VII)

Of course, this political schizophrenia could be attributed to a radical change in Donnelly’s identity, a change that corresponded to the boyhood loss of his father. Yet we’ll see that there is an even more likely explanation for Mr. Donnelly’s transformation into a champion for the underdog. Donnelly made an insight that, for a man of his time, was nothing less than amazing. This insight brought him within a whisker of decoding the Deluge. Because “the Deluge” is the basic stuff of all our religions, this insight heightened Donnelly’s awareness of the basic truths that our religions embody. With this new reverence for our modern religions, it became difficult for Mr. Donnelly to ignore their common moral imperative. Late in life, Donnelly adopted ethical reciprocity, the Golden Rule, as his guiding principle.

But let’s leave Mr. Donnelly for the time being. His great insight will provide us with much-needed enlightenment in a later chapter. Let us acquire now the most difficult background. Let’s bring ourselves up to date on psychoanalysis and the inner logic by which religion has developed. For help with this information, we must turn to three men: James George Frazer, Sigmund Freud and your friendly taxi driver --me.

Be prepared to work hard at understanding the next two chapters. Understanding them will make the rest of the book fun. These two chapters will enable you to decode (to analyze) the few myths that you’ve already seen and the many yet to come. *Many of those to come are actually Deluge myths without a deluge. They refer to the same violent events that were universally assumed to have brought on the Great Flood as punishment, events that became taboo to even think about.*

CHAPTER 3: FRAZER AND MAGIC

If we could trace the whole course of religious development, we might find that the chain that links our idea of the Godhead with that of the savage is one and unbroken. - James George Frazer, the Golden Bough, p. 107

Like Sigmund Freud, J.G. Frazer had an uncommon ability to systematically penetrate the inner logic of bizarre and anomalous phenomena that most of us fearfully avoid. His masterwork, *The Golden Bough*, systematically traces the development of a certain type of thought, from its earliest beginnings to the establishment of powerful monarchies, from the most unconscious and erroneous philosophical premises to its giving birth to the natural sciences. I shall outline Frazer's work for you. Following the most general train of thought, I shall add some of the related observations that Frazer inspired of Freud and make some necessary criticisms.

If you find Frazer's work half as fascinating as I did and if you haven't read him yet, you'll want to gallop to the nearest library or bookstore and get hold of *The Golden Bough*. Although I shall render almost all Frazer's interpretations obsolete, his work should continue to be treasured for its colorful accounts of the religious myths and rituals of primitive people from around the world. The original work is in twelve volumes; but the condensed, 752-page, one volume abridgement suffices for our purposes. This work will better acquaint you with your primitive ancestors and recall your childhood. This is so because Frazer's great contribution to comparative religion, to cultural anthropology, was his discovery of the inner logic of magic:

If my analysis of the magician's logic is correct, its two great principles turn out to be merely two different misapplications of the association of ideas. **Homeopathic magic** is founded on the association of ideas by similarity; **contagious magic** is founded on the association of ideas by contiguity. --Frazer: 3

Consider these examples of homeopathic and contagious magic. Let's say a primitive sorcerer, magician, wanted to make it rain. (The vagaries of nature were a matter of life and death to Neolithic peoples. Regional and international markets for grain and other foodstuffs didn't exist. A crop failure meant eating more of the animals. Several crop failures meant either death by starvation or having to make war on more prosperous neighbors.) A magician sprinkling water from a vase onto a parched field, while dancing

and chanting his incantations, was performing homeopathic magic. If he had the villagers blow in unison from the direction from which the rain clouds came or produce a sound that imitated thunder, he was adding an element of contagious magic.

At the same time, it is to be borne in mind that the primitive magician knows magic only on its practical side; he never analyses the mental process on which his practice is based, never reflects on the abstract principles involved in his actions. He does not distinguish between the symbol and the thing symbolized. With him, as with most men, logic is implicit, not explicit; he reasons just as he digests his food, in complete ignorance of the intellectual and physiological processes that are essential to the one operation and to the other. In short, to him magic is always an art, never a science; the very idea of science is lacking in his undeveloped mind. --Op. cit. 13

Human progress, from the most naive and elemental magic to the quantitative expression of scientific laws, from the most obvious and simple hypotheses to the most obscure and complex ones, could only develop by trial and error. As individuals, we tend to repeat this philosophical history, from the most simple and erroneous ideas about the world and our ability to influence it, to a more sophisticated and complex appreciation of other autonomous beings, forces of nature and the laws by which they operate. This development, from the simple to the complex, from undifferentiated homogeneity to differentiated heterogeneity, from the general to the special, goes forth by trial and error until the individual acquires and makes his own the culture of the historical stage of society into which he is born. We recapitulate our ancestors' worldviews in a manner analogous to our in-utero recapitulation of their phylogeny (evolutionary development).¹²

With the instruction and advice of adults, we are pulled through some of these stages before we even demarcate their boundaries.

¹² Gould points out (1977) that evolution is *not* linear. Developmental pace changes and occasionally reverses. No mechanism requires organisms to repeat all the *adult*, "dead end" developments of their ancestors. The conservatism and economy that causes the embryo to develop from the simple to the complex, generally does so by the shortest possible route leading from the earliest ancestors to the most recent. This might explain why most genes within the human genome appear to never turn on.

Toyland, toy land,
Good little girl and boy land,
Once you pass its borders,
You can never return again.¹³
- Popular song by Victor Herbert.

Excuse the interruption Mr. Frazer. Please continue:

*Both branches of magic, the homeopathic and the contagious, may conveniently be comprehended under the general name of sympathetic magic, since both assume that things act upon each other at a distance through a secret sympathy, the impulse being transmitted from one to the other by means of what we may conceive as a kind of invisible ether, not unlike that which is postulated by modern science for a precisely similar purpose, namely, to explain how things can physically effect each other through a space that appears to be empty.*¹⁴ (Op. cit. p. 14)

Here's a good example of primitive magic that, if ennobled with a theory, would rely upon either ether or the currently misunderstood “quantum mechanics”:

Among some of the Dyaks of Borneo, when a woman is in hard labor, a wizard is called in, who essays to facilitate the delivery in a rational manner by manipulating the body of the sufferer. Meantime, another wizard outside the room exerts

¹³ One October morning, when my son Danny was three years old, we went for a walk. He asked why the squirrels were so busy. I said, “They’re gathering up their chestnuts, as they must at this time of year.” He said, “Oh, are they getting ready for Halloween?” --Danny was still within Toyland’s borders.

¹⁴ Science gradually reduced “Aither,” the bright and shiny air that the Greeks believed to consist of souls, to the less personal “ether.” Belief in homogenous, invisible, evenly distributed stuff within the empty space between gasses died with the 1887 Michaelson-Morley experiment. However, the Michaelson-Morley experiment may have done more harm than good. Mark McCutcheon, the new leader in physics, shows that it was misinterpreted, misleading Einstein to develop his erroneous Special Relativity Theory, a false and unnecessary exception to general relativity. Mark also says that electrons, upon escaping the atom, expand at the speed of light (some becoming light) but prefer to return to the atomic state. The infinitely fine hairs that escaped electrons become may be the “ether” or magnetic flux that make motors and generators and the oddities of quantum mechanics possible.

himself to attain the same end by means that we should regard as wholly irrational. He, in fact, pretends to be the expectant mother; a large stone is attached to his stomach by a cloth wrapped around his body representing the child in the womb, and, following the directions shouted to him by his colleague on the real scene of operations, he moves his make-believe baby about on his body in exact imitation of the movements of the real baby till the infant is born. The same principle of make-believe, so dear to children (Op. cit. p.16).

If it is true, as Frazer suggests, that the primitive magician, “never analyses the mental process on which his practice is based, never reflects on the abstract principles involved in his actions,” then we can infer that magicians combined every conceivable method in a desperate effort to exploit every possibility of quickly and easily overcoming their impotence with respect to both the natural and the social worlds that constrained them. This failure to isolate variables made it impossible to evaluate the success of one method as opposed to another. Worse still, the mere existence of “spirits” made any certainty about the world impossible. Violation of a *taboo* or failure to properly propitiate or control a spirit might spoil even the best magic.¹⁵

But what was disastrous for public enlightenment, the inseparability of magic and religion and the difficulty of proving the efficacy of either, created fabulous career opportunities for wily magicians. The collective needs of society, the belief in magic and souls and the importance attached to performing rites in the “correct” and most productive manner gave birth to public offices for magicians. Because the welfare of the tribe was believed to be mainly in their hands, early magicians generally became the equals or the superiors of chiefs. Sometimes both offices were combined in a single person. (We are not yet speaking of kings. We will get to kings in a moment.)

¹⁵ Taboos are behavioral injunctions the rationales for which are unconscious. The unconscious element is always owing to ambivalent (mixed) emotions, one side of which is repressed and isolated within the unconscious mind. Josef Breuer, one of Freud’s teachers, was the first to understand this dynamic. Freud further explored it and wrote about some of the many taboos of our primitive ancestors. (See *Totem and Taboo*.) Our contemporary feelings about polygamy constitute a modern taboo. Many of us understand this taboo as being related to the [Oedipus Complex](#) and near-neighbor alienation; but, to date, no one (Herbert Spencer and Friedrich Engels inclusive) has put forth a thorough, systematic and logical explanation as to why our Oedipal and near-neighbor feelings became so very different from those of our polygamous pagan ancestors. I’ll do this in Chapter 7.

The profession accordingly draws into its ranks some of the ablest and most ambitious men of the tribe because it holds out to them a prospect of honor, wealth and power such as hardly any other career could offer. The acuter minds see how easy it is to dupe their weaker brother and to play on his superstition for their own advantage. Not that the sorcerer is always a knave and imposter; he is often sincerely convinced that he really possesses those wonderful powers that the credulity of his fellows ascribes to him. But the more sagacious he is, the more likely he is to see through the fallacies that impose on duller wits. Thus, the ablest members of the profession must tend to be conscious deceivers; and it is just these men who, by their superior ability, will generally come to the top and win for themselves positions of the highest dignity and the most commanding authority. The pitfalls that beset the path of the professional sorcerer are many, and as a rule only the man of coolest head and sharpest wit will be able to steer his way through them safely. For it must always be remembered that every single profession and claim put forward by the magician as such is false; not one of them can be maintained without deception, conscious or unconscious.

Accordingly, the sorcerer who sincerely believes in his own extravagant pretensions is in far greater peril and is much more likely to be cut short in his career than the deliberate imposter. The honest wizard always expects that his charms and incantations will produce their supposed effect; and when they fail, not only really, as they always do, but conspicuously and disastrously, as they often do, he is taken aback: he is not, like his knavish colleague, ready with a plausible excuse to account for the failure, and before he can find one, he may be knocked on the head by his disappointed and angry employers. --*Ibid.* p. 53

The knavery would have consisted not only of prepared excuses for failures but also of inventive, false credits for natural events. The astute observer of natural cycles would have been able to anticipate --better than his piers --when the rain could be expected, when the sun would begin to rise further or closer on the horizon (the autumnal and the vernal equinox), the migratory patterns of animals or the blossoming of food-plants, etc. Prior to

such an event, the rogue-magician-priest would publicly perform the magic that “made it happen.”

As such was a yearly pantomime that legend says was performed by the Inca high priest at *Machu Pichu*. Machu Pichu is the long-lost, mountaintop city of the Incas, the refuge to which the Inca priests fled with all the virgins in advance of Pizarro's conquering army. The priest's stage was a huge platform rock that still projects from the flat mountaintop city of Machu Pichu over the valley below. On the day before the vernal equinox, before a community of on-looking admirers and after much fanfare, the head priest-magician dramatically mounted this rock with a rope that had been treated in such a way as to make it stiff. (The sexual associations did not hurt his cause either.) After many threatening displays and much glaring at the sun, the priest-magician held the rope up toward the sun and struggled to pull the sun back to earth. The next day, when the sun rose higher in the sky and stayed longer, our hero was credited with returning life to the plants and animals and with feeding his people.¹⁶

Not long before the Spanish conquest of Peru, when all the Indians were familiar with the yearly movement of the sun on the horizon, this priestly trick became redefined by Inca lore. “*Manco Capac*, the first Inca, had lassoed and held the sun in place to lengthen indefinitely the one day during which the wind agreed not to impede the construction of Cuzco.” (Cf. Gifford: 54-55.)

Note also that the Incas, the pre-Columbian Mexicans, the ancients of the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia, the Indo-European peoples, all the North Americans and every primitive western people with whom I am familiar worshipped the sun as they acquired agriculture. The sun's importance, our dependence upon it, is obvious. The other, not so obvious reason why our ancestors everywhere associated the gods with the sun was that it meant relief from the severe cold of the Ice Age. Frazer has more to say to us.

The general result [*H of the practice and belief in magic*] is that at this stage of social evolution the supreme power tends to fall into the hands of men of the keenest intelligence and the most unscrupulous character. If we could balance the harm they do by their knavery against the benefits they confer by their superior

¹⁶ Many rites such as this one, that to the casual, modern observer appear only to involve the application of magic to nature's forces, were once thought to involve a cosmic struggle between two opposing groups of gods or the leaders of those gods. Paleolithic men believed warriors were minor players in these struggles after they died.

sagacity, it might well be found that the good greatly outweighed the evil.

This is an odd, western point of view that I shall criticize below.

For more mischief has probably been wrought in the world by honest fools in high places than by intelligent rascals. [*H He'll get no argument from me on this one.*] Once your shrewd rogue has attained the height of his ambition and has no longer any selfish end to further...

Stop. Frazer forgets about the unscrupulous means that rogues must use to *stay* in office. Moreover, only one who had lived all his life in the West would assume that real power, decision-making ability, was in the hands of the men and not the women whose husbands they were. Worst of all, Frazer seems not to have understood that masked, latent homosexual people, the worst liars and tricksters in our midst, are motivated only by fear and can never acquire enough money, power or genetic offspring. As we'll see their homophobia is mostly a product of the high birthrates of savage society and the dysfunctional monogamy of the modern era. During early adolescence, when they are putting on their masks; the rest of us tolerate them because, as we'll see, all of us have already acquired two lesser masks of our own. You're on again, Sir George:

[H]e may, and often does, turn his talents, his experience, his resources, to the service of the public. Many men who have been least scrupulous in the acquisition of power have been most beneficent in the use of it, whether the power they aimed at and won was that of wealth, political authority, or what not...

Thus, so far as the public profession of magic affected the constitution of savage society, it tended to place the control of affairs in the hands of the ablest man: it shifted the balance of power from the many to the one: it substituted a monarchy for a democracy, or rather for an oligarchy of old men; for in general the savage community is ruled, not by the whole body of adult males, but by a council of elders.

The change, by whatever causes produced and whatever the character of the early rulers, was on the whole very beneficial.

For the rise of monarchy appears to be an essential condition of the emergence of mankind from savagery.¹⁷

No human being is so hidebound by custom and tradition as your democratic savage; in no state of society consequently is progress so slow and difficult. The old notion that the savage is the freest of mankind is the reverse of the truth. He is a slave, not indeed to a visible master, but to the past, to the spirits of his dead forefathers, who haunt his steps from birth to death and rule him with a rod of iron. What they did is the pattern of right, the unwritten law to which he yields a blind unquestioning obedience. The least possible scope is thus afforded to superior talent to change old customs for the better. The ablest man is dragged down by the weakest and the dullest, who necessarily sets the standard, since he cannot rise, while the other can fall... From this law and stagnant condition of affairs, which demagogues and dreamers in later times have lauded as the ideal state, the Golden Age of humanity, everything that helps to raise society by opening a career to talent and proportioning the degrees of authority to men's natural abilities, deserves to be welcomed by all who have the good of their fellows at heart. --Op. cit. p. 53

Gee, if only I could suck up like this. Just imagine how many honorary degrees and nobility titles I'd have! Frazer is painting MK society in rosy colors. In Chapter 13's section on East-West differences, I'll define the MK and FR societal extremes. The letters indicate the correlation that we'll discover between types of gender and class domination. In Chapter 4, we'll take a closer look at latent homosexual "knavery" and the historical and psychological roots of the Orwellian personality type that Frazer so admired. We'll consider the guilt, paranoid delusions and the self-hatred that result from repression, violence and knavery. We'll consider also the insecurity and lovelessness of societies that, like ours, become ever more dominated by homophobic, latent homosexual, malicious knaves who are incapable of adult to adult (sexual) love.

¹⁷ If you think that Frazer and his turn-of-the-century peers were know-nothings, compare this statement with more recent findings: "In Mesoamerica, writing first emerged among chiefdoms, societies that had hereditary differences in rank ---based on the degree of kinship to the chief--- but that lacked the division into exclusive upper and lower classes typical of ancient states or civilizations" (Marcus, 1991).

Mr. Frazer also saw only one side of the issue of ancestor worship. Moreover, he and his professional colleagues have failed to see who the gods are. The gods and the demons and the modern God and Devil that have succeeded them are –universally and even for adult believers --ancestors and relatives. They are the projected spirits of two ongoing groups of ancestors and relatives in false or over generalized association with the myths and rituals about three prehistoric groups of ancestors and relatives. We modern savages are not nearly as different from primitive savages as (Sir) James George Frazer wanted to believe.

DID MAGIC DECLINE OR MERELY RELOCATE AND MATURE WITH THE MOST MATURE OF US?

Gradually, men lost confidence in their own, individual magic as a means of manipulating the gods. Submissive propitiation became the standard method of dealing with the gods. What caused men to attribute more power over natural events to external spirits and less to themselves? Frazer, on his page 824, ventures an explanation:

With all due diffidence, then, I would suggest that a tardy recognition of the inherent falsehood and barrenness of magic set the more thoughtful part of mankind to cast about for a truer theory of nature and a more fruitful method of turning her resources to account. The discovery amounted to this, that men for the first time recognized their inability to manipulate at pleasure certain natural forces that hitherto they had believed to be completely within their control. It was a confession of human ignorance and weakness... Thus cut adrift from his ancient moorings and left to toss on a troubled sea of doubt and uncertainty, his old happy confidence in himself and his powers rudely shaken, our primitive philosopher must have been sadly perplexed and agitated till he came to rest, as in a quiet haven after a tempestuous voyage, in a new system of faith and practice, which seemed to offer a solution of his harassing doubts and a substitute, however precarious, for that sovereignty over nature that he had reluctantly abdicated. If the great world went on its way without the help of him or his fellows, it must surely be because there were other beings, like himself, but far stronger, who, unseen themselves, directed its course and brought about all

the varied series of events that he had hitherto believed to be dependent on his own magic. (Op. cit. p. 65-66)

When he discovers his mistake, when he recognizes sadly that both the order of nature that he had assumed and the control that he had believed himself to exercise over it were purely imaginary, he ceases to rely on his own intelligence and his own unaided efforts and throws himself humbly on the mercy of certain great invisible beings behind the veil of nature, [beings] to whom he now ascribes all those far-reaching powers that he once arrogated to himself.

Frazer's assumption here -- and the traditional assumption of almost the entire scientific community -- is that the gods were invented, that they were wholly fictitious characters hoped to be responsible for and in control of the forces of nature. Frazer's contribution to this theory, to *naturism* is his contention that magic, when directed at living beings, was directed at unincarnated [*H pre-existent?*] souls, anonymous spirits, and that the distinct gods were invented only as magic was abandoned.

It is certainly true that primitive men would have practiced magic with little if any conscious consideration of their logical or "spiritual" assumptions. The Bible offers examples. In Genesis 30: 32-39, to increase the number of striped animals born to his father-in-law's herd and the share that will be his own, Jacob set up peeled wands at the watering troughs where the animals bred. No spirit or god is appealed to here, and it is obviously assumed that Jacob's magic affects some natural causality. Similarly, many "miracles," performed in the Bible by "Jesus" or "God" or the "Holy Spirit," working through the prophets, are probably propitiatory versions of earlier, nature-oriented, magical practices. This is suggested by *Kings* 17: 21 where Elijah gets down on the ground and superimposes his own body on that of a dead man to restore the corpse to life.

But from this early confusion of magic with science don't assume that "spirits" didn't cohabit with our earliest and most primitive ancestors or that they were entirely unconscious of the identity of the spirits that gradually became amalgamated and inflated into gods. *Homo sapien* evolved in a world that was already resplendent with spirits.¹⁸

¹⁸ By convention, "*Homo sapiens*" is an adjective and a singular and a plural noun. This Latin usage, though contributing to an international language for science, has a downside for English readers. It alienates us psychologically from our ancestors, and it encourages the wishful belief that their basic problems are not still with us. Opposing that point of view, I

As Freud and I will show you in the next two chapters, spirits are the projection of repressed ambivalence; and they became inflated into gods and demons as our primitive ancestors discovered that they were all obsessed with the same groups of ancestors and relatives. People above age four have always felt strongly ambivalent toward the parent of the same sex (the *competing parent*). People in their teens or older have always felt ambivalent toward their ongoing genetic competitors. Spirits were born as soon as our pre-*Homo sapiens*, hominid (bipedal ape) ancestors repressed the negative side of their ambivalence toward a parent or colleague whom they needed but whose mate they desired. Spirits were born as soon as our ancestors started killing and eating one another and then repressed feelings of remorse. Spirits always existed, and they were probably always the objects of most of our ancestors' magical rites. At least one of the Irish myths goes so far as to explicitly state that the gods were formerly manipulated by ancestors whose magic was more powerful than that of the tellers of the myth. (See for example "The King of Erin and the Queen of Lonesome Island" in my *Irish Mythology: Passageway to Prehistory*.)

We are all unable to perfectly control or adapt to our environment. This inability causes suffering and the ultimate failure, death. We all hope at one time or another that someone more powerful than ourselves will go to bat for us and control the world and our fate, as we cannot, as two god-like beings, our parents, did for us when we were babies. This is the demand side of religion. The naturists got this side right.

Where they failed utterly and completely was on the supply side. They failed to show that we all repress ambivalence toward our same-sex parent and ongoing genetic competitors and project the conflicting but repressed and unlocatable feelings as spirits, spirits that we mistakenly identify with grossly inflated mythological characters from our prehistory, characters that, outside of the Mid-East, became amalgamated and then divided into the gods and the demons (the "God" and "Devil" of modern religions). With the aid of a century of learning that was unavailable to Mr. Frazer, I shall show you this in detail. That will be in Chapters 4, 5 and 7. For now, so that you don't get mired down in the details, so that we don't lose anyone, here is a general outline, a first approximation of the unbroken chain of religious development.

shall drop the final "s" in favor of the more English-sounding *Homo sapien* when using the term as an adjective or a singular noun. The use of "*Homo erectus*" as a singular and a plural noun has similar ill effects. Perhaps worst of all, "*Homo erectus*" accommodates the wishful thinking that there may only have been one or a few of them. I therefore prefer "*Homo erecti*" as the plural noun.

Every person ever born has come into the world as a helpless baby. Our first clear images of other beings are of beings (parents) that created us, feed us, protect us and seem to be all-powerful and all knowing. The *archetype* of gods develops due to our earliest experience (C. Jung). Because we are mortal beings, we never lose our infantile desire for a protector who can deliver us from death and suffering. As the individual matures, his needs grow. Parents cease to perform as gods capable of fulfilling all these needs. Moreover, as we'll see when we study Freud and the Oedipal Complex in Chapter Four, the parent of the same sex does not only cease to be all-powerful and all-knowing. He becomes an object of strong mixed emotions, *ambivalence*. Because the individual still needs this parent, he represses the negative side of this ambivalence. The ensuing, unconscious struggle of mixed emotions and impulses (one side of which is unconscious and unlocatable) results in the projection of a spirit. Wanting the full protection and beneficence that his parents once provided, the individual readily equates the spirit with the God or gods of his culture's prepared religion. This "parent in heaven" is an amalgamation that includes the grossly disguised, condensed and inflated, oral-historical remains of the primal (or primordial) fathers. We'll learn more about them in Chapter Four.

As the individual matures and his needs grow still further, the adult society also fails in its promise. Adults that once seemed to be all-powerful and all-knowing come into focus as mortal beings with limitations. Moreover, sexually mature members of the same sex become unrestrained genetic competitors and new objects of extreme ambivalence. The individual represses the negative side of his ambivalence toward those with whom he must work or trade cooperatively. A host of new spirits is thus projected. The individual searches for the "true" gods of society to replace the failed gods of his childhood imagination and to incorporate the new spirits. Again, his culture's religion offers up fully prepared nominees for these offices: the chief transmitters of the "Holy Spirit," the grossly condensed, disguised and inflated oral-historical symbols of the victims of the violent events that underlie "the Deluge." I describe this systematically maladaptive (neurotic) association of ambivalent ongoing relatives with prehistoric relatives as the Fraternal Complex. It's dynamically like the Oedipal Complex but has different objects of ambivalence, relatives instead of ancestors. There's more on it in Chapter Four, *et seq.*

Yet the Deluge victims were also parents in another sense, and the killers of both the primal fathers and the Deluge victims were *sons* in one sense or another. Paul's Jesus, "the son of God," symbolizes the killer-sons of both

prehistoric groups of gods. By association, Jesus also symbolizes the hostile part of us that wants to eliminate the ongoing objects of our ambivalence, the ongoing elements of the godhead, the sources of the spirits, the competing parent and genetic competitors.

The Deluge victors gradually but universally contracted the ambivalence of their victims and were deified, becoming the fifth element of the godhead. This occurred during the Neolithic (the New Stone Age of early horticulture).

There are and were many similarities between the two complexes and the five elements of the godhead. Owing to these similarities and the competition among priests and cults to absorb each other's gods and patrons, the myths, rituals and projected spirits of all five groups of ancestors and relatives became amalgamated. In the modern era, expanding trade has required the repression of hostility toward an ever-wider circle of genetic competitors. People within the trading zone are assumed to be "good" people. Outsiders remain fair game but are ever fewer. The gods became similarly divided (dichotomized). "Good" ones condensed into "God," negative ones into "Devil." Jesus, the murderous "Son," is the perfect lamb whose sacrifice appeased "God," disengages the "Devil" and eliminates (for believers that magically participate in his sacrifice at "communion") the need to offer sacrificial victims (the potential pool of which is ever smaller).

This is the general outline for the most complex chain, the Christian chain, of religious development. We'll discover that the other religions deal with the same elements of the godhead, the same ambivalent ancestors and relatives, the same contradictions in our past and present lives. They deal with them in a more simple or abbreviated way and, in the East, without the male bias.

As this outline suggests, the spirits gradually grew in power as men developed ever-stronger ambivalence toward their fellow men. This occurred as population and technical ability grew, thus increasing our potential to alter our environment in both positive and negative ways.

The mythological characters symbolic of the spirits could only begin to grow into immensely powerful gods as the spirits grew and after groups of victims were produced universally. These groups were in some ways like and associated with the competing parent and ongoing genetic competitors. These victims became magnified or inflated into gods as tribes shared their oral histories, discovered the same types of victims to be universal and condensed countless victims into a few mythological characters that symbolized them and embodied their powers. Like the ever-more-powerful and hierarchical political state to which men were subject, the prehistoric gods became ever

more remote, powerful and hierarchically organized. Guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia also played a role in distorting the gods' identities.

Wishful thinking and the infantile desire for gods that could make the world benign (the demand side of religion) did, as Frazer suggests, play an important role in magnifying or inflating the gods. But this magnification was a protracted process, and at no time were its gods arbitrarily invented. Arbitrary inventions would have been no more popular or long-lived than the infinite varieties of speculative philosophy that are created daily.

To suggest, as Frazer and the *naturists* do, that the gods were arbitrarily invented is to underestimate believers. This is an insult to our ancestors and to religious fundamentalists everywhere, and the resentment toward intellectuals that grows out of this claim is entirely justified. Indeed, who would "throw himself humbly on the mercy of certain invisible beings" whom he doesn't know?

In fairness to Frazer, he wasn't the first to say the gods were invented. Classical observers (e. g. Caesar, *Conquest of Gaul*, 6.21 and 4.7 and Posidonius, cited by Rutherford below) and countless over-zealous Christians either misinterpreted or deliberately misrepresented pagan rites. Some early observers even claimed that pagan peoples had no gods or worshipped inanimate various objects. These objects were only symbols for the gods! All things sacred are sacred because of their close association with the ambivalent objects of the godhead. All the experts (Freud and Curtin notwithstanding) resorted to *naturism*, to the belief that our ancestors invented gods to correspond to forces of nature that they wished to control, simply because the experts had no idea who the "gods" originally were.

Emile Durkheim wrote a concise history of the various attempts to explain the origin of religious belief scientifically. He distinguished the advanced expression of naturism as "animism," the belief in "spiritual beings" that correspond to the natural forces that animate all things in precisely the same way that "souls" are believed to animate humans. Of course, if the gods were invented, then their characteristics would have been determined solely by the natural phenomena to which they were assigned. They don't. As we'll see, most of the pagan gods embody particularity that is unrelated to natural phenomena.

Most devastating of all to naturism is the uniformity of divinity names and characteristics that have no apparent origin in nature. As you will see, the "gods" acquired their mythological characteristics and assignments due (at least in part) to the exaggeration of their actual abilities. Grimm raised this argument long before Durkheim. He listed eight grounds for insisting on the

antiquity, originality and affinity of German and Norse mythology. The ground that best revealed the absurdity of the naturism hypothesis is Grimm's observation that all Germanic peoples maintained similar names for days of the week. These god-derived names differed only slightly from one Germanic people to another [e. g. Odin, Wodin, Wotan (Wednesday)] (Grimm: 10-11).

Durkheim "credits" Max Mueller with naturism's most systematic expression:

Religion...if it is to hold its place as a legitimate element of our consciousness, must, like all other knowledge, begin with sensuous experience.

But which are these sensations that give birth to religious thought? That is the question that the study of the Vedas [*H four ancient Sanskrit books of Hinduism*] is supposed to aid in resolving.

The names of the gods are generally either common words, still employed, or else words formerly common, whose original sense it is possible to discover. Now both designate the principal phenomena of nature. Thus Agni, the name of one of the principal divinities of India, originally signified only the material fact of fire, such as it is ordinarily perceived by the senses and without any mythological addition. --Durkheim: 91; quoting Mueller, 1889: 114

Negative, Mr. Mueller. Agni did become a god in India. Fire, oak trees and certain animals did become associated with the gods but not because of their inherent wonder or ambivalence or confusion over their names in different languages. The association of these objects with the gods, their sacredness, was owing to the physical characteristics of the gods and historical experience. We'll make all these connections in Chapters 28, 29 and 34.

Ethnography is the branch of anthropology that deals descriptively with specific cultures, especially those of preliterate peoples. One of the real giants of ethnography, one of the as-yet unsung heroes of social science was Jeremiah Curtin. Curtin rescued from oblivion primitive mythology of the Irish, the Mongols and several North American peoples. In the coming chapters, we will meet with this Harvard-educated American, this accomplished scholar and gifted linguist, several times. Curtin and some other giants from the field of ethnography did the difficult and dangerous job

of finding the puzzle pieces that we will be working with in the chapters ahead.

For now, note that in his autobiography and in the introductions of his books --seven years or more before Freud revealed two of the universal elements of the godhead and eighty-six years before the other three elements were identified herein --Jeremiah Curtin had an intuitive grasp of prehistoric realities. He sensed that the authentic and primitive mythology was invaluable for what it would one day tell us about our prehistory. He sensed that there were traumatic experiences from man's remote past that universally gave rise to man's religions.

Curtin had no conscious idea what those experiences were, but he was not misled by the "experts" of his day. Of Mueller, Curtin noted,

Mythology, according to his [*H Mueller's*] theory, is an outgrowth of error founded on mistaken identity of names; and the explanation of mythology follows on the discovery of the real meaning of those names by the aid of kindred languages in which their meanings are preserved.

Some stories connected with mythology have arisen in the way mentioned, and such stories cannot be explained, if explained at all, without the aid of kindred languages; but these stories no more constitute mythology than the bayous and creeks of the Amazon constitute the main body of that great river. Even if all that Professor Max Mueller advances regarding Greek and Sanskrit names were demonstrated beyond a doubt, it would explain, not the origin of myths, but the origin of the particular stories with which he connects these names [*H it doesn't even do that*]; for he has put in the place of mythology as a whole, the outcroppings of a part of mythology at a comparatively late period of its history and has not touched the real origin of mythology, which, at the time he fixes for its birth, had already attained a most vigorous growth. --Curtin, 1890: 20

This theory that the gods were invented implies that our ancestors were and religious fundamentalists are psychotic. They were not and are not psychotic. They are, as Freud said, only neurotic. Moreover, a strong tendency toward neurosis is built into our semi-civilized society. It tends to affect all of us. Even the great Freud was not immune to what I refer to as the Fraternal Complex (our strong ambivalence for our ongoing genetic

competitors and the closely-associated victims of the Deluge). We have ongoing fraternal ambivalence toward our genetically competing associates with whom we must cooperate but with whom we compete (as programmed by our evolution) to maximally and most securely reproduce our own genes within a limited-resource environment. As you will see, this ambivalence associates with the Deluge victims and tends to have its negative side isolated within the unconscious and projected onto phantasms or remote “bad guys.” These obsessive neurotic tendencies can only be corrected in the future by setting limits upon our genetic competition.

Freud and Josef Breuer (one of Freud’s teachers) discovered the process of neurotic symptom formation. Freud correctly understood the spirits to be neurotic symptoms of our ambivalence and the gods to have arisen from them. But he did not forcefully defend his theory by denying the incorrect alternatives. He must have lacked the confidence to do so due to his inability to figure out such things as whom the “Holy Spirit” fully represents. (Jesus baptized with fire and the Holy Spirit. Matthew 3:11) Freud must have sensed that there were elements of the godhead other than the two he discovered in the Oedipal Complex. He must have sensed that he didn’t have the whole of it.

But before we turn to Freud, a few more observations on magic are important. *Frazer believed that magic gradually declined as it was replaced by religious propitiation and science.* He noticed that science employed magic’s attitude, a determinist attitude that is wholly different from religious propitiation (from using sacrifices or obsessional gestures to beg the gods for favors). Practical people always have operated from day to day, to develop the knowledge and the skills that earned them their daily bread, by reliance upon a philosophy that is more akin to magic than to western religion. The *practical* assumption has always been that nature operates according to impersonal and invariable laws. This deterministic attitude, assumed by the first magicians, is the one that, according to Frazer, “gave birth to science and technology.”

It is true that magic often deals with spirits that are personal agents of the kind assumed by religion; but whenever it does so in its proper form, it treats them exactly in the same fashion as it treats inanimate agents, that is, it constrains or coerces instead of conciliating or propitiating them as religion would do (Frazer p. 59). [*H This narrower definition of magic completely separates it from naturism.*]

Frazer further observed that it was not religion but the sciences, “fashioned from magic's world-view,” that produced all the real security we have. Frazer, thinking that magic had died, offered a eulogy to it:

When...a number of men have been set apart for the express purpose of benefiting the whole community by their skill, whether that skill be directed to the healing of diseases, the forecasting of the future, the regulation of the weather, or any other object of general utility, the impotence of the means adopted by most of these practitioners to accomplish their ends ought not to blind us to the immense importance of the institution itself. Here is a body of men relieved, at least in the higher stages of savagery, from the need of earning their livelihood by hard manual toil and allowed, nay, expected and encouraged, to prosecute researches into the secret ways of nature. It was at once their duty and their interest to know more than their fellows, to acquaint themselves with everything that could aid man in his arduous struggle with nature, everything that could mitigate his suffering and prolong his life.

Stop! I realize how unseemly it is for me to keep interrupting you, Sir James; but I must remind our readers that there has always been and there remains a downside to the academy. In an overpopulated world, it is not just the few holders of ultimate power and prestige who must deceive and prevaricate. Every holder of even a *relatively privileged “position”* must exceed the objective requirements of the job. He must, additionally, act out the role of possessing *ability* that is superior to that of his fellows and that entitles him to his “position.” This rule is just as applicable to headwaiters and academics as it is to magician-priests. But with respect to philosophers and scientific researchers, the rule of role is especially ironic and problematic because role-playing, mask-wearing and every form of pretentiousness involves habits of mind that are quite the opposite from those needed for the pursuit of truth. This contradiction explains in part why a taxi driver, a layman with few social privileges, succeeded where Sir James George Frazer and countless other professionals -- failed. With this exception, your point is well taken, and your eloquence is inimitable. Please continue.

The properties of drugs and minerals, the causes of rain and drought, of thunder and lightning, the changes of the seasons, the phases of the moon, the daily and yearly journeys of the sun, the motions of the stars, the mystery of life and the mystery of death, all these things must have excited the wonder of these early philosophers and stimulated them to find solutions of problems that were doubtless often thrust on their attention in the most practical form by the importunate demands of their clients who expected them not merely to understand but to regulate the great processes of nature for the good of man.

That their first shots fell far wide of the mark could hardly be helped. The slow, the never-ending approach to truth consists in perpetually forming, testing and reforming hypotheses, accepting those that at the time best fit the facts and rejecting the others. The views of natural causation embraced by the savage magicians no doubt appear to us manifestly false and absurd; yet in their day they were legitimate hypotheses, though they have not stood the test of experience. --*Ibid.* p.71

Ridicule and blame are the just mead, not of those who devised these crude theories, but of those who obstinately adhered to them after better had been propounded. --Frazer: 72, [H emphasis mine]

This respect for magic's deterministic worldview and sympathy with its first practitioners is certainly warranted. But did magic really decline? Or did this product of the human mind relocate and mature with the most mature of us? Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer has shown us that our conventional understanding of disease is based on magical assumptions. Viruses don't exist! In November of 2016, over 62 million Americans voted for Donald Trump mostly, I suspect, based on wishful and magical thinking: "he's a rich real estate developer, a great man. Therefore, he can deliver on his promise to make all of us great (rich) again." Did magic really decline? Or did the most traumatized and least mature fundamentalists merely transfer belief in their own magic to "experts"?

"Modern religion" still depends upon magic. For example, the communion is still an essential requirement for Christians becoming "saved." It is wholly magical. The mere uniformity and regularity of modern religious practices betrays a lingering belief in magic. While average people remain primitive enough to believe literally in gods, can we expect them to be

sophisticated enough to discriminate between magic and science? The answer to this question will become increasingly obvious as we proceed and learn more about the evolution of our religions.

For now, notice that we can only apprehend the world with our subjective senses. *Things must first be causally connected within our own mind before we can articulate the hypothesis and run the tests that tell us whether they are objectively and causally connected in nature. Isn't magic simply preliminary science, play science, science without the additional steps that articulate and prove the hypothesis? Magic matured in the minds of us that matured into scientists.* Freud, a social scientist, taught us an enormous amount about us.

CHAPTER 4: FREUD, PSYCHOANALYSIS, SPIRITS AND TOTEMISM

Enemies are full of praise, to get the truth one must go to a friend.
- French proverb

IN PRAISE OF SIGMUND FREUD

Nothing is meaningful in isolation. In both physical and social science, it is only in comparison to other things that anything becomes meaningful. Because we compare all other people to ourselves, we must know ourselves; and this is perhaps our greatest challenge as social beings. It's the social science equivalent of understanding black holes.

Freud made a monumental contribution to this effort. His psychoanalytic technique was to use introspection and help others to introspect. He also analyzed dreams and other unconscious psychic phenomena such as jokes, slips of the tongue, bungled actions, myths, fairy tales and religion. Irrespective of the means we employ, to reliably know anything, to understand its relationship to us and to apply that knowledge effectively, we must know ourselves. Because we share so much in common, **THERE IS NO ROAD TO SELF-KNOWLEDGE THAT DOES NOT GO THROUGH FREUD'S DISCOVERIES.**

This is not to say that Freud knew everything and made no mistakes. Without understanding the Fraternal Complex, he could only partially understand politics and religion. Like most psychologists, his fear of losing his license prevented him from going where he intellectually needed to go. Although he knew that life is about love and work, at the nuts-and-bolts level of his theories, love disappears and we read only about sex. Even his understanding of incest was incomplete and wrought with wishful thinking. He seems to have had no understanding of sibling love. He seemed to think that “resolving the Oedipus complex” and “finding a substitute” was as easy as willing it and snapping the fingers.

In fact, except for persons raised in an orphanage who stay with and marry a sibling-like, fellow orphan, most of us never love anyone as much as we love our siblings and the face of our opposite-sex parent. *Our greatest loves remaining taboo to us precludes all possibility of happy, monogamous marriage!* By suggesting otherwise, Freud supported the lies of the most savage, latent homosexual Ks whose “success” strategy includes pretending that they are living exemplary lives.

Yet nobody pioneers in virgin territories without making mistakes and omissions. You might make Freud's discoveries on your own; but that would be like reinventing the wheel, the light bulb, the airplane (of course!) and perhaps a few more. So, regardless of whatever negative things you may have heard about Freud -- most of it resistance such as I described in the second paragraph of this book's introduction-- struggle through this summary of his work.

More specifically, we need Freud's help to understand myths, rituals and spirit projection. We shall work exclusively with myths and rituals recognizable as having been *sacred* and not with folklore that is so debased as to appear to be mere entertainment or speculation about nature. Functionally speaking, most sacred myths and rituals are what remains of our pre-literate ancestors' efforts to understand and communicate (myths) and commemorate (rituals) their prehistory. Analytically speaking, they are macrocosmic, recurrent dreams. *They are the dreams of man*. Freud discovered the dynamic process by which dreams are formed, a process completely analogous to that by which our pre-literate ancestors created their myths and rituals.

Those of you who are literal believers and know of Freud's opposition to religion need not feel threatened. You are not going to be asked to give up anything valuable. Freud was aware of the kernel of truth that is contained within religious myths and rituals. He made it quite clear that the historical truths embodied in religion are what give it its great power. (See Freud, 1933: Lecture XXXV.) My findings will more than substantiate that point of view. In coming chapters, we shall also review findings of modern geneticists that support (with modifications) the most important precept of all modern religions, the precept that all men are brothers.

We shall do more than just pay lip service to that precept. We shall scientifically uncover and analyze the history of strife and psychological confusion that stands between the status quo and our organization into the one virtual and loving family we ought to be. As tools for this task, we must first understand psychoanalysis, sibling imprinting, totemism, dream dynamics and spirit projection.

THE AGENCIES OF THE MIND, THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX AND SIBLING IMPRINTING

Start as Freud did with Aristotle's observation that what all men want is happiness. (His name was influential. *Freude* is German for "joy" and *freund*

is German for “friend.”) Next, Freud analyzed the pursuit of happiness into component parts: the avoidance of pain and the pursuit of pleasure. All human motivation, at bottom, can be roughly understood as some combination of these two goals.¹⁹

Previous social scientists had concerned themselves almost wholly with the avoidance of pain (the domain of political-economy). By acknowledging the role played by pleasure, Freud was the first to describe the importance of sex in the development of both the individual and the species. Some archaeologists and physical anthropologists still partially agree with Freud’s contention that sex, exposure of the genitalia, motivated our transition to bipedalism and erect posture (Freud, 1929: 53; Johanson: 309-40). Sex, said Freud, though not the only pleasure, is the ultimate pleasure for which other pleasures tend to be mere substitutes; and the sex drive, when inhibited in its aim, supplies the energy for many other activities (a process called *sublimation*).

So, we seek to attain pleasure and to avoid pain; but these two goals are often incompatible. In negotiating for these goals within a finite, indifferent universe and a competitive society, the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain come into conflict. Freud charted the development of this dialectical conflict, the consequent development of the human personality and systemic failures in adaptation (*neuroses*).

He named and described the dialectical functions or *agencies* of the mind accordingly. The names provide a linguistic handle for psychic processes of no definite physical structure. He called the pleasure-seeking agency the *id*.²⁰

The *id* blindly seeks to satisfy the instincts, the sources of constant internal stimulation, their common aims being homeostasis (self-preservation). Sex is among these instincts or drives. It has two components: the sex drive as the reproductive instinct or component of the survival instinct and the sex drive as organic need.²¹

¹⁹ Astute readers will immediately see a problem with this reductionist model. It’s too narrow. We pursue *love, sex and pleasure* and avoid *death, suffering and pain*.

²⁰ *Id* is the name of the divine Mesopotamian river in the name of which ordeal judgments were declared.

²¹ Sexual orgasm, with a partner or through masturbation, seems to involve the instantaneous dissipation of energy throughout the nervous system. As such, sexual release (*catharsis*, to use Freud’s term) is exactly the opposite of thought (*cathexis*, or the concentration of energy). Freud once noticed that neurotic symptoms of sexual deprivation are amazingly analogous to the symptoms of toxicity. Perhaps the peptide, oxytocin, which is produced throughout the brain, stored in the pituitary gland and released into the bloodstream in mega doses during and slightly before sexual orgasm, is a by-product or is assembled from by-products of

The agency that avoids pain is the *superego*. It represents the interests of significant others, especially parents and parental influences (past but still-active “object cathexes,” especially of the parent of the same sex). Normally, at about age five, the individual internalizes these influences as he begins to lose this parent’s immediate presence and protection. The power of the superego’s parental observations and dictates -- its orders, judgments and threats of punishment -- is proportional to the influence of whomever the superego represents. With respect to a parent, a child might fear the loss of love, acceptance, protection or the loss of the child’s own genitalia.

The *ego* monitors sensory input and mediates between the demands of the external world, the superego and the id. Gregory Bateson observed that any circuit of information (change over time) that adjusts output to input exhibits the phenomena of mind and memory. As an example, he cited the operation of the carburetor throttle or butterfly valve that governs the fuel intake and operating speed of our taxi’s engine. (He’s been in my cab too.) Self-awareness results when this ability to adjust to inputs is combined with long-term (extended) memory and a top-priority, hard-wired instruction to maintain homeostasis. The ego, the mind’s self-conscious operating system, is an electrical circuit that expands or contracts as it pulls into its orbit sensory images, language (descriptive terms) and logical syllogisms resulting from experience.²²

Freud, a neurophysiology student, speculated on how the ego evolved:

[T]he ego is that portion of the id that was modified by the proximity and influence of the external world, which is adapted

thought. If so, this provides a biochemical explanation for much of what we know from common experience and introspection. (See Angier [a] for the biochemistry of oxytocin.)

²² In the four decades between Bateson’s book and the present one, neuro-scientists have confirmed and significantly advanced this rude conception of the brain and consciousness. Bateson’s innermost circuit of the mind resides in a donut-shaped organ that professor Rodolfo Llinás of New York University refers to as the *intralaminar nucleus*. It is centrally located and within the thalamus. Pairs of long axons (neural wires) connect the intralaminar nucleus with the various sensory centers located in the cerebral cortex. Through these axons, scanning impulses link sensory data processed in these centers with the intralaminar nucleus. At an alert-state rate of 40 cycles *per* second, the instantaneous, multimedia circuits appear to be fluid; and our responses seem to be immediate. (Presumably, the responses result from cycles subsequent to perception that draw upon logic and programmed learning stored in more permanent memory that is between the intralaminar nucleus and the cerebral cortex.) For details see Blakeslee, 1995. Once the electrical circuit in this donut stops flowing, we’re 97 cents worth of chemicals. “*Souls*” have symbolic reality only to the extent that we are loved and can expect to be (or after death are) remembered.

for the reception of stimuli and as a protective shield against stimuli, comparable to the cortical layer by which a small piece of living substance is surrounded (Freud, 1933: 75).

Neurosis results from a systematic failure to deal effectively with competing demands. Some demands are traumatic, uncompromising and life threatening. Those that are too threatening to be resolved, synthesized, drawn into the ego's organization, must be repressed, kept out of the ego's (potentially conscious) organization.

The forerunner of all *individual* (nuclear family) traumas and neuroses tends to be the *Oedipus Complex*. [The *Fraternal Complex* concerns the individual's relationship with the larger, social family.] The name *Oedipus* comes from the protagonist and title of a Sophocles tragedy. He kills his father and marries his mother. Freud realized that heterosexual development typically involves a more moderate and unconscious version of this drama. He called women's ambivalence for mother and the love and desire for father the *Electra Complex*. I will usually use "Oedipus Complex" for both. Let's look closer at them.

For all of us, mother is the original sex object. For those of us whose early development follows a heterosexual path, as we learn about gender, its role in reproduction and our own gender identity, little girls transfer their desires to father and little boys focus theirs more exclusively upon mother. As this happens, ambivalence for the same-sex parent mounts.

Please bear with me as I scrutinize heterosexual development. Unlike Freud, I don't use "normal" or "abnormal" labels. I don't think there's anything normal about the savage world that we live in. However, the civilized, ideal world that we need to create must simplify and standardize family life to minimize conflicts and guarantee love and happy marriage for everyone. That will require us to make heterosexuals of all the children, so, we must understand psycho-sexual development.

Let's define an "effective father" as one meeting the minimal role requirements for the heterosexual development of the children. I've pondered this subject for many years. (All this knowledge being theoretical means that your taxi driver is at a distinct disadvantage to someone like Freud who had a serene, Victorian environment in which to meditate.) I've concluded that an effective father must love the child enough and be loved enough by the mother to cause the *same-sex* parent to become an object of extreme ambivalence, both a role model that merits the *opposite-sex parent's* love and

a tyrant that prevents the child from sexually possessing the *opposite-sex* parent.

Children who don't have an effective father tend to become unmistakably homosexual: effeminate boys and masculine girls. If (a) sibling(s) are present at the time the child is acquiring his gender identity, then this (these) object(s) of transferred desire determine the child's sexual orientation. If the siblings are all the same sex, the orientation is homosexual. If all opposite sex, heterosexual. If both sexes, bisexual. Of course, sexual orientation refers not to what one does but to what one wants to do. The desires are determined very early in life, and no amount of play acting changes them. I recently met a woman whose company is helping homophobic parents censor their children's television and internet programming. My advice to her was, "If you work hard enough, you can probably train a dog to act like a cat, but ..."

Anyone who is uncertain of his or her orientation, unconscious of his or her fantasies, can either analyze his dreams (first read Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*) or ask, "What type of sex do I desire?" Folks answering "oral sex" are homosexual. Those answering "intercourse" are heterosexual; and those who like both equally are bisexual. If you have no trouble understanding and accepting this, skip to the next subsection on totemism. The rest of you need more convincing.

It is interesting that, irrespective of any sibling relationships, the face of the opposite sex parent, becomes forever more an object of love, the face that the child wants to be with. Your guess is as good as mine as to why this is so. Is it because the opposite sex parent's face is the same as the child's own face (Norman O. Brown) or because the child learned to love that face before he acquired his gender identity, before he became "genitally organized" (Freud)?

Per Freud and for little boys, the fear of father's rivalry becomes an unconscious fear of castration. So, during the *latency period* the child represses his desire for the opposite-sex parent. Freud said the latency period occurs approximately between age five and puberty.

According to Freud, sexual interest resumes and grows during the hormonal activity and physical maturation of puberty. Now he must try to transfer his desire for the opposite sex parent to someone more available. The healthy, effective person represses incestuous desires during the latency stage and renounces incest during adolescence once he finds a substitute object of sexual desire outside of the family. Failure to do this and subsequent damming up of the *libido* usually takes the form of an internal conflict

between the unconscious (still wholly incestuous) sex drive and the conscious, superego forces of repression.²³

“The outcome of this [*H unresolved*] conflict is a compromise formation... [*H here, a neurotic symptom*] in which both trends have found an incomplete expression” (Freud, 1922: 238). Approach is met with avoidance. The struggle transfers to symbols for the repressed object of desire and then to symbols for the symbols. The internal struggle exhausts, paralyzes, accomplishes nothing and leads nowhere. The individual is beset with an obsessional neurosis. He either succeeds or fails in this transference of desire, and that success or failure is the last chapter in Freudian psychosexual development.

The above, Freudian discourse is not descriptive enough of romantic love and, in your taxi driver’s opinion, only partially describes our sexual development. Permit me to openly repeat what our most conscious poets, novelists and comedians have always suggested: *if siblings are present, early sexual desire for the parent of the opposite sex is generally transferred to (a) sibling(s).*²⁴ *In the early phase of what Freud referred to as a dormant, “latency stage,” one’s sibling relationships determine his or her sexual orientation. If the individual has only opposite-sex siblings, he or she becomes heterosexual. If only same-sex siblings are present, the individual becomes homosexual. If siblings of both sexes are present, the individual becomes bisexual.*

The why of it is easy. To the extent that our world is still a very savage one and the family survival unit is nuclear rather than global or societal, we become alienated from people outside of the family dwelling; and desire for the opposite sex parent is more easily transferred to siblings. But sibling desire is taboo too, forbidden for reasons that are unknown to the person and must remain unknown because the taboo impulse is so thoroughly repressed. Sibling incest is taboo within the family because it arouses jealousies that threaten to divide the family (survival) unit. Sibling incest is taboo within society because it arouses the same taboo desires in others. Moreover, family interbreeding, especially among the royal families of Europe, has expressed maladaptive, recessive traits in the offspring.

²³ Freud defined *libido* as sexual energy that readily converts into *interest* or vice versa, presumably as it transfers from one part of the neuro-system to another.

²⁴ See Edmond Rostand’s classic, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, for a subtle tale of two “cousins who grew up as brother and sister.” Sibling imprinting is the cryptic subject of Kafka’s *Metamorphosis*. Vargas Llosa and James Baldwin wrote openly about it. Comedian Steve Allen joked about it all the time.

The frequent bickering among siblings is a neurotic compromise formation. In part, it's a superego attempt to maintain the repression of taboo impulses by repulsing the object that elicits them. The other part is the id's desire to bring and keep the sibling in close physical contact.

Let's consider a psycho-sexual development model that modern ethologists created. This model is less complete but more concrete than Freud's. The model refers to *attachment* and *sexual imprinting*.²⁵ We'll only need to tweak it to include romantic love and *sibling imprinting*.

At least since Aristotle's time, people observed newly hatched ducklings and goslings to follow the mother or a close surrogate of her. In 1935, Konrad Lorenz declared that this following response reflects a strong bond to the mother figure, a bond that develops during a sensitive or critical period and is enduring. His paper aroused worldwide interest in sexual imprinting. By the early 1970s, researchers had amassed an enormous amount of data on the various conditions under which imprinting will or won't occur and the critical time periods for it to occur in the young of a host of species.

Developmental psychologists extended the model to humans *but with severe limitations*. *First*, the impossibility of tearing human young away from their mothers makes it impossible to perform controlled experiments such as those done with other animals. *Secondly*, academia proved as subservient as ever to the conventional wisdom. It kowtowed to the widespread but neurotic delusion that we are not animals and must be qualitatively different from them. Accordingly, when developmental psychologists refer to *attachment*, they suggest that our own imprinting is asexual, equally operative at any age and reversible. *Thirdly*, official science has become wholly disinterested in sibling imprinting. In print today, you'll only find vague banalities such as, "[F]ilial behaviors are likely to be found in interactions among organisms that share a significant portion of their genes."²⁶ One of the boldest of the developmental psychologists, psychoanalyst John Bowlby, suggested what is now widely accepted: that sexual imprinting developed as an adaptation to predatory selection pressure. Yet Bowlby's treatment of incest is as narrow as that of traditional psychoanalysis: human young become attached to the

²⁵ Scientists are only beginning to understand the mechanisms for acquiring, storing and retrieving the information that defines our objects of sexual desire and motivates our responses to them. See below or see Hess for more about sexual imprinting.

²⁶ This restates my claim that we trust family members more than others. From an abstract of the many works of Slobodan B. Petrovich and Jacob L. Gewirtz, in *Intersections with attachment*, J.L. Gewirtz and W.M. Kurtines eds., Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, N.J., 1991, p. 69.

mother and suffer *separation anxiety* when removed from her. Owing mostly to this third factor, a dread of the subject of sibling imprinting, it is as true today as it was in 1985 that, “[Q]uestions about what is learned during the attachment relationships, about the course of the attachment after infancy and about individual differences beyond security and anxiety have received little attention.”²⁷

Developmental psychologists stopped dead in their tracks and refused to extend the imprinting model to incorporate sibling relationships mostly because the social science establishment is afraid to offend men with brothers, afraid to offend the most powerful, angry and malicious subset of society, afraid to announce that a sibling or siblings replace the parent of the opposite sex as the imprinted model of beauty and sexual desirability. If mom does not remain available to us in fact or fancy once we start to learn about gender differences and siblings exist, then that is the general pattern. *Men with brothers are no exception to the rule.* Let’s take a closer look at the imprinting model and make an honest attempt to apply it to our species.

According to this model, the *neural imprinting* begins during very critical and early periods when the organism is maturing neurologically and sexually. (See, for example, Hess.) Owing to our enhanced sociability and facial differentiation, human imprinting became more complex than that of other animals. As described above, imprinting occurs in two stages. Addresses in the visual, auditory and olfactory data banks of the brain open and admit (a) first the facial characteristics of a parent [the opposite sex parent if an effective father is present] and (b) secondly and later the gender characteristics of a sibling or siblings. The second, (b) stage occurs after the child has become genitally organized, has learned to associate bodily pleasure with the genitalia. If siblings are present, the final imprints are of them. If mom has even a female lover, the children are forced to transfer their desires and fantasies onto someone as trusted but more available. Then the sibling relationships determine the child's sexual orientation. But in this case, the desire for mom tends to become offset by negativity toward another genetically-unrelated female; and the initial, parental heterosexual influence is weak to non-existent. Sibling influence upon orientation is then likely to be even greater than usual and to follow the usual pattern.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p 65, citing Waters, E and Deane, K.E. (1985) “Defining and Assessing individual differences in attachment relationships...” in I. Bretherton and E. Waters (eds.), *Growing Points of Attachment theory and research: Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, p 41-65, 50, No 1-2, Serial # 209

Women are more focused than are men on love, marriage and family life. In female dominated, eastern societies, especially the PRC, where women take the initiatives in love, marriage and family life; the woman is more likely to acquire a mate who looks like her father. Eastern, especially Chinese marriages, are therefore more likely to endure but not without the ongoing problem of sexual orientation differences between husband and wife. Most Chinese are clueless about these differences owing to the extreme conservatism of their society and the consequent lack of public dialog about this (and every other) controversial subject. As of 2014, the LGBT Rights Struggle that is sweeping across the world has barely begun in China. (I prefer “LGBT” because transgender people should be protected but not emulated. These guys, whose latent homosexual Moms brainwashed them, *as toddlers*, into believing that they were female, like the sister Mom so desperately missed, are wearing a Fourth Mask. All the masks must go.) Orwell’s *1984* remains uncensored, but Chinese readers have no clue about it and latent homosexuality. As everywhere, masked (latent homosexual) men and women sweep into all the positions of power; but in China they are wholly unchallenged in the exercise of their Orwellian personalities (their incapability of adult love, motivation based mostly on fear; mastery of deceit, trickery and theft; inability to change themselves; and dread of and automatic, knee-jerk opposition to change and basic truth).

In our more overtly savage, male-dominated societies, love and happy marriages become virtually impossible for all the reasons [cited](#) in the Conclusion (v3-103-104). Lonely westerners either become celibate or turn in desperation to *loveless, aberrant sex in all its forms. For those in the latter situation, sex becomes all-important as a narcotic, as a painkiller. Monogamous marriage tends to be dysfunctional everywhere within our savage, contemporary world.*

Most members of the male-dominated societies (and unless otherwise stated I refer to them throughout this book) marry for anything but love. We marry for security, convenience, loveless sex or offspring. Small wonder that many of us ditch our mates after the children have been produced, often with disastrous consequences to everyone – especially the children. Inability to understand these problems causes finger pointing and rationalizations until partners either divorce or resign themselves to abstinent lives and quiet desperation.

All the above distinctions between sexual imprinting and attachment or love suggest that, for those of us who grow up with siblings, finding a substitute for Freud’s all-encompassing “incestuous object of desire” is not

nearly as simple, easy, emotionally satisfying and final as he wanted to think. On this issue, popular culture continually argues contra Freud and pro Sinatra. (*Sinatra* translates unconsciously as, *Try a sin.*) For example:

It's the wrong time and the wrong place
Though your face is charming, it's the wrong face
It's not her face, but such a charming face
That it's all right with me. --Cole Porter

or

If you were the only girl in the world and I were the only boy
Nothing else would matter in the world today
We could go on loving in the same old way.
--Clifford Grey (lyrics) and Nat D. Ayer

If you search this work for “brother” and “sister,” you’ll discover a long list of gods and goddesses from around the world that were sibling lovers. This list is longer than any parent-child-incest counterpart that could be constructed. Some of these “gods” were early *Homo sapiens* and had to marry siblings. They had no choice. But the list also testifies to the power of sibling love. We’ll meet a few of these couples, below; but first, I’ll say what might seem even more shocking: *Few of us ever find anyone whom we can love as much as we love our sibling(s).*

In loveless, male-dominated society, when homosexual desires for a (especially male) sibling are repressed, extremely aggressive, *machismo* behavior is likely to result. Guys in this situation suppress the omnipresent and taboo impulse with a set of attitudes and behaviors that purport to be the opposite of what they really feel. They suppress the omnipresent and taboo impulse, causing guilt, and compensate with a set of attitudes and behaviors purporting to be the opposite of what we really feel. In men, this *macho* set of attitudes and behaviors seeks to define them as more masculine, stronger and tougher than other men. They must play football, box, carry a weapon (be it in the Marine Corps or the police force), etc. These macho activities are neurotic compromise formations that give partial expression to both the homosexual impulse (the physical contact) and the superego prohibition (the antagonism).

As an alternative to *unconscious* sexual imprinting, consider the “filial behavior” theory to which Petrovich and Gewirtz vaguely refer above. At a more conscious level, loving ourselves, valuing our own genes and striving to reproduce and continue our own genes are all necessary consequences of the

survival instinct for which evolution has selected us. If we must value and seek to reproduce our own genes, then the sexual objects that we will most value are those that are the most genetically like us. These objects are, of course, siblings, especially once the sibling has become sexually mature and survival-worthy. (Yet, this conscious aspect is apparently subordinate to unconscious and spontaneous neural imprinting. I have observed all the usual, incestuous, sibling desires between siblings who were *not* genetic siblings.)

Some have vaguely described macho behavior as owing to an *inferiority complex*. Freud preferred to describe it as above or as a *reaction formation*, as an out turning of violence that seeks to hide or deny one side of a violent internal contradiction. The contradiction becomes especially intense, the superego especially homophobic, if the same-sex parent presents a strong heterosexual role model. This is particularly true for males because brothers had no precedent for homosexual love in their love for mother, the initial love and sex object. Also conflicting with brother-love is one of the two wellsprings of homophobia: savagely-high birthrates (above that corresponding to the greatest *decrease* in the death rate) makes killing machines of men.

There are at least two other sources of homophobia. First, to practice homosexuality is to love a genetic competitor. This is a minor but timeless source. Some amount of reproductive competition will always and should exist. As we'll see in Chapter 7, the other wellspring of homophobia, a modern one, is the adoption of monogamy by families with multiple, same-sex offspring.

People within loveless, savage society who are *latently* homosexual are more likely to channel their energy into careers or higher education. They are more likely to be successful in the workplace; but because money, power and prestige can't substitute for love or sexual gratification, they are never happy. They get what they pretend to want but never *really* want what they get. Orwell's "Big Brother" is a caricature of their personality profile.

Freud had, in addition to several sisters, two brothers and a half-brother. Perhaps this background and his own repression, account for the fact that he seems to have understood all the related phenomena surrounding sibling imprinting without ever becoming conscious of it. He did define *reaction formation*. He described paranoid delusions as replacement ideas for repressed homosexual impulses. (This "abnormal" psychology is the norm among those men that are always fighting or searching for enemies.) He was aware of the many Melanesian and Polynesian restrictions (taboos) on the

interaction of brothers and sisters once the brother reached puberty or the sister married.²⁸

Yet throughout *Interpretation of Dreams* and *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*, he describes bisexual tendencies only as an archaic reversion to the child's polymorphous perversity, to an original predisposition that derives from the traces of the apparatus of the opposite sex with which each human being is equipped. Ditto for the homosexual lapses of the "occasional inverts," who are only superficially distinguished from the "absolute inverts" (males who identify themselves as female).²⁹ All this amounts to just name-calling and excuses for not probing the subject of sibling love.

Freud's own repression and the powerful and lasting impact he's had upon psychoanalysis are yet a fourth reason why few psychologists have explored or described sibling imprinting.

After the puberty of siblings, intra-family conflict is at least as likely to involve three or more siblings or siblings and a parent as it is to involve two parents and a child. Mythology confirms this. Though the earliest cuneiform tablets relating it are incomplete, what is probably the first, most popular and often revised of all the world's fertility myths describes the love between Innini (Sumerian Ishtar) and her brother Tammuz and the jealousy of another sister, Ereshkigal. Ereshkigal, the Queen of Hell, forces Tammuz (and the verdure) to spend each winter with her in the Underworld.³⁰ (Cf. Langdon: chapters X and XI.)³¹

My *Irish Mythology: Passageway to Prehistory* analyzes one of the oldest versions of the world's most popular fairy tale, a fairy tale that has several hundred versions. It clearly describes the rivalry between three sisters for their brother. Indian (Hindu) creation myths mostly describe rivalry for the daughter/sister. Many North American myths are subtle treatments of this theme. Almost all the earliest gods, all over the world, were said to have married -- not mother, but -- sister. A Greek version of "Osiris" in Appendix C refers openly to heterosexual sibling love. Here's a much subtler tale of sibling love.

²⁸ Freud, 1913: 10-11.

²⁹ Freud, 1905a: 522-

³⁰ Freud thought this periodic descent into hell was superego punishment for violating a taboo. We'll discover the original pagan motives for it in Chapter 36.

³¹ Freud either ignored or overlooked the vast majority of these Sumer-derived, fertility myths (Innini or Ishtar and Tammuz or Dumuzi, Aphrodite and Adonis, Astarte and Adonî, etc.), wherein the protagonists are *sister and brother*. (Cf. Freud, 1913: 152-153 and Langdon: 326-.)

There were two sisters who were playing in front of their house. They made a small hut and lay down in it to sleep. During the night, they awoke and saw the stars in the sky. One of the sisters said: "Do you see that white star? I will have him for my husband. You take that red star." They joked and laughed on this proposition and finally went to sleep again. While they were sleeping two men entered their hut. One of them wore a white blanket; the other wore a red blanket. The latter married the elder sister, the former married the younger. They removed them from the house into the sky. They were the two stars of whom the girls had been speaking. When they awoke and saw the strange men by their sides, they did not know where they were.

On the following morning, their mother called them to breakfast. [*H Mother saw that they had disappeared when she received no answer.*] During the night, a boy had heard how the girls had been talking about the stars, and thus the people were led to suppose that the stars had abducted the girls. The stars go out every night with bow and arrows hunting caribous. Then they look through the holes in the sky and see what is happening on earth.

The two stars who had married the girls also went out every night and brought home many caribous. The young women skinned and carved them. They made gloves, shoes and dresses from the skins. They cut long thongs from the skins of others, cutting spirally around their bodies. They hid the clothing and the thongs carefully from their husbands. There was no water, no cloud and no rain in the sky, and they were always suffering thirst. They had nothing to eat but meat. Therefore, they longed to return to their own country. When they had prepared sufficient thongs and cloths, they made ready to escape. One day, when their husbands had started on a long hunting expedition, they went to the hole in the sky. They tied stones to one end of a thong and let it down towards the earth. When one thong was paid out, they tied a new one to the end of the first, and thus they continued from morning to night. The one woman brought the cloths and the thongs from their hiding-place, while the other let them down. Finally, after four days, they felt the rope striking the ground. They could not see the earth because it was hidden by

smoke. They shook the thong and it fell a little farther, but finally it seemed to have reached the ground. At least they felt that it was held by something. Now they tied two pairs of sticks together, one being on each side of the rope. They put on four suits of clothing, four pairs of shoes and four pairs of gloves. The elder sister stepped on one pair of sticks and they began to glide down, the sticks acting as a brake. The rope swung to and fro, and the sister who had remained behind gradually lost sight of her. Finally, the young woman reached the end of the rope and found herself on the top of a tall tree. Her clothing and her gloves were almost worn through by friction. Then she shook the rope, and upon this signal her sister began to slide down in the same manner. She came down very much quicker because her sister was holding the end of the rope. Looking upward, she beheld a small dot in the air. It was coming nearer and increased in size. Soon she recognized her sister, who finally reached the top of the tree. There they were on the top of a tall spruce-tree, and there was no way of getting down. They broke off some branches and made a bed in the tree. The elder sister, before starting, had tied an additional piece of thong around her waist, thinking that she might use it in case the long rope should not have reached the ground. She untied it and fastened it on to the long rope, but still it was not long enough.

After a while, the young women saw men passing the foot of the tree. They were armed with bows and arrows and were on snowshoes. They recognized the wolf, the bear and many other animals. They called to them, asking them to help them down, but they passed by without paying attention to their entreaties. The next morning, they saw another man approaching the tree. They recognized the fisher. [*H Like the star-men [at the top of this myth-tale](#), the totem ancestors whom the North Americans often referred to as "animal people," are an amalgam of the Indians' aboriginal African American victims and Deluge victims and victors. Although the Deluge gods were not particularly handsome, the myth is giving us another, equally-subtle reason as to why the sisters reject their suitors.*] They called him, and he at once climbed the tree. The young women asked him to carry them down, but he demanded that they should first marry him. The elder one said: "I will do so, but first carry me down." The

fisher finally agreed and carried her down. When they arrived at the foot of the tree, she demanded from him that he should first carry down her youngest sister. Reluctantly he was compelled to do so. Then he demanded from the youngest sister that she should marry him. She said: "I will do so, but carry me down first." He took her down. When he insisted upon his former demand, the elder sister said: "We are almost starved; first bring us some food." He went away and soon returned, carrying a bear that he had killed. During his absence, the young women had lighted a fire. He wanted to roast the bear meat, but they said they wished to eat it boiled. Then the fisher made a basket of bark and placed stones into the fire, which he intended to use to boil water in the basket. Meanwhile the young women had hidden a few pieces of meat under their blankets, and now they pretended to go to fetch water in which to boil the meat. As soon as they were out of sight they ran away down the mountains. After a while the eldest sister flung a piece of meat at a tree, asking it to whistle. They went on, and again she threw a piece of meat at a tree, asking it to talk. In this manner, she continued to give meat to all the trees. [*H Trees, especially hardwood and oak trees, were universally sacred. You'll see ample evidence of this and have time to figure out the reason for this before I explain it in Chapter 34.*]

When the young women did not return, the fisher followed them to the brook, where they had gone to fetch water. He discovered their tracks and saw that they had escaped. He pursued them. Soon he came to the tree that they had asked to whistle. It did so when the fisher went past. Then he thought they were on the tree, climbed it and searched for them. When he did not find them, he continued his pursuit. He came to the second tree, which spoke when he went past. Again, he thought the young women might be on the tree. He climbed up, but did not find them. Thus...they made good their escape.

Towards evening they reached a deep *cañon*. They walked along its edge, and soon they were discovered by the grizzly bear, [*H another one of the "animal people"*] who was residing here. He wanted to marry them, and they did not dare to refuse. But they said: "First go and bring us something to eat. We are almost starving." While the bear was away hunting, the girls built a platform over the steep precipice of the *cañon*. It overhung the

abyss and was held in place by two ropes that were tied to a tree that grew near the edges of the *cañon*. Its outer edge was supported by two slanting poles that leaned against a ledge a short distance down the precipice. When the bear came back, he found them apparently asleep on this platform. He did not bring any meat; he had only roots and berries. The young women said that they could not eat that kind of food and demanded that he should go hunting again. It had grown dark, however, and the bear proposed to go out on the following morning. They lay down on the platform, and the young women induced the bear to lie near the edge, while they lay down near the tree to which the platform was tied. They kept away from the bear, promising to marry him after he should have obtained food for them. Early in the morning, when the grizzly bear was fast asleep, they arose without disturbing him, cut the ties with which the platform was fastened to the tree, and it tipped over, casting the bear into the abyss.

The young women traveled on, and for a whole month they did not fall in with a soul. Then, one day, they discovered tracks of snowshoes, and soon they found the hut of a woman who had given birth to a child. They entered and recognized one of their friends. They stayed with her for a short time, and when the young mother was ready to return to the village, they sent her on to inform their relatives of their return. She went to the mother of the two lost girls and told her that they were waiting in the woods, but she would not believe the news. The young mother returned to her friends and told them that their mother would not believe that they had come back. Then they gave her as a token a skin hat that was decorated with stars. She took it to the village and showed it to the mother of the two young women. Then she began to think that there might be some truth in the report and went out to look. There she saw and recognized her daughters. At that time, all the men were out hunting. The women on hearing of the return of the two lost girls went out to see them, and they told of their adventures. Then they climbed two trees, tied their skin belts to the branches and hanged themselves.³²

³² This is a Tillamook myth. It's in Hardin, Terri, pages 461-3.

Obviously, this myth-tale is about how homosexual people are oppressed by the homophobia and narrow-minded intolerance of conventional thinkers, of unrealistic, wishful thinkers. Notice too that the insertion into the myth of an alternative reason for them fleeing their star-husbands (the heavenly abode having allegedly been too uncomfortable for them) allowed the latent homosexual people of the tribal audience to “save face.” But those faces are Third Masks and our collective belief in our masks, in lies, has brought us to the brink of a catastrophic population collapse. We can no longer afford to tolerate the masks.

Sibling imprinting is so powerful and pervasive that the conflict with the competing parent has another sibling as often as it has the other parent for its object. So, I use Freud’s *Oedipal* or *Electra* labels to describe sexual conflict between two parents and a child and *incest complex* to more broadly refer to sexual conflict in the nuclear family.

Finally, we really don’t need mythology and psychoanalysis to know that we all love our siblings. Just ask any pre-pubescent child if he loves his brothers and sisters. After he looks at you as if you’re crazy for even asking, ask him if he tries to love them equally.

As the Conclusion suggests, sibling love is one of the main reasons why savage society’s transition to monogamous exogamy is incomplete and dysfunctional. Sibling imprinting/love is, in and of itself, sufficient reason to abolish multi-sibling families and inaugurate population control. (*Downward* pressure on the death rate requires a birth rate that is *less than* the population replacement rate.) Better still, I believe I know how to make geniuses of all our children with a new, standardized and simplified model for the socialist family, a model that will forever eliminate sibling imprinting, incest and all love and marriage problems.

Yet my little book that advocates this new, socialist family, *Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution*, is bound to be as threatening to religious fundamentalists as sibling imprinting is to men with brothers and heterosexual father role models. For fundamentalists, birth and death issues are “God’s” domain. We will have to educate these most uneducated and traumatized folks and eradicate homophobia (i. e. remove all the masks) if social improvement is to be possible.

TOTEMISM

Totemism is the name for the first form of religion, a system of religious belief and practice that lasted for all but the last 10 or 11 ky. Totemism

divided the tribe into clans and sometimes also sub-clans and larger groupings of clans called phratries or moieties. Each clan worshiped a different animal species (rarely a plant or a geographic object). This totem animal was believed to be ancestral to everyone in the clan. Neighboring tribes often had the same totems. One's totem or *clan* affiliation was often thought to be even more important than one's tribal affiliation. The totem animal was believed to provide guidance, protection and its abilities to clan members. It was taboo for one to eat his totem animal except at a clan supper generally held once a year at which participation was mandatory for all clan members.

The first clans were probably matrilineal: one was born into one's mother's clan and used her surname if any. (It required our ancestors a long time to understand the male role in reproduction, and polygamy made paternity uncertain.) Tribal society was also exogamous. For matrilineal societies, a man found a woman of another tribe (or *moiety*) and, upon marrying her, joined her tribe or *moiety*. Moieties were tribal groupings of clans created to regulate marriage.

Imagine how shocking it was to Europeans during the mercantile period when missionaries and explorers began to report finding totem societies (or the earmarks of past totem societies) all around the world! They realized that their own ancestors must have lived in similar fashion. Yet they had no record or recollection of it! They were unable to explain how totemism came into being and (in most parts of the world) died.

This mystery was solved in 1913 with the publication of Freud's book, *Totem and Taboo*, the basics of which we shall now review. Freud knew that all neuroses have a history. He knew that the history of neurosis in totem society had to explain the difference between the actual and the perceived ambivalence toward animals.³³ The totem animals had to be substitutes for other, stronger objects of ambivalence whose aspects were displaced onto them.

"Little Hans" and other children whom Freud psychoanalyzed had unconsciously resolved their ambivalence toward their competing parent. In the waking hours, under the direct influence of the competing parent, the children's superegos repressed their negativity toward that parent. They were unaware of it. In the safer world of dreams, the id-like (or bodily) fear of and hostility toward that parent erupts. In dreams, the superego's influence is

³³ On the plus side, animals are beautiful and provide us with food. They provided ancestors with clothing and tools. On the negative side, as children we fear them, as did ancestors who did not have fire.

limited. The most that it can affect is a compromise, which is disguising the competing parent as an animal.

In our individual lives, the original object of ambivalence is the competing parent. Even individuals who are raised without a competing parent, who are free of his or her immediate influence, develop ambivalence toward that parent in the abstract. Even parentless children develop Oedipal Complexes! Psychic dispositions, states of mind, are unconsciously transferred from person to person. They become an unconscious part of the culture that is learned automatically. Just as this cultural learning of unconscious, repressed impulses occurs between contemporaries, it occurs between generations. Children imitate everything about their parents and are actively taught by them.

Even the most ruthless suppression must leave room for distorted surrogate impulses and for reactions resulting from them. If so, however, we may safely assume that no generation is able to conceal any of its more important mental processes from its successor. For psycho-analysis has shown us that everyone possesses in his unconscious mental activity an apparatus that enables him to interpret other people's reactions, that is, to undo the distortions that other people have imposed on the expression of their feelings. (Freud, 1913: 159)

Myths and rituals and their modern counterparts (“modern” religions) are the primary medium through which most of our unconscious ambivalence has been communicated from generation to generation. Myths and rituals are compromise formations that associate and communicate -- albeit subtly, incompletely and unconsciously -- ambivalence toward the competing parent and an ongoing group of relatives with similarly-ambivalent feelings and deeds toward three prehistoric groups of ancestors and relatives.

Freud discovered two of these five groups with whom we have long been obsessed, two of the five ambivalent groups that ultimately condensed into “God” and “Devil,” two of the five *universal elements of the godhead*. One of his is ongoing (the competing parent). His other is prehistoric. He discovered the latter while analyzing totemism.

Freud knew that children’s ambivalence toward the competing parent is much like that felt toward totem animals. Indeed, competing parents become animals in children’s dreams. He also knew from Charles Darwin, James Atkinson, Robertson Smith and others that many species live in hordes, small

wandering groups that a single male dominates. This male monopolizes the females and either kills or expels young males as they mature sexually. This pattern is universal among the great apes that are, like us, sexually dimorphic (males being bigger than females).³⁴ Freud realized that, at some time before the dawn of civilization, our ancestors lived in hordes too.

So, Freud understood ambivalence, Oedipal conflict and obsessional neurosis. (We'll focus on obsessional neurosis below.) As he contemplated totemism, he knew not to ask, "How did totemism come into being?" This was the overly general question that had confounded anthropologists of his day. Instead, the learned *Herr Doktor* framed a question more to the point. Freud asked, "How did totemism develop out of the horde type of organization?" Of course, the answer fell right out: young, expelled males captured females from the hordes of established males and united to overthrow and -- consistent with the cannibalism of pre-Neolithic times -- eat their former rival. The triumph constituted a very liberating and total revolution. The murder would have been followed by a wild celebration that included the "first supper" and sexual orgy.

The overthrow of the dominant ("alpha") males, the primal fathers, must have occurred countless times. As soon as the challengers triumphed, a new fight would begin to determine the successor. Ultimately, young combatants ended these cycles of fraternal and inter-generational male violence by renouncing their claims upon the most contested sex objects (mothers and sisters) and by sharing the females. Although Freud never explicitly took note of it, this agreement, this first social contract, required digital language.

The result was that fathers tolerated the presence of sexually mature sons, and exogamy (marriage outside of the family) came into being. Ambivalence must be resolved in this way, by making some renunciation and accepting compensation. This renunciation and compensation that exogamy represented launched civilization and made all further progress possible. Cooperation, law (e. g. exogamy) and religious rites (e. g. the re-creation and sacrifice of the primordial father as a totem animal at the annual totem meal) were seminally sown.

But the transition to exogamy was rough and never fully satisfying. The opposite sex parent (facially) and siblings (sexually) remain our greatest loves. *To facilitate exogamous marriage, we donned the **First Mask** to mask our love for these family members. The transition to monogamy, covered in*

³⁴ Contemporary research shows that subdominant males, though deferential often to the point of being obsequious to the dominant ones and though discreet in their mating behavior, mate almost as successfully.

Chapter 7, was also imperfect and incomplete. It increased the need for and fortified the First Mask.

Let's focus more closely now on how their religion would have been affected by this *primal revolution*. The joyous and halcyon days that followed the overthrow of a dominant alpha male were darkened by a growing awareness: the dominant male whom they had murdered, dismembered and cannibalized -- was their father. As suggested by the Paleolithic (Old Stone Age) female fertility figurines that we will survey in Chapter 6, people probably were not fully conscious of the mechanics of reproduction until the dawn of the Neolithic Age. The most popular Hindu creation myths suggest otherwise. In them the rivalry between the primal father and his sons is over the daughter /sister. These myths presuppose an understanding of the mechanics of sexual reproduction, but this daughter status could have been a Neolithic enhancement added during the hominid reconfiguration of the totem gods. (More on this is in Chapter 5.) The earliest awareness of the father-child relationship was probably born of instinct. The instinct was honed at least two million years ago and during the time of primal fathers as a means by which dependent mothers and their infants survived on the African savannah in the presence of large cats. When needed, fathers instinctively protect their families and are gods in the eyes of children.

Nothin's gonna harm you, not while I'm around
Nothin's gonna harm you, not while I'm around
Demons are prowling, everywhere, nowadays
I'll send them howling, I don't care, I've got ways
--Stephen Sondheim

They had overlooked the positive side of the primal males during the heat of passion. After the primal deed, they began to feel remorse. Ambivalence for the primal males intensified.

Due to the powerful impact of the primal deed, the original sin, and due to ambivalent memories of the primal fathers; succeeding generations continued to be obsessed with the primal deed. To the extent that their rudimentary language permitted, they maintained an oral history of it. Gradually our ancestors developed glyphic writing and techniques that helped them to more accurately retain oral history. We'll review some of these techniques in the next chapter. Oral history was probably always more easily compromised than written records. That would have been especially true for the original sin (primal deed) and our ancestors' first attempts to retain oral

history. We'll also inquire into the social psychology of the process by which oral history is converted into myth (mythmaking) in the next chapter.

For now, suffice it to say that gradually, succeeding generations magnified the primal fathers. This occurred as tribes shared their oral histories, as priests and cults competed to capture the popular imagination and as countless prehistoric characters were condensed into one mythological character with superhuman powers. New generations began to believe literally in the mythological characters. These characters held out the promise of satisfying the innate religious demand for deliverance from death and suffering. Especially children, venturing away from their families and into the world, seek the protection that parents can no longer provide. But, of course, these gods' existence, like that of the even more abstract "God" and "Satan" of modern religion, was never more than poetic.

As this magnification was occurring, there was a tendency among ordinary folks to falsely impute to these primal characters the spirits that they projected due to their repression of the negative side of their ambivalence toward their competing parents. With only the rudiments of a spoken language, the nascent totem religion that each generation of little children re-creates in its dreams absorbed the primal fathers.

The result was the entrenchment of totemism by the combination of a historical reference and an annual rite. The rite, the annual totem meal, re-enacted the primal deed. The historical reference was a large variety of fragmentary creation myths in which a totem animal creates -- not savage society, but -- the world.

Glooskap gave names to everything. He made men and gave them life and made the winds to make the waters move. -- Opening lines of a Penobscot myth (See Leland: 65-66 or Hardin, Terri: 10.)

After the next two, great traumas in our prehistory ("the Deluge"), many of these creation myths were modified to include water. For example: 'Duck dove down into the primeval waters and brought up the mud that became the world.'

Agreeing with Freud that the original sin was the primal deed, we might presume that the fall from the Garden in Genesis was punishment for the primal deed and indicated a fall from God's grace. Freud thought so and not unreasonably. A fragmentary, totem creation myth could have evolved into "the fall from the garden." Genesis 2 and 3 could be an elaboration of

Genesis 1. The totem gods *were* reconfigured into hominid gods during Neolithic times (as men started to learn horticulture and animal husbandry, mastered all the animals, gained self-confidence and elevated a third group of ambivalent prehistoric ancestors to their pantheons). The modern religions consolidated the gods and demons into God and Devil for reasons that we'll explore in Chapter 7. So, assume for now that the fall from the garden is a true creation myth, symbolic of the original sin. But don't be too sure.

That the transition from the horde to society had been, among many peoples, a very bloody one involving the actual murder of primordial fathers, is probable for three reasons. First, and as Campbell has already suggested to us, there is enormous variation in the strength and the anthropomorphic nature of peoples' religious obsessions. This varying power of people's gods is partially explained by variations in the severity of the original and second sin trauma that different peoples underwent. As already mentioned, throughout much of the East (mountainous central Asia, the Malay Archipelago, Australia, Siberia and India and Korea notwithstanding), the gods never became as powerful as in the West. Buddhism, the modern religion that enjoys the greatest popularity in the East, propitiates the gods less. It denies them as it denies the reality of separate things and the separate and mortal self. Atkinson suggested that a different pattern for dealing with primal father conflict had unfolded in the East:

Atkinson, who incidentally passed his whole life in New Caledonia and had unusual opportunities for studying the natives, also pointed out that the conditions that Darwin assumed to prevail in the primal horde may easily be observed in herds of wild oxen and horses and regularly lead to the killing of the father of the herd. (*Ibid.*: 222.)

He further supposed that, after the father had been disposed of, the horde would be disintegrated by a bitter struggle between the victorious sons. Thus, any new organization of society would be precluded: there would be "an ever- recurring violent succession to the solitary paternal tyrant, by sons whose parricidal hands were so soon again clenched in fratricidal strife. (*Ibid.*: 228.)

Atkinson, who had no psychoanalytic hints to help him and who was ignorant of Robertson Smith's studies, found a less violent transition from the primal horde to the next social stage, at which numbers of males live together in a peaceable

community. He believed that through the intervention of maternal love the sons --to begin with only the youngest, but later others as well --were allowed to remain with the horde and that in return for this toleration the sons acknowledged their father's sexual privilege by renouncing all claim to their mother and sisters. -- Freud, 1913: 142; citing Atkinson

When we are better prepared to deal with East-West differences, in Chapter 13, we'll see that Atkinson was probably only partially correct.

Second, another reason why we know primal father conflict to have been bloody and not just the imaginary product of incestuous desire is that competing parent conflict alone is not powerful enough to account for all the obsessional religious strength of the creation myths.

Thirdly, the powerful, prehistoric elements of the godhead, another one of which you are about to discover, are what account for "His" timeless aspect. Indeed, you'll meet below a principle Greek god whose name was synonymous with time -- Chronus (Kronus, Chronos or Cronus).

Now, recall that I credited Freud with correctly analyzing the *dynamics* of the creation myths and totemism. His interpretation of their subject matter was only partially correct. The creation myths are more complex and the totem animal antecedents much more numerous than he suspected. As you will see in coming chapters, almost all the original creation myths became overlaid with second sin (Deluge) material. In fact, among all the Mongoloid Americans, the Deluge or second sin is virtually the only subject of their creation myths. Even those few Eurasian myths that remained distinct allegories for the original sin became attached to lengthy narratives that included the second sin. As you'll see, this is because the survivors of both prehistoric traumas reaped similar benefits: greater welfare, fertility and civility.

Again, the totem animals or "animal people" were more a product of the Deluge than the killing of the primal fathers. In fact, except for the bull (which, outside of Egypt, appears to point mainly to the objects of the Oedipal Complex --the primal father and the competing parent), all the totem animals in all the mythologies and religions of our ancestors primarily describe the victims and victors of the Deluge. You will see this at every stop of our journey around the primitive world. For the Indians, "animal people" or "balls of mud" included their African American victims. Here is a late-totemic, early-Neolithic myth that is especially clear. Can you tell from it who the Deluge victims were?

Old-One, or Chief, made the earth out of a woman and said she would be the mother of all the people. Thus, the earth was once a human being, and she is alive yet; but she has been transformed, and we cannot see her in the same way we can see a person. Nevertheless, she has legs, arms, head, heart, flesh, bones and blood. The soil is her flesh; the trees and vegetation are her hair; the rocks, her bones; and the wind is her breath. She lays spread out, and we live on her. She shivers and contracts when cold and expands and perspires when hot. When she moves, we have an earthquake. *Old-One, after transforming her, took some of her flesh and rolled it into balls, as people do with mud or clay. These he transformed into the beings of the ancient world, **who were people and yet at the same time animals.** [H emphasis mine]*

*These beings had some of the characteristics that animals have now and in some respects acted like animals. In form, some were like animals [H the Deluge victims], while others more nearly resembled people [H the Negroid victims of the Amerindians, all emphasis mine]. Some could fly like birds and others could swim like fishes. All had greater powers and were more cunning, than either animals or people. They were not well balanced. Each had great powers in certain ways, but was weak and helpless in other ways. Thus, each was exceedingly wise in some things and exceedingly foolish in others. **They all had the gift of speech.** [H The “animal people” that were Deluge victims had different abilities than we have, but even they had digital language.] As a rule, they were selfish, and there was much trouble among them. Some were cannibals and lived by eating one another. Some did this knowingly, while others did it through ignorance. They knew that they had to live by hunting, but did not know which beings were people and which deer. They thought people were deer and preyed on them. (H Here they are either projecting the crimes of the Deluge victors onto the victims or referring to the “animal people” that were Deluge victors.)*

Some people lived on the earth at the same time. They had all the characteristics that Indians have now, but they were more ignorant. Deer also were on the earth at that time and were real animals as now. People hunted them. They were never people or semi-human ancients, like the ancestors of most animals. [H Deer

were plentiful and everyone wanted to eat them, so the deer were not eligible as totem animals within this Salishan tribe.] Some people say that moose and caribou were also animals, although stories are told of the last three as though they were ancients or semi-human.

Old-One made each ball of mud a little different from the others and rolled them over and over. He shaped them and made them alive. *The last balls of mud he made were almost alike and different from any of the preceding ones. They became alive. They were Indians, but were ignorant and knew no arts. They were the most helpless of all things created; and the cannibals and others preyed on them particularly. The people and animals were made male and female, so that they might breed. Thus, everything living sprang from the earth; and when we look around, we see everywhere parts of our mother. --From a Salishan myth in Boas, Franz, 1917: 80-83 and in Hardin, Terri: 412-413*

Did the light turn on? Did you discover who the Deluge victims were? If not, have patience as we continue to dismantle your resistance.

REPRESSION, RESISTANCE AND REPETITION COMPULSION

Traumatic experiences and information unacceptable to the superego tend to become repressed. Such material becomes inaccessible to the ego, the mind's operating system. Repression produces guilt, the vague feeling that something about one's self is not correct. Latently homosexual members of savage society, especially people who are latent males, are excessively burdened by such guilt. They derive a twisted sort of relief from humiliating others and cherish the occupations that regularly permit them to punish or humiliate others: military, judicial, prosecutorial and police work.³⁵

George Orwell's book, 1984, describes a savage, K and R society totally dominated by latently homosexual males. To civilize our world and conquer

³⁵ I regret having to be so blunt with a message so sensitive; but the subtler attempts to deliver this message have failed in the USA, wherein the world's self-appointed policemen most need the message. A recent, New York City screening of Friedrich Dürrenmatt's *The Pledge* was understood only by the select few that already knew the message, by the few that stood up when the flick was over.

our homophobia and our homosexuality, to avoid Orwell's dark and dreary scenarios, we must minimize K and R (as only China and Singapore have even begun to do to date) and eradicate homophobia by legalizing and encouraging same sex and group marriages. A 25-year, transitional procreation moratorium may also be necessary. Our savagely-high birth rates, above the normally appropriate one, which is the one corresponding to the greatest decrease in the death rate, our tendency to make baby-making machines of women, makes killing machines of men. Killing machine is a role that is incompatible with the loving nature of homosexual men and causes homophobia in men. That male homophobia forces the homosexual men that can hide their homosexuality to do so, to adopt a false persona, the Third Mask, which portrays them as just the opposite of the loving person beneath the mask.

Returning to the relatively light and frivolous Freud, he discovered that memories easily recalled from early childhood, emotionally indifferent memories, often serve as a screen for other memories that are emotionally charged and repressed. Of these *screen memories*, he said:

“The unconscious mind works to avoid or forget what is painful or unpleasant, to forget even what reminds us of the “charged” memory and to substitute some unthreatening memory in its place. People whose unconscious is heavily burdened with such tasks are characterized by nervous behavior. They almost seem physically to be doing what their minds are doing -- taking flight in the face of ‘danger.’” --S. Freud, *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, p. 148

The *screen memory* often derives from a wholly different period in the person's life from that of the repressed memory, but it usually contains some of the same elements. It is as if the segregated trauma has been short-circuited due to having an electromotive force so powerful that it threatens the ego's integrity. The healing process involves draining off that short-circuited energy but under safe conditions --through gradual and peripheral contacts with the charged area/material. We are compelled to reprocess the elements of a trauma but under more favorable conditions -- in such a way as to produce a different, less traumatic or more satisfying outcome. In this way, the elements of a trauma are neutralized through new and less painful associations with those elements. The memory of the traumatic experience thus becomes gradually drained of its emotional charge on all sides. Freud

dubbed this gradual draining process *repetition compulsion*. Repetition compulsion is the more positive, healing aspect of our overall response to traumata.

The more negative aspect is the repression of the traumata and the ego's resistance to any association that threatens to undo it. We repress painful memories and thoughts that promise to produce pain. With thoughts, the ego "makes use of an experimental cathexis and starts up the pleasure-unpleasure automatism by means of a signal of anxiety" (Freud, 1933: 89). The experimental thought is sent out, and the superego monitors the reactions to it. "After that, several reactions are possible or a combination of them in varying proportions. The anxiety attack is fully generated and the ego withdraws entirely from the objectionable excitation; or, in place of the experimental cathexis, it opposes the excitation with an anticathexis. This anticathexis combines with the repressed impulse to form a symptom, or the anticathexis is taken up into the ego as a *reaction formation* as an intensification of certain of the ego's dispositions, as a permanent alteration of it," [*H as a character trait opposite from the repressed one, a trait that keeps the original impulse in check, emphasis mine*] (*Ibid.* p. 89).

With respect to strong antisocial desires that have not been renounced and compensated (e. g. strong incest desires), "repression is not an event that occurs once... [It] requires a permanent expenditure [of energy]. If this expenditure were to cease, the repressed impulse, which is being fed all the time from its sources, would on the next occasion flow along the channels from which it had been forced away, and the repression would either fail in its purpose or would have to be repeated an indefinite number of times" (Freud, 1926: 83). The reaction formations of obsessional neurotics, people with excessively severe superegos that demand ritual renunciations for every sexual or anti-social impulse, are especially effective for this purpose. They exhibit the attitude that is the opposite of the instinctual trend that must be repressed. For example, people with strong homicidal impulses will convince themselves that they are incapable of violence.

Both aspects of neuroses, the positive repetition compulsion and the negative repression, resistance and reaction formation are at work in the formation of the screen memory. Freud observed that many myths and legends function as *screen memories*:

"Thus the 'childhood memories' of individuals come in general to acquire the significance of 'screen memories' and in doing so offer a remarkable analogy with the childhood

memories that a nation preserves in its store of legends and myths” (*Ibid.* p. 148).

Freud even suspected that the analogy was complete. He anticipated what we will verify below:

“It is universally acknowledged that where the origin of a people's traditions and legendary history are concerned, a motive of this kind, whose aim is to wipe from memory whatever is distressing to national feeling, must be taken into consideration. Closer investigation would perhaps reveal a complete analogy between the ways in which the traditions of a people and the childhood memories of the individual come to be formed” (*Ibid.* p. 148).

Flood myths are indeed screen memories. *Noah's Ark in all its variations uses the second worst trauma in the life of our species as a cover for the worst one.*

Many more myths lie ahead; but to enjoy them, you will need additional psychological tools and background information. This will be provided in the next three subchapters and Chapter 5. Henceforth, the main author will be -- not one of the immortal icons of European scholarship but your own New York City taxi-driver -- me.

THE FRATERNAL COMPLEX

Man is a herd animal. We must cooperate to survive and thrive. Typically, men work with and for other men and need other men. Women work with and for and need other women. Cooperation produces strong positive emotions. That's the upside.

The downside is that of our gametes, our genes. We are in competition with our same-sex contemporaries for limited resources, opposite sex gametes and the right to reproduce. Like every other animal and plant, we have been selected over three or four billion years of evolution for our tendency to over produce and preserve our own genes. This is part of the survival instinct. This is what biological success means. Twentieth Century China and Singapore notwithstanding, we have failed to set any limits on this genetic (or reproductive) competition. We have always overproduced our own kind relative to our ability to utilize, manage and re-concentrate

resources. We have never provided equal opportunity for all our children, for the tribal, regional and global children. Consequently, men also have strong negative emotions toward all other men who are their unrestrained genetic competitors. Women have the same negative feelings for other women.

This emotional *ambivalence* is a big problem. If you merely hate someone, you can avoid that person and soon forget him or her. Avoidance is not possible when you are ambivalent about someone you need, especially someone who is a parent of some sort. Instead of forgetting about him or her, you become obsessed with this object of ambivalence. Competing emotions struggle with one another continuously. The ambivalent object becomes associated with every critical problem, every difficult decision and every momentous event. This struggle of competing emotions and impulses can only be resolved either by eliminating the need for the object of ambivalence or eliminating the negative side of that ambivalence.

Yet resolving the ambivalence toward the two universal ongoing objects of ambivalence, the competing parent and our ongoing genetic competitors, is more easily said than done. We need the competing parent until we can financially support ourselves. Dispensing with him or her is impossible until the late teens at the earliest. Only thereafter can we resolve the ambivalence, eliminate negative feelings toward the competing parent, by marrying a substitute for the opposite sex parent.

Just at the time when we do obtain financial independence from the parents and have an opportunity to resolve competing parent ambivalence, we start to cooperate with our ongoing genetic competitors in the workplace. Ambivalence toward them intensifies. This latter ambivalence that I call fraternal ambivalence is not directed toward any individual, but it is completely unmitigated. Humanity has done almost nothing to resolve or eliminate it.

We have already seen that the primal fathers closely associate with the competing parent. Both these objects of extreme ambivalence are ancestors, individuals and parents. The myths about the primal fathers and the “spirits” of the competing parent combine to form a universal neurosis, the *Oedipal* (or [for women] *Electra*) Complex. Notice that the Oedipal Complex has a prehistoric element/object/or component and an ongoing one. The prehistoric component, the primal fathers, makes the complex (and religion’s godhead) timeless. The ongoing component, the competing parent, makes the complex (and the godhead) universal.

Similarly, the victims of the Deluge are a prehistoric group of highly ambivalent relatives that became closely associated with an ongoing group of

highly ambivalent relatives -- our ongoing genetic competitors. The projected spirits of the latter group were (are) falsely attributed to the former group by “born again” believers who (usually as young adults) had (have) *noumenal* experiences. I refer to this other universal neurotic complex as the *Fraternal Complex*. It also has both a prehistoric (timeless) and an ongoing (universal) component.

In the next subsection, we will discover in greater detail how “spirits” arise. In the next chapter we will see, in greater detail, how the oral history of the prehistoric components of the complexes became compromised (distorted) into sacred myths and rituals. We’ll see how the prehistoric objects of the complexes were magnified into gods and demons. We will also begin to understand how the Deluge victors contracted the ambivalence of their victims. In later chapters, numerous myths and rituals from all over the world will show how the “gods,” “demons” and “spirits” of the Oedipal and Fraternal Complexes (the original four elements of the godhead) and the mythologically inflated deluge victors (the *derivative element of the godhead*) gradually became amalgamated into the “God” and “Devil” of modern religions.

Did you figure out yet what “the Deluge” is all about? Did this abstract treatment of the Fraternal Complex, which has the Deluge or the “second sin” as its prehistoric component, turn the light on? A conscious understanding of the ongoing component tends to undo repression of the prehistoric component. I’m pushing you toward that goal. Hang in there!

OBSESSIONAL NEUROSIS (REPRESSED AMBIVALENCE) GIVES RISE TO OBSESSIONAL GESTURES AND SPIRITS

We have seen that strong ambivalence toward the ongoing components of the universal complexes (the competing parent and [later] genetic competitors that we know, identify with and need) generally results in repression. The individual represses the negative side of his feelings toward these persons. But repression is not the final result of ongoing ambivalence.

Repression seeks to obliterate awareness of the repressed desires. As the awareness of these desires (e. g. to eliminate competitors and unite with their mates) is repeatedly thwarted by the censoring superego, symbolic substitutes for them develop. The superego struggles against the substitutes and the lesser gratification that they represent. The id then develops substitutes for the substitutes, and so on, until the ego senses that it is immersed in a conflict. The original objects of the struggle cease to be recognizable once they have

been eclipsed by a series of substitutes. Moreover, the conflict cannot be resolved so long as one aspect of it remains unconscious, remains repressed and isolated within a part of the mind that is inaccessible to the mind's operating system, the ego. Freud gave us a clear example of this ambivalence- repression-substitution dynamic in the touching phobias of young boys.

“Now both the clinical history and the psychological mechanism of obsessional neurosis have become known to us through psychoanalysis. The clinical history of a typical case of 'touching phobia' is as follows. Quite at the beginning, in very early childhood, the patient shows a strong desire to touch, the aim of which is of a far more specialized kind that one would have been inclined to expect. This desire is promptly met by an external prohibition against carrying out that particular kind of touching (of his own genitals). The prohibition is accepted, since it finds support from powerful internal forces (that is, from the child's loving relation to the authors of the prohibition) and proves stronger than the instinct that is seeking to express itself in the touching. In consequence, however, of the child's primitive psychological constitution, the prohibition fails to abolish the instinct. Its only result is to repress the instinct (the desire to touch) and banish it into the unconscious. Both the prohibition and the instinct persist: the instinct because it has only been repressed and not abolished and the prohibition because, if it ceased, the instinct would force its way through into consciousness and into actual operation. A situation is created that remains undealt with - - a psychological fixation -- and everything else follows from the continuing conflict between the prohibition and the instinct.

The principal characteristic of the psychological constellation that becomes fixed in this way is what might be described as the subject's ambivalent (to borrow the apt term coined by Breuer) attitude towards a single object, or rather towards one act involving that object. He is constantly wishing to perform this act (the touching), [and looks on it as his supreme enjoyment, but he must not perform it] and detests it as well. The conflict between these two currents cannot be promptly settled because – there's no other way of putting it -- they are localized in the subject's mind in such a manner that they cannot come up

against each other. The prohibition is noisily conscious, while the persistent desire to touch is unconscious and the subject knows nothing of it. *Were it not for this psychological factor, ambivalence like this could neither last so long nor lead to such consequences [H emphasis mine].*

In our clinical history of a case, we have insisted that the imposition of the prohibition in very early childhood is the determining point; a similar importance attaches in the subsequent developments to the mechanism of repression at the same early age. Due to the repression that has been enforced and that involves a loss of memory, an amnesia, the motives for the prohibition (which is conscious) remain unknown [*H like the identities of the prehistoric "gods" and the negativity felt toward the ongoing "gods"*], and all attempts at disposing of it by intellectual processes must fail since they cannot find any base of attack. The prohibition owes its strength and its obsessive character precisely to its unconscious opponent, the concealed and undiminished desire -- that is to say, to an internal necessity inaccessible to conscious inspection. The ease with which the prohibition can be transferred and extended reflects a process that falls in with the unconscious desire and is greatly facilitated by the psychological conditions that prevail in the unconscious. The instinctual desire is constantly shifting to escape from the impasse and endeavors to find substitutes -- substitute objects and substitute acts -- in place of the prohibited ones [*H e. g. stepping on cracks of the sidewalk*]. In consequence of this, the prohibition itself shifts about as well and extends to any new aims that the forbidden impulse may adopt. Any fresh advance made by the repressed *libido* is answered by a fresh sharpening of the prohibition. The mutual inhibition of the two conflicting forces produces a need for discharge, for reducing the prevailing tension; and to this may be attributed the reason for the performance of obsessive acts. In the case of a neurosis these are clearly compromise actions: from one point of view, they are evidences of remorse, efforts at expiation, and so on, while on the other hand they are at the same time substitutive acts to compensate the instinct for what has been prohibited.

It is a law of neurotic illness that these obsessive acts fall more and more under the sway of the instinct and approach

nearer and nearer to the activity that was originally prohibited” (Freud, 1913: 29-30).

“The child’s primitive psychological constitution” notwithstanding, the same dynamic applies to all the religious obsessions that we shall be studying. Only the content differs. In place of the prohibition against touching are commandments to “Honor thy father and mother” and “Respect thy neighbor and his rights.” In place of the touching impulse and contradicting these commandments are 1) the negative side of our ambivalence toward the competing parent, 2) the negative side of our ambivalence toward our unrestrained genetic competitors, and 3) (much less so in modern times) remembrance of the original sin and 4) remembrance of “the second sin.” The victims of “the second sin,” the Deluge, were long imagined to have surviving kinfolk who were determined to avenge their deaths. The contradiction between the commandments on the one hand and these negative impulses and memories on the other resulted in guilt (in part from the mere act of repression) and (at more conscious levels) fear of punishment. Fear results from the semi-conscious idea that someone will subject us to the same violent acts that our ancestors committed and that we would like to commit against others. Such fear, as obsessional as the unconscious impulses and memories that determine it, is in turn repressed by the superego and replaced with ideas, with replacement ideas. These replacement ideas require us to perform obsessional acts of compensation or avoidance. The repressed and unconscious, “I am afraid of my genetic competitors or competing parent” gets replaced by, “I am afraid of God” which in turn is replaced by, “I must do...to make God love me.” When feelings of love or sexual desire are repressed, they are often replaced with [paranoid delusions](#). Obsessional acts include all the prayers, sacrifices, acts of penance and all other gestures known as worship.

For a concrete example of an obsession that can become religious, consider mourning. Mourning is the obsession to pay tribute to spirits with funerals, flowers, grave maintenance and visitation and to punish oneself for one’s dead relatives. Negative thoughts and emotions exist even toward those whom we love most dearly, but mourners thoroughly repress their negative thoughts toward their dead. For proof of this, just read the headstones in any cemetery. You will see only expressions of love. The negative thoughts about the dead have all been repressed. Within the unconscious mind, “I didn’t like...about him” or “I hate him for having done...to me” is replaced by “He

doesn't love me," which is in turn replaced by "I must do...to compensate him." The resulting obsessional gestures are "protective" measures.

Important and central as all these protective and obsessional gestures are to religions, they are hardly the only result of obsessional neurosis. There's much more! When we feel ourselves to be the victims and repress the sources of our hostility, we are apt to displace our anger onto others. (More on this is in the Conclusion.) When we are unconscious of both the source of the hostility and the hostility itself, we are apt to project spirits. It works as follows.

The ego, sensing a struggle but unable to locate or interpret it, assumes that the struggle is with something external, such as the external sensations that the ego must monitor. But without the presence of a physical antagonist, the "external and immaterial combatant" is deemed to be a "spirit." The stronger the ambivalence and repression, the greater is the spirit thought to be.

Moreover, the ego has its own reasons for wanting to believe in the newly hypothesized spirit. Recall that the ego is merely the innermost electrical circuit of the intralaminar nucleus. It sends out scanning impulses that pull sensory inputs and stored information into its orbit. The ego wants to believe that it can surmount the death of the body as easily as it can abstract from the body. (See *ego* and *intralaminar nucleus* above.) It wants to believe that it and the egos of others are immaterial and imperishable "souls." The struggles with "external and invisible spirits" (repressed, projected, ambivalent emotions) provide it with direct "evidence" of the existence of immaterial and imperishable but un-incarnated "souls" like the immaterial and imperishable "soul" that it wants to believe it itself is.

Every new member of society "finds religion" when he projects spirits of his competing parent and ongoing genetic competitors and matches up these nameless spirits with the gods and demons or "God" and "Devil" of a historically prepared religion. The born-again believer who experiences this will invariably insist that he has been purged of his hostility toward everyone and everything. Finding Jesus, Allah or Whomever "washed his sins away" -- cleansed him of all his negativity. Of course, our real feelings and impulses inevitably reflect our corresponding relationships with the one real material and Malthusian world around us. For the believer to truly believe that he has nothing but positive emotions toward his competing parent and all his unrestrained contemporary genetic competitors, he must thoroughly repress the negative side of his ambivalence toward these objects. The dogmas, the repressive doctrines of organized religions, assist him in this. They strengthen the believer's neurosis by making it more difficult for him to discover his

ambivalence and the real source of the spirits that haunt him.³⁶ That's why believers are such consummate hypocrites.

Don't think that the false matching up of spirits (derivative of ongoing objects of repressed ambivalence) with mythological gods (prehistoric objects of repressed ambivalence) ever required any creativity or leap of faith. The generations of people who eliminated the primal fathers and the victims of "the Deluge" would have repressed all *positive* sentiment and memory of their victims to rationalize the taking of life and avoid conscious guilt. This repression by the violent perpetrators of the original and second sins, this repression of the *positive* side of their ambivalence for their dead victims would have caused spirit projection and *paranoid delusions*. These primal deed and deluge survivor generations would have been conscious enough to associate these spirits with their recent victims. They would have established their victims as immortal gods, and they would have taught succeeding generations about the "gods" that haunted them. False linkage of the prehistoric objects of ambivalence with other spirits, spirits derivative of the ongoing objects of ambivalence (the competing parent and known and needed ongoing genetic competitors) was then inevitable. It was just a matter of time, growing population and growing ambivalence toward genetic competitors.

DREAM DYNAMICS

It will be easier to understand the predominantly social process by which oral history is transformed into myth if we first understand the process by which the mind transforms antisocial and taboo impulses into dreams. As Freud suspected, these processes appear to be analogous.

Here is a summary of the dynamics of the dream process as first analyzed in Freud's, *The Interpretation of Dreams* and slightly amended to

³⁶ Unconscious fundamentalist believers who are convinced that they have no negative impulses or intentions become extraordinarily hypocritical when functioning as criminal prosecutors. The influence of right wing, fundamentalist hypocrites is clearly stamped upon the U.S. Modern Penal Code. Section 5.01 of the Code, Criminal Attempts, maintains the common law definition of an attempt as constituting both a mental state and an act. But Section 5.01 does away with the old common law tests for whether an act is sufficient to constitute an attempt and substitutes in their place the "substantial step" test. Under this test, the act can be any step that the fact-finder regards as corroborative of the criminal intention. Section 5.01 comes dangerously close to allowing the "Godly" to criminalize the rest of us for our thoughts.

account for the violent impulses of the Fraternal Complex.^{37, 38} Dreams are a picture language. The unconscious mind regressively converts the residues of the day's thoughts that were interrupted and never finished back into sensory images like those from which these thoughts arose. Abstract ideas and everything that was added due to linguistic processing tends to drop out.³⁹

The dream work of the unconscious mind rearranges these images to satisfy violent or sexual wishes or discharge the energy of still-isolated, violent or sexual traumas. The unconscious mind also attempts to appease other demands of the body and the superego without disturbing sleep. The superego is placated by submission to its criticism (e. g. the injection of nonsense into the dream) and by the unconscious mind disguising the violent or sexual wish fulfillment of the dream. The techniques or devices for disguising the "latent dream" and converting it into the "manifest dream" that passes superego censorship include: 1) suggestion (association), sometimes with an opposite; 2) condensation (of several elements into one); 3) displacement into a different context; and 4) associations arising from the plasticity of words.

"[Our] analytical work has shown that the dynamics of the formation of dreams are the same as those of the formation of symptoms. In both cases, we find a struggle between two trends, of which one is unconscious and ordinarily repressed and strives towards satisfaction -- that is, wish-fulfillment -- while the other,

³⁷ For a more detailed summary of Freud's work on dreams see the relevant lecture in *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. For a thumbnail summary see Freud's *Jokes and the Unconscious*, p. 175.

³⁸ If humanity survives long enough to resolve its Fraternal Complex, there is no doubt in my mind that someone will invent the "dream-recorder." Perhaps it will enclose the dreamer's head like a magnetic resonance imaging machine does. It will probably have to be able to map the movement of micro- or nano-volts that activate engrams during the dream, record the amperages and voltages, thus permitting the awakened dreamer to redirect identical currents in the same sequence and over the same pathways so as to reproduce the dream. As I proofread this work, scientists in ten different centers are reporting achievements in mapping deoxygenated blood flow and, by inference, brain activity. Fast M.R.I. machines are able to detect differences in the magnetic field surrounding oxygenated and deoxygenated blood. (See Blakeslee: 1993b) One is almost forced to wonder if the same sequential differences in the magnetic field -- produced externally -- would not induce the corresponding brain activity (analogous to the conversion of an alternator into a motor). But don't think for one minute that this invention will eliminate the demand for therapists; most people won't want to play back the unpleasant dreams. (E. g. "No, no, not that one again!")

³⁹ Cf. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 222-3.

belonging to the conscious ego [H *superego*], is disapproving and repressive. The outcome of this conflict is a compromise formation (the dream or the symptom) in which both trends have found an incomplete expression.” --Freud, 1922: 238

Think generally of the dreamwork as consisting of id efforts to release internal tension and satisfy desires and superego efforts to inhibit those desires. The outcome, the manifest dream, is a compromise between the two.

Some dreams employ symbols that are so universal in their meaning, that Freud was often tempted to treat them as I treat myths and rituals. He was tempted to forego the slow and more reliable method of interpretation that has the *subject* freely associate with his dream elements. Drowning or going under water is one such universal symbol. It's a symbol for death. Our unconscious minds employ drowning as an image for death because the death of the victim is certain and no culprit need be depicted. *One can safely surmise that the Deluge myths refer to the death of a whole lot of people.*

With our new background in totemism and psychoanalysis, we are now ready to probe deeper into obsessional religious gestures and the social processes by which oral and commemorative history transformed into myth and ritual. We must now consider these social processes in the abstract. Your understanding of them will remain sketchy until you know who the Deluge victims were and see the evidence of these processes in the mythologies that we'll analyze in Parts II and III.

CHAPTER 5: FROM SPIRITS AND TOTEMS TO PAGAN GODS

*Now it is inherent in human nature to have an inclination
To consider a thing untrue if one does not like it.
Thus, society makes what is disagreeable into what is untrue.
-- Sigmund Freud (1916: 27)*

As you will soon see, the Deluge coincided everywhere with a revolution in stone tool making and a rapid increase in the human population. Archeologists refer to this new period as the *Upper Paleolithic*, the upper *Old Stone Age*, because it is everywhere higher is the ground than the period that preceded it, the *Lower Paleolithic*. Using technology that I'll outline in Chapter 10, geneticists have dated the Upper Paleolithic onset at 60 kya in Africa (but since their first human out of Africa migration date is 75 kya, make it 75 kya); 50 kya along the South Asian coast and Australia; 45 kya in the (*H outer most parts of the*) Middle East; 40 kya in Central Asia; and 30 kya in Europe. As you will start to discover, these Deluge events greatly overshadow the primal deed in all our mythologies. Because the primal deed is so comparatively sketchy and because the participants in the primal deed were relatives who dominated the earth for two million years, it is safe to estimate that the two events were separated by at least 100,000 years. When the original sin was committed, when the dominant males of the horde were killed, modern men with all our characteristics (*Homo sapiens*) probably didn't exist. Combining our knowledge of psychoanalysis, ethnography, archaeology and the myths themselves, we can much more confidently make inferences about the mythmaking of "the Deluge" or second sin than we can about the original sin. Therefore, this chapter will focus on the former. We'll draw only the most basic conclusions about the primal deed. Yet, until we learn otherwise, assume that what we conclude about Deluge mythmaking applied to primal deed mythmaking in some more simplified form.

We already know from our Salishan ancestors (of the Pacific Northwest) that the animal people had well-developed language and taught this language to our immediate ancestors. Other myths, especially American myths, verify this. All accounts suggest that the largest subgroup of "animal people" was the Deluge victims. (Negroid, aboriginal Americans were later added to the "animal people" category.)

Archaeologists concur that language had a very early origin:

The relatively sudden expansion at this time [H of the *Upper Paleolithic*] into new and difficult environments, whose exploitation on a sustained basis demands all these capacities [H e. g. *alliance networks, information exchange, seasonal planning, separation and division of labor, extended kinship, etc.*], argues further for... [H *the emergence of language*] at this time, breaking communicational and organizational “blocks” to such colonization, blocks that must have existed previously (Gamble, 1983).

All this does not mean, though, that fully developed language and cultural systems sprang up suddenly in the Upper Paleolithic out of nothing. In fact, it seems most unlikely that fully developed language capacities could have emerged from other than an already evolving system of symbolic communication (Whallon’s “Elements of Cultural Change in the Later Paleolithic” in Mellars and Stringer: 450, citing Bickerton 1981: 261, *et passim*).

If digital language predates *Homo sapiens* and if the earlier *Homo erectus* species of Man (of whom *Neanderthal* is the western variant) had language, then we must suspect that the *Homo erecti* are both “animal people” and the victims of “the Deluge.” As we’ll see, mythology also repeatedly tells us that *Homo erectus* committed the primal deed. The survival of any oral history necessitates digital language. *Homo erectus* must have had a rudimentary language at the time he orally recorded the primal deed. The *Homo erecti* must have invented digital language out of kinesthetic (body) language. They progressively substituted parts for the kinesthetic whole, until those parts were merely vocal. Redundant usage of these established them as words (Bateson, paraphrasing Darwin, 1871: i 56-7). The first words corresponded to broad areas of meaning. What we now consider to be metaphors would have been used to describe aspects of the primal deed for which more precise words did not exist. Of course, they had no television, radio, newspapers, magazines, photographs or writing of any kind. History was preserved orally, in their rudimentary language.

Because animals were so all important to these early Stone Age peoples and because their limited language limited their dreams, their dreams must have been like those of little children. They dreamed of animals. Their dreams compromised competing parents and genetic competitors as animals. Succeeding generations of people absorbed the oral history of the primal deed

into their animal dreams. The basic outline of the stories was preserved, but the primordial fathers and rebellious sons were transformed into various totem animals.

That's enough of the primal deed and the Paleolithic. Jump forward with me beyond the Paleolithic boundary. I've already told you that the Deluge occurred at that boundary, 75-35,000 years ago. Consider now the more elaborate Deluge mythmaking, the mythmaking of the post boundary era.

THE COMPROMISING (DISTORTION) OF THE GODS

Archaeology and mythology assure us that language was well developed at the time of the Paleolithic boundary. I have assured you that the Deluge occurred at this boundary between the upper and the lower Paleolithic (Old Stone Age). The Deluge survivors who remained fully conscious of what they experienced would have talked about it. Their conversation would have prevented the most severely traumatized from fully and permanently suppressing the memory of events. The tribes underwent talk therapy. Most of the distortion of these events into the fairy-tale-like myths that have come down to us was the work of later generations. *The social process by which this distortion occurred requires explanation and is the subject of this subchapter.*

Our pre-literate ancestors wanted and needed to do exactly what we are doing right now. They wanted to understand, communicate and commemorate their history. It is the past that equips us with the goals and expectations that we need to go forward. As one observer remarked, "We go forward with one eye on the rear-view mirror" (McLuhan). Rob a people of their history, as our savage and racist world has done to African Americans; and you rob them of their impetus to go forward.

But individuals differ widely in the strength of their egos and their capacity to accept the past, to assimilate its most painful truths. When we come to some of the North American myths, we'll see a seemingly simple but actually quite sophisticated myth that appears to intentionally incorporate the understanding of *both* the most enlightened and the most neurotic people of its tribe. It is readily and easily interpreted, as either group would have preferred. But this myth is an exception. Most myths don't offer alternate interpretations that jump right out at you.

In every society, there are forces at work that are the social equivalents of the ego, superego and id functions of the mind. In contemporary society, with respect to the past and the recording of history, the ego or operating

system that mediates or compromises between demands of the superego and id is represented by the writers, editors and publishers of history and news.

People who value censorship or function as censors for other adults represent modern society's superego. These are the neurotic people with weak egos but a high tolerance for alienation and guilt. They insist upon staying the course. The fundamentalists among them, the literal believers in myths, have a static world view. They refuse to accept full responsibility for their own actions and prefer to remain unconscious or insensitive to their own contradictions. In the modern era, these neurotic censors tend to be latent homosexual people who associate change with the removal of their masks. Therefore, they are afraid of change and any information that might require them to change. They prefer a lie or a half-truth to a truth that is unflattering to them, their ancestors or institutions with which they identify.

Opposed to society's neurotic, superego forces are its id forces. The id forces are all those people who value and uphold the truth. We id people are the scientists who see change as inevitable. We value as "true" all the information that accurately and predictably describes nature and society. We view the censorship of such information and the designation of "taboos" as criminal and incompatible with social progress.

Of course, similar divisions existed within Stone Age societies. With respect to the past, persons charged by the tribes with the duty to perform commemorative rites and maintain oral histories functioned as the tribal ego. They too had to deal with individuals of widely different ego strength and capacity to accept and assimilate painful truths. This social ego, this societal operating system, this fledgling priesthood had to mediate between the demands of the most repressed and hysterical people (the superego forces) and the id-like folks who merely wanted to know and preserve the truth about themselves and their ancestors. The developing tribal priests had to strike compromises acceptable to these forces to retain their offices, their positions of privilege.

Rivals competed for these positions. Aspiring novices competed to unseat their mentors. Neighboring shamans competed at inter-tribal gatherings. Recorded examples of this competition reveal how it compromised oral history. *But most of the compromising of oral and commemorative history, most of the superego work, occurred in the inter-generational transmission of oral and commemorative accounts. Superegos compromised oral history in the same way that the individual's superego compromises his dream.*

The standard means of satisfying superegos, of not piquing the guilt, paranoia and obsessional fear of the most neurotic people, was to compromise the identity and the number of the victims. This was done with metaphor and condensation. Moreover, metaphor and condensation (of the many into one symbolic representative) was poetic and facilitated memorization. Poetic end rhymes locked verses into place and made it possible to memorize lengthy narratives. Modern men observed this process among the Celts, Norse, Aztecs and other pagan peoples.

Townsend notes that metaphors were the very substance of Aztec poetry. The Aztecs used a form of extended metaphor not unlike the kenning of Norse poetry. *Kenning*, explains Townsend, is even more obtuse than both simile (e. g. “the water is like jade”) and metaphor (e. g. “the lake’s jade water”). When kenning, the speaker merely calls one thing something else. Ceremonial and courtly Aztec language routinely made such comparisons by substitution (e. g. “Jade skirt” to refer to the water of lakes, streams or rivers, which by implication became feminine like *Chalchiuhtlicue*, the goddess with the jade skirt). Jose Luis Martínez adds that the Aztecs routinely employed extended metaphors not only for the names of deities but also for places, actions, heroes and objects and concepts of special importance. Listen to Townsend and the post-conquest authorities that he cites to verify the extent and development of this poetic, national consciousness:

Many of the hymns and speeches recorded by Bernardino de Sahagún have archaic and hermetic forms of metaphor that seemed so unclear that he commented, “They would sing without understanding what was said.” Durán, on the other hand, recognized that these forms of expression masked age-old mysteries and had a liturgical purpose:

All the songs of these (Indians) are composed of metaphors so obscure that there are only a few who understand them, without taking pains to study and discuss them to grasp their meaning. I have given myself the purpose of listening with great attention to that which is sung, and between the words and terms of the metaphors, while they may first seem nonsense, but afterward, having spoken and conferred, they are admirable sentences, as much in the divine ones they compose as in the human songs composed.

--Townsend: 162, quoting Durán, 1971: 154-71

As to the art forms by which they publicly expressed their myths,

It would be difficult to underestimate the importance of music, song and dance in Aztec society, and the *telpochcalli* [*H schools for male commoners*] and *calmecac* [*H schools for children of the nobility*] took pains to instruct students in these subjects. Everyone from the *tlatoani* [*H emperor and chief priest*] down to individual family members took part in dances held on all festival occasions. The Spanish friar Gerónimo de Mendieta attests:

One of the principal things that was in all this land were the songs and dances, both to solemnize the feasts of their demons that they honored as gods and for private enjoyment and solace. Each lord had in his house a chapel with composer-singers of dances and songs, and these were thought to be ingenious in knowing how to compose the songs in their manner of meter and couplets that they had. Ordinarily they sang and danced in the principal festivities that were every twenty days and on other less principal occasions. The most important dances were in the plazas; on other occasions in the houses of the lords, as all the lords had large patios; they also danced in the houses of the lords and magistrates. When there had been some victory in war, or when a new ruler was assigned, or when a marriage was made with a high-ranking lady, or for any other novel event, the master would compose a new song, in addition to the general ones they already had for the festival of the demons and the deeds of antiquity and of past lords.

--Townsend: 162, quoting Mendieta 1945

All the male Deluge victims would typically be represented as a condensed, single character and the female victims as another condensed, single character. Again, this distortion of myths and rituals into ever-more-simple, generalized and abstract poetry was only partially due to the limitations of language and the need to lock the history into retainable poetic verse. It was also due to popular censorship and competition among priests

and cults to absorb each other's gods and patrons. The more powerful and popular your god, the better were his chances to absorb the god of a competing priest. This *syncretism* and *condensation* of oral history was analogous to the superego's influence upon our dreams.

An important third means by which the news reports of our oral history became transformed into dream-like myths and rituals was the dream process itself. Many of the most dream-like Deluge symbols were derived directly from the repetitiously compulsive dreams of Deluge war veterans. In most cases, these individuals would have recognized these as dream substitutes for their real-life antecedents. But the more neurotic people would have preferred the most therapeutic dreams to reality. Succeeding generations that lacked personal knowledge of shared traumas would have felt more at liberty to prefer a therapeutic dream to a harsh reality. As we'll see, at least one such dream, a dream full of wishful thinking, was later regarded as a "message from God."

Throughout the Stone Age, when gods were distorted, magnified, reconfigured and reformed in their dietary habits; the struggle between negative and positive emotions toward them continued in the unconscious minds of our ancestors. Positive and negative emotions latched onto symbols for the victims and symbols for symbols. The original significance of the symbols, the identity of victims, ceased to be understood; and the symbols themselves were felt to be sacred because they elicited the ambivalence felt toward the "spirits" that they had come to represent. Ambivalence and the dialectical nature of thought itself caused emotions toward the gods to swing between negative and positive until they were as perfectly balanced as the ambivalence felt toward the spirits that were displaced onto them, the spirits of the ongoing sources of ambivalence, the competing parent and genetic competitors. At this point tribal histories tended to become fixed as sacred myths.

THE MAGNIFICATION OF THE GODS

As tribes shared their rituals and oral histories, they discovered that they all had two types of traumatic experiences. The universality of these two types of rites and histories meant that the underlying events had to have been real. Moreover, the (totem) characters of these histories and rites were all highly ambivalent. The reality, the ambivalence and the parental or relative status of the (as yet, totem) characters made them suitable objects for

everyone's repressed ongoing ambivalence toward his competing parent and genetic competitors (tribal and inter-tribal relatives).

These histories of the original and second sins and these very universal, real and ambivalent ancestors and relatives who were the characters of these histories became the sacred stuff of everyone's religion. All other history that was particular to the tribe or clan was of lesser credibility and importance. All other, lesser history was deemed unworthy of the high social cost needed to maintain it. All lesser history faded into obscurity.

Sacred characters became magnified or inflated into immensely powerful gods for the following reasons. First, condensation required the mythological character that was symbolic of a group to acquire the power of the group. Second, they were discovered to be universal. Third, priests and cults that were in competition to absorb each other's gods and patrons had to keep magnifying the powers and dramatic appeal of "their" gods. Fourth, gods had to be extremely powerful and all-knowing to be suitable objects for the displaced ambivalence felt toward an ever more powerful society of genetic competitors and the powerful archetype of the parent that we all acquire as babies. Fifth, only all-knowing and all-powerful gods have the potential to grant every appeal made to them. And lastly, only survivors can maintain history. It was more flattering for the surviving perpetrators of the original and the second sin (and their descendants who identified with them) to claim that their victims possessed awesome power and ability. Take on a champ and you're a hero; take on a runt and you're a bully.

It was owing to these forces of magnification and symbolic compromise or distortion as discussed above that oral and commemorative history was transformed into the fantastic myths and rituals that have come down to us and out of which our modern religions were constructed. Again, mythmaking consists of neurotic compromises that are totally analogous to dreamwork.

THE RECONFIGURATION OF THE TOTEM GODS

Just as you don't win any praise for beating up runts, you don't win it for killing relatives either. Although the Deluge victims weren't fathers (like the primal or biological father), they were fathers of a sort; and all were relatives. Casting them as totem animals lessened any conscious guilt of the Deluge victors and later generations who identified with the victors.

But the id sets limits upon the wishful thinking of the superego. The id forces within tribal society, the persons with stronger egos, demanded retention of the truth. They account for the truth that remained within

totemism and all other sacred myths and rituals. Details of our most traumatic and bloody prehistory are encoded, compromised but still extent, within the heritage. The id-like forces account for the allegorical accuracy of myths and rituals. The symbolic logic and accuracy of detail with which men were transfigured into totem animals enabled them -- during the Neolithic and later Ages -- to be reconfigured back into hominid but greatly compromised gods, giants, fairies, demons, witches, etc. When we get to Appendix B and the rituals of Native Australians, we'll see primitive examples of the allegorical form in which sacred totem myths and rituals preserved prehistory, a form that will be easy for us to interpret. By using allegory, tribes and clans retained the basic outline of their Paleolithic prehistory.

Like the author of the above myth that started [here](#), the wisest and most insightful people of every generation probably knew that the totem gods were really men. For most of the other members of totem, tribal society, the hominid status of the gods and the symbolic truths within sacred myths and rituals were less perfectly understood. This information was transmitted between generations -- *unconsciously*. Contra Freud's "[archaic inheritance](#)," this unconscious transmission of historical truth was and is cultural and not genetic.

During the Neolithic, Iron and, especially, the Bronze Age, priests reconfigured, condensed and amalgamated these myths and rituals into the lengthy narratives, poems, hymns and sagas that have so confounded scholars. To scholars, these myths seem to have crystallized out of thin air because they can't connect them with their totem precursors.⁴⁰

Much of the confusion arose because phonetic writing was nonexistent during the Paleolithic. Glyphic writing was difficult and rudimentary. So, the totem precursors of the narratives were not recorded but only obliquely referred to by animal symbols or half-animal, half-hominid representations of the gods. In Appendix C, we will connect some of the post-Neolithic narratives with fragments of the Paleolithic, totem myths or rituals from which they were reconfigured.

The id-like social forces responsible for the metaphorical and allegorical maintenance of prehistoric truth consisted of more than an impersonal desire to know and communicate the truth. Each generation wanted to know and

⁴⁰ "In the earlier ages of Egyptian history, myths can inform rituals or even dramatic and mime performances and chorus songs; but there are no long sagas. These make an appearance, in rather primitive form, in the texts of the Ninth Dynasty, c. 2150 B.C... Most early Egyptian myths are quite short episodes and can be told in one or two sentences" (R.T. Rundle Clark: 263).

imitate its ancestors. Individuals wanted to neutralize traumatic elements through repetition compulsion (e. g. talk therapy or dance) that moderates the associations with those elements. Minds wanted to liberate and redeploy energies devoted to repression. Enlightened individuals, with the strongest egos, found subtle ways of interjecting their consciousness into tales -- often in expressions that went over the heads of the others.

In the Neolithic, in the New Stone Age of fledgling agriculture, something happened that brought the more conscious id-like forces to the fore in the game of mythmaking. Objects that had been surrogates for gods or hiding places for them lost their inherent ambivalence and mystery. As of the Neolithic Age, almost all the most fearsome animals had been eliminated and many others were domesticated and bred. Men learned the reproductive facts of life. Adults became unable to think of animals as their fathers. Other animals ceased to be worthy representatives of the gods. (There are still other reasons for the transformation of totem gods back into hominid form. The two most important reasons await our analysis of the mythology pertaining to them. We'll get to it after you identify the Deluge gods. Some of you still haven't undergone that revelation.)

So, as repression gradually lifted and as the animals ceased to be appropriate as surrogates, the gods were returned to hominid form. The hominid reconfiguration of the gods occurred in the Neolithic. Long before empires and trade brought about monotheism, the gods had become human in virtually every way but their power and immortality. With the coming of modern religion, the pagan gods became denigrated as "giants," "giantesses," "fairies," "witches" etc. The later reduction of the pagan gods into diminutive figures resulted from censorship and their inability to compete with modern religion. Listen to what Rolleston said about the Celtic gods: "The ancient mythical literature conceives them [*H the gods*] as heroic and splendid in strength and beauty. In later times and as Christian influences grew stronger, they dwindle into fairies, the People of the *Sídhe*"⁴¹ (Rolleston: 137). This degeneration of the pagan gods occurred everywhere during the era of modern religions. Pagan mythology was ousted and only tolerated as folklore and children's literature.

If the tribes could have continued to exist in relative isolation, with traditions intact and within a stable, secure and prosperous environment that fostered the development of science and analytical thought; they would have

⁴¹ Pronounced "Shee." Rolleston tells us that the word literally means "the people of the (Fairy) mounds," the latter being the megalithic tumuli discussed in Appendix D.

eventually accomplished independently what we are doing here. They would have uncovered the precise, prehistoric meaning of their own sacred traditions. But of course, the world was not large enough to permit that. Moreover, science and analytical habits of mind are, for the most part, the result of and are at the service of society's requirements for material production and exchange. As we shall see in Chapter 7, the economic sphere placed other, more immediate demands upon our religious institutions and ideologies. It was this sphere, trade, that gave birth to the modern religions.

Modern religion is Chapter 7. Consider next the political aspect of religious repression. Like psychological repression within the individual, the political power and censorship of priests has slowly eroded. In the struggle between sacred and secular society, the healing effects of time, forgetfulness and technology are on the side of the secular.

FROM MYTH TO HISTORY

Technology was to deal an insidious and shattering blow to religious repression, ignorance and superstition. Writing is usually thought to be just another secular milestone in the continuous growth of science and technology. Yet the invention of writing -- first with pictographs (illustrated events), then with glyphs (illustrated words) and eventually with a phonetic alphabet -- was the turning point in the battle between sacred myth and secular history for the minds of men. Ironically, the same innovation that enabled tribes to petrify the forms of their sacred myths also removed the justification for stifling the discussion and criticism of those myths. Shamans and priests could no longer operate in the dark. Myths and rituals could no longer be free of rational and critical evaluation. *The sharper minds of more realistic, analytical and formerly oppressed minorities made themselves heard.*

The importance of this freedom to challenge the authority of priests and their eventual loss of political hegemony throughout most of the world cannot be overstated. To cite but one example: it now appears that the Celts were the masters of central and western Europe throughout the third and second millennium B.C. and through all but the last three centuries of the first millennium B.C. The undisputed rulers of Celtic society were not kings but the Druids (priests). Mythology confirms the ancient observers: in the official councils, the Druids spoke before the king; and the superstitious Celts submitted to them in all matters, public and private. The Druids had more than just their own "runic" system of writing. Caesar and Strabo tell us (and later chapters of this book will confirm) that the Druids used Greek letters in

keeping all their public and private accounts. Yet it was unlawful to commit Druidic *religion* to writing (Rolleston: 37, 84-). But as the historical and archaeological record shows everywhere, wherever priests thrive, civilizations fall. The religious Celts who had long subjugated the German tribes and had sacked Rome in 390 B.C. could not compete with either of these societies once they became unified under secular leaders:

What exactly took place at the time of the German revolt we shall never know; certain it is, however, that from about the year 300 B.C. onward the Celts appear to have lost whatever political cohesion and common purpose they had possessed. Rent asunder, as it were, by the upthrust of some mighty subterranean force, their tribes rolled down like lava-streams to the south, east and west of their original home. Some found their way into Northern Greece, where they committed the outrage that so scandalized their former friends and allies in the sack of the shrine of Delphi (273 B.C.) and Lake Vadimo (283 B.C.). One detachment penetrated Asia Minor and founded the Celtic State of Galatia, where, as St. Jerome attests, a Celtic dialect was still spoken in the fourth century A.D. Others enlisted as mercenary troops with Carthage. A tumultuous war of Celts against scattered German tribes, or against other Celts who represented earlier waves of emigration and conquest, went on all over Mid-Europe, Gaul and Britain.

When this settled down Gaul and the British Islands remained practically the sole relics of the Celtic empire, the only countries still under Celtic law and leadership. By the commencement of the Christian era Gaul and Britain had fallen under the yoke of Rome, and their complete Romanization was only a question of time (Rolleston: 34-35).

The freedoms essential to science -- freedom to criticize, communicate and verify -- are inimical to religion. That's why all attempts to muzzle criticism, to destroy the revealing evidence of the primitive past and to repress awareness are doomed to failure. The necessary exercise of these freedoms and their translation into constitutional law guarantees that all the universal forms of obsessional neurosis (religion) will disappear. As we become more conscious of our ambivalence toward the five elements of the godhead, as we learn to accept responsibility for what we do and who we are,

as science and social science replaces religion; then Man will come more clearly into focus and “God” and “Devil” will fade away. Stripped of our insane disguises, we’ll be able to organize ourselves in such a way as to “put the Devil – permanently -- behind us” just as surely as we did that symptom that we shall consider next.

BLOOD SACRIFICE, THE EVERYDAY WORK OF THE PAGAN PRIEST

Sacrifices were made throughout the temperate zones in the spring and at summer solstice (the longest day of the year) from time immemorial. The purpose, at this time, was to magically replace the gods with younger and more vigorous incarnations who would more surely revive the plants and animals (aggressive or paranoid, magical manipulation) and to propitiate the gods (submissive guilt). Typically, a nubile and beautiful young person was selected, forced to have sex with all interested parties (thus magically causing the plants also to reproduce), killed (in imitation of the plants that seem to die each fall) and finally “brought back to life” by a priest who danced around with his or her dead body or within his or her flayed skin. (See Frazer, Harner and Meyer or, for a dramatic fictional treatment, Jennings or the many rites of Chapter 35 or Appendix A herein.)

Even the Neolithic sun god needed to be propitiated and fortified so that he would return at the winter solstice. If drought threatened, the rain god had to be appealed to -- over and above the regular, periodic appeals. New ventures of every kind required the gods’ approval to ensure success. Included herein are sea voyages, newly constructed buildings, migration to new territories, marriage, appointments to positions of authority, initiations of young people into adult society, etc. The earliest accounts of missionaries and explorers, the reports of classical writers who journeyed to central and northern Europe, the thinly veiled symbolism of folk traditions and myths and rituals the world over all agree. Everywhere the gods were thanked and propitiated, and vows were fulfilled in the same way. The gods were steadily fed animal and human sacrifices:

The Indians of Guayaquil, in Ecuador, used to sacrifice human blood and the hearts of men when they sowed their fields. The people of Canar (now Cuenca in Ecuador) used to sacrifice a hundred children annually at harvest...

At a Mexican harvest-festival, when the first fruits of the season were offered to the sun, a criminal was placed between two immense stones, balanced opposite each other and was crushed by them as they fell together. His remains were buried and a feast and dance followed...

We have seen that the ancient Mexicans also sacrificed human beings at all the various stages in the growth of the maize, the age of the victims corresponding to the age of the corn... No doubt the correspondence between the ages of the victims and the state of the corn was supposed to enhance the efficacy of the sacrifice...

The natives of Bontoc, in the interior of Luzon, one of the Philippine Islands, are passionate headhunters. Their principal seasons for headhunting are the times of planting and reaping the rice. (Frazer: 500)

Lord Shiva, the (Hindu) god of death, was adorned with skulls and serpents. Kali, his consort, had ferocious teeth. And as I went on to more advanced studies of Sanskrit and the Vedic texts themselves, I learned that the ancient rituals required the slaughter of birds and beasts of many kinds [*H especially horses*], often in prodigious quantities and on hundreds of different occasions. Human victims were required for at least three types of sacrifices --for gaining wealth and immortality, for the fulfillment of vows and for erecting buildings. The Rajasuja frankly states that human sacrifice is the most auspicious ritual, one that turns the victim into the creator god, Prajapati, the Great Victim. [*H We shall see below how the primordial fathers and the victims of the Deluge tended to become blended in the minds of men.*] But what really surprised me was discovering that human sacrifice had continued on a large scale in India up until the nineteenth century, when the British banned it. (P. Tierney: 21)

Prisoners and criminals, or if these failed even innocent victims, probably children, were encased, numbers at a time, in huge frames of wickerwork and there burned alive to win the favor of the gods. The practice of human sacrifice is, of course, not uniquely Druidic -- it is found in all parts of both the Old and

the New World at a certain stage of culture and was doubtless a survival from the time of the Megalithic People. The fact that it should have continued in Celtic lands after an otherwise fairly-high state of civilization and religious culture had been attained can be paralleled from Mexico and Carthage and, in both cases, is due, no doubt, to the uncontrolled dominance of a priestly caste. (Rolleston: 84-85)

The above testimonials are a small sample of what one inevitably finds in studying primitive religion. Modern-day fundamentalists generally want to overlook this essence of "That Good Ole' Time Religion." But the texts retain plenty of evidence, despite extensive editing. Aeschylus' Agamemnon lures his daughter Iphigenia away from home to sacrifice her to Artemis and obtain favorable winds for the journey to Troy. Jephthah vows to the Lord, "If thou wilt give the Ammonites unto my hand, then whoever comes forth from the doors of my house to meet me, when I return victorious from the Ammonites, shall be the Lord's, and I will offer him up for a burnt offering." (II Judges 30: 31) When Jephthah returns victorious, his young daughter and only child walks through the door first and gives herself up willingly. Curiously, we are told that Abraham's hand is stayed at the last moment from sacrificing his son Isaac atop Mount Moriah by the angel of the Lord. A ram appears and is substituted for Isaac. (Genesis 22: 1-13) This ram substitution is the result of major editing; for as we'll see, Abraham is a character from Paleolithic mythology; and blood sacrifice was certainly not abolished in backwater Canaan prior to its abolition in Egypt. Yet Manetho, the Egyptian historian who wrote in the third century B.C., informs us that human sacrifice was not abolished in advanced, cosmopolitan Egypt until the beginning of the XVIII Dynasty, about 1600 B.C. (Cf. Rolleston: 85-86.) This was during the Hyksos Regime and long after the time of Abraham of the "stayed hand."

Listen to Patrick Tierney, author of *The Highest Altar: the Story of Human Sacrifice*, testify again as to the extent to which human sacrifice occurred:

Not wanting to know about human sacrifice is one of the dominant themes of religious history -- almost as dominant as its repeated performance... Blood sacrifice is the oldest and most universal act of piety. The offering of animals, including the human animal, dates back at least 20,000 years and depending on how you read the scanty archaeological evidence, arguably back

to the earliest appearance of humanity. Many religions recount the creation of man through a bloody sacrifice of a God-man -- a divinity who is torn apart to sow the seeds of humanity. [H *this refers to both the "original sin" and to "the Deluge."*] To paraphrase this cross-cultural scripture: "In the beginning there was blood..."

Advances in Near Eastern, Greek, European Megalithic, Andean and Mesoamerican studies all underscore the importance of human sacrifice in man's social and religious development. Human sacrificial myth and ritual constituted the primitive core for the Pan-Hellenic celebrations at Mount Olympus, Bronze Age ceremonies at Stonehenge, Jewish holidays at the Great Temple on Mount Moriah and the dynastic offerings atop the Mayan pyramids... (P. Tierney: 10)

Our history of religious bloodshed has even left its imprint upon language. When we "cut a deal" we unconsciously echo our ancestors' custom of cutting the throat of an animal victim to seal a contract with blood... Indeed, the very words "sacred" and "sacerdotal" come from "sacrifice." The priest and the god were both defined by the act of killing. From Israel to Greece, from the Old World to the New, sacrifice was the religious experience. (P. Tierney: 14)

Now, as our various ambivalent ancestors (the gods) began to fuse into one supreme god (a process that paralleled the concentration and hierarchical organization of power within early settlements), the persons sacrificed to (and in effigy of) the supreme god acquired special significance. Great benefits were expected to result from their dispatch. At some point, magician-priests must have started using these human guinea pigs for the supreme magic trick: the sacrificial victim was instructed to act out the role of a loving and beneficent god. It was hoped that some secret sympathy between the two similar beings would cause the real god to perform like his mime, to bring peace and prosperity. At the same time, the rest of the tribe was expected to play the role of extras in this ongoing passion play, extras whose role was to love, worship and ultimately obey the god. "Love God and He'll love you."

Note too that there has probably never been an instance of the Ks creating their own political rival to tribal authority as might be assumed from Marxist-Leninist reflections upon the evolution of the state. It was far easier for the *nouveau riche* Ks to collaborate with their political brothers and to use

their newly gained wealth to promote the rise of the worst scoundrels (Frazer's "clever rogues") who'd do their bidding. Every concentration of political power was in K class interest and bound to come under their control until the present era when it is slowly being realized that the Ks are incapable of directing the social and political changes necessary to civilize our world.

These religious and political dynamics explain how the first kings were born and progressively accumulated power. At this time, myths of many peoples developed to declare that kings and queens descended from heaven.⁴² There may be a psychoanalytic aspect to this expression. Falling out of or descending from heaven may be dream symbolism for something erupting from the unconscious mind. "Heaven" also associates with the blissful fetal state, the state thought to be befitting of and hoped to be a product of kings. *But for the most part, this expression reflected the popular and wishful thought that kings were more closely related to the gods, the Deluge victims in particular.*

Any indication of a decline in the king's powers (the graying of his hair, the yearly decline of the sun with which he was identified, the complaint from a wife that he was losing his virility, etc.), and he was also sacrificed.⁴³ Another young man was then chosen to be the Earth Goddess' lover-king, to satisfy the woman solely responsible for nature's reproduction. (Cf. Graves: 14.) Priests managed, in this way, to shield themselves from the blind rage of an ignorant people.

The lot of the early kings was not one to be envied. Paranoid feelings toward the father and other ancestral objects of ambivalence were united and focused upon the person of the king, producing fantastic expectations of him. He had to make the rain fall, the sun to shine and the crops to grow. Failure to produce the desired results brought a premature end to the regal reign. He was then demoted to his traditional role -- victim.

From the standpoint of a head priest-magician, his creation of the first king amounted to the supreme magic trick. How could one better show the

⁴² See for example "The Legend of Etana and the Plant of Birth" in Langdon. "The divine right of kings, their messianic character as sons of the Mother goddess, form the Sumerian and Babylonian theory of the state. The Sumerian lists of antediluvian and post-diluvian kings begin, in both periods, with the statement that 'rulership descended from Heaven.'" -- Langdon: 166

⁴³ At this point, unless you know who the victims of the Deluge were and what happened to them, you are unlikely to guess why the principal gods were identified with the sun. I'll explain the symbolic connections between the Deluge victims and the sun, water animals, birds, hardwood trees, snakes, wolves, lions, bears and animals in general in Chapters 34 and 35. See if you can figure them out between here and there.

Mother Goddess or the chief god (the developing “God”) the proper way to perform than to use a king to act out “God's” role before a loving and obedient court (the world in microcosm). Moreover, a head priest-magician with such an operation in progress interposed a scapegoat between himself and a hostile and paranoid people who could now vent their hostility and grandiose, infantile expectations of God onto someone else. When the experiment appeared, as often as not, to fail, the magician could always blame the king. “He didn't breathe lightly enough, so the hurricane came.” “He didn't love the people enough to make it rain,” etc. Thus, the magician survived all setbacks:

“The idea,” writes Frazer, “that early kingdoms are despotisms in which the people exist only for the sovereign is wholly inapplicable to the monarchies we are considering. On the contrary, the sovereign in them exists only for his subjects; his life is only valuable so long as he discharges the duties of his position by ordering the course of nature for his people's benefit. As soon as he fails to do so, the care, the devotion, the religious homage that they had hitherto lavished on him cease and are changed into hatred and contempt; he is dismissed ignominiously and may be thankful if he escapes with his life. Worshipped as a god one day, he is killed as a criminal the next. But in this changed behavior of the people there is nothing capricious or inconstant. On the contrary, their conduct is entirely of a piece. If their king is their god, he is or should be also their preserver; and if he will not preserve them, he must make room for another who will. So long, however, as he answers their expectations, there is no limit to the care that they take of him and that they compel him to take of himself. A king of this sort lives hedged in by a ceremonious etiquette, a network of prohibitions and observances, of which the intention is not to contribute to his dignity, much less to his comfort, but to restrain him from conduct that, by disturbing the harmony of nature, might involve himself, his people and the universe in one common catastrophe. Far from adding to his comfort, these observances, by trammeling his every act, annihilate his freedom and often render the very life, which it is their object to preserve, a burden and sorrow to him.”
--Freud, 1913: 44; quoting Frazer

Frazer and others have suggested that three *specific* developments combined to reverse kings' fortunes, to transform these pathetic puppets into all-powerful despots. *First*, the guilt that was evolving in conjunction with ethical reciprocity and that had always been felt toward the primal father and the Deluge victims and then transferred onto the totem animal was now felt toward the king. (Cf. Frazer: 105.) *Secondly*, as kings failed time and again to deliver nature's beneficence and abundance, those kings (and priests who in better times for the monarchy sought the job) succeeded in reducing the king's status to that of an intermediary between the populace and "God." In Egypt, the pharaohs generally claimed to be only the son of the greatest gods (Atum/Ra and Osiris). *Thirdly* and most importantly, as craftsmen began to group together along trade routes where goods and services were abundant, as the first towns were formed, men specializing in violence were needed to protect them and their goods. A recognized authority was needed to regulate these men and the warlords who sought to rob or tax merchants traveling the trade routes. It was also necessary to standardize weights and measures and the minting of coins. These were some of the useful roles, fledgling roles of the K state, to which clever and ambitious kings eagerly adapted. But every successful king's most important accomplishments related to defense and the prosecution of warfare (e. g. the protection and expansion of his realm). Once an ambitious king had acquired a loyal military, it was possible for him to protect himself, to develop an internal police force (necessary to protect private property and public order), to tax the people and to organize public works. These developments had a salutary effect and were another landmark in the development of K society.

Gilgamesh, not the epic hero of Chapter 19 but a later Gilgamesh, the king of the early Sumerian city of Uruk, built the city's impenetrable walls. The first pharaoh of Egypt, Menses, militarily unified the Upper and Lower Kingdoms and proceeded to bank and redirect the Nile. He is credited also with founding the city of Memphis (Campbell, 1962: 50). *Such militarily successful and wise kings would have killed their conquered counterparts and protected the newly conquered priests. That way, as was ultimately the case with most lasting and successful, secular states, religious authority was divided and brought under the control of a more powerful monarch.* (Cf. Coon, 1977: 179.) Thus, the puppet became the master of his puppeteer and the transition from tribal to secular, K society became complete.

In Egypt, another stratagem by which the pharaohs escaped the sacrificial blade was the appointing of surrogates. Strong and clever kings must have played important roles in eliminating the institution of blood

sacrifice *per se*. “Good King Josiah” of Judea ruled during the last half of the seventh century B.C. By then, blood sacrifice was mostly restricted to animals and children. Nevertheless, he apparently developed a symbiotic relationship with the high priest Hilkiah. Josiah mandated and enforced the public collection of funds to rebuild the temple, and Hilkiah “found a lost book of the Mosaic law” in a temple storeroom during the reconstruction. This “early version of the *Book of Deuteronomy*” called for the eradication of polytheism, temple prostitution and blood sacrifice, laws that Josiah eagerly enforced. (Cf. Comay: 177-78.)

There is still another force that put a stop to blood sacrifice, the traditional work of priests; and it was the most powerful force of all. It had an unanticipated and unnoticed effect upon people’s attitudes toward “strangers.” It gradually developed not only a new ethos but also a new means of making religious sacrifice, a new means of reacting to obsessional fear, guilt and paranoia vis-à-vis the gods. This force was another product of K society, trade. We’ll consider it in Chapter 7.

But before we leave the topic of blood sacrifice, let us articulate its three major functions and one of its very subtle effects. *First*, human sacrifice was often a cover for cannibalism. It tended to be universally the case that the victim’s flesh was eaten, in some portion however small, by all the beneficiaries and participants of the rite. In Mexico, the captor or purchaser of a war prisoner received all but the heart, which the gods devoured vicariously through their priests. Patrick Tierney journeyed to the Andes to study Indians who, to this day, practice human sacrifice. They explained to him a doctrine that appears to have once prevailed everywhere: it is necessary to eat the victim to control his spirit by sympathetic magic. We’ll consider cannibalism in greater detail in another chapter.

Second and perhaps most obviously, men have always been filled with obsessional fear and paranoia with respect to the gods. All the prehistoric and the ongoing elements of the godhead are objects of extreme ambivalence. To the extent that the hostility is repressed, vague feelings of guilt result. To the extent that the hostility is partially conscious, the elements of the godhead (or their relatives long thought to be still at large) “want to do to us” what we did or would like to do to them. Now you have already heard me say that the primordial father and the Deluge folks were victims. I’ve explained, after Freud, that the primordial father was eaten. You should be able to guess (before coming to Chapter 9) what happened to the tastier parts of the bodies of the Deluge victims. *After the Deluge, our paranoid and obsessionally-fearful ancestors mollified all these angry and vengeful “gods” that*

ultimately condensed into "God." They fed them with sacrificial victims. The victims were both surrogates for gods -- whose murders they ritually reenacted -- and propitiatory food for the gods.

Cannibalism was abolished during the Neolithic and votive offerings replaced blood sacrifice in the early modern era as beliefs about the gods' eating habits changed. Gods who originally demanded flesh (e. g. "Cloud Catcher" an Ojibwa tale in Hardin, Terri: 245-6) later required only the vapors or smoke from the sacrifice (e. g. in a Zuñi tale, Cushing: 401-410 or Hardin, Terri: 281). Eventually they settled for votive offerings (e. g. "The Journey Across the Ocean," a Tillamook tale in *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, vol. 11, p. 27 or Hardin, Terri: 518-20).

The *third* important thing to remember about blood sacrifice was (is) that for primitive peoples it's a means of population control. "The Polynesians seem regularly to have killed two-thirds of their children. In some parts of East Africa, the proportion of infants massacred at birth is said to be the same. Only children born in certain presentations are allowed to live" (Frazer: 341). In Chapter 37, the Polynesian stop on our tour, we'll find abundant evidence that human sacrifice was their principal means of population control. In Chapter 9, Michael Harner will tell us of the macabre system worked out by the pre-Columbian Mesoamericans to control population and maintain social equilibrium through a combination of war and human sacrifice:

Molina [*H Abbot Cristobal Molina who spoke to sixteenth century Inca priests in their capitol of Cuzco and chronicled their beliefs and practices*] gives an almost unbelievable description of a ceremonial system that prepared hundreds of victims to accept their sacrifices at sacred spots across the continent several times a year... Estimates for the total number of children sacrificed vary from several hundred to several thousand *per* year, depending on the circumstances and the Spanish source. --P. Tierney: 35

It was long believed that the grisly accounts that fill the diaries of conquistadors and early missionaries were greatly exaggerated to defame primitive paganism and justify the atrocities committed by Europeans. But not only are these accounts proving to be accurate, they provide us with an explanation for the otherwise equally unbelievable success that Roman Catholic missionaries had in converting pagan peoples to Christianity. Their ability to brave the grisly realities of pagan society with strong stomachs and

open eyes enabled them to develop an equally realistic assessment of the psychological situation in which their archaic counterparts were enmeshed.

Recall Frazer's observation. The priest who rises to the top of his profession is no fool. The pagan priests were probably the Indians who *least* believed in magic and living "gods." Yet these were the very individuals who had to perform and supervise the sacrifices, the murder of innocents! These men would have accumulated unthinkable guilt. Their self-hatred had to be boundless, and they punished themselves accordingly. Listen to Professor Brundage describe the auto sacrifices of Aztec priests:

Auto sacrifice took on a multitude of forms. The commonest consisted in piercing the lips, ears, legs, or arms with maguey needles and then collecting the blood on slips of paper that could be presented to the god. There were certain ritual times of the year when the entire population of a city was required to draw blood in a kind of corporate self-humiliation. The maguey thorns would be deposited finally in a certain holy place, where the gods could not help but become aware of their existence. Such blood tokens were an occasional part of the penitential life of the common people, but for the average Aztec priest auto sacrifice was constant and was of an unprecedented rigor.

In Teotihuacan, for instance, there were priests who volunteered for a four-year fast and penance so exacting that mental derangement and death must often have resulted.⁴⁴ Because sexual activity was unclean and an offense to the gods, the priests pierced their genitals and pulled knotted cords through the wounds; in some cases involving this form of humiliation they would string themselves on the same cord and would perform their cult duties. A common variant of this penance was to drill a large hole through the tongue and then to pull through it cords with spines knotted in them or long wands, sometimes four hundred in number, to produce superior holiness. After such heroic masochism, the mutilated priests forced themselves to sing hymns of praise to the god. Such penances were thought to be

⁴⁴ Citing copious sources, Professor Brundage shows that these penitential priests of Teotihuacan were merely the most famous college. There were many others, for which he cites Torquemada II, 182-; Las Casas, p. 69-; and Motolinia, 69-. Durán, a most important source on the Mesoamericans, was also appalled at the rigor with which Aztec priests carried out their exercises.

surrogate self- mortifications for the whole people, and the priests who volunteered for them were considered extremely holy. There were a great variety of such penitential exercises, culminating in self-devotion to death, often by throwing oneself off a high temple pyramid.

More formally, a priest might devote himself to death in a four-year penance, during which he passed from city to city discoursing about the gods, principally Tezcatlipoca. He wore special garb indicating his intention and was correspondingly revered; at the end of the four years, he was put to death and his heart offered up. --Brundage: 214⁴⁵

Moreover, pagan priests could not easily extricate themselves from their stations once they had performed the duties of office. They were largely responsible for creating a mass psychosis. All the people who had willingly consented to the sacrifice of friends, lovers and family had to maintain their own belief in the psychosis or suffer guilt themselves. The executioner-priest who admitted to the hoax (or unintentional error of judgment) opened himself up not only to punishment for his own guilt but for the displaced (or projected) guilt of everyone else!

Once the Catholics understood this -- and they would have understood it at least as quickly as the best psychoanalyst -- the good Catholic brothers had only to gain the private council of the high pagan priest. They offered this poor fellow the ideal escape from his psychological predicament: "We understand exactly what you're going through. Allow us to open your eyes to the one true God, the all-loving and all-powerful God of modern, commercial society. You will be forgiven for all your crimes, and you will never have to kill people again. Moreover, you will be able to work under us, to help us bring your people to Christ; and you will continue to enjoy the privileges that accrue to the shepherds of His flock. Only henceforth, instead of being sustained by animal and human sacrifices, you will receive (in God's stead) sacrifices of money."

This alone is the appeal and the psychology that can explain the recorded ambivalence, the fitful paralysis, of a Moctezuma or an Inca. (See for example Jennings or Linares.) This alone explains why, soon after Ireland converted to Christianity, the country was covered with monasteries, "whose

⁴⁵ Here Brundage cites Hernández, p. 176 and recommends López Medel, quoted in Landa p. 222.

complete organization seems to indicate that they were really Druidic colleges transformed *en masse*” (Rolleston: 83, citing Bertrand, “Rel. des Gaulois,” lecion xx).⁴⁶

Brundage cites three early Spanish sources that confirm that the Aztecs had reached a point where they felt human sacrifice to be indefensible. (Cf. Brundage: 218.) Moreover, as we shall see, at the time of Cortés’ arrival, the most advanced people of Aztec society, led by the merchants, were trying to create a modern religion. In Chapter 7, we shall discuss in greater detail the critical role-played by trade in replacing polytheism, blood sacrifice and polygamy with monotheism, votive offering and monogamy.

This is an appropriate place in which to share what may be a shocking realization: as grotesque and atrocious as the preceding testimonies about pagan society must seem, pagan peoples were (are), on balance, no less civil in their human relations than are we. Yes, we are modern and superior to them in our technology, in our ability to manipulate the natural world. Yet contrary to what we would like to believe about ourselves and contrary to the propaganda developed by the missionaries of our modern religions, we are still savages. We are every bit as savage as the ancestors who began to renounce cannibalism some 10,000 to 11,000 years ago. In the conclusion, an elegantly simple, holistic analysis of the human condition will make this abundantly clear to any of you who still don’t see it.

In Chapter 7, your preparation for becoming conscious of the Deluge will include an analysis of the transition to monotheism and modern religions. We’ll pursue these topics with special emphasis upon Christianity, the religion that converted the whole of Europe and the Americas. But first, before leaving paganism, let’s consider another aspect of it about which there is much popular confusion.

⁴⁶Writing on the medieval church, Bainton confirms that this was everywhere the method by which Christians converted archaic societies. “The missionaries commonly made their initial approach through the ruler. Without at least his benevolent neutrality, they could make little headway. Secondly, they acquired land [*H from the ruler*]; and thereby the Church came to be geared into the entire social structure of an agrarian society” (Bainton: 16-17).

CHAPTER 6: MATRIARCHY, IN MYTH AND IN REALITY

All that is real is rational, and all that is rational is real. – Hegel

The Webster's College Dictionary defines matriarchy as "a family, society or state governed by women." This very broad usage of the word reflects the vast differences in and confusion about the roles and status of women. In this chapter, I will attempt to convince you that, with a few, rare, individual exceptions, women have never been in the forefront as military or political leaders. Moreover, and despite several western myths that appear to say the opposite, *western* women have mostly and almost always been as subdominant and oppressed within society as they are within the typical *western* family. Let's first survey the relevant *western* mythology and what we can generally surmise of *western* woman's history from the Deluge forward.

Our ancestors evolved among the other animals. They never received a lesson on the birds and the bees from atop Mount Sinai. We may safely assume that for a very long time they remained ignorant of the male role in reproduction. For a very long time, the female, *and the female alone*, must have been associated with fertility. Later, when the facts of life were understood, polygamy made one's paternity uncertain. Consequently, there evolved among most (if not all) primitive peoples a Great Mother Goddess. She was known by various ancient cults as Niobe, Cybelê, Demeter, Artemis, Lato, Leto, Latona, Persephone, Isis, Ninhursag, Tiamat, Ishtar, etc.

For primitive peoples, the Great Mother Goddesses were, like their mythological symbol, the moon, objects of great reverence, beauty and wonder. Occasionally they were goddesses of war (e. g. Hathor, Aphrodite and Ishtar). Yet, as objects of fearful power and physical violence, they were generally not the equals of their male counterparts, whose symbol was the sun. We will find this to be true despite the multiplication of claims to the contrary since 1873 when Johann Bachofen advanced his theories of matriarchy in *Das Mutterrecht*.

Nevertheless, we shall discover in the Deluge mythology that there was a time when certain western women did acquire great power. This was a unique period wherein some women manipulated men sexually as never before, a period wherein their power was not religious and based upon fear and unconscious ambivalence but was wholly political and based upon

manipulative control.⁴⁷ This was a period that men wanted to quickly forget, a period wherein these manipulative women were much hated. The ubiquitous image of the “witch” was originally developed as a symbol for these women. We'll analyze mythology that will tell us who the witches were in a later chapter.

To say that *western* female gods were *relatively* powerless is not to say that *some* were not violent and fearsome. Professor Brundage describes *seven* Aztec goddesses (several of them war goddesses with names like “Snake Woman” and “Obsidian Knife Butterfly”) in terms that make one’s hair stand on end. (Cf. Brundage: 153-175.) But even these darlings were not as fearsome as their mates. They were the creations of a society that had become necrophilic. Close examination will show them to symbolize Deluge victims or the “at large” and fearsome relatives of Deluge victims.

Women have been less physically violent than men in myth and real life for a simple reason. They have a lesser capacity for physical violence. The female is adapted to beget and feed -- what is from its, the host's, point of view -- a parasite of incredible size in comparison to the mother's own proportions. Moreover, because primitive women were primarily gatherers and not hunters, it is even more unlikely that many of them were Deluge combatants. With the rare exceptions that I will discuss shortly, our mythology associates only men with weapons. Although Genesis describes Eve as persuading Adam to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, close analysis of even this myth, in Chapter 36, will confirm the message of other creation and Deluge myths. They are unanimous in charging males with the actual killing.

Nor are women adapted psychologically for violence. In one of his poems, Yuri Yevtushenko speculates that if men had the capacity to nurture a seed within their bodies for nine months as it grows into a human being, they would not have their capacity for physical violence and cruelty. Within our savage societies, men, especially western men, have always been violent, anarchic and lawless. *Women have always been chiefly responsible for overpopulation.* It is a paradox that applies only to the supreme species but is

⁴⁷ Teotihuacan (tay-oh-tee-wha-KAHN) was the capitol of a yet little-known culture that followed the Olmec, paralleled the Zapotec and Mayan and preceded the Toltec and Aztec. It lay northeast of the Mexican basin and flourished from 100 or 200B.C. to 750 A.D. Some archaeologists think they may have recently discovered there the first known instance of a Mother Goddess who was supreme. See Wilford, 1993a; but don't bet the ranch on it. The largest Teotihuacan temples appear to have been dedicated to Quetzalcoatl and Tezcatlipocha, supreme *male* gods of Chapter 35.

nevertheless a true paradox, which escaped Yevtushenko's observation, that women's tendency to be baby-making machines has forced men to become killing machines. Only the maximization of population control and equal opportunity can civilize us.

Given this violent nature of our semi-civilized world and the gender-division of savagery's roles, is it even conceivable that there could be such a thing as a state (e. g. military and foreign service) consisting mostly of women? Could such a state project the physical power necessary to discourage potential aggressors? The answer that modern scholars have reached with uncommon and resounding unanimity is "no." Here's what Harvard's famed anthropologist and archaeologist Carlton Coon said:

The oft-repeated statement that our ancestors went through an early agricultural period of woman rule, female inheritance, and the worship of a supreme fertility goddess is completely unsupported by known facts or logical deductions. The main line of cultural evolution that has culminated in our modern western civilization has followed a path in which the relationship between the sexes has been constant from hunting days to the present. -- Coon, 1977: 177

Generally speaking, *western* women have always been dominated by men. Yes, there have been temple priestesses; yes, we've seen an occasional Margaret Thatcher or Queen Elizabeth. Although their first love is for a woman (mother), women do feel ambivalent toward other women as genetic competitors or toward Mother as the competitor for Father. It is natural for women to cast Eve in the garden, sharing responsibility for the dirty deeds. Women are included in many of the Deluge myths too. Noah's wife and two daughters-in-law are in the ark and juxtaposed to the Deluge victims. *Women do, when not brainwashed by an organized, all male priesthood, depict their God as a projection of essentially female objects of ambivalence -- as a Goddess.* Perhaps because the orthodox, *male*, Irish priesthood was overthrown by continental Celts circa 1200 B.C., then intimidated by the Roman extermination of the Druids in Gaul and finally converted by the Church in the first millennium; at least two of the myths of the popular Irish tradition describe the "Devil" as a "witch."

Although there is little evidence of women in positions of state authority, *matrilineal* societies have existed among the Northwest Pacific Coast Indians

and elsewhere right up to recent times.⁴⁸ In these societies, one's kinship and clan affiliation is that of his mother. Primitive societies tended to be matrilineal. As Coon said, *ibidem*, "Evidence taken by Bachofen [*H and his followers*] to prove matriarchy attests rather to *matriliney*. In groups governed by matrilineal descent, men occupy the positions of authority, albeit as brothers and uncles rather than husbands and fathers."

Close examination reveals that the many claims for the existence of matriarchal *western* societies have all been based on art and mythology. Norma Goodrich devoted a book, *Priestesses*, to the promotion of this old "evidence" before admitting in her conclusion on p. 383 that, "The pleasant thought that there was once a wonderful Matriarchy where young women were cherished by hordes of doting ancestresses is probably false, we are now being told by sociologists." Four pages later, she admits that modern scholars are correct by paraphrasing nineteenth century godfather of "matriarchy," Johann Jacob Bachofen, thusly:

How shall we reconstruct the inner life of dead civilizations if not by their literature, language, rituals, allegories and myths? We must by then come to understand the ineradicable, changeless and religious nature of all men and all women. All past life rises from oblivion via Myths, Religion and Mother-Right, he said. *Whether what the myth records for us really happened or was only thought in the minds of this earliest society makes no difference. Since legend [sic] and myth [sic] preserve for us all a collective memory from the past, they are historical [H emphasis mine].*

Now if James Frazer could hear this remark, he'd say that Herr Bachofen and Ms. Goodrich missed their nobler and true calling. If these two are correct, then many of us have been wasting our time and effort on the scholarly reconstruction of history and prehistory when *we* could have been dancing with angels on pinheads. We could have left the research to Bishop Berkeley, asylum inmates and men of their ken.

Seconding the matriarchy claims with more scholarship and less philosophical idealism but flimsy arguments is Marija Gimbutas. Her book, *The Language of the Goddess*, is beautifully illustrated with precious

⁴⁸ See Curtin, 1890: 212-229 and 186-194.

primitive works of art, many of which Gimbutas has personally unearthed over a long and distinguished career.

She advocates the combining of mythology and archaeology to unlock the mysteries of our pre-history. I agree but caution that mythology must first be understood with the help of psychoanalysis if it is to be of any value. The failure of most mythologists to do this reflects a failure to understand psychoanalysis and its application to their own lives. How far would archaeology have gotten if archaeologists had chosen to ignore ancient history or had refused to employ the dating techniques provided by physical science? In the chapters ahead, I hope to convince you that mythology (understood with the help of psychoanalysis) and archaeology dovetail beautifully. Mythology provides us with general relationships and events. Archaeology provides dates, places and other contextual details for those events.

Gimbutas' basic thesis is that Indo-European peoples from the Caspian Basin radiated across Europe in the mid-fifth millennium, bringing with them the domestic horse, improved lethal weapons, the change to small agriculture, animal domestication, the bow and arrow and patriarchy. These features "stand in opposition to the Old European (egalitarian non-sexist), peaceful, sedentary culture with highly-developed agriculture and with great architectural, sculptural and ceramic traditions" (Gimbutas: XX). The principal deity of the prior culture, Gimbutas says, was the Great Goddess.

It is widely accepted that the horse evolved on the central Asian steppe and was first domesticated somewhere around the Caspian basin, but the other Gimbutas claims don't necessarily follow. Having horses does not, in and of itself, make people into war-mongering charioteers. (We often think that we have met Hegel's dictum and found the rational for events, only to discover that a still more rational explanation exists.) Horses have also been known to pull ploughs and wagons. There seems to be no evidence that the first farming peoples who came into Europe came as conquerors; and as we will deduct in subsequent chapters, the bow and arrow was probably invented about 50,000 years prior to this period.

Most modern archaeologists agree that the spread of agriculture across Europe, from the *seventh* through the fourth millennia B.C. --whether out of the Eastern Mediterranean (Champion *et al.*: 117-121) or out of the Caucasus (Gimbutas) or both -- was disorganized, gradual and peaceful (O'Kelly: 33-67; Burges: 15-36). How could it have been otherwise? Arable land was plentiful. Europe's marginal lands weren't sown until the third millennium (Champion: 124, 153-). Not only was there plenty of arable land, but also the eastern

newcomers brought new resources and production techniques (cereals, legumes, sheep, goats, cattle and the pig). These resources created a more reliable, stable and settled subsistence economy that allowed formerly semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers to live lower on the food chain and need less territory. Conditions for warfare, violent subjugation and the imposition of new social and religious values simply didn't exist at this time.

Moreover, there seem to be no signs of conquest. Champion *et al.* note (p. 149) that, "Evidence from temperate Europe by the fourth millennium does not suggest on the whole such developed social change [*H as that indicated by new temple constructions on Malta and other Mediterranean islands, for example*] ... [T]he variety of settlement forms, exchanges and burial practices does not support any uniform model of social organization." They cite the circular passage graves of fourth millennium Ireland, such as Knowth and Newgrange, as only superficial exceptions. Though these mounds are up to 80 meters in diameter and 15 meters high and constructed with vast quantities of stripped turf, soil, clay and river stone; they appear to have been built over long time spans. Also, other data shows no evidence of a large, well-organized population. In Appendices D and F, I offer an outline of the prehistory of the British Isles that explains, among other things, why Neolithic and Bronze Age Britons built and designed the tumuli, stone circles, dolmens and stone alignments as they did.

Gimbutas' only hard evidence for the alleged Neolithic transition from matriarchy to patriarchy is the coming of the horse and the abrupt end to the emphasis that Paleolithic and Mesolithic art put upon the female form.⁴⁹ As already stated, the assumption by Gimbutas (after Joseph Campbell) that horses mean warfare is absurd. One may as well say that Walter Chrysler and the UAW are to blame for World War II because auto factories can make tanks. Regarding the artwork, inspection of it confirms what I stated above: almost all of it depicts females in a pregnant or sexually suggestive state. They are fertility goddesses only. The books by Gimbutas, Graziosi and Leroi-Gourhan are all tomes; and they are full of it. (See Figure 1b, below.)

⁴⁹ Scientists date the end of the Pleistocene or the last Ice Age to about 11.7 kya, to the end of the Younger Dryas (a mini ice age of 12.85 to 11.7 kya). Thermally, we've been in the Holocene since then. Regarding tools, scientists divide the Paleolithic (Old Stone Age) into Upper and the more primitive Lower. The Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age) is somewhat arbitrarily set as beginning with the Holocene, and the Neolithic (New Stone Age) begins in different places whenever men appear to have domesticated animals and to farm. In Mesopotamia and Mesoamerica that was about 8,000-7,000 B.C. But in Appendix H, we'll discover that there was a much earlier, aborted Neolithic era!

The earliest terra cotta figures from Babylon are also almost all female. But they too show naked females, pregnant or with babes in arms or with emphasis on erogenous zones. (Cf. Koldewey: 277-286.) *They are not suggestive of power*, and there's a simple explanation for their Neolithic disappearance. Scientific animal husbandry discouraged religious awe, wonder and fantasies of asexual reproduction. Moreover, fledgling farmers needed to apply their artisanship to farm implements.



(a) The "assembly" of Snake Goddesses found in a vase and possibly used in rites. Statuettes have snakes coiled upon their abdomens, lozenges and dotted triangles over their thighs and carliouches with chevrons over their bullocks. Early Cucuteni (Poduri-Dealul Ghindaru, Moldavia, NE Romania, circa 4800-4600 B.C.)



(b) The vaginal portal is twice suggested by this limestone sculpture. Height is 39.5 cm, Chalcolithic Cyprus, circa 3000 B.C.

(b)

Figure 1b: typical female sculptures and figurines through the Neolithic Period, after Gimbutas; for more examples, see Graziosi and Lerio-Gourhan.



(c)

(c) (left) This black and white, encrusted terracotta is marked with chevrons on both sides. Early Bronze Age II, Anatolia (Caykenar type, SW Anatolia; early 3rd millennium B.C.). Height is 9.1 cm.

(d) (right) Mammoth-ivory sculpture, height 14.7 cm, Gravettian-Upper Perigordian. (Des Rideaux, at Lespugue, Haute Garonne, France, c. 23,000 B.C. Breasts have been reconstructed. Negative #109117, photo by Logan, courtesy Dept. of Library Services, American Museum of Natural History.



(d)

Nor should Gimbutas' interpretation of many of the symbols associated with this early artwork be accepted. For example, all waterfowl are feminine, says Gimbutas, because water suggests the wetness of the vagina and amniotic fluid. (Cf. Gimbutas: 1) But as I shall show you below, waterfowl were worshipped everywhere because they were a symbol for the victims of the

Deluge. In most cases, they had little if anything to do with vaginas or sexuality, male or female. The Icelanders and Danes call a small waterfowl (*tringa minima, inquieta, locustris et natans*) *Odinshani, Odenshane* or *Oden's fugl*. This means "Odin's bird," and Odin was a male god (Grimm: 159). Even swans, which one might expect to be associated with women because of their gracefulness and the absence of sexual distinction by color, are of both sexes in Irish mythology. (See Rolleston: 122, 139-140, and 162-163.) Gimbutas would also have us believe that deer, bears, snakes --and even the ram -- are female symbols. But all these are just totem animals that were, for the most part and like all totem animals, male and female victims of the Deluge. Of the animals that Gimbutas labels as female symbols, the only one that has a definite gender is the ram -- and it's not feminine, Marija. (A ram is a male sheep.) Snakes were, like lions, wolves, black birds, water birds, horses and bears, very closely associated with the female and male Deluge victims.

Nor does Gimbutas' argument for supreme female gods check out with what we know about blood sacrifice. Among the heathen Indo-Europeans, only male animals were sacrificed. This was mostly because only one male was needed to produce offspring, but every female animal had reproductive value. (*Cf.* Grimm: 53-4.) Also, since blood sacrifice was repetition compulsion for prehistoric trauma and catharsis for ongoing repressed hostility, the masculinity of the selected animal tended to reflect the masculinity of the prehistoric or the potential human victim. These males were the most hated because they (and not females) were the most powerful and warlike.

Here's another example of inimitable Gimbutas logic: waterfowl are female; by association with them, birds *per se* must be female (and not generally associated with air-born spirits of either sex).⁵⁰ Then, of course, anything with a "v" (single or nested chevrons) is also female because it symbolizes the bird's wings. Get the picture?

Of the *western*, mythological matriarchy "evidence," most interesting and noteworthy are the Greek Amazon myths and the Hain (male lodge) myth of the Ona Patagonians.

ATHENA AND THE AMAZONS

⁵⁰ Below, we'll see numerous examples of crows and black birds being identified with male gods. For example, "Beowulf" (a male hero) signifies bee-wolf (Old High German: Piawolf), the name for woodpecker. The original Picus, the woodpecker, is a son of Saturn (*Cf.* Grimm: 249).

In his scholarly work, *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*, William Tyrrell introduces us to these mythological but idiosyncratic, female warriors.

Like Greek girls, Amazons mate with males and bear children, but they do not leave their mothers for the house of a husband, nor do they become, like Greek women, wives and mothers of sons. They are mothers of daughters who live with mothers. --Tyrrell: 66

Keep in mind that the only artifacts *possibly* evincing Amazons are in a few graves containing female skeletons and daggers, swords or bows and arrows. These were unearthed near Pokrovka, Kazakhstan, 1,000 miles east of the alleged Scythian encounter with Amazons that Herodotus recalled and that we'll review below.⁵¹ All the Amazon references within Homer, Herodotus, Xenophon, Arrian and Plutarch appear to be based upon popular folklore or works of art and *not* upon the authors' personal knowledge. Arrian, in particular, questioned whether they had ever existed (Arrian: Book VII, Ch. 11.9-14).

In your own questioning of how this myth came into being, you might suspect that it derives from the frustration of women who are oppressed by male dominated society. Western women want equality and some would like to have the capacity to defend themselves, to counter male violence with violence. (However, few women want to know that the non-violent society that will provide equal opportunity *must abolish reproduction as a private right*. More on this is in the conclusion.) But if female frustration and wishful thinking had created the Amazons, then the Amazon women would be depicted as victors in battle. They aren't. They were always defeated!

Tyrrell informs us that Amazons enter Attic history after 575 B.C. as Heracles' opponents in paintings on black-figure vases. The might of Heracles is depicted on these vases. Apparently believing that potters inspired the myth, Tyrrell says that the Amazons, "appear suddenly, in force and without apparent antecedents" (Tyrrell: 2, paraphrasing Bothmer: 6).

Euripides was the first to record the struggle between Heracles and friends with Hippolyte (Andromache in the artistic tradition). In his ninth labor Heracles is in quest of the Amazon queen's golden girdle (a waist belt

⁵¹ For more on the Pokrovka graves, see Wilford, 1997.

signifying her authority as queen of the Amazons). Although the men want only this girdle for the daughter of Mycenaean King Eurystheus, the Amazons mistakenly conclude that they are out to kill the queen. They are saved and the Amazons are destroyed by the timely assistance of Athena. Athena is Heracles' half-sister; and, as you'll see, she is of the same pedigree.

Several myths describe conflict between Theseus, the blind prophet, and the Amazons. The most popular of these, a myth that was often depicted on sixth and fifth century vases, tells how Theseus and friends journeyed to Themiscyra, the Amazons' city, to rape and abduct an Amazon. This sparks a retaliatory war, which is resolved by the intercession of the aggrieved Amazon, now mother to a son by Theseus. (Cf. Tyrrell: 8.)

After the Persian Wars, the Amazon myth returned in times of intense antipathy toward Persians and other foreigners who had under Cyrus the Great, Cambyses II, Darius and Xerxes dominated Asia Minor and Ionian islands. Tyrrell shows how the myth was periodically resurrected and modified to support Athenian rationales for imperialist aggression and to equate enemies with women so that victory could be assumed imminent.

Ultimately Tyrrell intuits the correct strategy for analyzing idiosyncratic myths: *find what is most idiosyncratic about the culture that produced them, and you are likely to find what they reflect*. He reminds us that classical Greek society was, like Twentieth Century America, continually racked by war. Warrior societies devalue women and reduce them to a lowly status. According to Athenian embryology, recited by Apollo in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, a pregnant woman was just the caretaker of her mate's seed. The Athenians' real mother was the earth. As *autochthons*, their claim upon the earth superseded those of mere invaders who were everywhere foreign to the lands they possessed.⁵² Tyrrell points out that this autochthonous birth argument was used to rationalize Athenian imperialism. After the retreat of Xerxes, orators at state funerals developed a catalog of exploits whose purpose was to disguise Athenian imperialism. Tyrrell cites ample evidence of this religious propaganda in the funeral speeches of Pericles, Demosthenes and other political pundits. (Cf. Tyrrell: 18, 114.) Just listen to this one that is attributed to Demosthenes:

The noble birth of these men has been acknowledged among
all mankind from time immemorial. Not only is it possible for

⁵² Many primitive peoples and most of the Polynesians thought their ancestors were autochthons.

them and every one of their ancestors to refer their physical nature to their father; they can also trace it back to the whole fatherland, which they hold in common and from which, it is admitted, they are born. They alone of all mankind inhabit the land from which they sprang and passed it on to their descendants. The following assumption may thus be made: those who came into their cities from elsewhere and were called citizens are like adopted children. These men [to whom the oration is dedicated] are legitimate children born of the seed of their fatherland. That the fruits by which mankind lives first appeared among us, in addition to being the most important service to all, seems to me to be a self-evident sign that our land is the mother of our ancestors. For all things that give birth provide by their nature nourishment for their offspring. This the land has done. The ancestors, fathers and grandfathers of the present generation never wronged any Greek or foreigner. Besides their other noble and brave qualities, it was their nature to be the most just.

I intend to show you, in a later chapter, that this alleged autochthony disguised more than just the imperialism of Athens' classical period. *It was also used as a cover-up for national origins that were anything but "noble," "just" and nonviolent.* (I'll be the first to admit that it is a great relief to a Caucasian American to be able to point this out about *other* peoples. Note too that Plato, as a member of this classical, Greek, autochthonous class, could not admit that his family or neighbors had brought the Atlantis myth with them from a distant land.)

Yet in fairness to both Greeks and white Americans, it would seem that mendacious myths about national origins are rather commonplace. Throughout history and prehistory, rapid climatic change, overpopulation and reckless destruction of the land has impelled peoples to invade, plunder and exterminate. Fictional pedigrees and histories were everywhere invented to cover-up the shameful past. We will discover other instances of this in the chapters ahead.

The Athenian woman's main role and life goal was to marry and produce warrior sons. In any event, she remained subordinate to men. Nothing reveals the devaluation of Greek womanhood as clearly as Aeschylus' story of Clytemnestra. Her husband, High King Agamemnon, sacrifices their beautiful daughter, Iphigenia, to Artemis so that he and his men might have favorable winds for Troy. When victorious Agamemnon returns ten years

later, Clytemnestra, still bitter over the sacrifice of her daughter, has taken a lover (Aegisthus) who helps her murder the High King. Prince Orestes and the other daughter, Electra, then kill Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. The furies, women who avenge unavenged crimes, apply to Athena to punish Orestes for matricide. At a trial with public judges Athena's vote decides the issue. Ever the loyal sister and comrade in arms, she disavows her womanhood and upholds the double standard. Orestes is set free.

Here the subjugation of women is graphically illustrated. In a savage, physically violent society, woman's status is commensurate with her strength in arms. She cannot have equality. A mere slave to her husband/protector, she shares the slave's rancor. "[T]he myth of the Amazons aided in dissipating those anxieties by supporting the sexual dichotomy institutionalized in Athenian marriage. The message of the myth had to be repeated and heard again and again because the problems of women and marriage could never be solved once and for all" (Tyrrell: 113). The Amazon myth dramatized the absurdity and the horrifying consequences of sexual role reversal, of women trying to dominate their men. Athenian men used the myth as a way of telling their wives to remain in their places as breed-mares and loyal servants.

But next, in his effort to negotiate the psychoanalytic details, Tyrrell shipwrecks: Athena, he says, is "the non-threatening counterpart of the Amazon... [T]he violence and chaos of her liminality -- that is, the notion that the daughter would use her productivity, protected by her own military might, to found her own household and city -- had been excised in the death of her surrogates, the Amazons" (Tyrrell: 125-126).

It's simpler than that. Athena is the heterosexual, Athenian man's fantasy of his sister. She remains single, celibate and loyal only to him. The Amazons are the fantasies of latent homosexual Athenian men. Here are the supporting details. See for yourself.

Athena sprang fully armed from the head of Zeus, her father, after he had swallowed her pregnant mother, Metis. She inherited Metis' ambivalence toward Zeus, her father. Indeed, when Typhus routed Zeus, Athena mocked Zeus. Nor was it likely for her father, from whose head Athena had painfully sprung (his head was split open to let her out), to relate to her positively. Hephaestus, the tool-making son of Zeus by Hera, provides the seed that, when planted in mother earth and watered by Hephaestus' half-sister Athena, becomes the first Greeks. That was the closest she came to being a mother. Never a mother and outcast as a daughter, Athena consummated her relationship with no one and remained the exclusive possession of every heterosexual Athenian male -- *in fantasy*. She was every heterosexual male's

incestuous sister. Like a loyal sister, Athena accompanied and assisted Homer's Achaeans (ancestors with whom the Greeks identified) in battle. She preferred to remain a virgin at the side of her brothers rather than marry.

In the *Odyssey*, Nestor, speaking to Odysseus' son Telemachus, subtly identifies Athena as his prime object of sexual desire in the family romance: "If only Athena Brighteyes would show her love to you, as she used to care for that glorious man Odysseus, in the Trojan land, among all those hardships that our nation had to suffer! -- For never have I seen the love of the gods so manifestly shown as when Pallas Athena stood manifestly by his side. *If only she would show love to you like that and care for you, many a one of them would have something else than marriage to think of*" (*Odyssey*, III: 240-41, *H emphasis mine*).

The Amazon myth that reflects latent homosexuality comes from a Scythian episode in Herodotus. After inspection of the first victims revealed an invader group to consist of young Amazons, the Scythians sent out their young men to encounter them. They avoided battle but encamped as close to the Amazons as possible to gradually win their favor and to make children from "so notable a race." We're told that the young Scythians preferred these beardless men with vaginas to their own wives and eloped with them to the wilderness where all lived a life of perpetual bivouacking and hunting (Herodotus, Book IV, Chapters 110-116).⁵³ *The Amazons probably originated as brother surrogates in the recurrent dreams of latent homosexual soldiers.*

THE HAIN MYTH

The Hain myth of the Ona people of Tierra del Fuego is superficially like the Amazon mythology. For twenty years, I thought that this myth too had been invented to intimidate women and make them subservient. I now believe that the next three paragraphs are largely and literally true. The myth appears in Campbell's *Primitive Mythology* (p. 315). Quoting Mr. Lucas Bridges' summary of the legend, Campbell tells us that the Ona idea of women having dominated men is fundamental to the origin of the lodge or *Hain* of the men's secret society:

⁵³ Do you doubt that most spouse abusers unconsciously think that they are beating up their brothers? That's why they are most aroused by their spouses after battering them. To prove this thesis, I tried to obtain New York City's statistics on batterers; but the NYPD prevented me from obtaining them.

In the days when all the forest was evergreen, before *Kerrhprrh* the parakeet painted the autumn leaves red with the color from his breast, before the giants *Kwonyipe* and *Chashkilchesh* wandered through the woods with their heads above the tree-tops; in the days when *Krren* (the sun) and *Kreeh* (the moon) walked the earth as man and wife, and many of the great sleeping mountains were human beings: in those far-off days, witchcraft was known only to the women of Ona-land. They kept their own Lodge, which no man dared approach. The girls, as they neared womanhood, were instructed in the magic arts, learning how to bring sickness and even death to all those who displeased them.

The men lived in abject fear and subjection. Certainly, they had bows and arrows with which to supply the camp with meat, yet, they asked, what use were such weapons against witchcraft and sickness? This tyranny of the women grew from bad to worse until it occurred to the men that a dead witch was less dangerous than a live one. They conspired together to kill off all the women; and there ensued a great massacre, from which not one woman escaped in human form.

Even the young girls only just beginning their studies in witchcraft were killed with the rest, so the men now found themselves without wives. For these they must wait until the little girls grew into women. Meanwhile the great question arose. How could men keep the upper hand now they had got it? One day, when these girl children reached maturity, they might band together and regain their old ascendancy. To forestall this, the men inaugurated a secret society of their own and banished forever the women's Lodge in which so many wicked plots had been hatched against them. No woman could come near the Hain, under penalty of death. To make quite certain that this decree was respected by their womenfolk, the men invented a new branch of Ona demonology: a collection of strange beings -- drawn partly from their own imaginations and partly from folk-lore and ancient legends -- who would take visible shape by being impersonated by members of the Lodge and thus scare the women away from the secret councils of the Hain. It was given out that these creatures hated women but were well disposed

towards men, even supplying them with mysterious food during the often-protracted proceedings of the Lodge.

Following Bridges, Campbell describes five of these women-hating spirits, two that came out of the lichen-covered rocks, one that came out of a beech tree, one from the cumulus clouds and one that came out of the red clay. These are all places that, as you will see, would have been associated with the corpses of murdered Deluge victims.

Next comes an amusing comment, quoted in Campbell (1959: 317):

I wondered sometimes," states Mr. Bridges, who was himself an initiated member of the Hain, "whether these strange appearances might be the remains of a dying religion, but concluded that this could not be so. There was no vestige of any legend to suggest that any of these creatures impersonated by the Indians had ever walked the earth in any form but fantasy." -- Bridges: 412-414

Well Mr. Bridges, these spirits were the conscious replacement of the unconscious obsessional fear of the spirits and the vengeful, surviving kinfolk of the Deluge victims. The Ona men didn't invent the demons that supposedly terrorized women; these demons were already in the men's psyches, vexing the men themselves. As we'll discover in another chapter, the "witches" were so defined because they were women who once enjoyed a very cozy relationship with the Deluge victims. We'll also discover that similar demonology has been adapted by the Scandinavians and the Australian aborigines -- in part -- to keep the girls and children close to camp at night. Virtually all the religious ceremonies among the Australians are for men only. The principal sacred object that figures into most of the rituals in some way or other is the *Churinga*. (Some tribes call it a Bullroarer.) *Churinga* means "sacred secret," a secret known only to men. These guilty secrets have been withheld from women because women had only supporting roles in the Deluge events; and men didn't want their women to know about many of their most bloody, ignoble and guilt-piquing deeds. In coming chapters, we'll discover the meaning of all these secrets. We shall discover who the witches were and why they were -- for a limited time -- powerful.

But Tierra del Fuego, the home of the almost extinct Ona people, is a group of islands separated from South America by the Strait of Magellan. For as long as anyone can remember and since their arrival, the Ona have been

dark skinned, a mixture of Aboriginal African and Amerindian peoples. (See Imhotep or Wikipedia and Figure 2a, below.) Wikipedia says the same of their geographically and linguistically close neighbors, the *Tehuelche*, an uncommonly tall people.

Their African ancestors were some of the last survivors of the aboriginal, African civilization of the Western Hemisphere that was founded roughly 65 kya. Their civilization built the first mounds and pyramids in this hemisphere. They were originally a marine (fishing) people and inhabited the hemisphere's coastlines and river valleys. Yet in post-Columbian times, Ona men couldn't swim and were afraid of the water! Ona women did the diving for their main food staple: shell fish.

The Mongoloid Amerindian hunters started pouring into North America en masse when a corridor in the North American Ice Sheet opened 13,200-12850 cal. ya. The aboriginal, African Americans, who had come to the Americas no later than 65 kya and who weren't drowned in the Great Flood, were mostly wiped out by the in-pouring Mongoloids. The last African town dwellers were in and around the Yucatan Peninsula and dubbed the Olmecs ("the rubber people") by the Nahua Amerindians because they grew rubber trees. The Olmecs were defeated and largely exterminated by the Mayas, Amerindians who severed the Olmec Empire by attacking where the Central American isthmus joins the southern continent. This was circa 900 B.C. We will discover, in coming chapters, the several reasons why the Negroid mound builders of North America were conquered almost unbelievably quickly. Aboriginal, African Americans survived only in remote places where racism did not prevent them from intermarrying with the Mongoloids and where it was most difficult for the Mongoloid Amerindians to dislodge them: the swamps of Florida and Belize, the largest Caribbean islands and Tierra del Fuego.

To defend themselves from male-dominated, Amerindian hunters; the Aboriginal African Tierra del Fuegians also had to transform their marine, female-dominated society into a male-dominated society. The Hain Myth describes this transition, a transition that the women resisted because they preferred to risk being conquered rather than give up their domination of men. For the women, being conquered only meant slavery or concubinage. For the men, it meant death. We'll learn more about the aboriginal, African Americans in Chapter 14 and Appendix H.

**Figure 2a:
This photo of
a Tierra del
Fuego man
was taken
during the
1872-1876
voyage of the
HMS Challenger.
The photo is
now in the
London Natural
History Museum.**



The African ancestors of the Ona may have been the last western, matriarchal people. The other western references to matriarchy attest either to matriliney or are purely mythological. When closely scrutinized, the mythological references attest to male dominance, aberrant sexual desires or to a very early era, the pre-Deluge era of the “witches.”

Yet in our decoding of the Deluge and in Chapter 13 of this prehistoric tour of the world, we’ll find that there was a watershed dividing patriarchal and matriarchal societies. That watershed was geographical, Marija, not temporal. That watershed may have shifted, but it still exists. The matriarchy is infinitely subtler than anything depicted in mythology. Had I not migrated to the opposite side of the world, to the Far East, I would have overlooked this watershed completely and would never have even believed that it could exist!

CHAPTER 7: BLOODLESS SACRIFICE, MONOTHEISM AND DYSFUNCTIONAL MONOGAMY: THE MIXED BLESSINGS OF MODERN RELIGIONS

*She was to experience this sadness many times, this chronic sadness of late Sunday afternoon, when the couples had exhausted their game, basketball or beach going or tennis or touch football, and saw an evening weighing upon them, an evening without a game, an evening spent among flickering lamps and cranky children and leftover food and the nagging half-read newspaper with its weary portents and atrocities, an evening when marriages closed in upon themselves like flowers from which the sun is withdrawn... --John Updike, *Couples*, p. 80-81*

In 339 B.C., at age 16, Alexander, King of Macedonia, and his well-disciplined army began a career of military conquest that expanded upon what had been the Persian Empire. He subdued Asia Minor, the Fertile Crescent, Egypt, North Africa as far as Libya, Persia and parts of India. He died of fever in 323 B.C. at the age of 33 without realizing most of his unification plans. But the world was never to be the same, for Alexander had pulled the modern era from its womb. He respected the customs and religious views of all the peoples he conquered. He judged men according to their merits as individuals and was remarkably free of prejudices. Like the great Achaemenid emperors of Persia, Alexander promoted communications, trade and the integration of the various cultures. The old, isolated, xenophobic world shrank. Communications and trade mushroomed. People, goods and culture became more mobile. Universally respected, he was the Ted Turner and Mikhail Gorbachev of ancient times, rolled into one. *He was also openly bisexual.*

Yet what was good for politics and economy proved disruptive to religion. Communications, trade and the expansion of the market were incompatible with paganism. This incompatibility gave birth to monotheism and bloodless sacrifice, the intentional reforms and reason for being of all the modern religions. In this chapter, we shall examine modern religions' reforms, the strategies adopted by the three major western religions to affect them and the individual and collective shortcomings of the three western religions. Consider first monotheism.

MONOTHEISM

Trade made modern religion. Its connection with the three major western religions is well documented. The Kingdom of Israel that was founded by David and consolidated by Solomon in the 10th century B.C. lay astride the two main trade routes of the ancient Near East.⁵⁴ These routes enabled the Israelites to prosper from their own trade and the taxation of caravans. Christianity's founder, Paul, was born in Tarsus, Cilicia, a district of Asia Minor that lay on the main East-West trade route. The Angel Gabriel mysteriously revealed Islam's *Holy Qur'an* to Muhammad (570-632 A.D.) *who was born into, trained and employed by and propitiously married within the merchant class. Trade spawned his home cities of Mecca and Medina in the fourth century A.D. when the old Suez Canal silted up. At that time, conflict between the Byzantine and the Sassanid empires closed the Persian Gulf and the Silk Road between Byzantium, India and China.*

In Mecca, Medina and other trade centers, the blending of peoples and cultures highlighted the interchangeability of the various pantheons. Lengthy divinity lists had become ungainly even for the pious. Before Muhammad triumphantly returned to Mecca and swept it out, the *Kaabah*, Mecca's enormous cubical Shrine, had become filled with stones, images, statues and other objects sacred to Mecca's trading partners. For everyday citizens, economy of thought required *syncretism*, the amalgamation of the gods. The amalgamation or eclipse of the gods, languages and other culture of lesser peoples by those of greater peoples mirrored the economic amalgamation of governments, the subordination of local potentates to kings and kings to emperors.

Syncretism was possible because people everywhere were ambivalent toward and troubled with the same five groups of ancestors and relatives. Similarities between these universal elements of the godhead and associated events and competition for parishioners led to the "one true God" and, in the Middle East and the West, to the survival of only Judaism and its two offspring.

⁵⁴ "One [*H trade route*] was the *Via Maris* (the Way of the Sea) that linked the Nile Valley with Mesopotamia. It came along the Sinai coast through Gaza, up the coastal plain and through a pass behind the Carmel range into the valley of Jezreel at Megiddo. It then ran along the floor of the valley, crossed the upper Jordan River and traversed the Hauran plateau to Damascus. From there it continued eastward to the Mesopotamian plain... The King's Highway ran from Arabia to Damascus, passing through the Trans-Jordan kingdoms of Edom, Moab, Ammon and Bashan. It was the main road for the lucrative spice trade." -- Comay: 348

From a social and political point of view, empires required a God who was a mythological least common denominator, a nameless and faceless “God” that all could worship. Gods were becoming ever more remote and impersonal like their trading partners (who now produced commodities for the market, goods and services intended to be exchanged for money as opposed to natural goods and services produced for one’s self or fellow tribesmen). The gods were also becoming more powerful -- like the emperors to whom men were subjected and one’s ongoing genetic competitors as a whole. “He” had to be stripped of more than just ethnic and national identity. “He” had to be stripped of all particularity, of identifying characteristics, of evidence remnant of our mythologies (oral histories), of all evidence that might reveal who the gods are and were. Most importantly, “He” could not remind men of the terrifying gods who had brought the Great Flood, gods that, as a protective measure, had been expunged from all oral histories and become too tabu for anyone to think about.

Priests had their own motive for stripping “God” of particularity. For them, abolishing pagan images was a matter of occupational survival. Modern men were dividing their labor and absorbing science and technology. They were becoming analytical in their thinking. Analytical minds could see through the symbols. Parishioners who could identify the gods wouldn’t need priests as intermediaries. To prevent this, priests commanded that, like the face of many kings, “God’s” face was not to be looked into. (*Cf.* Exodus 14: 24; the Greek version of the Osiris myth wherein a boy dies for looking into Isis’ face [in Frazer]; Odin’s description, v2-08; etc.)⁵⁵

Although monotheism unified peoples, in two respects it was a giant step backward. It kept people dependent upon priests; and it represented a new high point in men’s psychological repression, the formal expressions of which were the first and second “commandments.” (“Thou shalt not have any other gods before me,” and “Thou shalt not make a graven image.”)

BLOODLESS SACRIFICE

⁵⁵ Even without this element of repression, the face of God would be difficult to identify because, as we shall see, “God” is universally a composite of the positive aspects of the 1) primordial father 2) competing parent, 3) Deluge victims, 4) Deluge victors, and 5) one’s ongoing, genetic competitors. Numbers 1) and 2) are the objects of the Oedipal Complex, and 3), 4) and 5) are the objects of the Fraternal Complex. Numbers 1) and 3) are similar looking as are 2), 4) and 5). Yet as you will see, the faces of 1) and 3) on the one hand and 2), 4) and 5) on the other are very different.

Trade was also changing ethics. Empire and modernity were changing pagan ethical assumptions. The same values of equality and democracy that, for the greater part of his career, Alexander had applied to government and the army were essential to and fostered by trade. Philosophy articulated the modern ethos. It was an ethos that, since “the Deluge” and our secure arrival atop Earth’s food chain, had been taken for granted between -- and only between -- fellow tribesmen and clansmen. People within the tribal or clan family had related beautifully to one another. Tribesmen had hunted, fished or scavenged together. Tribal women had scrounged for roots and berries, made clothing and taken turns watching and nursing the children. They had returned to camp at dusk to pool their resources and eat communally. Before trade with outsiders was well established, they had lived in long lodge houses -- two to ten or more families -- polyamorously. Sharing and ethical reciprocity, the golden rule, hadn’t applied to “outsiders.”

In the old Stone Age and after the Deluge victims were eliminated (during the *Upper Paleolithic*) and as we competed only with each other, outsiders, distant neighbors from other tribes and clans, had become receptacles for all the inter- and the intra-tribal hostility created by unrestricted, ongoing, genetic competition and obsessional fear and paranoia remnant of the original and second sins. Warfare, captive-taking and human sacrifice had characterized relations between different tribes and clans. Now “outsiders,” “fair game,” were becoming trading partners and had to be treated better. Ethical reciprocity, the golden rule, had to be articulated and extended. Blood sacrifice had to be abolished so that people of different tribes and clans could meet with goods in hand instead of weapons.⁵⁶

So, polytheism, pagan images and blood sacrifice had to be abolished, but society was hardly ready to dispense with religion. Everyone was still traumatized by “the Deluge” (by the Great Flood and the protracted and more universal trauma increasingly thought to have caused it). Everyone still believed in things immaterial and metaphysical. Moreover, the negative sides to the elements of the godhead were not diminishing. Yes, time heals everything; but the closely associated ongoing aspects of their respective

⁵⁶ The classical expression of this precept is sometimes attributed to the Jewish sage Hillel who lived c. 100 B.C. “Asked by a heathen proselyte to teach him the entire Torah (the Law [H *the first five books of the Bible*]) while standing on one foot, Hillel replied: ‘What is hateful to you, do not do unto your neighbor; this is the entire Torah, all the rest is commentary’” (Comay: 290). But with respect to foreigners of different tribal ancestry, the golden rule was still very new at this time; and commentary had predated it by tens of thousands of years.

complexes reinforce the original and the second sins. The ongoing aspects were more problematic than ever. The crowded new metropolises of the melting pot empire cultivated repressed and unconscious *ongoing* fraternal conflict between estranged, genetically diverse, biological competitors for the same habitats, mates and resources. Yet with the expansion of communications, trade and ethical reciprocity, the metropolis was running out of eligible victims. In newly developing modern society, society too poor to afford universal public education and too primitive to limit genetic competition, religion was still needed to control population and balance mixed emotions.

To abolish blood sacrifice and extend the golden rule to everyone (as trade required) three problems had to be solved. *First*, priests and the ever-increasing poor and property less people would require a bloodless form of assistance. *Second*, some rationale had to be invented to explain why the vengeful god(s) would no longer require a diet of blood. *Finally*, human sacrifice had to be replaced with other means of population control. Consider the first problem.

The general trend was from human sacrifice to infanticide to animal sacrifice to obsessional gestures, penance and votive offerings. Charity and alms giving had always been required; but now they would involve money, not weapons and meat. The growth of the market (money) economy fueled the trend. Judaic priests promoted it. Josiah, king of Judea, in 621 B.C., inaugurated the Law of Moses, which was “discovered” by the priest Hilkiah. It (the Book of Kings) called for strict monotheism, banishment of the prostitutes from the temple ground and an end to child sacrifice. Pagan images throughout the Kingdom of Judea were also destroyed at this time. (Cf. Campbell, 1964: 98-100 or Comay: 178.) Next consider the rationales for bloodless sacrifice.

Judaism developed the first rationale. Our Hebrew ancestors were the first permanent adherents of a monotheism that was probably adopted from Egypt where it was first practiced during the 14th Century BC reign of Akhenaton. Jews attributed positive impulses and good fortune to the grace of God that resulted from their observances and their “chosen” status. Jews originally didn’t separate out God’s vengeful aspect as the subdominant “Devil” because they didn’t need to do this to escape God’s wrath.⁵⁷ As

⁵⁷ The “Devil” embodies the negative sides of our ambivalence. He is the “demons,” “giants,” “witches” and other “monsters.” “Giants” were the kinfolk of the Deluge victims, kinfolk feared to be still at large. As little children displace their negativism toward the competing

God's favorite, "chosen" people, as the first to recognize "Him," they were entitled to God's grace whenever they performed the required observances. This Chosen People doctrine was essentially a denial syndrome and reaction formation to a special Hebraic role in the Deluge events, an ignoble role that had to be denied and redefined. This doctrine also strengthens their superegos' denial of the primordial father murder, the Deluge *per se* and murderous impulses toward the competing parent and one another.

Yet this Hebraic, doctrinal "solution," this creative denial and reaction formation, wasn't for everyone, not if "chosen" was to have meaning. Non-Jews could only escape "God's" wrath by distancing themselves from it, by separating out the wrathful, negative God as "the Devil," by avoiding Him and ingratiating His better half. But how do you indulge without blood? They needed another ideology capable of at least balancing the negative and the positive sides of their ambivalence, another ideological means of "salvation," another argument. Without one, who would believe that weapons or coins could satisfy the gods as much as what was understood unconsciously to be revenge in kind? In no event could votive offerings, penance and obsessional gestures (bloodless sacrifice) cathart the believer's own repressed hostility.

The need to amalgamate the gods and the general malaise and longing among the non-Jewish *pot-pourri* of dying and eclipsed religions for a new obsessional "solution" caused mystery cults to spring up throughout the Greek and the Roman Empires. (See Angus.) Apologists for religion would like to believe that these mystery cults possessed arcane books that revealed the secret and profound meaning of their rites. Needless to say, no such manuscripts have been found. What is known about the mystery cults suggests that most were social clubs. They employed enhancements of Paleolithic initiation rites to attenuate and equilibrate the initiate's ambivalence toward the universal objects of the godhead by bringing him into intimate contact with symbols for these objects. Initiation rites usually involved a frightening but harmless encounter. The antecedents of rite symbols remained as much a mystery to the cult priests and initiates as they were to the uninitiated. Between them, the mystery cults of the Mid-East probably represented the totality of man's religious experience. Would-be priests formed them to create careers. Isolated individuals sought "salvation" in them. Loose aggregations joined them to re-create some of the community

parent onto a totem animal, humanity displaced its negativism toward the Deluge victims onto "jinn," "demons," "witches" and "giants."

that empire and modernity were destroying. We'll reconsider mystery cults in a later chapter.

Out of this early first century turmoil, there arose a learned scholar. He was born in Tarsus, Cilicia, a district of Asia Minor that lay on the main trade route between East and West, a city famous for its Stoic philosophers. A hereditary Roman citizen, he mastered ancient Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew. He studied under the Pharisees, a religious and political party that sought to adapt religion to its time. Proud of his Roman citizenship, the scholar sought to unite men religiously as Rome was uniting them politically. This man, Paul, created the Christian religion.⁵⁸ More than anyone else, Paul enabled the transition from primitive to modern savagery. He discovered or at least intuited what was not to be consciously understood for 2000 years.

The Romans crucified lots of Jews, and variants of the name "Jesus" were common; but no shred of historical evidence for Paul's Jesus is known to exist. *Paul's Jesus is the ideal scapegoat invented to shoulder humanity's accumulated guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia from the Oedipal and Fraternal Complexes. Paul realized that this ideal scapegoat would have to represent the killers or would-be killers of the four, original and universal elements of the godhead: (1) the fifth, derivative element of the godhead, the Deluge victors, (2) the sons of the primal fathers, (3) the part of each of us that would like to kill his same-sex parent and (4) the part of each of us that would like to kill his ongoing genetic competitors.*^{59 60} *If you've correctly guessed who the Deluge victims were, you'll see that all the four killers are sons of one sort or another and all the victims are parents (fathers) of one sort or another. "Jesus" shoulders responsibility for all the negativity of both complexes simply by admitting to being the Son of God.* His thorny, wooden

⁵⁸ Paul penned it. All the earliest Christian documents, from 51 to 64 A.D., are his letters to followers. Moreover, no known record of a person contemporary with "Jesus" and possessing personal knowledge of "Jesus" exists. (Cf. Walker, Doherty: 141.)

⁵⁹ Most of the *Homo sapiens* who coexisted with the victims of "the Deluge" tended to share some degree of direct responsibility for the elimination of these victims. All the survivors felt guilty owing to their extreme ambivalence toward the victims. They felt indirectly responsible due to benefiting from "the Deluge." I realize that many of you are still unconscious of what the Deluge was. Have patience; we're getting there.

⁶⁰ Freud identified the condition by which the individual submits to the authority of the group, identifies with it and subordinates his interest to it: "the group loves all the individual members with equal love" (Freud, 1921: 26). This observation has profound implications for contemporary society! It necessitates that people be born with equal opportunity if they are to behave as civil members of a civilized society.

crown is symbolic of both the regal suffering that he must undergo and his origins in the Stone Age.

Like Dusares before him, “Jesus” had to be born of a virgin not just because of the Oedipal wish to possess the mother but because Jesus’ mythical fathers, the victims of the original and the second sins, are in “heaven.” They are un-incarnated members of the spirit world.⁶¹

Jesus, “the lamb of God,” “the Prince of Peace,” was envisioned as the ideal victim, the one whose sacrifice could compensate for the crimes of an entire species and preclude the need for additional sacrifices. Jesus’ killer is not Pontius Pilate or the Jewish people but “God” achieving his revenge. Jesus hosts the last totem meal, the “last supper,” at which the disciples (his symbolic army) participate and our universal ancestral and ongoing objects of ambivalence (“God” and “Devil”) are not the victims but the invisible guests of honor. “Jesus” himself is the victim in this elaborate rite of make-believe.

The Christian allays his fears of all the problematic and ambivalent, elements of the godhead by believing that Jesus Christ is the “Son of God” and by symbolically and magically participating in his sacrifice (drinking his blood and eating his body during the “communion”). For the Christian, the sacrifice of this princely, “lamb of God” slakes God’s thirst for revenge and buys a pardon. Being pardoned also requires admitting “original sin” (guilt owing to repression generally and to the unconscious, cultural transmission of first and second sin awareness).⁶² Last but not least, one needs to pay the priest.

So, we’ve seen the Judaic and Christian arguments for bloodless sacrifice. The Christian argument was created for all the non-chosen, the non-Jews. But there remained a large group of people for whom both these arguments were unacceptable. Middle Easterners in ancient times would have despised the Jews for their [Habiru origins](#) and their ignominious role in the Deluge events, a role that we shall discover in Chapter 20. Most Middle Easterners of ancient times would have recognized the Chosen People Doctrine for what it was and would not have wanted to self-identify as Jews. Most Middle Easterners of ancient times weren’t susceptible to Christianity either. They were familiar with the Gilgamesh, Mithra and Marduk cults

⁶¹ Later we’ll discover why the gods “dwelled” in the “Netherworld,” the mountaintops, the waters and the sky.

⁶² The communion has a secondary meaning. Primitives believed that one person could not harm another without hurting himself if portions of the same food or blood were within each. By the same “logic,” the risen and divine Jesus *must* protect those who have recently “received the communion,” symbolically eaten his body.

upon which (as we'll discover in Chapter 19) Christianity was based. So, Middle Easterners needed another argument for bloodless sacrifice and its modern ethic.

Muhammad developed it. His solution, Islam, was religion by fiat, an ethical straightjacket, the simplified, stripped-down, religious equivalent of fast food. For all the sins of the distant past and the psychic garbage that has been bequeathed to us, he came up with a simple and logical answer: fuggedaboutit. "That community [*H of Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac*] has passed away. Theirs is what they did and yours what you have done. You shall not be questioned about their actions." (*Qur'an*: 2: 132-) But questioned we shall be for our own actions and thoughts -- all of them -- on the *Last Day*. According to Muhammad, death, human mortality, was not God's punishment for misdeeds in the Garden of Eden (the symbolic meaning of which we'll discover). Death was God's call for each man to judgment, a judgment that is unerring and microscopic in detail. Those who give alms, say their prayers, believe in the one true God and the Last Day and obey the *Holy Qur'an* spend eternity in paradise, attired in green silk in a garden with running streams and surrounded by "spouses of perfect chastity" (*Qur'an*: 3: 15) or "bashful dark-eyed virgins" (*Qur'an*: 37: 48) or "attended by boys graced with eternal youth, who to the beholders eyes will seem like sprinkled pearls" (*Qur'an*: 76:9). Fail and you burn in Hell with Satan and other Jinn. The *Qur'an* also has concrete rules for inheritance and the treatment of slaves, wives and orphans.

Unlike Jews and Christians, whose passive creeds only require them to not do evil (i. e. break the commandments); Muslims are required to wage jihad, to *actively* do good and oppose evil. Although they differ greatly in their interpretation of this, the requirement to be responsible for the state of our community and world is *the only correct attitude*. We *must* each struggle to improve ourselves and our world – not because a god requires it of us, but – because we owe that to our ancestors and to posterity. We didn't get atop Earth's food-chain (obtain the "tablets of fate" and stewardship of the biosphere) by accident or because a god put us there. At every stage of our four-billion-year-long evolution, from one-celled organisms to the present; our ancestors struggled to improve themselves. We have a moral obligation, a duty, to do the same. We owe it to them and to posterity.

All religions described some system of automatic or inescapable rewards or punishments to deter undetectable and petty wrongdoing. Apostasy voided this service; and modern psychology has yet to fill the void, to adequately

analyze and educate the public on the “good or bad conscience” phenomenon. Chapter 8 will attempt this.

As for the difficult problems, our relations with and negativity toward the five universal elements of the godhead, our religions don’t even identify them, much less provide solutions. Judaism gave us the commandments, a set of behavioral absolutes, a moral straightjacket that is bound to fail while society is unconscious of its contradictions with the ongoing elements of the godhead. The injunctions to “Honor thy parents” and “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you” only serve as advisories, as sporadic restraints upon ongoing Oedipal and Fraternal conflict. They don’t eliminate it. Obsessional gestures must be continually repeated in response to guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia *vis-à-vis* the competing parent and one’s ongoing genetic competitors. Modern religions only manage the believer’s neuroses. They don’t solve them. Christianity’s contribution is mere make-believe, a balm for anxiety. Thus, the Catholic Church tells believers they are born and will die guilty:

Therefore, just as through one person sin entered the world, and through sin, death, and thus death came to all, inasmuch as all sinned.

--Paul’s Letter to the Romans, Chapter 5, Verse 12

Islam appears to eliminate the problem with the prehistoric elements of the godhead by telling us to forget about them. *But a man who doesn’t know his past doesn’t know himself or how to go forward.* Moreover, if we could fully forget our past; we’d forget “God” too because “He” is largely a product of our (traumatized) past. As for the ongoing side of religion, although Islam advocates moderation and merciful treatment for the weak and the needy, it fails to even identify the ongoing elements of the godhead, much less prescribe the ultimate solutions for dealing with them. Freud did clearly identify our problem with the competing parent, but telling us to “find a satisfying substitute for the opposite sex parent” is not much better than pushing the patient out the door and wishing him good luck. Marx, with his theory of the class struggle, was groping but failed to even identify the ongoing genetic competitors, much less eliminate our negativity toward them. My works solve both problems. This work will provide the final solution for our negativity toward ongoing genetic competitors. Another of my works, *Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution*, provides the final solution to the competing parent negativity, incest *per se* and every sort of love and marriage problem.

As we'll see, curing the individual of his "spiritual" (psychological) problems involves 1) helping him to achieve consciousness of the prehistoric and ongoing traumas and ambivalences, 2) helping him to realize whatever renunciation and compensation should have been made (ideally) to resolve *past* conflicts and 3) embracing the similar *societal* renunciations and compensations that will minimize *contemporary* ambivalence and conflict. These tasks, especially number 3), require another revolution in our laws and socio-political behavior; and they are tasks for which sincere, non-cynical, community leaders will be desperately needed and for which trusted clergymen are ideally situated. Yet these are also tasks with which neurotic rituals and belief systems are incompatible. To exert a positive influence within their communities, clergymen will have to update their ideologies and convert churches of "God" into churches of Man.

Christian attitudes toward sex also need updating. "Jesus" and "the Virgin Mary" both forego healthy, sexual marriage and thereby renounce the most important compensation needed to minimize K and R and eliminate the Oedipal Complex. Furthermore, far from advocating the equal opportunity and population control reforms that will (as you'll see) minimize our Fraternal Complex, "modern" religions still tell believers to "be fruitful and multiply." No message could be less appropriate for a species that lacks a natural predator and is already grossly out of balance with every other organism in the food chain that must help supply its needs. Yet fundamentalists *must* renounce population control!

Whether they are conscious of it or not, religious fundamentalists who believe in an immortal soul also believe in reincarnation. For regardless of what the believer wants to call the "afterlife" (Heaven, Paradise, Elysium, Nirvana, Hell, etc.), the only life of which we know and can concretely conceive is earthly life. Any conception of "afterlife" can only really mean earthly life. The belief in "afterlife" is belief in reincarnation. (In Appendix B, you will be amazed by the extensive role reincarnation played in the lives of Australian aborigines.)

Origen was a Christian theologian and scholar from Alexandria who lived in the first half of the third century. The Catholic Church debated the issue of the "pre-existing soul" in the doctrines of Origen during no less than one synod and three councils.⁶³ Only thereafter did the Church finally and irrevocably reject the belief in reincarnation, and then only because they

⁶³ They were the Synod of Constantinople in 543 A.D. and the councils of Constantinople (553 A.D.), Lyons (1274 A.D.) and Florence (1439 A.D.) (Heaney).

realized that belief in reincarnation minimized the importance of the fictional Jesus' resurrection.⁶⁴

When the fringe elements who oppose abortion under all circumstances speak of “the rights of the *pre-born*,” whether they know it or not, they are referring to the “spirits” of ambivalent relatives and ancestors who are waiting to be “reborn!” Belief in reincarnation and “God” or “gods” taking our lives accounts for all the problems that fundamentalists have with birth and population control. This is why they can't treat these subjects rationally. For them, birth or population control means preventing deceased loved ones from being born again. For religious fanatics, to even contemplate matters of life and death is to infringe upon “God's” prerogatives. The serious threat that this point of view poses to our civilization cannot be overstated. That is why I must prove to you that the “gods” and “God” have never been anything more than mortal hominids. “God” or the “gods” did not create any of our problems, and “they” can't solve them. (All our problems have arisen from our natural [social and biological] evolution.)

Returning to Islam, it has two more unique problems. Before receiving God's Word from the Angel Gabriel in a cave, Muhammad had been a caravan leader, a person distinguished for fairness but not for esoteric knowledge. He lacked the authority and credibility that could be attributed to a fictional Moses (a high priest from Egypt) or to Paul (an insightful and ingenious priest). Moreover, by 610 A.D., it was getting difficult to believe in angels. He attempted to overcome this liability through the persistent use of fear, Hell's fire for the nonbelievers. To support the threat, he invoked all the best-known Biblical characters. But in the *Qur'an*, they are stripped of their prehistoric context and meaning. They are all described simply as apostles with one mission: delivering the same warnings that Muhammad delivered.

The other uniquely Islamic problem is the *Qur'an's* insistence that Muhammad, although only a mortal chosen to become a prophet, was the *last* prophet. Even if one believes literally in God and Muhammad as his prophet, how logical is it to believe that God became brain dead or deaf and dumb after 610 A.D.? Just image the backward, retarding influence that the Forget-the-Past and Last-Prophet doctrines have had upon the Islamic World over the long run! Every new phenomenon and issue is difficult to perceive and must be evaluated and decided per the limited awareness of a narrowly circumscribed and bygone era!

⁶⁴ Can you see why Jesus had to be resurrected? He didn't just revive after death. He “returned from the spirit world or heaven.” Resurrection symbolizes more than just the miraculous conquest of death that biblical prophets were said to have accomplished.

Incidentally, Muhammad's obvious motive for calling himself the last prophet was to preempt challenges to his authority. I freely admit that I'm fallible. None of my books are perfect. This one is in its 25th edition. Countless errors have been corrected and omissions filled just between this and the first edition! My work will always be improvable, and I'll always welcome advice from *honest* scholars. (Masked ones are more trouble than they're worth.)

Such are the intended tasks and major shortcomings of our modern western religions. Consider now the last major effect of modern religion, an effect that was wholly unintentional, an effect that partially replaced blood sacrifice as a control on population growth -- but at a terrible cost.

DYSFUNCTIONAL MONOGAMY

Unless based upon a unique love and fully satisfying sexuality between individuals that are lord and bondsman to one another, monogamy is dysfunctional. For all the reasons stated in the Conclusion (in v3), monogamy becomes increasingly dysfunctional in savage, K and R society. For modern (K and R) heterosexuals, it becomes a prison. For homosexual folks, it's a wellspring of homophobia, forcing them to choose between love and children. For bisexuals, it permits only partial satisfaction. What started it?

It did enter the world with private property and class society; but to assume, as many have, that monogamy was solely motivated by the Ks' need to designate heirs is to miss most of monogamy's story. Its universality in the modern era can only be understood macroscopically.

Contrary to missionary propaganda, arrogance and wishful thinking, modern religion and the modern era did little to improve *overall* civility. Despite our exquisite technology, our *overall* relations are little better than those of the ancestors who renounced cannibalism 11,000 years ago. The modern religions and the expanded marketplace did improve relations between *distant* neighbors. But we still have our naturally evolved instincts to overproduce and preserve our own genes; since the Deluge, we've been uniquely without a natural predator to control our population; and there is no literal and willful "God" or "Devil" to control us. Given these circumstances, we have no choice but to control our own population and genetic competition because there is no god or animal to do it for us. *Rationally* controlling ourselves means creating equal opportunity and population control. That means reducing, preferably minimizing, the K and R Strategies, respectively. "Modern" religions didn't (and couldn't) inaugurate these rational controls,

so we have had to control ourselves *irrationally*. That means overpopulating and unnecessarily increasing our death rate with every form of homicidal and suicidal behavior. Modern era savagery has been inevitable.

Given the inevitable savagery, modern-religion-improved *distant-neighbor* relations required *near-neighbor* relations and *suicidal tendencies* to worsen proportionately -- and they did.^{65, 66}

After the Deluge and our elimination of our only natural competitor, we began to compete ferociously with each other; but throughout pagan times, the competition was mainly inter-tribal. With the advent of trade and modern religion, ever so gradually, as distant-neighbor relations improved *and continue to improve*, war became the exception. Suicide, drug abuse, indifference and common crime became the norm. Ever so gradually, tribal land became private property and tribal-elder controls on production, marriage and reproduction gave way to modern state power. Ever so gradually, near-neighbors who were once fellow tribesmen became ever more abusive in their competition, ever more isolated in their production and consumption and ever more unequal and resentful of one another. The distinctions between tribal family members and strangers dissolved. Modern men learned, ever so gradually, to live in a gray, monotonous state of continuous insularity. Guilt and alienation separated us from our neighbors next door almost as much as from those around the world. At some point in this transition to modern savagery, everyone became too alienated from his near neighbors to continue living polygamously in what the Indians had

⁶⁵ **Here's the basic equation for savagery in savage society: Distant-Neighbor Savagery (SD) plus Near-Neighbor Savagery (SN) plus Suicidal Tendencies (SS) equals Total Savagery (ST). (SD + SN + SS = ST.) The right side of this equation will remain a constant until we set limits on our genetic competition. Until then, any decrease in any one of the terms on the left must cause an equivalent increase in the remaining terms on the left.**

⁶⁶ This inverse proportionality of near and distant neighbor relations is currently causing a national identity crisis in Japan. Lowering barriers to international trade will end the protection of the less competitive Japanese workers and lessen *giri*, the moral obligation and sense of identification that the Japanese feel for one another. Similarly, making the Chinese Yuan fully convertible and fully opening China's capital market will accelerate the death of Chinese nationalism. Like all forms of religion, nationalism is both a ceiling and a floor. Nationalism is these for a whole people. Without it, they will either rise through their present ceiling (by embracing social science) or fall through their present floor (by regressing to the old, dog-eat-dog, unrestrained capitalism ideology).

called the long house.⁶⁷ Like the most successful first farmers, everyone gradually abandoned the long house for a tee pee, wigwam or hut.

The Iroquois Confederation and the Micmac Algonquin (northeastern United States and southeastern Canada respectively) traded on the Great Lakes, the Saint Lawrence Seaway and the North Atlantic Coast. They were transitioning to modernity when the white men arrived. The wisest of them were not impervious to these changes:

Glooskap's Departure from the World

[From the Micmac people (Newfoundland and Maritime Provinces)]

Now Glooskap had freed the world from all the mighty monsters of an early time: the giants wandered no longer in the wilderness [H *Glooskap (the amalgamation of the primal father and, especially, the Deluge warriors) killed or brought under control the last of the Deluge victims and their kin.*]; the cullu terrified man no more as it spread its wings like the cloud between him and the sun [H *A mighty bird that created the winds by flapping his wings was brought under control when Glooskap clipped one of its wings.*]... [N]o evil beasts, devils and serpents were to be found near his home. [H *Communication, trade and expanded travel made primitive peoples worldlier.*] And the Master had, moreover, taught men the arts that made them happier; but they were not grateful to him, and though they worshiped him, they were not the less wicked. [H *Thanks.*]

Now when the ways of men and beasts waxed evil they greatly vexed Glooskap, and at length he could no longer endure them, and he made a rich feast by the shore of the great Lake Minas. All the beasts came to it, and when the feast was over he got into a great canoe, and the beasts looked after him till they saw him no more. [H *As men became more skilled, worldly and confident and as the gods became amalgamated, "God" became more powerful but more remote.*] And after they ceased to see him, they still heard his voice as he sang; but the sounds grew fainter and fainter in the distance, and at last they wholly died away, and then deep silence fell on them all, and a great marvel

⁶⁷ Muslims are only a partial exception. They retained a narrow polygamy, a hypocritical polygyny for men rich enough to imprison more than one woman.

came to pass, and the beasts, who had till now spoken but one language, were no longer able to understand each other, and they fled away, each his own way, and never again have they met together in council. [*H In early times, the animals were thought to be totem gods, victims of the Deluge who had been changed by their deluge adversaries, and the wishful thinking of later generations of hungry and guilty Indians into animals. As we'll see, the guilty expunction of Deluge victim mythology caused the universal prejudice against dark skin, which in turn caused the Indians to include their aboriginal African American victims in the category of "animal people." Glooskap sailing away and taking the animal people's common language reflects the fact that the animals lost their sense of wonder and suitability as receptacles for the gods, their "animal people" status, during the Neolithic. As we'll see, the scattering, loss of a common language and estrangement of the animals is displacement for the "the Deluge" having caused men to migrate, lose their common language and become estranged to one another. The Mesopotamian "Tower of Babel" myth will say the same more accurately.*⁶⁸] Until the day when Glooskap shall return to restore the Golden Age and make men and animals dwell once more together in amity and peace, [*H until we resolve our Fraternal Complex and unite humanity into one virtual and loving, socialist family*] all Nature mourns. And tradition says that on his departure from Acadia the Great Snowy Owl retired to the deep forests, to return no more until he could come to welcome Glooskap [*H This seems to refer to an owl species that became extinct or endangered at the start of Indian modern times.*], and in those sylvan depths the owls even yet repeat to the night *Koo-koo-skoos*, which is to say in the Indian tongue, "Oh, I am sorry! Oh, I am sorry!" And the Loons, who had been the huntsmen of Glooskap, go restlessly up and down through the world, seeking vainly for their master, whom they cannot find, and wailing sadly because they find him not. [*H It's not just the fanning out of the*

⁶⁸ A Nez Percé tale similarly compromises our prehistory: "Next day the new people came out of the ground -- not just our people but all people. And they spread over the earth. When the human beings came, all the animals became silent. No longer did they have the power of speech" (E.E. Clark: 43).

“gods” or the coming of the white men that saddened them. These Indians are also lamenting some of modernity’s changes.]

But ere the Master went away from life, or ceased to wander in the ways of men, he bade it be made known by the Loons, his faithful messengers, that before this departure years would pass, and that whoever would seek him might have one wish granted, whatever that wish might be. Now, though the journey was long and the trials were terrible that those must endure who would find Glooskap, there were still many men who adventured them...

When all men had heard that Glooskap would grant a wish to anyone who would come to him, three Indians resolved to try this thing, and one was a Maliseet from St. John, and the other two were Penobscots from Old Town. And the path was long, and the way was hard, and they suffered much, and they were *seven* years on it ere they came to him. But while they were yet three months’ journey from his dwelling, they heard the barking of his dogs, and as they drew nearer, day-by-day, it was louder. And so, after great trials, they found the lord of men and beasts, and he made them welcome and entertained them.

But, ere they went, he asked them what they wanted. And the eldest, who was an honest, simple man and of but little account among his people because he was a bad hunter, asked that he might excel in the killing and catching of game. Then the Master gave him a flute or the magic pipe, which pleases every ear and has the power of persuading every animal to follow him who plays it. And he thanked the lord and left. [*H They weren’t opera fans. Wishful thinking and similar conditions made similar dreams of magic flutes.*]

Now the second Indian, being asked what he would have, replied, “The love of many women.” And when Glooskap asked how many, he said, “I care not how many, so that there are but enough of them, and more than enough.” At hearing this, the Master seemed displeased, but, smiling anon, he gave him a bag that was tightly tied, and told him not to open it until he had reached his home. So, he thanked the lord and left.

Now the third Indian was a gay and handsome but foolish young fellow, whose whole heart was set on making people laugh and on winning a welcome at every merry-making. And he, being asked what he would have or what he chiefly wanted, said that it

would please him most to be able to make a certain quaint and marvelous sound or noise that was frequent in those primitive times among all the Wabanaki and that it is said may even yet be heard in a few sequestered wigwams far in the wilderness, away from men [*H He wants to recapture the fraternity, laughter and merriment of life in the long house, life before the advent of the single-family wigwam.*]; there being still here and there a deep magician, or man of mystery, who knows the art of producing it. *And the property of this wondrous sound is such that they who hear it must needs burst into a laugh; whence it is the cause that the men of these our modern times are so sorrowful, since that sound is no more heard in the land [H emphasis mine].* And to him Glooskap was also affable, sending Marten into the woods to seek a certain mystical and magic root, which when eaten would make the miracle the young man sought. But he warned him not to touch the root ere he got to his home, or it would be the worse for him. And so, he kindly thanked the lord and left.

It had taken *seven* years to come, but *seven* days were all that was required to tread the path returning to their home, that is, for him who got there. Only one of all the three beheld his lodge again. This was the hunter, who, with his pipe in his pocket, and not a care in his heart, trudged through the woods, satisfied that so long as he should live, there would always be venison in the larder. [*H Game was scarce but still attainable in modern times.*]

But he who loved women and had never won even a wife was filled with anxious wishfulness. And he had not gone very far into the woods before he opened the bag. And there flew out by hundreds, like white doves, swarming all about him, beautiful girls, with black burning eyes and flowing hair. And wild with passion the winsome witches threw their arms about him and kissed him as he responded to their embraces, but they came ever more and more, wilder and more passionate. And he bade them give way, but they would not, and he sought to escape, but he could not; and so, panting, crying for breath, smothered, he perished. And those who came that way found him dead, but what became of the girls no man knows.

Now the third went merrily onward alone, when all at once it flashed upon his mind that Glooskap had given him a present, and without the least heed to the injunction that he was to wait till

he had reached his home drew out the root and ate it, and scarce had he done this ere he realized that he possessed the power of uttering the weird and mystic sound to absolute perfection. And as it rang over many a hill and dale and woke the echoes of the distant hills until it was answered by the solemn owl, he felt that it was indeed wonderful. So, he walked on gaily, trumpeting as he went over hill and vale, happy as a bird.

But by and by he began to weary of himself. Seeing a deer, he drew an arrow and stealing silently to the game was just about to shoot, when despite himself, the wild, unearthly sound broke forth like a demon's warble. The deer bounded away, and the young man cursed! And when he reached Old Town, half dead with hunger, he was worth little to make laughter, though the honest Indians at first did not fail to do so, and thereby somewhat cheered his heart. But as the days went on, they wearied of him, and, life becoming a burden, he went into the woods and slew himself. And the evil spirit of the night-air, even Bumole or Pamola, from whom came the gift, swooped down from the clouds and bore him away to "*Lahmkekqu*," the dwelling place of darkness, and he was no more heard of among men. [*H The two Indians bearing gifts associated with the long house and pagan times were unable to enjoy these benefits because each was unable to act differently outside the house than inside. Each saw no reason not to open his gifts outside. This is a perfect metaphor for modern man's inability to distinguish between tribal family and strangers, an inability that resulted from a steady improvement in distant-neighbor relations and a steady deterioration in near-neighbor relations.*] --Hardin, Terri: 17-19 or Leland: 66-73

So it was that the long house gradually disappeared. Tepees, huts and wigwams replaced it. But remember: at this time, blood sacrifice was also being replaced by votive offerings. Since men were still savages and without automobiles and firearms as a means of eliminating one another, some replacement for blood sacrifice as a means of population control and outlet for hostility had to develop. The new population controls could not discourage communications, social integration, trade and production for the market. These new controls developed unwittingly. New suicidal tendencies increased the death rate and monogamy lowered the birth rate.

Modern religion fostered suicidal tendencies by increasing psychological repression. It represses the negativity felt toward genetic competitors and competing parents. Christians, in particular, learn that to find Jesus is to “put the Devil behind you.” Repression causes guilt (the vague feeling that something about one’s self is not right). Extreme guilt is self-hatred. Self-hatred leads to suicide. Moreover, selfless Jesus presents a model for suicide.

Monogamy, by limiting us to one partner, helped to lower the birth rate. The dysfunctional monogamy of still savage society brought population control by default, the control of the folded legs.⁶⁹ Men of modern savage society began to suffer in the modern way, to resign themselves to dysfunctionally-monogamous and psychically impotent lives. For those of us who are conscious of our incest complexes, psychic impotence sets in as we become survival partners with our spouses and associate the partner only with work instead of pleasure, especially after the birth of a child. (I suspect that the sensations of the spouse who is associated ever more with work become habitually routed through asexual nodules of the hypothalamus. On the specialization of these nodules that are strung together to form the hypothalamus, see *The Brain*: 220, 224-225, 192-193.⁷⁰ The more we overpopulate the planet, the greater is the strain of each new person on the environment, the difficulty of rearing children and the psychic impotence of those foolhardy enough to rear them. In dysfunctionally-monogamous and psychically impotent savage society, the indiscriminate fostering of children of unknown paternity slowed to a trickle. (In pagan society, all children had been entitled to share in the bounty of mom’s tribal family.)

Dysfunctional monogamy gave birth not only to psychic impotence but also to aggravated homophobia, rampant latent homosexuality and a rebirth of incest! Monogamy forces homosexual people to choose between having love and having children! That’s a horrible double bind; so, the people with same-sex siblings who can hide their homosexuality generally do. They develop a Third Mask. (As we’ll see below, the Second Mask, which virtually all of us are wearing, was created by the Deluge.) But if you can lie about something as basic as which sex you love and desire, then you can lie about anything, which is why latent homosexuals become the most successful savages: consummate liars, cheaters and scoundrels. Unable to love,

⁶⁹ Again, for all the reasons why the monogamy of savage, K and R society is dysfunctional see v3-104 to v3-105.

⁷⁰ Physiologists understand the mechanism for this neural conditioning (from neurons firing in sync) and refer to it as *long-term potentiation*. The connection between these neurons is *potentiated*, gets stronger. Strengthening lasts for weeks, months or years.)

rightfully angry, motivated only by fear, valuing only what contributes to their individual survival (money, power and their own offspring), always fighting (the most repressed replace “I love him” with “I hate him” and “He hates me”), associating all change with the big change they cannot and dare not make (removing their masks); they ever-increasingly dominate our world, which is why the world is ever-increasingly as Orwell described it: loveless, polluted, overpopulated, strife-torn, oppressive and immutable. The other savages are unlikely to be only children and unalienated enough to imprint and remain with an opposite-sex child next-door or (due to ignorance, economic insecurity and lack of equal opportunity) marry and stay with the person that most resembles their opposite sex parent. Lacking a fully satisfying partner makes incest more likely.⁷¹

Faced with a terrible and universal *fait accompli* of its own making, plagued with the monogamous suffering and quiet desperation of psychically-impotent cell-mates, modern religion could only redefine the new and inexplicable monogamous incarceration as a virtue: Thou shalt not commit adultery. -- The *seventh* commandment.⁷²

The dysfunctionality of monogamy made exogamy still more difficult and increased the need to facilitate marriage by reinforcing the First Mask, which masks our love for our siblings and opposite-sex parent. The system of marriage and child rearing proposed by my, *Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution*, will perfect the transitions to exogamy and monogamy and eliminate incest complexes, latent homosexuality/homophobia and all other marital problems.

To summarize: we have seen the *how and why* of monotheism, one of modern religion's three products. We've seen how and why the gods were

⁷¹ From the point of view of someone within a monogamous social system it may appear that our incest complexes caused monogamy. But think out of the box: pagans had many parents. The transition was as I have described it. The relationship between incest and monogamy was largely one of effect and cause respectively.

⁷² Some have suggested that monogamous marriage was a necessary compliment to private property, that it made possible the determination of a single heir. Private property had -- at most -- a secondary effect upon marriage. Our tribal ancestors invented rules for determining primary, secondary and tertiary spouses; and, until the advent of DNA analysis (and as an Irish myth suggests) no man -- primitive or modern -- could be certain of “his” child's paternity. The determination of paternity (or more precisely -- *the male's need to identify his offspring*) does and will probably continue to play a role in fostering monogamous sentiment and values *during the childbearing years*. Yet the fact that most of us expect our spouses to remain monogamous -- even after the childbearing years -- suffices to show that private property is not the motive force for monogamy.

amalgamated into “God” and “Devil.” Monotheism also had by-products. After revolutionizing their theory of life and the universe, our ancestors had to revolutionize their theories of creation. Henceforth, the world was no longer viewed as having been dredged from primeval waters by totem animals or created by divine councils or Mother Goddesses. The new western creator could only be the nameless, faceless, male “God.” In coming chapters, we’ll see why the details of the Book of Genesis were sketched out as they were. We’ll discover the new (and especially *western*) creation story, a subtle by-product of monotheism, to be another accidental curse of modern religion.

Modern religion’s great blessing was its abolition of blood sacrifice. But it accidentally created a monogamy born of near-neighbor alienation, a monogamy that, within savage, K and R society, can only be dysfunctional. (See v3-103-104 for the romantic problems of savage societies.) Dysfunctional monogamy condemns people to lives of misery, sexual frustration, confusion, homophobia and latent homosexuality. Although it can be credited with helping to establish paternity, designate heirs and accumulate capital, its designation of heirs also aggravated disparities in social and economic opportunity. As the quote at this chapter's top notes, affluence and the escape to the suburbs don’t cure the psychic impotence that usually follows childbirth.

Yet as soon as it caused women to recognize a single father, monogamy developed staying power. Despite the ever-worsening deterioration of marital and family life in our over-crowded, K and R world, barring a nuclear holocaust that returns the few survivors to a hunter-gatherer existence, suspending monogamy even temporarily will not be easy. The most easily realized form of mutual lordship and bondage, of romantic love, will be the monogamous, heterosexual pair that resemble each other and their opposite sex parents. This is the ideal for future, civilized generations whom we’ll rear in simplified and standardized, Stage II families; but monogamy cannot satisfy our homosexual and bisexual contemporaries. Moreover, a transitional 25-year moratorium on new births, a controlled population collapse, is needed to minimize the violence and trauma of the coming, inevitable population collapse. Such a moratorium will enable us to end homophobia and other prejudices, reduce the population to a reasonable level, create equal opportunity, educate the people and complete the spread of the world’s most simple trade and port language as the world language.

Marry the wrong person (as all of us do --Kurt Vonnegut), and you won’t be happy. New cars or bigger and better houses won’t do it for you. Money

only makes life easier. It's never made anyone happy. The "American Dream" -- which has the descendants of the unfortunate castaways to America always chasing one carrot after another, each one promising to bring happiness -- is a total and complete fraud. (US foreign policy aggregates these delusions!)

In the PRC or any society where K and R start to become controlled, computerized facial matchmaking could provide improved marriages even for the most mobile members of society (folks who don't stay in one place long enough to imprint and marry the one next door). We have super computers, and a face-matching program can be developed by adding 3 modules to facial recognition software. We could, right now, in our present, savage, K and R world, load a super computer with records, one for every single adult, describing faces per the distances between facial detection points and write a program enabling us to select the face that is the most subjectively-beautiful to any other face, a face-matching program.⁷³ (For heterosexuals, love is potentially very simple because the guy who looks the most like a gal's father will have a mother that looks like that gal.⁷⁴) This program could be used, immediately, to accelerate our transition to a civilized, sustainable and happy world. With probably less money than what the Peoples' Liberation Army or the American Military spends annually on cigarettes, we could also develop, and have globally in-place and ready for deployment by the end of a 25-year Transition Period, the Baby-Face Generating software needed to launch the Stage II system of marriage and child-rearing described in *Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution*, a system that will guarantee perfect love for everyone and turn our unhappy world into a paradise.

The full and revolutionary *Stage II*, program for marriage and child rearing can only be realized within a society that minimizes the K and R class struggle by maximizing equal opportunity and population control. *Stage II* is not an option for savage K and R society with every variety of family, three or four kinds of masks and six or seven common problems that make love and happy marriage all but impossible.

⁷³ If you think looks aren't most important for love, that we are not visual animals, compare the diameter of the optic nerves with that of the other sensory organ nerves!

⁷⁴ If $m=wf$, since $w=wf$ and $m=mm$, then by double substitution, $mm=w!$ This relationship, Huttner's Law, also shows why we were selected for having this yet-to-be-discovered, genetic mechanism that causes men to facially look like their mothers and women to facially look like their fathers. It makes love easier to find.

Unable to see the way out of the tunnel we're in, many people despair. They conclude that aggression and violence are invariable parts of "human nature." With a brief treatment of the subject, I'll convince you otherwise.

CHAPTER 8: AGGRESSION

*Admire, exult-despise-laugh, weep, -for here
There is much matter for all feeling: --Man!
Thou pendulum betwixt a smile and a tear.
--Byron, Childe Harold, Conto iv, st. 109*

Late in life, Freud solidified his views on aggression. He came up with the weird notion that there is an aggression or a “death instinct.” (Remember: “instinct” refers to a drive that arises regularly and automatically from within the organism.) As editor/translator James Strachey notes in the introduction to *Civilization and Its Discontents* (p. 8), Freud's problem here first appeared in 1905 when he defined sadism as “one of the component instincts” of the sexual instinct during the latter part of the oral stage. It would have been better to attribute the teat biting of babies to teething or frustration (the self-preservation instinct).

One can nevertheless find within Freud the correct view: “Impulses of aggressiveness, and hatred too, had from the first seemed to belong to the self-preservative instinct, and, since this was now subsumed under the *libido* [H *psychic energy that converts from interest to libido and vice versa*], no independent aggressive instinct was called for. And this was so despite the bipolarity [H *ambivalence*] of object-relations, of the frequent admixtures of love and hate and of the complex origin of hate itself” (Strachey, *Ibid.* p.8, citing “Instincts and Their Vicissitudes” [1915], St. Ed., 14, 138-9). To the credit of the industry, few of Freud's friends and colleagues bought his “death instinct.”

The modern and widely accepted view of animal aggression in general was expressed by sociobiologist E.O. Wilson (Wilson, p.248):

Aggression evolves not as a continuous biological process as the beat of the heart, but as a contingency plan. It is a set of complex responses of the animal's endocrine and nervous system, programmed to be summoned up in times of stress. Aggression is genetic in the sense...that its components have proved to have a high degree of heritability and are therefore subject to continuing evolution ... Aggression is also genetic in a second, looser sense, meaning that aggressive and submissive responses of some species are specialized, stereotyped and highly predictable in the presence of certain very general stimuli. The adaptive

significance of aggression, its ultimate causation and the environmental pressures that guide the natural selection of its genotypic variation, should be an object of analysis whenever aggressive or submissive components are discerned in any form of social behavior.

The proximate causes of the variation [*H in aggressive response*] ...are most easily understood when classified into two sets of factors. The first is the array of external environmental contingencies to which the animal must be prepared to respond, including encounters with strangers from outside the social group, competition for resources with other members of its own group and daily and seasonal changes in the physical environment ... The second set of stimuli is the internal adjustments through learning and endocrine change by which the animal's aggressive responses to the external environment are made more precise.

Of course, with respect to humanity as a whole and the “proximate causes of the variation (in aggression),” it is the first set of factors that we must learn to control. With respect to civilization, that set can be reduced to a single ultimate determinant: the competition for resources. There is no aggression for the sake of aggression or for the satisfaction of an innate “death” or “aggression instinct.”

Because Freud couldn't see the way out of our seemingly endless cycles of fraternal violence and self-hatred, he couldn't undo his own psychological repression and fully see just how extremely violent our ancestors have been. Failing to understand the Fraternal Complex and (as we shall see in Chapters 35 and the Conclusion) the class struggle that it generates and failing to understand how to minimize that complex and struggle, Freud's subsequent and despairing worldview encouraged his disparaging and exploitive attitude toward “patients.” Add to this despairing worldview Freud's insistence upon playing the Doctor and knowing everything and one might say that endless listening and fee collecting was his inevitable mode of operating.

Without knowing the way out for man, the full realization of our history of violence would have been unacceptably threatening to Freud's concept of man and himself and his hopes for our future.

By now, you reader/passengers have lifted much of your repression, repression that has prevented you from decoding the Deluge myths of your respective cultures. If you have not yet seen the light, hang in there. After a

brief discussion of two or three more subtopics, I'm sure that the light will turn on for you.

I promised to develop the “good or bad conscience” phenomenon into a replacement for the “heaven and hell” paradigm. Of course, “heaven” and “hell” are metaphorically true. To the extent that one’s superego is underdeveloped, one lives in constant fear of his genetic competitors. Life, for the hunted, is a living hell. To the extent that one has been privileged enough to acquire a superego, one cannot be a savage, cannot benefit himself at the expense of others, without developing an internal contradiction. To the extent that one has a superego but fails to distinguish between true and false, right and wrong, and to resolutely adopt and support the former over the latter, one internalizes the contradictions of savage society and becomes schizophrenic.

The Mr. Hyde in all of us is our tendency to hide the truth, to wear masks and accept lies when they conveniently excuse savagery. But internal contradictions cause self-doubt, stress, guilt and pain. Repressing one side of the contradiction leads only to guilt at a less conscious level. Rationalizing guilt with false philosophies that deny the humanity of our victims leads to alienation and isolation. All these states of mental anguish are the real fires of hell, hell on Earth and for the living. Without moral and behavioral reform, the only escape from hell is through alcoholism, drug use, self-mutilation and – ultimately -- suicide.

Heaven is a much more distant realm that only the luckiest and least masked of us savages are likely to catch glimpses of – when we truly love someone who truly loves us.

CHAPTER 9: CANNIBALISM

I never met a man I didn't like. -- Anonymous ancestor

CANNIBALISM 'ALA HUTTNER

It is true -- as William Arens maintains -- that Euro-centricity has been an ugly participant within the European and American anthropological tradition. Euro centricity is merely comical when it refuses to see the prehistory of human sacrifice at Stonehenge or tries to prove that *Homo* evolved in Europe, but it is criminal when it hides Black history or promotes racial prejudice.

Nevertheless, facts are stubborn things that should remain immune to political sensitivity, even the sensitivity of the most fragile peoples among us, peoples still very traumatized by our horrific prehistory or still undergoing the agricultural or industrial revolutions. (Modern anthropologists increasingly regard the agricultural "revolution" as having been protracted.) The first-hand observations of cannibalism or of skulls hanging from necklaces or mounted near the entrances of lodges and huts are too numerous within the classical and the recent literature to be denied. (Cf. Lewis: 73-75.)

Pick up any well-illustrated book dealing with physical anthropology, such as *Ancestors* by Johanson *et al.* or the text book by Robert Jurmain, Harry Nelson, and William A. Turnbaugh, (*Understanding Physical Anthropology and Archaeology*, 1987) and you will quickly learn that virtually all the skulls that predate the Neolithic (Stone Age agricultural period) are incomplete. The part most often missing is the thin flange of bone that surrounds the foramen magnum (the hole for the spinal cord at the base of the skull). Although it is true that wolves and hyenas have been observed gnawing into this area of skulls, buried bodies would not have been exposed to wild dogs. Neanderthal and *Homo sapiens* have been burying their dead for 100,000 to 125,000 years.⁷⁵ Yet almost all the skulls found that are between 10,000 and 125,000 years old are also broken -- usually around the foramen magnum, the skull area that shatters most easily.

Also, what about the modern instances of cannibalism? A.W.B. Simpson has written about the cases of cannibalism that have occurred over the last two hundred years at sea following shipwrecks. These cases are documented in British court archives and newspapers. And who could forget the

⁷⁵ Personal communication with William A. Turnbaugh

spectacular plane crash of the Uruguayan rugby team in the Andes in 1972? All the survivors admitted having resorted to cannibalism. Do the William Arenses deny these instances too? It is ridiculous to suggest that cannibalism *per se* is a mythical fabrication of alienated, Euro centric anthropologists. We need to study cannibalism not so that we can jokingly point fingers at each other's ancestors but so that we can better understand its whys and wherefores. By obtaining an overview of it, we will be able to better uncover our own prehistory and better understand, for example, our pre-Deluge ancestors or aboriginal Americans. Here's an attempt at just such an overview.

The richest Japanese industrialist, the angriest young man in the Bronx, the first Borneo native ever to encounter a European missionary, you and I all have one thing in common: we will do anything to survive. Our genes are not among the products of 3-4 billion years of natural selection due to descent from quitters.

To unfold our genetic potential and replace dying cells with new ones, our bodies produce up to 10,000 different proteins. Proteins are made from 21 different amino acids that must be brought together simultaneously, albeit in different sequences and proportions. Eight of these twenty-one are *essential amino acids*. Our bodies cannot make them. We must ingest them to make and replace the protein that our bodies need. We can obtain all eight from the flesh of other animals; or we can eat select combinations of vegetables that, ingested simultaneously and as the body needs them, will provide us with all eight that we need to make protein. An organism can cannibalize itself to undergo development or maintain a minimum of homeostasis but not without sacrificing abilities and survival worthiness.

For survival, many animals turn upon their own kind:

Cannibalism is commonplace in the social insects, where it serves as a means of conserving nutrients as well as a precise mechanism for regulating colony size. The colonies of all termite species so far investigated promptly eat their own dead and injured. Cannibalism is in fact so pervasive in termites that it can be said to be a way of life in these insects (Wilson, 1975: 84).

It is also true that the young of a few vertebrates kill and eat one another. Crowding in ambystomid salamanders induces cannibalism among the aquatic larvae. The winners grow at increased rates by consuming smaller larvae that would otherwise die from starvation or from the ill effects of overcrowding.

Consequently, at metamorphosis some individuals are larger and therefore better adapted to the land environment they enter because larger size provides a higher volume/surface ratio and greater resistance to desiccation (*Ibid.*: 85, quoting Gehlbach, 1971: 211).

Cannibalism has been documented in more than 1,300 species, from insects to mammals. (*Cf.* Crump: 46.) Crump found, in experiments with meadow tree frog tadpoles and mosquito fish, that cannibals grew larger, developed faster and had reproductive advantages over non-cannibals.

I am not pitching cannibalism as a form of population control. I can almost hear some of you objecting that there is such a thing as altruistic behavior, or at least there is behavior that has the immediate appearance of self-sacrifice in the service of a friend or close relation. You might argue further that altruism toward one's friend, when reciprocated, is selected behavior, that it becomes conditioned and that therefore one would not eat one's friend. You might also claim that, because blood relatives can be expected to have in common some proportion of their genes, one might sacrifice oneself for two full siblings or that one would be likely to do so for three full siblings. (*Cf.* Hardin, Garrett.)

For your sake, I'll qualify my argument: under the most adverse conditions, one cannibalizes first one's enemies, then strangers ...

"Wait," you say, "Women and children would tend to be eaten first and this would not be selective for the species as a whole."

To this I reply that all the evidence indicates that we did not undergo our phenomenal success story (population growth) until the agricultural revolution.⁷⁶ Before that time, nothing like a Wendy's salad bar existed anywhere in the world. One generally couldn't make protein from purely vegetable foods. *Rampant cannibalism was inevitable.*

Moreover, until the bow and arrow was *perfected* (no later than 35,000 years ago), hunting was an uncertain proposition. After the bow and arrow was first invented, large mammals tended to disappear quickly. Thus, in many Paleolithic situations, cannibalism was the only way for our ancestors to obtain protein. Worse still, if a neighboring tribe practiced cannibalism, your own tribe was forced to partake of the same reproductive and competitive advantage or face extinction.

⁷⁶ Until the permanent Neolithic starting between 8,000 and 7,000 BC, the world's human population probably was between 2 and 20 million (Cipolla p. 110).


However demeaning it may be to conclude that human beings are, under the most adverse circumstances, just so many pounds of protein to one another; that is exactly what it (pardon me I can't resist) -- boils down to. The emotional reactions from investigators, no matter how natural they are within a cultural context of continuous affluence, are *dishonest* and should not be confused with science. The conscious rationalizations of cannibals are secondary to their vital organic needs, and human cultures have been and continue to be quite creative in providing rationalizations when needed.

It follows, logically I believe, that wherever and whenever the following conditions all apply, human cannibalism is likely to occur:

1. When one can't hunt, fish or grow one's own protein,
2. When (in a market economy) one can't purchase protein,
3. When one can't steal protein,
4. And when one cannot depend upon one's fellows for assistance.

EARLY AMERICANS

Mass migrations of Asian peoples across the Bering Strait and into North America began 13,200 to 12,850 cal. ya. (*Calibrated* dates are adjusted for differences in the C¹⁴ content of the atmosphere at different times.) This was the Clovis Period, named after a prolific archaeology site near Clovis, New Mexico. It began when a corridor in the North American ice sheet opened for Amerindians to walk through. See Figure 2b. It shows pre-Clovis archaeological sites and all but the most obvious route to the Americas. We'll focus on this Period in Chapter 14. For now, note the following.



As previously unknown **and suppressed** evidence of earlier, Western Hemisphere occupation has become published, heated debate has developed within archaeology and anthropology as to who the pre-Clovis, aboriginal occupants were and where they came from.

Some of the experts believe that most if not all the pre-Clovis Americans also came through Beringia from Asia. The hope that they were the Iberian-Peninsula-based creators of the Solutrean tools has been thoroughly discredited. The most likely possibility, which I showed you in [Figure 1a](#), is still not even under consideration in North American academia! Your (Chapter 7) understanding of how distant-neighbor, pagan savagery differed from modern era savagery *combined with your understanding of cannibalism (this chapter)* will enable you (in Chapter 14) to determine whether the Pacific Rim or the African route is more realistic and likely to be correct.

Be that as it may, the event within the evolution of culture that did the most to eliminate cannibalism was the agricultural revolution (if it can be called a revolution).

CANNIBALISM 'ALA HARNER

Until Bill Turnbaugh told me otherwise, I had believed that, starting 10 kya, the agricultural revolution, wherever it had taken root, had eliminated cannibalism. As a first approximation, you'd think that agriculture would have made a war prisoner more valuable as a slave than as food. (*Slavery was, at its start, a progressive development!*) *It would follow that wherever slavery had replaced cannibalism, religion would adapt by eliminating the belief that one can incorporate the soul and the power of another person cannibalistically. No longer would heads be the taboo dwelling place of the soul. No longer would one seek to imbibe the dying breath of a powerful foe to capture with the soul his mana or power.*⁷⁷ This does seem to have happened in Mesopotamia, Egypt and Greece where, after the agricultural revolution, the soul was said to travel to the "underworld."

I had also thought that I was well acquainted with pre-conquest Mexico. I had a Mexican wife. I traveled there many times; I had read an *abridged* diary of Hernan Cortez and a recent, best-selling tome about the Aztecs; so, this seemed to be a reasonable assumption.⁷⁸ Fortunately, my friend, Professor Bill Turnbaugh, insisted that I become familiar with Michael Harner's work. Harner informs us that cannibalism and blood sacrifice had much more staying power than most of us want to believe. His case in point, Pre-conquest Mexico, was not the garden spot that most of us like to imagine.

I shall reproduce for you the guts of Mr. Harner's work on cannibalism. That many of Mr. Harner's findings are based on documents that are now almost 500 years old and that the revelations made in these documents are still unknown to the public -- even in Mexico -- testifies to the strength of human psychological resistance.

The long-term increase of human population has led to increased degradation of the plants and animals used for food. The extinction of many big-game mammals by the end of the European Paleolithic and by Paleo-Indians appearing in the New World (see Martin 1967, 1973; Mosimann and Martin 1975) is the first outstanding evidence of this human-caused environmental degradation. The evolution into the Old-World Mesolithic with its shift to marine resources and small-game hunting and the development of the New World cultural analogue

⁷⁷ Cf. Frazer: 235-52, 262-69, 344

⁷⁸ Perhaps I should have read Michael Harner's and Alfred Meyer's excellent novel, *Cannibal*, which is less dramatic but more authentic than its popular rival.

can be seen as continuing and necessary responses to such environmental degradation. The increased scarcity of wild game and food plants soon made the innovation of plant and animal domestication desirable and competitively efficient in several regions of the planet. With the passage of time and the further growth of human populations, more areas became similarly degraded; and plant and animal domestication necessarily became even more widely adopted, providing an increased proportion of the diet.

The need for intensified domesticated food production was especially felt early in such fertile, but environmentally circumscribed localities as the riverine valleys surrounded by less desirable terrain (Carneiro 1962, 1970). Under such circumstances, climate and environment permitting, plants always became domesticated, but herbivorous mammals apparently could not be unless appropriate species existed. The Valley of Mexico, with its fertile and well-watered bottomlands surrounded by mountains, fits well the environmental circumscription model. Population growth increased relatively steadily in this circumscribed area up to the Conquest.

In the Old World, the domestication of herbivorous mammals proceeded apace with the domestication of food plants. In the New World, however; the ancient hunters completely eliminated potential herbivorous mammalian domesticates from the Mesoamerican area... [T]he *Camelops* (e. g. llama and alpaca) species became extinct at least several thousand years before domesticated food production had to be undertaken seriously. Nor was the guinea pig available... [E]mphasis was on the domestication of wild fowl, such as the turkey, as well as the dog... The dog, however, being a carnivore, was not an efficient converter and additionally was a competitor with its breeders for animal protein.

As population pressure increased in the Valley of Mexico, wild game supplies were decreasingly available to provide protein for the diet (Vaillant 1966: 142 noting that "the deer were nearly all killed off" before the Aztec period). The seriousness of population pressure in general in the Valley during the time of the Aztecs has been discussed by many researchers (e. g. Vaillant 1966: 136-7). In terms of carbohydrate production, this challenge

was usually met by *chinampa* development and other forms of agricultural intensification; ... but domesticated animal production was limited by the lack of a suitable herbivore. This made the ecological situation of the Aztecs and their neighbors unique among the world's major civilizations... [*L*arge-scale cannibalism, disguised as sacrifice, was the natural consequence of this situation (Harner 1977: 118-119). [*H* Cannibalism simultaneously decreased the demand for and increased the supply of protein. Climate and geography accentuated the problem by continually promoting migration to the Basin of Mexico. Mexican religious ideology promoted cannibalism as the solution. We will return to this problem in Chapter 35. By that time, you will understand religion and our horrific prehistory much better than Mr. Harner did. You will know that the religious rationales for cannibalism, even in Mexico, were not just an excuse for cannibalism. They were a driving psychological motive as great as any other motive.]

Woodrow Borah, who is now possibly the leading authority on the demography of Central Mexico around the time of the Conquest, has given me permission to cite his new unpublished estimate of the number of persons sacrificed in Central Mexico in the fifteenth century; 250,000 *per* year, or equivalent to one percent of the total population. This quarter-million annual figure, according to Borah ... is consistent with the existence of thousands of temples throughout the triple Alliance alone and with the sacrifice of an estimated 1000 to 3000 persons at each temple *per* year. --*Ibid.* 119

Harner (1977) gives us six pages of convincing quotations from conquistadors Hernan Cortez and Bernal Diaz. Here are my favorites:

So, in return for our coming to treat them like brothers and tell them the commands of our lord God and the King, they were planning to kill us and eat our flesh and had already prepared the pots with salt and pepper and tomatoes (Diaz, 1963: 199).

I think that my readers must have heard enough of this tale of Cholula, and I wish that I were finished with it. But I cannot omit to mention the cages of stout wooden bars that we found in

the city, full of men and boys who were being fattened for the sacrifice at which their flesh would be eaten... (Diaz, 1963: 203).

Or for the Alfred Kroebers who insist upon eyewitness accounts ([Kroeber](#) expected the impossible of Freud.):

Moreover, every day they sacrificed before our eyes three, four, or five Indians whose hearts were offered to those idols and whose blood was plastered on the walls. The feet, arms and legs of their victims were cut off and eaten, just as we eat beef from the butchers in our country (Diaz 1963: 138).

And as for the extent of it:

I remember that in the square where some of their cues stood were many piles of human skulls, so neatly arranged that we could count them, and I reckoned them at more than a hundred thousand... We saw more of such things as we penetrated further inland. For the same custom was observed here and in the territory of Tlascalala [Tlaxcala] (Diaz, 1963: 138).

As population pressure grew, cannibalism became more frequent.⁷⁹ The lack of a large, domesticated herbivore within this climatically ideal but narrow, circumscribed strip of the continent where most primitive men wished to migrate resulted in an ever-burgeoning population problem. Mesoamericans adapted to it by maximizing the death rate, through continuous warfare, blood sacrifice and cannibalism. Blood sacrifice had always been the chief business of the pagan priesthood, and Mesoamerican priests met the challenge. These elite, ruling classes organized the whole of their societies for killing.

But contrary to the conventional image of the rigid class society, Mesoamerican civilizations had well-known roads for upward mobility. The selection of aspirants to the upper classes, the toleration of those on the bottom and defense from external enemies was all guaranteed by the same rules of cannibal etiquette: commoners were forbidden to eat human flesh unless they were invited to a nobleman's banquet or treated to dine on the war

⁷⁹ Population pressure, agricultural inadequacy and dietary deficiency also appear to be the underlying causes of isolated but still extent cannibalism in Papua New Guinea. See Harner, 1977: 128; Hallpike, 1977: 1-2, 202; and Knauff, 1985: 15, 17.

prisoner of a friend or relation. The host-cannibal, due to his captive taking, was elevated to nobleman status. One who took three prisoners in war was elevated to a still higher rank of nobility. (*Ibid.* 129-130)

Whenever the long-time Aztec minister of state, *Tlacaelel*, decided gods were hungry and in need of additional sacrifices, he called for a *flower war*, *Xochiyaoyotl*. These highly controlled flower wars occurred with neighboring rivals and between total wars of conquest. "All the battlefields were known, for each of the larger cities had set aside out on its borders a field that was used only for such agreed-upon confrontations. These fields were held to be especially sacred [H *one of the first treaty agreements*]." (Brundage: 205.) Attendance was purely voluntary but very effectively encouraged by the system of social rewards and punishments and the religious ideology.

The flower wars were allegedly prosecuted to produce sacrificial victims for the gods and maintain fighting skills. The production of food for cannibals was thought to be just a happy consequence. That hungry mouths and stomachs -- competitors for food -- were also being eliminated probably never occurred to the average Aztec in the street.

Are you shocked and mortified by this thinly disguised savagery? Don't be. Our own savagery is not much better disguised. Although we no longer eat the victims, the perpetual aims of war -- whether we are conscious of it or not -- are resource defense or acquisition and the elimination of surplus population. Modern men are influenced less by religion and more by nationalism (national religion, which we'll analyze in the Conclusion). Belief in both is essential to the denial of individual responsibility and continued savagery.

Certainly, the most powerful and influential savages would like to retain the Aztec flower wars, the designation of battlefields; for this would lessen the toll that modern warfare takes upon property. But were this to be done, even the most unfortunate, young and untutored would begin to fathom the real purposes of war and refuse to offer themselves as victims. So, the elite savages devised a new means of achieving flower war ends: they developed the neutron bomb. But the public disclosure of this weapon that topples people and leaves the buildings standing outraged people and became a source of embarrassment for the better classes. (Damn those public schools!) This assessment of the real purposes and necessity of war will become clearer in the Conclusion.

The insanity of the religious rationales for war will become still more transparent in coming chapters. Yet for the Aztecs, they were the equals of our own political disguises. Aztec religion, like all religion, had its deepest

roots in the “Deluge.” We are discussing cannibalism now mainly as a means of dismantling your resistance, as a means of preparing you psychologically for the realization of what the Deluge was. *You will discover that cannibalism and the Deluge are so intimately connected that it is impossible to fully understand the Aztec religion that promoted cannibalism (or cannibalism and sacrificial rites generally) without understanding what the Deluge symbolizes. The ambivalence felt toward the “Deluge” victims is the prehistoric model for the very similar ambivalence we feel toward our ongoing genetic competitors. Together they constitute what I call the Fraternal complex. The political aspect of the ongoing side is the K and R Class Struggle.*

Prior to writing version 25.6 of this work, I read Diego Durán’s other great work, “The History of the Indies of New Spain.” The censorship of this and his earlier, “Book of the Gods and Rites...,” by churchmen for roughly 400 years, is, in my opinion, one of the greatest crimes against humanity in the history of the world. Not only was Durán bilingual. He was bicultural too. He was an insightful genius, as Catholics go, comparable only to Paul. Born in Seville, c.1537, he acquired his “second teeth in Mexico.” His family was not notable but comfortable enough to have owned slaves. Any wise philosophers and historians that wrote the Indians’ codices and survived the 1520 massacre of 8,600 noblemen at the Templo Major, were in hiding. Durán couldn’t find any still alive. So, he became the undisputed expert on their culture.

*Although human sacrifice and cannibalism may have been motivated, early on, as Harner suggested above, by a need for protein; that was **not** the case in Aztec times. The Aztecs (the Mexica) were the last Chichimec people, nomadic hunter-gatherers from the north, to settle in the Basin. They had to fight for the right to settle on the most undesirable, snake-invested corner of the lake. For this, they paid tribute (payments of food and sacrificial victims) to the people of Azcapotzalco. Aztec women invented chinampa farming and marketed their produce to peoples surrounding the great lake. But as they grew richer, the King of Azcapotzalco twice increased the onerous tribute payments expected of them. Aztec leaders were wise enough to know that the culture permitted of only two national roles: hammers and nails. To become hammers, they had to outnumber their oppressors. So, they “continued to pay the same tribute for fifty years, keeping silent, pretending to be content and feigning obedience, while their numbers multiplied, while they became stronger.” (Durán: 57) As they threw the yoke off themselves and onto others, all their savagery was principally motivated – not by hunger but by raging Fraternal complexes -- by the desire to keep all other peoples numerically*

weak, divided and terrorized until they could be replaced by Aztecs. In cannibalizing other peoples and replacing them, asap, with their own exploding population; the Aztecs were doing exactly what our ancestors did to the victims of “the Deluge.” We will learn much more about the Aztecs in Chapter 35.

Although cannibalism lasted longer and assumed greater proportions in Mexico than in other parts of the world, we find references to it in every mythology. As we’ll see, the earliest, recently unearthed tablets of the Gilgamesh Epic contained a Flood story with explicit cannibalism references that later generations of Babylonian priests expunged. Greek mythology also preserves cannibal tales. Even the Egyptians, possessors of one of the earliest and grandest civilizations, have texts that make our hairs stand on end. Here are some passages from their earliest funerary records, the *Pyramid Texts* that were taken from the pyramid walls of King Wenis of the end of the 5th Dynasty and of the rulers of the 6th Dynasty (c. 2500 B.C.). Listen to these passages from Utterances 273-274, “The king hunts and eats the gods”:

As a god who lives on his fathers
And feeds on his mothers...
The King is the Bull of the sky,
Who conquers at will,
Who lives on the being of every god,
Who eats their entrails,
Even of those who come with their bodies full of magic
From the Island of Fire...
The King is one who eats men and lives on the gods,
--R.D. Faulkner’s translation of the ancient Pyramid Texts,
a small but characteristic sample, omitting some of his notes.

For a comprehensive record of cannibalism through colonial times, see Andree. For the incidence of it in East and Sub-Saharan Africa and blood-chilling accounts, see Gero.

I turned to the topic of cannibalism to better acquaint you with the cultural milieu of our ancestors at the Paleolithic boundary when the Deluge began.

By now, you should thoroughly understand that our primitive ancestors were not kind to strangers. The repressed, negative side of their ambivalent relationships, the guilt, obsessional fears and paranoia from the ongoing sides of their Oedipal and Fraternal Complexes, were attributed to the “demons”

and opportunely vented upon tribal neighbors. Moreover, surviving relatives of the Deluge victims were thought to be still at large. These “demons” were likely to appear in the form of anything or anyone who was unfamiliar or different. “For everything new is apt to excite awe and dread of the savage” (Frazer: 262).

The universal forms of neurosis were commonplace and intense among primitive men. Among strangers, neurotics were on their own psychological turf and therefore spontaneous and uninhibited. You wouldn't want to meet one of your Paleolithic ancestors in a dark alley. This is the personality profile and social setting that we must keep in mind as we proceed.

CHAPTER 10: MISCELLANEOUS MATERIAL EVIDENCE

Manifest sufferings... [H of religious cult members are traceable to some] ancient source of wrath: some terrible deed of the past has aroused still-active powers of destruction; spirits of ancestors, victims of murder, or someone deprived of proper burial is harassing the living.
-- Plato (*Phaedrus*)

HOMEOSTASIS

E. O. Wilson has observed that homeostasis applies not only to individuals but to groups and genes too. He defines group and genetic homeostasis as “the automatic resistance of evolving populations to selection that proceeds at a rate fast enough to make deep inroads into genetic variability” (Wilson: 11).

Freud was also interested in species change. He referred to the “feelings of superiority” that one species develops toward its inferior relative after a mutant population branches from its parent species. Wolves, for example, are bigger, stronger and smarter than dogs. Given the chance, a wolf will dispatch his inferior relative. Freud also observed that we despise our (or at least other peoples') feces. We also despise other animals -- even our best friend, the dog -- “whose dominant sense is that of smell” and who have “no horror of excrement” and are “not ashamed of sexual functions.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents*: 47) We repressed our sense of smell, said Freud, as we learned to stand erect and depend more on vision. He described this contempt for the archaic or inferior traits of other species as *organic repression*.


Since Freud's time it has been recognized that we probably started to repress our sense of smell and better-develop our vision when our prosimian ancestors first took to the trees. This was at least 100 million years (my) before the time, 3-5 million years ago (mya), when any of our ancestors stood erect. Nevertheless, Freud's point, that we despise our archaic past and any creature that reminds us of it, is well taken. It was this observation of Freud's that turned the light on in my mind, the light that illuminated “the Deluge.” Freud was ever so close to anticipating me. If the light hasn't gone on for you yet, perhaps it will as you read the next section.

THE BOW AND ARROW

The only clear developmental break in the European Paleolithic occurs around 35,000 ya with the appearance of the Upper-Paleolithic stone and bone technology. Prior to this date there is evidence of both continuity and great variation in assemblages and industries at all times since the earliest colonization of the continent. --*Prehistoric Europe* by Champion, Gamble, Shennan and Whittle, page 31


At the beginning of this Upper Paleolithic period, at least 50,000 years ago in Africa and the Mid-East and 35,000 years ago in Europe, our ancestors started punching blades from flint and chert. They learned to chip away at a flint core until it was in the shape of a cheesecake. Then, setting this core on top of another rock for support, they delivered a hard, perpendicular blow to one overhanging edge of the core with another rock that served as a punch or with two other rocks that served as hammer and punch. This new core-punching technique allowed them to produce blades such as those of Figure 2c, below. Figure 2c shows a small but representative sample of the Upper Paleolithic toolkit. Prior to this simple revolution in stone technology (and with at least one exception that we shall explore below), men had only been able to produce flakes such as those of Figure 3, below. Using one rock to chip off another produced these. Alternatively, a flat surface could be chipped at until a small plateau was created in the middle. This plateau could then be flaked off with a sharp glancing blow to one of its lower sides, producing the Levallois flake.

The new, Upper Paleolithic, enormously expanded toolkit included fine knives, burins (specialized scrapers, chisel-bladed graters used to score bone, ivory or antler), blade-like spearheads and notched blades used either as arrowheads or as spokeshaves embedded in the shafts of spears. (*Cf.* Jurmain, Nelson and Turnbaugh: 444-5.) Bone, antler and teeth began to be used for a variety of tools, weapons and ornaments. Heavy-duty tools of the late, Lower Paleolithic (*Mousterian*) type, hand-axes and choppers, disappeared completely. The spear-thrower had appeared at some time earlier. See Figure 4, below.



Most of the reliable dates that scientists derive for artifacts still come from carbon 14 dating. Carbon 14 dating relies on the following natural process: “cosmic radiation enters the earth's atmosphere, producing neutrons, which react with nitrogen to produce a radioactive isotope of carbon, Carbon 14. As the Carbon 14 is diffused around the earth, with the earth's rotation, it mixes with Carbon 12 and is absorbed by plants in their life process. It is then transferred to herbivorous animals that feed on plants and to carnivores that feed on herbivores. Thus, Carbon 14 and Carbon 12 are found in all living forms at a fixed ratio. When an organism dies, it no longer absorbs Carbon 14, which then decays at a constant rate to Nitrogen 14 (the beta particle). It takes 5370 years for half the amount of Carbon 14 to become Nitrogen 14.” (Cf. Jurmain, Nelson and Turnbaugh: 285.)

Figure 3: Examples of flake and blade tools from Bordes' typeological list from the lower and middle Paleolithic. Numbers refer to Albrecht's type list: (3) LeVallois point with prepared striking platform; (6) Mousterian point obtained by retouching LeVallois point; (17) Double-sided scraper whereon retouched edge is concave and the other convex; (23) Convex transverse side scraper; (30) Typical end scraper; (32) Typical burin; arrow points to position and number of facets; (38) Naturally backed knife. The cortex surface forms a naturally dull edge, characteristically curved; (43) Denticulate with continuous notches on one edge. After Bordes, Champion et al., courtesy of the authors, Academic Press and Presses du CNRS.



The Carbon 14 dating technique, discovered in the 1940s, has since been improved by calibrating the results against variability in plant intake of Carbon 14 in different periods as indicated by *dendrochronology*, the study of the tree rings, especially of bristlecone pine trees. Still the Carbon 14 dating technique has two serious limitations. First, it can only date organic materials. Dates for mineral and metal artifacts must be inferred by the stratigraphic context (by the dates for artifacts found nearby in what is believed to be the same substrate). The second limitation of Carbon 14 dating is its range of reliability. It extends only to 30-40 kya.

New absolute dating techniques, free of Carbon 14's limitations, are being developed; but some are still provisional. These include amino-acid racemization, electron-spin resonance, Uranium-series disequilibrium, archaeomagnetic (using Earth's magnetic field to date fireplaces), thermoluminescence (for fired minerals like pottery and bricks) and optically stimulated luminescence, OSL (for unfired minerals). OSL tells when an object was last exposed to sunlight and is good for a few hundred to several hundred thousand years. The physics for each of these methods is complex. (I'm not one to ask about it.)

Now, my friend Bill Turnbaugh and most of his professional colleagues are reluctant to admit that the bow and arrow existed prior to the appearance of barbed and tanged arrowheads. To my knowledge, the earliest barbed and tanged arrowheads (Figure 4, for example) are from eastern Spain and the Solutrean industry of 18 kya (Champion *et al.*: 39;




Figure 4: barbed and tanged points are points like the one fitted to this foreshaft. Foreshafts were seldom more than five inches long and were often friction fitted like this one. Sinew was wrapped around the dart socket to prevent splitting. Both tangential and radial feathering (fletching) were used. Tangential was probably invented first. (After Hamilton and the Missouri Archeological Society)

citing Davidson). This barbed and tanged artifact is the simplest type that archaeologists unanimously identify as an arrowhead. *But I'm sure that this design is an advanced arrowhead that had several precursors.*

First, let's back up a bit. The debate over the date for the appearance of the bow and arrow is one of the longest-running debates among archaeologists. Many attempts have been made to place the bow and arrow before 18 kya. The debate surrounding these attempts remains very much as Tom Prideaux described it in 1979:

There is no clear-cut archaeological evidence that he [*H Cro-Magnon, or early Homo sapiens, the first men who were physiologically indistinguishable from people today*] used such a weapon until, at best, the very end of his period of dominance. Since bows are normally made of wood and sinew or gut, it would be a lucky accident indeed if any had survived the last ice age. A couple of bows have been uncovered in Denmark that date back approximately 8,000 years, and a large number of stone-tipped wooden arrow shafts, perhaps 10,000 years old, have been found in camps of reindeer hunters in northern Germany. In a cave in La Columbiere, in France, there have been found small stones, possibly over 20,000 years old, with pictures scratched on them that may represent feathered projectiles; whether they were arrows or dart-like spears, however, is uncertain.

It is clear though, that Cro-Magnon man had the wit and ingenuity to invent the bow. He knew that saplings bend under tension and spring back when released...

So, Cro-Magnon, like modern Eskimos, devised snares for trapping animals. Our Blackfoot (North American) ancestors seemed to concur that the snare inspired the bow:

A long time ago, very far back, before any of these things happened, or these stories had been told, there was a man who had a wife and two children. This man had no arrows nor bow and no way to kill food for his family. They lived on roots and berries. One night he had a dream, and the dream told him that if he would go out and get one of the large *spider-webs*, such as hang in the brush and would take it and hang it on the trail of the animals where they passed, he would be helped and would get plenty of food. He did this and used to go to the place in the morning and find that the animals had stepped in this web, and their legs were tangled in it, and they would make no effort to get out. He would kill the animals with his stone axe and would haul the meat to camp with the dog travois. -- *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, vol. 6, p. 44-47 or Hardin, Terri: 229.

Did spiders inspire the first snares and ropes? Who knows, but let's not interrupt an expert with this folklore that established science rejects as worthless. Please continue Mr. Prideaux:

[H]e had leather thongs and almost certainly knew that dried animal gut and sinew made a strong and flexible cord. Believing this, many archaeologists today are convinced that some Cro-Magnon hunters did indeed use the bow before 10,000 B.C., [*H before 20,000 B.C.*] despite the lack of physical proof...

He also had the fire drill, which made use of an instrument that was a miniature replica of the bow.


Certainly, the bow would have given Cro-Magnon an enormous advantage when hunting. The spear thrower [*Figure 5, below*], no matter how valuable an aid, required him to break cover and stand out in the open where his prey could spot him; an unsuccessful launch would have scared off the target. But with the bow, he could remain hidden. If he missed with his first arrow, he could shoot again and again. Moreover, the arrow was swifter than the

spear -- and its striking power was greater over a longer distance. And it could be shot at running prey, as well as at any variety of animals big and small, including birds on the wing, with a better chance of hitting them. --Tom Prideaux:

77

As shown here, the spear further evolved into the dart and foreshaft, the latter fitted with a stone or bone point. The atlatl butt is "u" shaped at its end so as to fit into a socket in the dart.

Figure 5: The Spear-thrower or Atlatl



The reluctance of professionals to jump to hasty and possibly misleading conclusions is commendable. But the mythological record on the bow and arrow decodes very uniformly *all over the world*. As you will see, it tells us that our immediate ancestors were ashamed of the bow and arrow because of the historic use to which it had been put. Knowing this required me to take a closer look at the archaeological record. Having done so, I think I can convince you that this weapon was inextricably bound up with the revolution in tool technology c. (circa) 50-35 kya.

First and most obviously, the barbed and tanged arrowheads of 18 kya predate western European agriculture by about 10 ky. They are thin enough to have been fitted to notched arrow shafts that (if like those used until recently by the North Americans) were rarely more than 3/16" in diameter (Hamilton: 26). Is it conceivable that so much artisanship and labor would have been invested in such exquisite masterpieces if archers of the time had not possessed the laminated bow? In the temperate zone, where powerful plant toxins for the poison tipping of arrows do not exist, only bows of great power and flexibility (i. e. laminated bows) are effective. Only these can reliably cast an arrow a great distance and still penetrate the rib cage of a large mammal. Unlaminated bows break easily, but laminated bows consistently cast 200 yards or more (Cf. Holm in Hamilton: 116.). *Time out for a minute! Do you see anything significant about the length of the expected cast of the horn bow? You will.*

Incidentally, fletching (feathering) only helps casts of over 50 feet and therefore is not of benefit to the dart. The fletching acts as a rudder

or drag to keep the rear end of the shaft from catching up to the front. (Hamilton, citing Hill: 41)

The first material used successfully for a laminate would have been the tough, flexible covering of the horn of the mountain sheep or Alpine ibex. (See the article by Bill Holm, in Hamilton, for a detailed description of how the Indians used horn and sinew laminates.) The tough, inner pulp of the horn had to be gouged out and the horn's outer covering scraped free of it. Bill Holm made his glue by boiling buffalo hide scrapings or salmon skin in water. Primitive men probably learned to boil the pulverized or finely cut up pieces of the inner part of the horn for glue. This material is like that of horses' hooves, a traditional source of manufactured glue. In *Irish Mythology: Passageway to Pre-history*, the supplement to this work, I show you an Irish myth that decodes to suggest this lamination process for bow making.

The production of laminated bows (which is implied by the barbed and tanged points of 18 kya) involves many processes for which there would have been no other Paleolithic application. A major revolution in tools is implied. The only major revolution was c.50-35 kya.

As Hamilton noticed, perhaps the most important thing to realize about the bow is that it evolved as a modification of the much older and traditional dart and throwing stick, the *atlatl*, the spear and spear thrower of [Figure 5](#). Hamilton tells us that the North Americans often used reeds as darts, strengthening the ends of the reed by wrapping them with cord. Twisting long strands of sinew together made cords and bowstrings.

As others have said, the plain, pointed wooden shaft was eventually divided into a shaft and foreshaft. The foreshaft was always made of wood. The shaft that fits into or over the foreshaft was usually friction-fitted and could be of cane, heavy reed or wood. The next stage in the development of the throwing stick was the similar subdivision of the foreshaft into shaft and point. When the North Americans did use points on their arrow and dart shafts, about half the time, they made them from flint, chert, antler, bone, copper and wood (Hamilton: 26). *The inventors of the shaft point would have made a male-female, pressure-fitted connection like the earlier one of the foreshaft and shaft because everything we do tends to become habit.*⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Do you know why our taxi engine is in the front of the car? Because that's where the horse used to be.

This connection had the advantage of permitting the delivery device to fall away from the prey, which might otherwise fall upon it or carry it away. Not only was this male-female, pressure-fitted connection economical, it helped the thrower to develop accuracy by using the same weapon, day after day.

Now, the arrow was, initially, just the elongated foreshaft of the throwing stick, the shaft (or dart) and thrower having been replaced by the bow to increase the cast. *When the first arrowheads came into being, they too would have been made to make male-female, pressure-fitted connection with the shaft --just like the previous connections for the dart, the foreshaft and the dart point.* Of course, there is no possibility of finding wooden bows and arrow shafts from 50-35 kya. The earliest, hard-won horn laminates may have been too precious to bury and could have been re-used when bows broke. Nor would horn or even points and other fine instruments of bone preserve for tens of thousands of years. Even the bone grave goods of the Bronze Age that were found at Wessex are very badly deteriorated. (See Burgess: 105.)

Look again at [Figure 2c](#). Assuming for the moment that the first arrowheads were not barbed and tanged, do you see any artifacts in this early Upper Paleolithic toolkit that may have been male-female, pressure-fitted arrowheads? How about the left-hand members of “(a)” and “(b)” and “(c)”, “(d)” and “(k)”? Especially likely to be arrowheads are (d) and (k)!

Certainty about the function of Stone Age tools cannot be obtained until scientists have produced replicas of them, put the replicas to the suspected use and then compared the microscopic wear on the replica with the wear on the original. But before any of this can be done, archaeologists must first recognize a stone as an artifact and then imagine its possible uses.

While stopping short of assigning the bow and arrow’s birth to the Paleolithic boundary, Champion *et al.* were aware of the possibilities: “While stone projectile points are known from the earlier period, the upper Paleolithic is remarkable for the range and diversity of such tools... Their size is such that many could have formed the tips and barbs for arrows” (Champion *et al.*: 39). One would almost have to say that points such as “(f)” in [Figure 2c](#) are too thin to be anything but arrowheads. Moreover, H.J. Deacon reports that there is now ethnographic evidence for the hafting of backed tools for use as

arrowheads.⁸¹ “Among the modern San, projectiles are male artifacts; and a recent study by Wiessner (1983) shows that the style of hafting can define high levels of social and linguistic identity...” (Deacon in Mellars and Stringer: 560).



Figure 6: Very thin, untanged and unbarbed points such as these are usually attributed to the Upper Paleolithic. These were found at the lowest level of the open site of Kostienki I, on the Don River in Russia. After Champion et. al. and the journal, "Archiologicky Ustav," Brno, Czechoslovakia.

This identification of aboriginal people with their arrow designs had been described earlier, “The Cheyenne identified themselves by drawing the right index finger across the left one several times, a gesture that was misinterpreted to mean cut fingers but that really meant ‘striped arrows,’ alluding to their preference for turkey feathers as arrow-wings” (Peyer: 25). Remember this. It will be import in Appendix H.

Of course, this hafting of untanged, unnotched and unbarbed points supports my claim that the early Upper Paleolithic points such as in Figure 6, above, were indeed arrowheads. The tendency of primitive peoples to identify with their arrows is one of the reasons why improved arrowhead technology (e. g. barbs and points) was slow to be adopted.

Moreover, all of us, primitives and archaeologists alike, tend to see only what we look for: “Recent excavations by Bouvier (1977) have shown how the small size of some of the stone tools requires careful recovery. Small backed bladelets formed a dominant part of the various assemblages in the site and these are so small that some 8000 can be fitted into a liter bottle. At the Magdalenian site of Petersfels, in southern Germany, a recent excavation by Albrecht (1979) of the spoil tips from the earlier digs of Peters (1930) showed that some 95% of all the smaller tools had been missed”⁸² (Champion *et al.*: 56).

Let’s examine some of these small tools. Most tools became dramatically smaller throughout the Upper Paleolithic, probably

⁸¹ Hafting is the process of attaching an artifact to a handle or shaft.

⁸² *Magdalenian* refers to a late Upper Paleolithic industry such as that excavated at an ultra-prolific site on the Vézère River in the Dordogne region of France. Many thousands of tools have been discovered there, indicating that it was the site of a Paleolithic factory of some sort.

because hafting techniques were improved and popularized. Look again at the Upper Paleolithic toolkit, [Figure 2c](#), as I speculate as to the uses of some of these other tools. The various flat-sided scrapers could have been used to plane the bow, other than in the middle where it is gripped. Bladelets “(l)”, “(i)” and “(o)” may have been the most critical tools of all. If I'm not mistaken, they were used as hand-turned drill bits to start either side of the hole that is in a *baton de commandement*, “walking stick” or “perforated baton.” See Figure 7. Artifacts like this one have been found

in abundance in the Dordogne and elsewhere at sites that date to the Paleolithic boundary. In Helsinki, in the Finnish natural history museum, I saw many that were shaped like kayaks. The shapes and etchings vary greatly. What they all have in common is the holes in the thicker part of the antler. Some have holes of different sizes. An unusual one from Le Souci has a row of eight holes of different sizes (See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B%C3%A2ton_de_commandement.)

Figure 7: "Baton de commandement," "walking stick" or "arrow straightener" depending upon the speaker's guess as to the intended function. (It's a bark and



**stem stripper for the
sapplings that were
to become arrows.)
Photo by the late
Jean Vertut.**

Although there has been much and varied speculation as to their purpose, the above facts leave little doubt that this artifact (Figure 7) was a tool for stripping the bark and little stumps from the water-soaked seedlings and branches that were to become arrow shafts. The shafts were made round by this process, so holes of different sizes were needed and drilled. They had to be drilled precisely. (Or at least the hole had to be started very precisely on either side of the antler. The innermost core of the hole-to-be could then be punched out and a tool such as [Figure 2c](#)'s “(m)” or “(n)” could be used to pare away the rough edges at the center of the hole.) The old triangular flakes of the Lower Paleolithic type could only have been used to make a tapered hole in the antler. An antler that was gouged in this manner --instead of drilled-- could not be used to shave thin strips from a seedling. If [Figure 2c](#)'s “(l)”, “(i)” and “(o)” are indeed primitive drill bits, then this would explain why they are found in such great quantities at La

Magdelein and elsewhere. The cutting end would quickly become blunt with use and had to be retouched repeatedly. Retouching caused them eventually to either break or become too short to turn between the fingers. Antler was the ideal material for the baton because it is soft when wet and hard like wild animal bone when dry. Flutes are grooves winding around the bit starting from the front side of the cutting edge. Primitive drill bits did not need flutes because they were turned by hand and shavings could be shaken or blown out of the hole.

The split-based bone and antler points, the right-hand members of “(a)” and “(b)” in [Figure 2c](#) were apparently used for piercing hides, ornaments, sea shells and animal teeth that were made into beads and pendants. From long over-looked and unpublished data, White reveals that tremendous amounts of these ornaments and others made from mammoth ivory have been found at the earliest levels of the Upper Paleolithic in France and Germany. Large numbers of the split-based antler points are associated with these beads and appear to have been used to pressure-pierce the shells and the gouged-out roots of teeth. (*Cf.* White, in Mellars and Stringer: 370, 378, 383.)

White's article includes a picture of beads made from mammoth ivory that are obviously and precisely bored with the “drill bits” that I described above. But the most impressive evidence I've seen of our ancestors' technical prowess at the Paleolithic boundary is mentioned almost casually by White: at least three batons have been found in boundary strata that appear to have been *threaded*! (See White: 373.) While I've yet to see a photo of one of these, White assured me via a phone call that he had indeed found three of them in France. If true, my guess is that these were used to score the bark of water-soaked branches and seedlings. No craftsman would even conceive of threading until after he had mastered the art of boring.

This scenario that identifies most of the new Upper Paleolithic tools with bow and arrow making, also suggests explanations for two other mysteries that surround these tools. Look at the knife, “(j)” of [Figure 2c](#). This curved knife with a thick back is the hallmark of the *Chatelperronian* industry. The *Chatelperronian* was an industry that arose mostly in France and Spain (with one or two sites elsewhere) and that embodied fewer tools than the widespread *Aurignacian* industry and many tools that were common in the Middle-Paleolithic (or Mousterian industry). The *Chatelperronian* was everywhere replaced by the more sophisticated Aurignacian, which did not have a curved knife. I suspect that this knife was used to gouge out the pulp of the

mountain sheep's or Alpine ibex's horn that was the first material used as laminate. Bows laminated with horn are greatly inferior to bows laminated with sinew. The horn bow is heavier and less flexible and apparently little, if any, stronger. But the sinew, which is embedded between coats of glue and layered along the outside length of the bow, is a much subtler innovation that would have been conceived only as a result -- probably an accidental result -- of working with horn and glue. (Horn resists compression; sinew resists stretching. They're applied to opposite sides of the bow.)

The inventors of the first laminated bows, horn bows, lost their need for and quit making *Chatelperronian* knives once they learned how to laminate bows with sinew. Peoples who were introduced to the bow by other peoples would, in most cases, never have experienced the horn laminate or the *Chatelperronian* industry; and most people apparently never did.

J.D. Clark presents what appears to be another mystery: "A phenomenon that was apparent throughout the continent [*H of Africa*] 100 kya or more is the appearance of blade technology. Blades were sometimes present with the *Acheulian* [*H uniformly big, simple, heavy, pre-Mousterian tools of the Lower Paleolithic*] and form small but significant components of the Evolved Acheulian of Morocco." (Clark, in Mellars and Stringer: 571.) But these blade industries disappeared 80-75 kya only to reappear some 35 ky later (Clark: 574). In previous versions of this work, I tried to explain this disappearance and reappearance in terms of the tools themselves and their uses. These attempts were overly speculative and probably incorrect. But Clark's dates are very important. These dates and our developing understanding of "Deluge" politics will give rise to a general outline of the African tool-making industry in the next chapter.

Archaeologists believe that the world's earliest cave and rock drawings date to the Upper Paleolithic boundary. They coincided with the revolutionary, new tool kits. Wavy lines and finger impressions placed close together to look like snakes began to show up all over the world at this time, 40-50 kya in Africa and the Middle East, 30-42 kya in Australia and 30 kya in Western Europe (Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 299-300). The principal locations for primitive art are the caves of Western Europe (200 or 85% of them being in France and Spain), the Drakensburg Mountains of South Africa and --most important of all--Australia. As we'll see in Appendix B, one of the most primitive Australian sites clearly depicts the bow and arrow. Of these, a few

caves in Spain and France have received the most attention due to their beautiful likenesses of Pleistocene mammals. These date to 20-12 kya. Some of these Upper Paleolithic sites in the Dordogne region of southern France contain paintings showing “darts” that may be arrows. “In the vast, multi-chambered hunting-age sanctuary of Lascaux-- which has been termed ‘the Sistine Chapel of the Paleolithic’-- ...some animals are shown with darts in their side...” (Campbell, 1959: 300-305). In the late Count Henri Begouen’s caves at Montesquieu-Avantes (Ariege) in the Pyrenees, “one sees darts everywhere, flying at the game” (Campbell, 1959: 308; quoting Kühn, Herbert: 91- 94).

It is likely that these missiles have been assumed to be darts due to the absence of bows and bowmen within the paintings. Note too, with respect to these “darts,” that *projectiles that are closely grouped in flight are much more likely to be arrows than darts because archers can fire from within much closer ranks than are dart-throwers.*

In any case, one would not expect to find our Paleolithic ancestors making straightforward references to their bows and arrows, be it in myth or visual art. If renegade minorities had dared to depict such scenes, they eventually would have been discovered and destroyed by the outraged majority of our ancestors. The reason for this, as I mentioned at the top of this section and as later inquiry will confirm, is that the weapon is intimately connected with our ancestors’ and our own neurosis. It was the weapon used to kill the victims of the Deluge. The bow and arrow contracted all the same ambivalence that was felt toward those ancestor/victims. It became a *sacred* object. This sacredness also explains -- far better than the identification of primitive men with their arrows -- the lethargy of Upper Paleolithic men in applying hafting technology to the sacred arrow. Even the baton, because of its contact with the arrow, had apparently become sacred. White and others report excavations of batons that were collectively buried in spots isolated and apart from the other “profane” artifacts. (White: 370-) Among the Irish, the very name for the weapon, the Gaelic name, became taboo. (See v3-270 to 271.)

Here’s a quote that should leave you with no doubt that the bow and arrow was the decisive Deluge weapon. We noted that Jeremiah Curtin did not live long enough to obtain the archaeological data and the psychoanalytic tools with which we are working. Yet the man's intuitive understanding of religion and the myths that he interpreted and collected from around the world appears to have been virtually flawless:

There is no more interesting fact than this in myth tales, that no matter how good the hero, he must have the right weapon. Often there is only one spear or sword, in the world with which a certain deed can be done. The hero must have that weapon or fail. --Curtin, 1894: 554-555

Curtin *unconsciously* knew the role that the bow and arrow had played in our prehistory. He was very familiar with primitive mythology from all over the world. As you'll see, it is all very much alike.

As for myself, I suspect that I could easily compile a 200-page book containing nothing but mythological material that psychoanalyzes to identify the bow and arrow as the weapon used to murder the Deluge victims. You're going to see an enormous amount of this material before our journey is over. For now, consider the following.

Consider a Cheyenne myth about a malicious medicine man in *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, vol. 13, p. 177-179 or Hardin, Terri: 240-42. It describes how this powerful man exploits numerous husbands of his beautiful daughter and then kills them one after another before any of the marriages can be consummated. This medicine man is perpetually over-supplied with buffalo meat because he supervises the profitable operation of his own cottage industry -- bow and arrow making. The partnership formed by one of the sons-in-law with the animal people to kill this bow and arrow tycoon and the method by which he is destroyed clearly reveal some of the most important aspects of the Deluge.

Yet for our present purposes, it is a minor detail of this myth that is most important: "The first morning he sent his son-in-law out *to cut arrows*. He told him that if he brought no smooth, straight sticks, he need not come back [*H emphasis mine*]." As I suggested, the first arrows were not chiseled from tree trunks and limbs. They were cut saplings or reeds; and during the Deluge, when arrows were in great demand, many of these were stripped of their bark, planed or made round with tools like the *baton de commandement* of [Figure 7](#).

A Blackfoot myth, "More Bands and Dances" (Hardin, Terri: 163-6), tells of how the Indians were starving at a time long ago when the buffalo had not been seen and the smaller game was all but exhausted. They are saved from starvation by a "strange Person" who leads a delegation of *seven* of them to the camp of the animal people who give

them food, skins and teach them their various totem dances. But before the stranger leads them to the animal peoples' camp and their salvation, he says, "Now, one thing I caution you about. In this be careful. If you should find an arrow lying about, in the *pis'kun* [*H area at the base of a cliff or within an enclosure toward which buffalo were stampeded*], or outside, no matter where, do not touch it; neither you, nor your wives nor children." Later the story says, "The new-comers went to the *pis'kun* for meat, and one of the children found an arrow lying on the ground. It was a beautiful arrow, the stone point long and sharp and the shaft round and straight. All around the people were busy; no one was looking. The boy picked up the arrow and hid it under his robe. Then there was a fearful noise. All the animals howled and growled and ran toward him. But the chief Wolf said: "Hold! We will let him go this time; for he is young yet and not of good sense." So, they let him go.

Even today, we have some very obsessive vegetarians among us, but a myth this obsessive certainly indicates more guilt than what could have been felt toward non-human animals alone.

When you confirm who the Deluge victims were and discover that "animal people" refers mostly to them, will the above myth leave you with any doubt as to the weapon that won "the Deluge"?

You who haven't confirmed my interpretation of the Deluge will do so as you read the next section. You are about to discover man's oldest, biggest and best-kept secret.

HOMO ERECTUS, THE PARENT WHO DISAPPEARED

It has long been believed that about 15 mya (million years ago), changes in Antarctic Ocean currents caused the belt of tropic forest that covered most of Africa to contract (Pfeiffer). In 1994, soil analyses in the Kenyan part of the Great Rift Valley (running from Israel to Mozambique) caused paleontologists to dispute this plausible-sounding theory. They are again wondering why some of the great apes that lived on the margins of the forest came down out of the trees and onto the savannah in search of food (Wilford, 1994a). Yet come out they did.

These apes already had developed semi-erect posture and stereoscopic binocular vision while they were still tree-born. These abilities enabled them to jump from branch to branch and to grab and eat their prey with forelimbs that were well on their way to becoming hands. (*Cf.* Johanson and Mailand: 316.) Some of these apes were probably ancestral to both us and today's chimpanzees. In fact, studies

comparing the allergic reaction of the genes of different species to rabbit albumen suggest that chimpanzee DNA is 98.8% identical to human DNA (Sarich and A. C. Wilson).⁸³

Once out of the trees, those that were to become our ancestors had to evolve rapidly to adapt to the African plain. Food was scarce. One had to travel to get it. Their protein would have come entirely from large animal (including hominid) sources; and large animals, being toward the top of the food chain, are relatively few. Sex, the female's continuous receptivity for it, enabled these ancestors to overcome this problem. By strengthening the male-female bond, sex encouraged male hunters, who had to travel ever-further over the savannah in pursuit of protein, to return to their lactating consorts and helpless, nursing infants with food.

Over the course of their first eleven m.y. on the ground, there appeared among these more adventuresome apes *Australopithecus afarensis*, discovered by Don Johanson and Tim White. Johanson believes that *Afarensis* is one of the more advanced of five species (two of them gracile) in the *Australopithecine* genus of early, bipedal apes. In 1974, near Hadar, Ethiopia, Johanson and White found "Lucy," an almost complete *Afarensis* skeleton. Until 1994, the most primitive *Australopithecine*, and the only gracile one, had been the very first one discovered. South African anatomy teacher Raymond Dart named this hominid, *Australopithecus africanus*. In 1924, Dart was brought an almost complete skull of a child found by miners. Twelve years later, a retired South African doctor, Robert Broom, similarly obtained a very different variant of these most primitive, upright apes. Broom's *Australopithecus robustus* had the massive jaws and teeth of a vegetarian. One of these *Australopithecines* or an even earlier and more primitive species may have been our great grandparent species and our first bipedal ancestor. Another *Australopithecine* was discovered in 1994 by another Tim White expedition and tentatively named *Australopithecus ramidus*.

The next erect species (or, as some paleoanthropologists would argue, genus) may very well be that of our grandparent species, *Homo habilis*. Louis and Mary Leakey and their son Jonathan first discovered *Homo habilis* in 1960 at Olduvai Gorge in the northern Tanzanian

⁸³ In 2003, Wayne State University researchers compared 97 functional genes in six species. They concluded that 99.4% of the important gene sites and 98.4% of the much less important sites were (are) the same in chimps and humans. Other studies have since found crucial differences in the genetic software of the two species.

portion of the Great Rift Valley. The team of another Leakey son, Richard, discovered an abundance of similar fossils at Koobi Fora, east of Lake Turkana in Kenya. *Habilis* means “handy man.” He was so-named by Louis Leakey and others because these sites are loaded with flakes of stone, rough-edged cobbles and broken animal bones, which are the earliest known tools. Whereas the *Australopithecine* fossils date from 3.8 to 3.0 mya (million years ago) and have a cranial capacity of 380-530 cc, *Homo habilis* fossils date from 3 to 2.5 mya and have a cranial capacity averaging 650 cc.

Since bipedalism is so distinctively human, it is generally considered to be the trait that qualifies these apes for *hominid* (human-like) status. The taxonomy of hominids that have been extinct for ages and for which there are few if any complete skeletal specimen is, of course, a very hypothetical business. Paleoanthropologists are labeled as either *splitters* or *lumpers* according to their taxonomic predilections. I adopted Johanson’s lumper tendency for three reasons. First, it’s expeditious. The other two reasons are ones that we will consider below.

Now, both lumpers and splitters agree that since bipedalism makes running and blood circulation more difficult, it had to offer other advantages to these earliest hominids. The main advantage was that it liberated the arms for specialized labor (Darwin, 1871: i141), e. g. carrying food back to lactating females and infants with large and post-natal-developing brains. Yet to be truly sovereign on the savannah, to wander far from riparian (water-adjacent) forests and not need the trees for refuge from large carnivores, the liberated arms’ upper body musculature had to be capable of efficiently using the club (Darwin, 1871: i141). Both these tasks were important milestones in the success story of our ancestors. The latter task had to await the development of the prehensile thumb (Engels, Friedrich, 1876). Randall L. Susman, an anatomist at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, has recently reported that only the last survivor of the upright-walking *Australopithecines* did indeed have a thumb capable of tool making and club-wielding. This was *Australopithecus robustus* --also known as *Paranthropus robustus* because he is thought to constitute a branch that was parallel to the human line. (Wilford, Sept., 1994b)⁸⁴ Like the other

⁸⁴ Soon after the release of Susman’s finding, a Rutgers University team turned up flaked stone tools of the most primitive type. These tools for scraping and cutting predate the earliest (2 m.y.o.) *Homo habilis* fossils. These *Oldowan* tools were found near the Gona River in Ethiopia, are currently the oldest and date from 2.5 to 2.6 m.y.

Australopithecines, *Robustus*' skull was much more ape-like than the rest of his body. According to Susman, *Robustus* was --like our grandparent species, *Homo habilis* --a toolmaker. Their toolmaking and club-wielding thumbs differed from the earlier thumb of other *Australopithecines* and modern chimpanzees. The essential difference is in the first pollical metacarpal (which is embedded in the palm). The first pollical metacarpal of the distinctly hominid, tool making, prehensile (*club-wielding*) thumb is robust enough to provide attachment points for three extra muscles. Since *Robustus* became extinct only 900,000 years ago, this toolmaker coexisted with at least two other toolmakers. One was *Homo habilis* (thought to be our grandparent species). The other was *Homo erectus* (our parent species). This coexistence of toolmakers does *not* contradict the long-held belief that such coexistence was not possible. It only modifies it. None of the pre-*Homo erectus* hominids were secure atop Earth's food chain, and it probably took *Homo erectus* longer than one might expect to acquire the skills, social organization and population needed to eliminate competitors and become globally secure atop Earth's food chain.

Homo erectus did have plenty going for him. He had all the elements of a *positive feedback loop* that ultimately resulted in the tools, culture and cranial capacity similar to that of early modern *Homo sapiens*. Several elements are included in this loop, wherein every element tends to grow in response to the growth of any one element. They are tools, cranial capacity, meat-eating, linguistic communication, continuous sexuality and complex cooperation. (Meat supplied the protein for brain growth and development [Shipman, 1988]. Continuous sexuality means without annual or biannual estrous cycles for the female and with plastic facial expression and the frontal display of genitals -- also made possible by bipedalism. Complex cooperation means with learned as opposed to only instinctual behavior. This positive-feedback loop explains the sharp upturn of the curve of cranial capacity in what is believed to be the human line. See Figure 8. Hominid evolution, the dominant force within our competitive ecosystem, has tended to be continuous with respect to this loop, with continuous, competitive survival pressure producing intermittent or punctuated, qualitative changes in social and physiological

by argon isotope analysis (Wilford, 1995a). Many Oldowan sites have since been discovered. As of late 2016, they are thought to have been used by late *Australopithecines* and early *Homo habilis*. Today's chimps use twigs, leaves, branches and rocks as tools. See <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oldowan>.

C Hominid and Near-relative Cranial Capacity Over Time
Data from JN&T and Poirier




Figure 8

organization and structure (Gould). For instance, cranial capacity could grow only to a limit whereupon either: 1) cranial bones had to become thinner or more cartilaginous, 2) the pelvic bones and the pelvic opening had to become larger or 3) the infant had to undergo brain growth after birth during a prolonged period of dependency. Of course, at various stages, our evolution has proceeded along each of these paths.


Each new hominid member of the human line that separated from other great apes tended to be taller, to have proportionately shorter arms, to be better adapted for travel over arid land, to have a higher forehead, to have smaller teeth and jaws, to have a more prominent chin and to be generally less ape-like in appearance.⁸⁵ (See Figure 9, below.) Moreover -- and this is very important; make a mental note of it -- a reduction in body hair would have been one of the continuous trends in the hominid line from ape to man. It has been said that this trend served to keep our ancestors cool. Ever less body hair enabled them to better tolerate savannah and desert climates. Perspiration cools

⁸⁵ Robert Franciscus and Erik Trinkaus, anthropologists from the University of New Mexico have observed (after Coon, 1977: 534) that protruding noses function like an air conditioner/humidifier. They heat or cool incoming air to the right temperature, hydrate it and condense and trap water from outgoing air. More skin pores and less body hair also help to evaporate sweat on the skin and keep the body cool. See Waters.

better when evaporating on the skin instead of falling from the ends of body hairs.

Now, Louis Leakey had suggested that early hominids might have used their tools to scavenge. “When he made this statement in the 1960’s he was alone with that assessment; and even he viewed scavenging as an intermediate behavior, a transition phase between plant-food foraging and full-fledged hunting” (Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 98). Unlike hunting, as Johanson notes, scavenging does not conjure up glamorous images. For over a decade, archaeologist Lewis Binford, now at Southern Methodist University, antagonized the scientific community by opposing the widely accepted early hunter scenario. He argued vehemently that the tools at Olduvai Gorge did not evidence hunting but the butchering of scavenged carcasses. Two Cal Berkeley archaeologists, Rob Blumenschine and his student John Cavallo, have apparently enabled Binford to win the day in this long-running feud with the conventional, wishful-thinkers. Recall Randall Susman’s above-mentioned observation that *Robustus* was the only *Australopithecine* known to have a toolmaker’s and spear-thrower’s thumb. Even *habilis*’ average cranial capacity of 650 cc is far below the 1400 cc average of modern humans. Susman, Jack Stern and Bill Jungers (State University of New York, Stony Brook) have also pointed out that *Afarensis* retained a number of primitive features such as the curved fingers and toes of tree-climbers. Blumenschine adds that the evidence for arboreality doesn’t disappear in the fossil record until one gets to *Homo erectus*. (Cf. Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 125.) Although the first spears were probably wooden and for that reason may never be dated, none of the pre-*Homo erectus* hominids appear to have had *Homo erectus*’ massive, spear-enabling pectoral muscles. (“Evidence for wooden spears has been found at a few Neanderthal sites in Europe, most notably the Mousterian site of Lehringen in Germany, where a twelve-foot preserved yew spear dated at 120,000 years was found lodged between the ribs of an elephant” [Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 276].) Neither did any of the pre-*Homo erectus* hominids have fire. The oldest undisputed evidence for controlled fire is a 500,000-year-old *Homo erectus* site at Zhoukoudian Cave in China. The 900 kya level of Swartkrans Cave in South Africa might also evince controlled fire and is thought to be *Homo erectus*. (Cf. Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 171.) Without fire, our ancestors would have needed to sleep in the trees, and even there they would have been vulnerable to leopards. Without the spear, encounters with lions were


encounters to be avoided. Blumenshine and Cavallo confirm that *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* were mostly scavengers in riparian forests. Leopards often store their kills in trees where both *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* could have found them. *Australopithecus* probably used blunt stones and *Habilis* his sharp-edged hammer stones to break open bones for their marrow. Lions and leopards usually leave plenty of marrow in the bones of their kills. “Rob has calculated that a healthy, well-fed adult impala would yield 1,500 calories worth of marrow from the twelve major limb bones” (Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 118). Circling vultures would have alerted our ancestors to these kills; and while hyenas and some other carnivores are stingier with the bones, these could have been more easily scattered by club-wielding hominids.



So, *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* were still vulnerable to carnivores. They had plenty of prey and predators. Although the cannibal past of our own species (and, as you will see, of *Homo erectus*) suggests that these earlier ancestors, *Afarensis* and *Habilis*, also preyed upon each other, we can't conclude that either drove the other to extinction. Carnivores certainly could have been chiefly responsible for the extinction of either one of them.

Our next and last relative was *Homo erectus*. *Homo erectus* did climb very securely to the top of Earth's food chain. He evolved roughly 2 mya -- probably in East Africa. The primal deed, cooperation between male hunters and tool-makers, cooperation among nursing and foraging females and the invention of the spear and of controlled fire enabled *Homo erectus* to prey upon every other species and to spread out over all but the coldest parts of Eurasia. (See Shreeve [1994] for recently revised, earlier dates for *Homo erectus*' migration out of

Africa.) *Homo erectus* did not permanently occupy the near-glacial areas as our immediate ancestors did. Instead, during the *penultimate* (next to the last) glacial (starting 74 kya), *Homo erecti* poured out of Europe and into the Levant, displacing our immediate ancestors from the prime coastal and oasis habitats. (Cf. Bar-Yosef in Mellars and Stringer: 604, 591.)




Homo erectus lived from about 2 mya to (at least) 30 kya. (We'll discover that a few survived almost into the modern era.) He more or less coincided with the geological era known as the Pleistocene. It was an era of great mammals that were all but eliminated within the upper part of the epoch. By studying foraminifera deposits on the ocean floor or ice cores, scientists can estimate the near atmospheric temperatures and CO² levels over the last 700 ky or more. See Figures [10a](#) and [10b](#), and read them from right to left.⁸⁶ Notice that temperature lags slightly behind CO² but closely follows it. Notice too that ice ages (the troughs) are triggered after CO² peaks due to the rapid, runaway and catastrophic melting of the ice (ice sheet slides and coastal inundations) and/or the abrupt stoppage of the ocean current (thermohaline circulation) and the resultant, atmospheric havoc. Despite the fact that the atmospheric CO² level is already off the chart, far higher than at any previous time and about to rise asymptotically; despite the fact that humans create it and exhale it, cannot control their own population and continually eliminate the trees that (at most times) inhale CO² and exhale O² (undo the damage); wishful thinkers (even within the scientific community) believe that we can avert the coming ice age and

⁸⁶ Figures 10a and 10b are based on studies of the Vostok ice core in Antarctica. For more information, go to http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/last_400k_yrs.html.

population collapse through go-green, technical advances and piecemeal life style reforms and treaty agreements. Commentators like Mr. Al Gore, who suggest that moral, individual and voluntary zero-carbon life style changes can solve the problem, generate false hope, complacency and unrealistic prognostications.

Even the direst predictions of global warming and glacial thaw have proven to be overly optimistic. No one can foresee all the positive feedback relationships, the ways in which increases in one factor (to some critical level) increases all the others. The greatest and apparently uncontrollable, positive feedback factor that few people understand and nobody but I dare to openly describe is homophobia/latent homosexuality. Because the Orwellian, Third Mask people are the most successful savages, cannot enjoy adult, sexual love and are motivated mostly by fear and value only money, power and their genetic offspring; every growing social or environment threat causes them to become more fearful and increase all the selfish behavior that aggravates all the problems! Don't bother looking at any of the predictions or "If, then" studies. All of them, no matter how scientific they pretend to be, are rose-colored and unrealistic. Our "civilization" is a runaway train, racing toward a cliff, with Big Brother (insane latent homosexuals) at the controls and screaming, "Growth, growth, faster, faster."



In appendixes G and H, I'll prove to you that sea level rise has been catastrophic in the past and will probably be so again. Sorry if this makes you lose sleep, but losing sleep now could save your life later.

Homo erectus, the man of this last ice age, made many outstanding contributions to our culture. He completed striding bipedalism and embraced culture wholeheartedly as a strategy of adaptation. His brain

was reshaped and increased in size to within sapiens range. He became a proficient hunter with greater dependence on meat (that in turn reduced jaw and posterior teeth size). He established more or less permanent living sites, probably some sort of social organization, such as family and band; and used fire extensively. (Jurmain, Nelson & Turnbaugh [henceforth JN&T]: 408)

There is much evidence to suggest that *Homo erectus* also worshipped totem animals. We can infer from this and his semi-permanent settlements that *Homo erectus* committed the primal deed. *Homo erectus was our parent species.*⁸⁷ (As you'll see, mythology is unequivocal on this.) His was the family from which our family evolved. While under his tutelage, our early ancestors had every reason to respect *Homo erectus*. As you'll see from later mythology, they did.

There is tremendous diversity in *Homo erectus*' fossil record. Some paleoanthropologists believe that *Neanderthal*, the last, most brawny and brainy variant of *Homo erectus*, the one associated with Europe and the Middle East, was a dead-end *Homo erectus* subspecies, separate, parallel to and distinct from our species. Your taxi driver disagrees.


Homo erectus dominated the earth for two million years. Within approximately the same geographic range but in one twentieth the time, our inbreeding species evolved Eskimos, northern Europeans, Pygmies and Zulus!⁸⁸ *Homo erectus*' long life and broad range provide the second reason why your taxi driver is a lumper rather than a splitter.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Archaeologists and geneticists are not yet able to prove that *Homo erectus* is our evolutionary, hominid forbear. I don't know how much proof they need; but I can assure you of this, due to consistencies in mythology that we'll discover below.

⁸⁸ Allen's Rule states that mammals living in colder environments will generally have shorter limbs and stockier bodies to reduce heat loss.

⁸⁹ The most recent additions to the fossil record are vindicating the lumpers. The most amazing recent finds are those from Flores Island. Peter Brown (team leader) and Mike Morwood (dig director) from the University of New England, Armidale, Australia continued the excavation started by Professor R.P. Soejono of the Indonesian Center for Archaeology in Jakarta. In the lower layers of Liang Bua Cave, they found five or six individuals with distinctly *Homo erectus* features, *individuals who were only one meter tall*. Various dating techniques consistently yield dates from 18 to 13 kya. The stature of these tiny people is smaller than anyone would have anticipated. Brown notes that Flores Island was probably rain-forested in the Pleistocene too, and mammals of the rainforest all tend to be small because the small bodies better regulate body temperature and can subsist on fewer calories. I can think of at least two other reasons for their miniaturization. In the rainforest, small bodies are more able to evade that voracious and predatory omnivore -- man. Still more

Mythology provides the third and most important reason why I'm a lumper. I shall show you that our mythologies -- the voices of our *Homo sapiens* ancestors -- speak everywhere of just them (*Homo erecti*) and us (*Homo sapiens*). Any third hominid contestant for the top rung of the food chain would have had to ally himself with one of the two, major competitors; and that alliance would have left a prominent record within all our oral histories (mythologies). That being so, "Denisovan Man" would have had to have been totally hidden from his other hominid contemporaries. I won't reference any of "Denisovan" Man's authors because, after twenty-six years of this book circulating within government and academic circles, it is hard for me to believe that these authors have honorable intentions.



The only other people described by our Paleolithic mythologies are the hybrids, the products of mixed, *Homo sapiens/Homo erectus* unions. The very large cranial capacity skulls in the fossil record, skulls that exhibit both *Homo sapiens* and Neanderthal features, are hybrid skulls.

importantly, the submergence of large areas of the archipelago from a maximum declination of 80-100 meters would have created tremendous overcrowding and survival pressure on the remaining islands. For defense, men would have reverted to arboreal life wherein the small are advantaged. They can live higher in the trees, see further and cast spears or arrows faster and further. See the article by K. Wong in Scientific American.

Let's compare *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapien* skulls. Neanderthal, the largest, European variant of *Homo erectus*, was slightly shorter but larger-boned and more muscular than our immediate ancestors. He also had an average cranial capacity that had become greater than *Homo sapiens*'. The average cranial capacity of Neanderthal skulls is over 1500 cc! (Modern man's average is 1400 cc.) Compare the respective shapes of typical *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens* skulls in Figure 11.

Carlton Coon noticed that the traditional emphasis on the cranial breath/length index in hominid craniometry might be misguided. He seems to have been correct in believing that the extremes for these values are largely due to climate adaptation. (See Coon, 1963; 529.)⁹⁰ In plain English: short, wide heads (from the facial profile) is indeed a cold adaptation. Moreover, babies' heads are so heavy and plastic that even active babies that lie on their backs often can become *brachycephalic* (broad, short-faced skulls), (*Ibid.* citing Walcher)

The height to length ratio (the skull's side profile) is the index that shows the biggest difference in the skulls of the two sub-species.


Look again at the profiles of the skulls in Figure 11. We'll discover that our primitive ancestors developed a universal symbol for *Homo erectus* based on these proportions of his anatomy. Coon also observed that elongated skulls are associated with enhanced perceptual ability:

In nearly all species of animals and birds that have been domesticated, both the muzzle and the skull have grown shorter than those of the wild forms. The muzzle is short because man prepares the animal's food for him, reducing the work of teeth and jaws, which then grow small. In this change the animal copies man. The skull grows short because by protecting the animals from natural enemies and bad weather, man has made unnecessary the full development of the animal's senses, and those parts of the brain in which the messages from eyes ears and nostrils are received lie fore and aft in the brain. --Coon, 1977; 137.

⁹⁰ I have calculated the combined, male-female, XCB/GOL x 100 values (maximum cranial breath / maximum cranial length) for Howells' population samples. (See Howells.) If one excludes those groups that have relatively recently migrated from very different climate zones (i. e. Peruvians, Arikara, Norse, Eskimo and perhaps Andaman Islanders), then a positive correlation between values greater than 80 (brachycephaly) and cold adaptation is apparent.

Brain size and weight are dramatically influenced by sensory development because storage of sensory information takes up tremendous space. Multimedia computers could not have been produced without a tremendous increase in the capacity of our storage devices.


Radical changes in the brain weight of animals undergoing domestication are possible between generations. A German zoologist demonstrated these changes that are too short-lived to affect the genotype. He caught a pair of wild foxes and placed them in a zoo. "After the vixen had littered and the young had begun to grow up, he released some of them, and they in turn produced young. Having caught and killed members of all three generations, he weighed their brains. The original wild generation had fifty-gram brains, the generation born and reared in captivity thirty-five and the second wild generation fifty." (Coon, 1977: 137) Recent and better-controlled studies show that the enabling mechanism for *rapid evolution* involves selective fetal cell death. (See Blakeslee.) *Dr. Hamer's new medicine shows us that trauma causes organ size adjustments at any stage of life.* Neanderthal, closer to nature and more reliant upon sensory ability, had, on average, a larger brain than ours.



Now look at Figure 12. This figure, taken from p. 274 of *The Brain: a User's Manual*, shows the short-term memory banks for auditory, visual and kinesthetic inputs. Areas (a) and (b), the auditory and visual banks, appear to find their start on forward fissures and to spread in a posterior direction. Kinesthetic bank (c) is in the posterior (extreme rear) of the brain. *These functions probably account for the*

famous bun at the back of Homo erectus' skull. As we shall see, mythology confirms that he had extraordinary sensory perception.

Let me remind you that I am no expert in neuroanatomy -- or anything else for that matter. But cursory investigation would seem to confirm what we would expect: that evolution selected the human brain for culture. Observations of brain-damaged individuals subjected to electrical stimulation suggest that beneath our prominent foreheads, the prefrontal cortex is adapted for the emotional response "to circumstances." (See Figure 13.)



It seems likely that at least part of the hyperextension of this prefrontal cortex is owing to displacement by the growth of the forward of the two main language areas ("A" in Figure 14) and the growth of some corresponding area in the right hemisphere. Another speculative observation almost forces itself to the fore: main language area "B" (Figure 14) and whatever corresponds to it on the right side grew at the expense of our sensory memory storage banks. Remember Coon's comment: the dog that is fed does not need keen perception; he needs to comprehend his master.


Figure 14: The Main Language Areas

A Broca's area in the left frontal lobe controls the production of speech.

B Wernicke's area in the left temporal and parietal lobes governs the understanding of speech. The corresponding area on the right side tends to be involved with long term memory.

C Damage to these links tends to impair spontaneous speech.

After the Putnam Publishing Group and The Brain: A User's Manual by Diagram Visual Information Ltd.



Homo erectus was taller, much larger brained, stronger, less ape-like in appearance and more dependent on culture than *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis*. He stood more fully erect than his predecessors but not quite as erect as we do.⁹¹ “If you looked up and saw one dressed in a business suit and seated next to you at a lunch counter,” said one anthropologist, “you wouldn't exactly take him home to meet your sister; but you wouldn't fall off your chair either.”

Many neuroanatomists and paleoneurologists believe that *Homo erectus* had, “a well-developed language area and that his speech was only slightly inferior to ours”⁹² (Begley and Gleizes, quoting Dean Falk of the SUNY at Albany and Terrence Deacon of Harvard). His voice box was a bit lower than ours. “He would have sounded a bit nasal and would have had trouble pronouncing ‘oo’ and ‘ee,’ but he would have had no trouble communicating with us... They were

⁹¹ Yoel Rak and colleagues from Tel Aviv University found the first complete Neanderthal pelvis. It was at a burial site not far from Quafzeh. The thighbone sockets are further back than are ours. See Bower, 1988.

⁹² Wernicke's area (Figure 14) is critical to understanding speech, but many areas are devoted to language. See Figure 14, above.

articulate, intelligent humans we would be able to understand and interact with" (*Ibid.*).

In 1983, Baruch Arensburg of Tel Aviv University led a team that discovered a well-preserved post-cranial *Homo erectus* skeleton that revealed a U-shaped hyoid bone (between the root of the tongue and the voice box). This strengthened the argument for *Homo erectus*' linguistic ability (Bower). Falk and Terrence Deacon point also to dimples and bumps on the endocasts of hominids going all the way back to *Australopithecine* and insist that tens of millions of years of left and right-side brain differentiation was not for naught. Others note that *Homo erectus*' recessed pre-frontal lobes -- the lobes behind his famous slanting forehead -- suggest that his speech was not nearly as well developed as ours. These people note too that we have no archaeological evidence that *Homo erectus* dealt with graphic symbols. *Figure 75a of Appendix B, if left by Homo erectus, is such evidence.* It remains to be seen whether the lack of *Homo erectus* masterpieces on rocks evince his graphical inability or the inability of paint and scratches on wood, stone and bone to preserve over long time spans.

Lieberman argues (after Darwin [859: 191]) that the human supra-laryngeal (above the voice box) vocal tract has the disadvantage of crowding the teeth, decreasing the area for chewing and increasing the likelihood of choking. Given these disadvantages, it is reasonable to assume that the human supra-laryngeal vocal tract can only be selected for within a species that has the corresponding neural mechanisms for speech. The supra-laryngeal vocal tracts for fossil hominids can be reconstructed. From the reconstruction of Neanderthal's tract, Lieberman concludes that his speech was probably nasal, lacking in the "i" and "u" vowels and more prone to syntax errors --but otherwise like ours. (*Cf.* Lieberman in Mellars and Stringer.)

Ann MacLarnon of London's Roehampton Institute studied the vertebrae of a *Homo erectus* boy first found in 1984 near Nariokotome, Kenya by Kamoya Kimeu, leader of Kenya's famous fossil-hunting team. Had he lived to maturity, he would have been over six feet tall! Ann saw that the boy's thoracic vertebral (spinal cord) canal was smaller than ours, roughly half as wide. She concluded that the much greater amount of gray matter that the human canal accommodates in this region (as compared to that of other primates) is devoted to nerve control of nearby chest and stomach muscles. These, in turn, finely control breathing as necessary for speech. The smaller cavity of *Homo erectus*' thoracic vertebrae suggests that *Homo erectus* had less control

of these muscles and either could not talk -- as MacLarnon tentatively suggested -- or talked with difficulty. (Cf. Johanson, Johanson and Edgar: 196-200.) We'll return to the subject of *Homo erectus*' language ability later. MacLarnon's discovery of *Homo erectus*' lack of vertebral gray matter will prove important.

Figure 15: Pleistocene Land Bridges of The Mediterranean may have bridged Gibraltar with Morocco and Sicily with Libya/Tunesia for *Homo erectus*. Dotted line shows present-day 200-meter deep contour, which is almost twice as deep as the 300 foot level believed to have been the lowest surface level. But over the last million years, water would have leveled the floor considerably.



Homo erectus apparently migrated to what is now Indonesia and Southeast Asia by 1.2 to 1 mya. By 700 kya, he ranged over all but the coldest parts of Eurasia. His brain was reshaped and increased in size until, with Neanderthal, it surpassed our own. He hunted systematically and depended upon meat. If what we have inferred about his perceptual ability is correct --and mythology leaves us no doubt-- then he was an awesome hunter. He used fire, and he established permanent living sites where group marriages appear to have been the norm. (Cf. JN&T p. 408.) Regional populations of *Homo erectus* developed highly specific traits.

Figure 16a: *Homo erectus* and Hybrid Fossil Sites

No distinction is made here between "transitional forms" (Neanderthal and other *Homo erecti*). Mythology suggests that the most nearly *Homo Sapien* "transitional forms" were hybrids and that our ancestors made no bright line distinctions between *Homo erecti*. Note the heavy concentration in Western Europe.



About one mya, some *Homo erecti* moved northward out of Africa into Europe. Most of them probably made their journey during a glacial period, when much of the world's water was locked within the ice sheets. The oceans and seas were then greatly contracted. Additional land bridges existed, or the far shores were at least visible between Morocco and Spain and Sicily and Libya. (See [Figure 15](#).)

This would explain the high concentration of Neanderthals shown by the archeological record to have populated Western Europe. See Figure 16a. Over the next, roughly 960,000 years, Neanderthal progressed steadily. He was taking in more kinds of food and sheltering himself better. During the middle Pleistocene, approximately 850 to 200 kya, "changes in stone technology were made, as well as at least a beginning in the use of new materials. Not many tools have been found, that suggests the possible use of wooden weapons" (JN&T: 419). Europe was covered with trees, especially oak trees, which provide hard, quality wood. "Neanderthal produced excellent Mousterian [*H flake*] implements and, in fact, invented a new technique, the disc-core technique [*H for systematically punching out blades*] ... [T]hey [*H often*] lived in caves, wore clothing and built fires, gathered in settlements and hunted with a great deal of skill" (JN&T: 421).

Erik Trinkaus, a Neanderthal physiology expert, says the average Neanderthal male stood 5 feet 6 inches tall. The female was about 5 feet tall. That would have made them only slightly shorter than the “Cro-Magnon” *Homo sapiens* of their day and 3 or 4 inches shorter than today’s average Americans. (See Trinkaus or Begley and Gleizes.) The eastern *Homo erecti* were smaller. Yet Neanderthal’s bones and muscles were much more powerful than those of our immediate ancestors. Trinkaus says that their pectoral muscles were more than twice as wide as ours!



Figure 16b: Carlo Ranzì's conception of Neanderthal Man, taken from his out-of-print book, Seventy Million Years of Man. Better than any art I've seen, this drawing captures the respect, admiration and gratitude that early *Homo sapiens* must have felt for our archaic ancestor. Without this positive side, there can be no ambivalence, no obsession and no apotheosis. One who is merely hated is avoided and easily forgotten.

In hand-to-hand combat our immediate ancestors would have been no match for Neanderthal. (See Figure 16b.) Nevertheless, it is now known, beyond all reasonable doubt that men who were in all their attributes and capacities identical to modern men (*Homo sapiens*) completely replaced *Homo erectus* everywhere. There

is simply not enough variability in our mt or Y DNA to suggest multi-regional evolution from different *Homo erectus* ancestors⁹³

Homo sapiens branched from *Homo erectus* in Africa about 200 kya. The mitochondrial and Y-chromosome DNA evidence suggests that about 75 kya, one large group left Africa and migrated along Asia's southern and eastern coast and to Australia. A larger and more successful group left for the Middle East roughly 45 kya.⁹⁴ By then, glacial thaw had inundated the Mediterranean land bridges. So say the DNA guys, but your taxi driver disagrees.

I'm no expert, but it seems to me that mt (mitochondrial) DNA studies and Y DNA studies both have serious limitations. Mt DNA is inherited only from one's mother and the Y chromosome is inherited only by males from their father. For any variant of these forms of DNA to stay in the population, there must be at least one continuous chain of same-sex progeny. Within small populations (like our early, global population) it is (was) easy for any variant of mt or Y DNA to disappear. When a variant disappears within a population, that population appears to be younger than it is; and any variant that branched from the disappeared variant becomes harder to position within the evolutionary tree. As we proceed and in the appropriate place, you will understand the logic of why our first human family would have made one major division, into two halves, in Africa, roughly 75 kya. Half of us walked north and established our first, out-of-Africa settlement in lower Mesopotamia. Most Eurasian migrations would have emanated from this settlement because there were reasons for the first split being permanent, for the two halves not reuniting. We are only starting to learn about our African half that migrated mostly in

⁹³ For an excellent article that explains the complex mitochondrial DNA technology developed by Sarich and Wilson in a layman-friendly style, see Gould, 1987.

⁹⁴ Spencer Wells informs us that the mitochondrial DNA and (more recent) Y-chromosome DNA studies reach the same conclusions. Mitochondria (the power plants within cells) have unpaired, inherited-from-the-female genes that do not break up and recombine like ordinary, nuclear DNA. The inherited-from-the-male Y chromosome differs from its X mate. It also does not break up and recombine along most of its vast length. Therefore, polymorphisms, changes in the nucleotide patterns of both mtDNA and Y-DNA occur only through mutation. Mutations are assumed to occur at a regular rate. After applying Ockham's razor to the permutations that characterize the mt or Y-DNA of population groups, after building the ancestral tree that attributes the maximum amount of variability to inheritance and the minimum of mutations, geneticists infer migration routes and dates. (See Wells: 29-30-.)

an opposite direction. It will not be easy for mt or Y DNA analysts to convince us otherwise.

Using improved electron spin resonance and thermoluminescence dating techniques, Bar-Yosef and others have reported finding Neanderthal and *Homo sapiens* remains in the same context of different caves within the Levant. From this they conclude that, “Some *Homo sapiens* and Neanderthals lived peacefully as neighbors in the Mid- East and perhaps parts of Eastern Europe for 20 to 60 ky.”⁹⁵ My interpretation of these sites with fossils of both subspecies but only Middle Paleolithic (pre-bow and arrow) tools is that they were Neanderthal communities that tolerated *Homo sapien* breeding only because *Homo sapiens* were desired to produce hybrids. This would explain the high frequency of skulls with mixed characteristics within the Levantine and European fossil record for the Middle Paleolithic (250-50 kya). (See JN&T: 396-436 for examples of these skulls.) Yet *Homo erectus* and Neanderthal mitochondrial DNA are not among us. Geneticists have been able to construct a highly-probable tree showing how all the currently-extant forms of mt DNA evolved (with the fewest possible mutations) one from another starting with one form of the mt DNA still extant in Kenya. Because this most-probable mitochondrial DNA tree shows all of us to have a common African (*Homo sapien* or mutated *Homo erectus*) female ancestor, it is reasonable to assume that all *Homo erectus* genes other than those from this woman and her similarly-mutated (*Homo sapiens*) male consort(s) died out and that the hybrids were sterile.⁹⁶ Y-DNA studies

⁹⁵ See Sharon Begley and F. Gleizes, “My Granddad Neanderthal?” Newsweek, Oct 16, 1989 or see Bar-Yosef, “Geochronology of the Levantine Middle Paleolithic,” in Mellars and Stringer (ed. s), *The Human Revolution*.

⁹⁶ At least one molecular biologist (Templeton) disputes the “Eve Hypothesis” and claims that the possible, non-African mtDNA trees are more parsimonious than the African one first suggested by Cann, Stoneking and Wilson. A few other biologists maintain that nuclear DNA sequences must be obtained and evaluated with the mtDNA sequences before a *Homo sapien* origin can be determined from phylogenetic analysis alone. Yet that other evidence supports the African hypothesis (e. g. Hedges, Kumar and Tamura). Although the present author lacks the technical acumen to fully follow this debate, the most important point made by the many advocates of the Eve Hypothesis appears to be one that Mr. Templeton is unable to answer: *the 182 distinct types of extant, fast-evolving, 37-gene, human mitochondrial DNA sequences are too few and too similar to support the multi-regional evolution of separate and distinct human populations from archaic ancestors who had had approximately 1.8 million years to evolve tremendous mtDNA variability.* (Cf. Wilson and Cann: 72-73.) Moreover, Mr. Templeton’s brevity and failure to write in a style that would educate

confirm this; and hybrids, produced from different members of the same genus (e. g. mules from horses and donkeys), are usually sterile.

Allow me to repeat what a growing mountain of DNA and mitochondrial DNA studies (since the pioneering work of Cann, Stoneking and Wilson) are concluding: *Homo erectus*' genes (except for those of two or several mutated *Homo erecti*, an "Eve" and two or three "Adams") are not among us. Although most of the evidence is too esoteric for a popular work such as this, anyone questioning this conclusion should first read Gould's, "Bushes All the Way Down." This is an extremely well written exposition that explains the genetic experiments in terms that the layman can understand. Other excellent works are those of Stringer and Andrews (an article) and Spencer Wells.

Some paleontologists confuse their hopes for man's future with natural history and the principles of evolution. If *Homo sapien* is really sapien (wise) and able to avoid extinction, we shall have to greatly lessen our impact upon the environment by imposing some conscious social controls upon our own evolution. By making our evolution more *conscious*, we shall indeed make it more linear, decrease the number of births and deaths and reduce both the bloodshed and our environmental impact. Yet *natural* history has never proceeded from such a conscious (or "divine"?) blueprint. Nature has always selected from an overabundance of variant populations and species that genetic recombination and mutation and the instinct to survive and reproduce provide.⁹⁷ "Scientists" who doggedly continue to argue in favor of *multi-regional evolution* and parallel transition of *Homo erectus* (in some vague and gradual manner) into *Homo sapien* are in a state of denial. Either they are refusing to face the ugly reality, or their K

and involve the layman almost forces one to suspect the nature of his motives and the identity that he has derived from his name. Reasoning like that in the italicized passage above and applied to the mountain of evidence for a proto-language (that was prejudicially labeled Indo-European) caused linguists long ago to support the Eve hypothesis. In the coming chapters, we shall discover four pairs of words to add to the mountain of evidence for a proto-language. Each pair consists of similar or identical words; each pair derives from primitive and widely separated peoples. We shall also discover below that sacred myths confirm that the initial mating of the first humans was extremely chancy (e. g. Genesis: 6) and that the survival of the first fledgling, *self-governing*, human population was an event too tenuous to be often replicated (e. g. the Hindu tale of Manu and Vishnu, page 34, above or the efforts of Rhea and Mother Earth to hide the baby Zeus in a cave on an island, v2-95, below).

⁹⁷ See "Bushes All the Way Down," Stephen Jay Gould, *Natural History*, June, 1987.

sponsors want the Rs to think that we are much more genetically diverse than we really are to discourage R demands for equal opportunity.

Yet there seems to be no limit to the financial support for these neurotics. In 2010, while I was still isolated in China and long after the issue of human origins seemed to have been settled, a new contingent of neurotics took to the field, armed with claims of a “Denisovan” man and a more complex but still vague theory of multi-regional evolution. Suffice it to say that if interbreeding between our ancestors and other hominids had been as complex as Multiregionalists claim, then Paleolithic boundary social and military relationships would reflect that complexity and be traceable in our oral history (mythology). As we’ll see, they weren’t and aren’t. The one apparent exception, the Hebrew conquests related in the Pentateuch, will prove to not be an exception. Everywhere, it was us and most of the hybrids against them. Because the Multiregionalists’ claims are not possible, their intentions must be assumed to be the worst possible.

Certainly, there may have been numerous instances of mutant individuals evolving from *Homo erectus* parents within *Homo erectus*’ 2 m.y. lifetime. But the DNA evidence confirms what mythology and common sense will tell us about the social and political obstacles for these mutants: only one very small group of them liberated themselves, defeated *Homo erectus* globally and bred the rest of us.

Among those who are realistic enough to accept the inescapable conclusion that *Homo erectus*’ genes are not among us, the debate continues as to what happened to him. Most archaeologists and paleoanthropologists alike regard it as a great mystery that Neanderthal seems to have “disappeared” circa 35 kya in Europe, even more suddenly than *Homo erectus* disappeared elsewhere. But that most of them “disappeared” very suddenly is not open to doubt. Analysis of hominid cranial and facial fossils reveals that Neanderthal just isn’t in the ample European fossil record after 35 kya.

Corresponding to this break in Homo’s fossil record is the equally stunning break in the artifact record: “The only clear developmental break in the European Paleolithic occurs at around 35 kya, with the appearance of the Upper Paleolithic stone and bone technology. Prior to this date there is evidence of both continuity and great variation in assemblages and industries at all times since the earliest colonization of the continent.” (Champion, Gamble, Shennan and Whittle: 31)

Protracted debate has been raging (see JN&T: 422- 4), as to the probable cause of his “disappearance.” *Although opinions still differ, most experts agree that Homo sapien is not the culprit! His acquittal is supported by Richard Leakey and justified by the widely-accepted view that, “None of the known Neanderthal sites reveal any signs of a bloody takeover by invading hordes”* (Leakey, Richard: 159).

Aren't you glad you're not an expert? No laughter, please. It's natural that we should be reluctant to view our ancestors as patricidal mass murderers; but on the probable cause of *Homo erectus*' “disappearance,” this taxi-driver dares to differ with the experts.

Most of my evidence is from the sphere that science disparages -- religious myth and ritual. On the one hand, I quite agree that science has every reason to despise this worldview that is avowedly hostile to science and antithetical in its attitudes and means of investigation. On the other hand, we must distinguish between western mythology (i. e. *sacred* religious myths and rituals) and stories that were meant simply to entertain or explain natural phenomena. Western mythology represents the best efforts of our pre-literate ancestors to preserve their prehistory.⁹⁸ Knowing this, we shall, like Freud and Frazer before us, subject sacred myths and rituals to scientific scrutiny to extract the kernels of truth that our primitive ancestors bequeathed to us.

At no time were sacred myths constructed from “*free associations.*” *Psychoanalysis shows there to be no such thing.* Even hallucinations are determined by the inner logic of the person's unconscious thoughts, impulses and history. Sacred myths and rituals, the oral and commemorative history of entire peoples, are determined by the traumas of prehistory and the logic of obsessional neurosis symptom formation and myth development as shown in previous chapters. Religious myths and rituals are, as Freud and I have shown, entirely analogous to dreams.

The psychoanalysis of these myths and rituals, together with what we can infer from folk customs, geography and the scanty archaeological record, will speak volumes. It will tell us, with a high degree of certainty, where the major battles of a protracted war were fought, what the decisive weapon was and what happened to the bodies of the victims. We will thus derive a basic outline of the most important events to date in the life of man. Out of the confused and

⁹⁸ In Chapter 13, we'll discover why western mythology is of infinitely greater value to social science than is eastern mythology.

mysterious archives of religion and the darkest and most painful recesses of our own minds, we will extract the long-buried outline of the *Species War*.

First, let's draw some conclusions about *Homo erectus*' language ability and anatomy. One can be drawn from what we've already seen.

In their creation myth [above](#), our Salishan ancestors introduced us to the animal people. From what you now know and from the creation context of this myth, you should be able to confirm my suggestion that "animal people" refers mostly to *Homo erectus*. The emboldened passage of the myth says that, "They [*H the animal people*] all had the gift of speech." In later chapters, we'll review a Biblical passage and "true of speech" reaction formation epithets for Neanderthal. You will have no doubt that *Homo erectus* could talk.

Regarding anatomy, I believe that there are at least two other differences between modern humans and *Homo erecti* that might seem trivial at first glance but are actually quite important. First and contrary to opinions once issued by Lovejoy, *Homo erectus* could not run as well as our immediate ancestors. The sockets in his pelvis are further back, showing that he was slightly stooped. Moreover, numerous mythological references associate our immediate ancestors with "tricksters" who are usually either hares or coyotes. At least one other myth that we will study suggests that the pregnant Neanderthal female had great difficulty in running. It was long speculated that Neanderthal's term of pregnancy was longer than *Homo sapien's* (Trinkaus, 1984). Scientists are now rejecting that hypothesis based upon analysis of a complete Neanderthal pelvis found at Kebra Cave, Israel, but that finding was based only on the central diameter of female Neanderthal's pelvic opening being the same size as the human counterpart. (Rak: 331) This may say more about our sexual compatibility with them than it does about their obstetric demands (e. g. their skulls were thicker).

The other seemingly trivial but actually quite important difference between our archaic forbears and us is our thumbs. Trinkaus made an exhaustive study of Neanderthal's anatomy based on an archaeological record that, as of 1983, included portions of roughly 400 specimens. He found their hands to be within the range of modern humans in overall size relative to arm length. The sum of the lengths of their thumb bones compares to the length of their first metacarpal as does ours. But the Neanderthals had a relatively long outer bone of the thumb and a relatively short middle bone of the thumb. Trinkaus thinks

that this difference is insignificant: “All these features of the Shanidar pollical bones indicate that they have thumbs that were capable of the same manipulative movements as recent humans but were characterized by the robustness that is found elsewhere on their upper limb skeletons” (Trinkaus, 1983: 275). I disagree. There was at least one strategic movement that *Homo erectus* couldn't perform with his thumb and pointing finger. I'll verify this with the mythology of coming chapters.

Before we do this or anything else, I need to fulfill a promise. I promised to prove to you that the meaning of the Deluge myths has always been in your unconscious adult mind.

CHAPTER 11: YOU GUESSED IT!

All great truths began as blasphemies. --George Bernard Shaw

PROOF BY CONTRADICTION

We can solve the meaning of the Deluge either by starting with the basic myth itself or by starting with the fact of Neanderthal's disappearance. In either case, proof by contradiction logic leads us to the same conclusion. Consider first the myth.

Discard the myth's literal meaning. As Campbell said, "A number of scholars have thought that actually there may have been some devastating flood that all but annihilated civilization in the area of the early cities, and some have even thought that in their excavations they had discovered the evidence. However, the flood strata unearthed in the various Mesopotamian city sites do not correspond to one another in date" (Campbell, 1962: 121).

The *sexagesimal* (sixty-based) number system and the sexagesimal-based Mesopotamian history provided another dead-end path of investigation. This system worked well for measuring circles (360 degrees) and time (60 seconds to the minute, 60 minutes to the hour, 360 days to the year -- or so they thought). "Furthermore, as the day was in proportion to the year, so was the year in proportion to the great year; and at the close of each such eon or great year there was a deluge, a cosmic dissolution and return" (*Ibid.*: 116). Accordingly, the Sumerians and the late Babylonian priest Berossos constructed mythical histories of the kings that were thought to have reigned between the floods. These "histories" said the kings reigned from 10 to 65 ky. (*Cf.* Jacobsen, 1987:147.) The desire was to project the Deluge as far back in time as possible. These and other Bronze and Iron Age mythical histories often spoke of "floods," plural, probably because the diverse metaphors of different peoples were often not recognized as referring to either the same Species War events or the Great Flood. Mesopotamian overawe of numbers and belief that numbers determined the events on earth and the motions of the heavenly bodies also promoted these erroneous "histories." (*Cf.* Campbell, 1962: 115-21.)

The fascination for the number sixty and the choice of it as a basic unit of measurement is also due in part to the associations that we

unconsciously make with it. As we shall see below, the number 60 (sixty) associates with “perfect sex.”⁹⁹

For us new initiates in psychoanalysis, the symbolic meaning of the “Deluge” is clear: a massive catastrophe occurred that took the lives of an incredible amount of people worldwide.

What could have caused such a catastrophic loss of life --a plague? Consider the following quotation from Russell. He refers to the two great plagues of Europe, the *Plague of Justinian* in 542 A.D. and the *Black Death* (bubonic plague) of 1347-1348 A.D. As of 650 A.D., the population had largely recovered from the first plague.

Up to 650 A.D., the population had been relatively sparse in the north and thus to some extent protected from disease. Diseases might come in from the great centers of animal and bacterial life in Africa or Asia, but they would not have survived without sufficient population to preserve them. The first plague died out in the west, for instance. Now with denser population the chances were greater that more diseases would appear and remain permanently... -- Russell: 37.

During the many editions of this work, medical science has been revolutionized by Ryke Geerd Hamer. Hamer discovered how our autonomic nervous system evolved and functions. Every one of our organs evolved with a specific brain center that controls the amount of work that the organ does by controlling its size. Nerves that are routed through the brain stem and spinal column connect every organ with its brain center. Whenever we undergo a trauma, depending upon how the psyche interprets the trauma, one brain center or another gets switched on and causes its organ to grow by one of two different (old or new brain) procedures. Death usually results from a combination of traumas, kidney collection tubule syndrome and at least one other. Epidemics and plagues result from societal traumas that similarly affect large numbers of people. For a detailed (and probably the best) introduction to the New Medicine, see “The New Medicine of Ryke Geerd Hamer” at <https://peaceloveandprogressparty.org/blog/f/the-new-medicine-of-ryke-geerd-hamer>. So, although the bacillus *Uersinia pertis* did not cause the bubonic plague, as claimed in previous editions of this work,

⁹⁹ Here’s another reason as to why the 1960s were wild and crazy times.

the conclusion is the same. Plagues only affect communities that undergo similar traumas. Others living apart or in isolation are unaffected.

Genocide had to be the cause of a massive, prehistoric, worldwide catastrophe such as the one described by the flood myths. Our immediate ancestors could only inflict such worldwide violence on people that were in some way different from us, people that violated our sense of genetic homeostasis and maintained those differences by not pooling their genes with ours. Is it possible that our ancestors would have allowed a more primitive ancestor, a man intermediate between the apes and us to survive? Obviously not, and one can reason that there had to have been such men and that they are the subject of the Deluge myths.

Starting with Neanderthal and asking, “What happened to him,” we get the same result. How do animals become extinct? They fail to adapt to sharp climatic changes, fail to obtain food or water, fail to reproduce or they fail to defend themselves from predators. Neanderthal, or better still *Homo erectus* in general, ranged over most of Eurasia. Certainly, no climatic changes were cataclysmic enough to have eliminated him without eliminating our immediate ancestors too. The same is true for potential food, water and reproductive problems. Neanderthal was a proficient hunter. His brain was, on average, bigger than ours. It is believed that his speech ability was not quite as good as ours, but surely the cleverest Neanderthals could have successfully competed with the dullest *Homo sapiens* for food, water and mates. It is not possible that peaceful competition with our immediate ancestors could have caused them to die out overnight. As for predators, he had none within the pre-*Homo sapien* world. As we saw in the previous chapter and unlike earlier hominids, *Homo erectus* had securely climbed to the top of the food chain. He was equipped with fire, the spear and the musculature to use the spear effectively. As the Germanic myth of Balder will verify for us (Chapter 21, below), *Homo erectus* was supreme on Earth. His only potential predators were the mutant ones that he begot, our ancestors. There’s your answer. *Henceforth, when you see “Deluge,” think Species War. I’ll say “the Flood” when referring literally to the Great Flood, the precise date and causes of which we shall also discover.*

ARCHAIC INHERITANCE AND FREUD’S OTHER BIG SECRET

These logical but unconscious deductions (intuition) permit us to process knowledge that is commonplace within the culture or within myth in such a way as to arrive at the answer to mankind's biggest "secret." There is no need to postulate anything as complex and speculative as Freud's "archaic inheritance," a mysterious, system that *genetically* passes abstract information from one generation to the next. (Cf. Freud, 1939: 129-130.)¹⁰⁰

Embarrassing and unpleasant secrets of history are not only encoded within our neurotic social symptoms (e. g. myths and rituals). They are also quietly but deliberately kept alive by the saner and clearer-thinking minorities who pass them (or the relevant myths) on to their successors until the majority is less hysterical and willing to tolerate a more realistic point of view. It is this social (and not any genetic) mechanism that accounts for the re-emergence into the light of day of one of Freud's own two great secrets -- the fate of Moses. (I have already explained the logic by which Freud deduced his other great secret -- the meaning of the [original sin](#), above].)

Moses is the single most important figure in the Jewish religion. For those of you who don't know the basic story of the Exodus, of Moses leading the Israelites out of Egypt and into the "Promised Land," it goes like this: the Israelites (the southern ancestors of the Jewish people of Israel/Palestine) were enslaved in Egypt. (In fact, the land of Palestine was marginal. During periods of drought, many of its people would have wandered toward the nearest big river, the Nile, and sold themselves into bondage. Others were taken as war prisoners.) The experts can't agree on a date when Akhenaton died; but Freud suggested 1353. Whatever the date, at some time between 1443 and 1250 B.C., a monotheistic priest, Moses, led the Israelites out of Egypt. The army of the pharaoh, who reneged on his promise to let them go, chased them. God parted the waters of the Red Sea to let the Israelites cross over but then closed the sea, swallowing up their pursuers. They

¹⁰⁰ Freud's archaic *intellectual* inheritance is an academic creature unlikely to have a home in our genes. It is apparently true that the hard wiring, the if-then addresses of our autonomic nervous system are set up by one set of genes and then loaded with simple, if-images and then-responses by other sets of genes. This would be remnant of the insect stage of our evolution. We also have archaic organs (e. g. the appendix and the gall bladder); and, of course, we have no shortage of archaic cultural beliefs and practices. But the knowledge of prehistoric and historic events that Freud thought to be passed on to us, genetically, is attributable to deductive logic.

wandered aimlessly through the dessert for 40 years. They enlarged their numbers by absorbing a nomadic people at the oasis of Qades in the Sinai. At God's calling, Moses went atop Mount Sinai and received from God the Ten Commandments, carved in stone, rules for living that would direct the Jewish people to live according to God's will and earn them lands of milk and honey to the north, the "Promised Land." But they would have to take these lands from the present occupants and slay them, which they did. For more details, see any of the numerous websites.

When we discover in a coming chapter who the victims of the Israelites were, you will probably conclude, as I have, that Moses and the Israelites are entirely fictional creations intended to excuse or at least create sympathy for the actual perpetrators of genocide. The archeological and historical record has little to say on the question. Egyptian manuscripts tell how the 18th Dynasty Pharaoh Ahmose ended Canaanite (Western Semite) influence in Egypt circa 1550 B.C. when he chased out the Hyksos. The Hyksos, an Asiatic people who may have come from the Canaan area, ruled parts of Egypt for about 150 years. Other than this, the name Israel *first appears* in non-biblical sources c. 1209 BCE, on a stele of the Egyptian pharaoh Merneptah. The inscription is very brief and says simply: "Israel is laid waste and his seed is not." (Schiffman) How likely is it that (to use the Biblical figure) 2,000,000 Israelites could disappear from Egypt without leaving behind any record of their disappearance or the fact that they were ever there? Moreover, this stele post-dates the period in which the Israelites are said to have left and scholars agree that they could have left Egypt!

Freud was not the only one obsessed with the story of the Israelites. Countless other scholars, over the last several centuries, secular and non-secular alike, have tried to account for its logical and factual inconsistencies. Their attempts to make sense of it have led to progressively more obtuse interpretations.

In recent decades, there has been a breakthrough. Assyro-Babylonian scholars, who can now read cuneiform tablets, have discovered who the original "Hapiru" or "Habiru" were. With their help, we'll be able to get to the bottom of all this in a later chapter.

OTHER CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS CLUES PRESERVED DELUGE TRUTH

Another sign that we've long known the "Flood" to include more than a flood is the universal use of the dove to herald the end of it. With all the species of birds that Noah supposedly had on board, wouldn't a shorebird or even a predatory bird have been a better choice as a scout for land? Gulls and terns are at home on the water. Predatory birds fly higher and see further. But no, it is the gentlest bird, the universal symbol for peace, that was set aflight by Utnapishtim (in the Babylonian deluge myth), by Noah, by the hero of the Mandan Indian myth (Donnelly: 115), by Deucalion (Graves: 139) and perhaps by other deluge heroes as a test to see if the waters had receded. If we did not know, at least unconsciously, that the Deluge screens out the first holocaust, would so many of our myth-making ancestors have put this *gentle* bird in juxtaposition to "the flood"? Conversely, could any association of the dove with the termination of floods -- *that were merely floods* -- have so strengthened its meaning as a symbol of peace? No, and nothing exerts so powerful an influence as that which remains isolated within the unconscious and immune to critical evaluation.

Other indications of our unconscious awareness of the real meaning of the flood abound. We have endless fascination for "Yeti," "Bigfoot," "The Abominable Snowman," "Harry" on the recent American television show "Harry and The Hendersons," "Chuchunaa," "Almas" and other reputed wildmen.¹⁰¹ Alleged sightings of "Sasquatch" persist throughout much of North, especially Northwest, America. (Cf. Shackley: 40.) The alleged sightings of "Almas" or Almas-like creatures (like Neanderthals but usually without many of Neanderthal's cultural acquisitions) are more credible and more frequent across a long band stretching from the Caucasus Mountains to Outer Mongolia. This band includes the Pamir, Tien Shan and Altai Mountains, some of the most remote parts of the world. Although the band has already produced at least three Neanderthal sites, some of which date later than 20,000 ya, most of its more promising sites have yet to be excavated. As late as 1775, the belief in wildmen, Neanderthal or other hominid survivors was pervasive enough to prompt the great Swedish zoologist Carl Linnaeus to identify three species of living men: *Homo sapien*, *Homo ferus* ("wildman") and *Homo troglodytes* ("cave man"). Intrigued by the work of Professor

¹⁰¹ The interest in "Harry" goes well beyond the guilt that we have due to the extinction of his species, but psychic impotence and bisexuality are not topics of this chapter.

Boris Porshnev, the Academy of Sciences of the former USSR commissioned the famous Snowman Commission that went hunting for manlike creatures as late as 1958. In the 1970s and 1980s, the Chinese mounted similar expeditions to look for the larger and less manlike “Yeti.” Despite a total absence of living specimen or skeletal evidence, the Chinese went on to designate an area of the Shennongjia Forest as a “Yeti” preserve (*Ibid.*: 8, 10, 15-). We want to believe that some of our *Homo erectus* relatives are still with us to dampen our guilt over having exterminated all of them. As you’ll see, the same remorseful wish turns up time and time again in the primitive mythology of our immediate ancestors.

The *fear* that *Homo erecti* were still at large expressed the negative side of our ambivalence toward them. There was no global news network to tell men otherwise. By the time they developed, we had thoroughly distorted or repressed all memories of our archaic ancestors.

We will discover the same mixed emotions in all the mythologies that we analyze. On the one hand, guilt over the *Homo sapien*-caused extinction of our parent species gave rise to the wishful thinking that denies that extinction. On the other hand, our myth-making ancestors maintained a sense of fear that some *Homo erecti* remained at large. This ambivalence is especially transparent in the mythology of the Scandinavians, the North and South Americans, the Australians and the Irish (whose language and mythology survives in western Ireland).

Consider now the Roman myth of Cupid. Venus’ messenger causes people to fall in love by shooting them in the heart with arrows.¹⁰² Hasn’t this strange myth always provided us with a strong clue to prehistoric realities? After its use in the war, the bow and arrow became a highly charged, traumatic element. We find no direct references to it in primitive *Homo sapien* art for many thousands of years. The same is true with respect to the earliest “heroic” literatures. Primitive peoples made miniature children’s toys of the weapon as a means of repetitiously and compulsively creating positive associations with the weapon and gradually draining its psychic charge. We saw a suggestion of this in the [Blackfoot arrow tale](#), above. “Cupid” was the ultimate possessor of this toy and the best fulfiller of its function.

¹⁰² The myth of Romulus and Remus describes the founders of Rome as having been raised by a she-wolf. Virgil’s *Aeneid* describes Rome as having been founded by Trojan survivors. As we’ll see, wolves and Trojans are unconsciously associated with the victims of the Deluge. By associating the Romans with the Deluge victims, toward whom everyone felt guilty, both myths contributed to Roman military success.

Do you recall me asking you the original significance of the [stade](#) as a unit of length? Bill Holm gave us the answer when he told us that the [expected cast of a good horn bow](#) is 200 yards or 600 feet, which equals one stade. Our complete inability to remember the original meaning of this unit of length reinforces my claim of the bow's high antiquity. Recall that J.D. [Clark gave us rough dates](#) for its invention and the Species War. It was invented and the Species War began around the time when *Homo erectus* halted stone tool experimentation in Africa, 75 kya. Such experimentation would have resumed there around the time that the Species War ended, 35 kya. After the Species War, its use and every association with it -- including the meaning of *stade* -- was suppressed.

Each new generation of men learns what happened to Neanderthal and to what the Deluge myths refer. The various flood myths, combined with a minimal amount of survival knowledge, suffice to compute the message unconsciously. This awareness has been and remains a major source of human guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia. After *Homo erectus* was eliminated, our ancestors realized that they had murdered their parent species. In a collective, species-wide sense, the *Homo erecti* were our parents. They gave birth to us, initially sheltered us, protected us and shared with us their fledgling culture. The guilt over having exterminated our parent species was so great that *Homo erectus*' identity had to be everywhere suppressed. This suppression compromised the id-like desire to remember and emulate ancestors and to lift repression through repetition compulsion with the superego tendency to repress everything threatening and painful. Among Species War victors, this compromise caused spirit projection. These spirits were, throughout Upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic times, cast in the same popular forms in which the primordial fathers had been disguised: as totem animals.¹⁰³ This substitution of totem animals for Deluge victims was, for many other members of post Deluge society, a *conscious* one. Rather than repressing the traumatic events, they performed talk therapy upon one another. They developed conscious philosophies that (so they hoped) described the totem transformation of Species War combatants and compromised painful

¹⁰³ All tetrapods, when stripped of their hides, do look basically alike. This is suggested in all the North American myths wherein the animal people "take off their skins."

truths.¹⁰⁴ These totem animals replaced the *Homo erectus* victims of the Species War in oral histories and rituals that maintained prehistoric truths metaphorically and allegorically. Thousands of years later, most people believed literally in the totem myths and rituals. Yet their allegorical accuracy and the unconscious understanding of their real meaning enabled Neolithic priests to reconfigure the gods as hominids and to condense and amalgamate mythology into lengthy narratives without losing the original meaning. This preservation of oral history was possible because myths and rituals (like all neurotic symptoms) are *compromise formations*.

The confusion and blending of first and second sin victims, of ambivalent ancestors and relatives whose identities had been repressed as part of a neurotic compromise, was further encouraged by the similarity of many of the aftereffects of the first and second sins. Physical security, sexual liberation, seasonal or semi-permanent settlement, expansion into new territories and increases in cooperation, food supply and population were major aftereffects of both traumas.

During this blending of the original and the second sins, pantheons were augmented with a new group of members. Hebrew scholar Hyam Maccoby noticed that executioners are always sacred. Executioners acquire the ambivalence felt toward their victims, toward genetic competitors. The executioners of the gods, the champions of the Species War, contracted all the ambivalence and divinity that was felt toward their divine victims. They were loved to the extent that *Homo erectus* was hated and hated to the extent that *Homo erectus* was loved. As the victors became ever more closely identified with the fallen gods, they grew first into legendary figures and ultimately into gods themselves. They became the *derivative element of the godhead*. Their extreme ambivalence and divinity *were derived from* their role as exterminators of one of the *original* four universal elements of the godhead.

This gradual elevation of the Deluge victors to the pantheon of the gods was one of the decisive factors in enabling our infantile, late

¹⁰⁴ Search the e-book for the intersection of “North Americans” and “philosophy” or for the popular, Mesopotamian myth of *Lugal-e*, in which the rhapsode composer says that, “From this day on, may (the name) Azag [*H the leader of the Homo erecti in the mountains whom Ninurta slaughtered*] not be spoken. Let ‘stone’ be its name” (Jacobsen, 1987: 251). Similarly, “fish” appear to be consciously substituted for those who were “gaping in death,” and “flying birds” appears to have been consciously substituted for those who “had their heads beat in” (Op. cit. 241).

Neolithic ancestors to recast their totem gods in human form. Remember, the Homo erecti were indeed much more like the apes, like the other animals -- including the totem animals -- than were our immediate ancestors. The addition of Homo sapiens to the pantheon had the effect of bringing Homo erectus' more human aspects to the fore and promoting the reconfiguration of the gods into hominid form.

We'll see a suggestion of this apotheosis of the Species War victors when we get to Mesopotamia. We'll clearly see it in Scandinavian (Germanic) mythology. Our Germanic ancestors will show us clearly and systematically how they blended the *Homo erectus* chief with the "creator" (primal father) and the vanquished of the Species War with their killers. This combined cast of characters was divided into good guys and bad guys who, in turn, would ultimately and respectively contribute to the historic, timeless aspect of "God" and "Devil."

Let's complete *Homo erectus'* epitaph with --

A GENERAL OUTLINE OF OUR PREHISTORY

The first modern individuals were mutants of *Homo erectus* people. Mutations are rare. Adaptive mutations are extremely rare. Making it even more unlikely for a mutant male to meet a mutant female and start producing our kind was the fact that the *Homo erecti* didn't like us and didn't want us producing our own kind. They especially didn't like our men, who were weak in the upper body and not nearly as good with the spear. When a mutant male was lucky enough to meet a mutant female, for a long time, they were not allowed to marry. For this reason, we'll never know when and where the first *Homo sapiens* evolved.¹⁰⁵ When we finally were allowed to mate with each other, we had to also mate with at least some of them *per* polygamous tradition. The offspring of a mixed couple was a hybrid. Like mules and most hybrids, the hybrids of genus *Homo* were superior in all ways but one. They were bigger, stronger and smarter than both parents; but they were sterile. This made the Species War inevitable. We couldn't blend our genes with theirs except in one generation of sterile hybrids. We couldn't share grand-children, so the world had to belong to either us or them.

¹⁰⁵ The earliest remains of modern men date to 198 kya. Because the first exodus of *Homo sapiens* from Africa was 75 kya (archaeologists and geneticists) because that exodus implies the possession of the bow and arrow (Huttner), it is safe to say that modern and archaic men peacefully coexisted for at least 123 ky.

Fortunately, most hybrids had *Homo sapien* mothers and sided with us. Our people also deployed the hunting dog, which compensated for our sensory inferiority.¹⁰⁶ But these two advantages were not enough to enable our first family, consisting of one woman and two or three men, to unite and, in defiance of *Homo erectus* tradition, start producing our own kind. Our superior intelligence had to be translated into weaponry if an army of Davids was to defeat an army of Goliaths.¹⁰⁷ We obtained that weapon when one of us replaced his dart thrower and foreshaft with a bow. Our first family used the bow and guerilla warfare to survive until they could migrate to a place in Africa where they designed and built a defensible settlement. This first settlement of a tiny group from which everyone alive today is descended could only be atop or adjacent to Lake Victoria in the heart of lion country. Why? Because the cats have night vision and hunt at night. They provided a buffer that helped to prevented us from being surprise-attacked and overwhelmed, especially when we were most vulnerable – at night.

This was roughly 75 kya. The last thing anyone wanted to do was become separated from our united family and secure settlement. No one dared to unnecessarily increase the risk of becoming overwhelmed and eaten by the *Homo erecti* who controlled all the earth outside of our settlement and vastly outnumbered us. We ceased to migrate with the herds as men had always done. But as [Figure 10b](#) shows, temperatures were falling quickly. The world was plummeting into the next to the last, major ice age. The flora and the fauna were dwindling due to drought.

¹⁰⁶ The use of the dog to hunt *Homo erectus* is unmistakably encoded in Irish mythology. See my *Irish Mythology: Passageway to Prehistory*. Those of my claims that aren't proven in *Irish Mythology* will be proven below.

¹⁰⁷ The David and Goliath myth is also a metaphor for the Species War. Species War victims grew to ever greater dimensions within the oral history of the victors. Ultimately, fraternal ambivalence for the “giants” became conflated with the ambivalence felt toward ongoing enemies. Goliath is described in the Bible as a giant and a *Gittite* Philistine. He was said to have come, in the second half of the second millennium B.C., from the coastal town of Gut or Gath and one of the warlike Philistine tribes that overran the southern coast of what is now Israel. As we'll see, many of the “Philistines” were Celts. Yet “Philistine” is also one of the confused *potpourris* of names for peoples whom the Hebrews, in the first five books of their Bible, admit to having slaughtered several hundred years earlier. All these peoples were allied with or coexisted with the “Rephaim,” a race of “giants” who were dispossessed and annihilated throughout the greater Palestine area by the “chosen people.”

We had never been popular with most of them. They knew we were clever, but we had refused to provide their witchdoctors with people for sacrifice. Our hunting methods were incompatible with theirs. In the best of times, they had only tolerated us. When repeated sacrifices to their gods failed to improve conditions, their witchdoctors blamed our expanding family for the drought, the cold and the dwindling herds.

War or total exodus was averted through compromise. Exactly half of our first family, including half of our best hunters and their immediate families were forced to migrate.

This is a good place to fulfill a promise of the last chapter. In the pre-Species War and pre bow and arrow days, when *Homo sapiens* was much dominated and oppressed by *Homo erectus*, *Homo sapiens* would have been desperate to realize their potentials, to turn potential advantages (conferred by abstract thinking ability and [as we'll see] superior hands) into actual ones. Even those *Homo sapiens*, especially males, who were content to live out their days within Neanderthal society and were not daring enough to join our first family of *Homo sapiens* renegades, would have wanted to contribute to the success of our subspecies by experimenting in the making of tools, and especially, weapons. The laminated bow was probably the product of many *Homo sapiens* working in isolation and secretly collaborating.

But at some time between the appearance of the “lightning spear” on the military/political stage and *Homo erectus* forcing us to divide our family and expelling half of us, *Homo erectus* would have put a stop to all tool and weapons experimentation. For new technology could only work to his disadvantage. Knappers would have acquired the status of today's nuclear scientists. They would have become closely watched and controlled, at first only in Africa, but ultimately everywhere where *Homo erectus* controlled territory.

So, the emigres walked out of Africa to the swamp land at the mouth of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. (The Red Sea was dry at this time.) There they formed our first, out-of-Africa settlement. Nobody else wanted to live in a swamp, so we lived there securely and grew our family to a great size before becoming, once more, a threat to the surrounding *Homo erectus* community. Still no one dared to leave the family. We possessed a superior weapon, but we had never fought a positional warfare battle with our parent species, and they controlled all the earth outside of our two (disconnected) settlements and vastly outnumbered us. Espionage and the utmost discretion were deployed to

prepare for and anticipate their attack. We had to win at least one such battle and thoroughly annihilate at least one army of attackers before our ancestors dared to willingly divide the family and migrate in different directions. (I must omit many of the details or risk giving away the entire story of my screenplays, Genesis I and Genesis II.)

Migration in different directions was necessary to most quickly take the world from *Homo erectus*. Fishing people migrated east along the Indian Ocean. Most hunting groups migrated north with the animals in the spring. No one wanted to return to Africa where conditions were severe, survival precarious and “Not” was prefixed to the “Welcome” mats. (The half of our first family that left Africa had promised *not* to return.) Most of the people who migrated east along the Indian Ocean and up river valleys were marine people and loaded with the clever women who had learned to fish to not be dependent upon a man. Their female-dominated groups spawned the cultures of the eastern world. Women shaped the languages and religions of the east. The hunting groups, especially the most successful ones that walked westward into the wind (as good hunters must) were male dominated. Pleistocene mammals were big and fierce. Moreover, hunting had traditionally been done with the spear, for which you had to be very strong. Few women could hunt well. Men controlled the food supply within the hunting groups and shaped the languages and religions of what became our western cultures. The expanding, *Homo sapien* population brought the Species War with them. Roughly 40 ky after it began in lower Mesopotamia, the last battles with free-roaming *Homo erectus* were fought in Ireland. Small pockets of *Homo erecti* survived by hiding out in remote places like Flores Island and the mountains of Central Asia. The last, surviving members of our parent species were killed in Israel/Palestine in the thirteenth or fourteenth century B.C.

What about the half of our original family that didn’t leave Africa first? We all like to imagine that places where we once lived and the people we once knew have remained the same. Those that didn’t migrate to cold climates and weren’t selected for making less melanin and more vitamin D did retain their dark skin. But the Species War, especially post-Species War guilt and religious beliefs, affected our attitude toward people with dark skin. Did racist prejudice add to the assumptions that the first-out-of-Africa people made about the half of the original family that they left behind? It’s natural for those of us who left Africa first to think that those who stayed have just been

hanging out all this time – huddled around campfires, smoking dope or chasing the animals. What have you assumed about them, and are those assumptions correct?

The coming chapters will address these questions. We'll tour the prehistoric world, psychoanalyzing sacred myths and rituals and getting help from archaeologists and ethnographers, to verify this human prehistory outline. Along the way, we'll learn much, much more.

MISSING PUZZLE PIECES

As I learned from living in China for over ten years and as I explain in Chapter 13, below, men and women tend to have very different values. Once you understand this, you can tell if a society has been male-dominated and to what extent and for how long by the quality and extent of its mythology or the character of its language or religion. We'll focus mostly upon the mythology of male-dominated, western societies.

Male-dominated, hunting tribes selected young men for their honesty and ability to remember. They designated these individuals as the owners of sacred myths and rituals, which had to be memorized and passed on to a successor. We will see how the Australians did this. We will see that the Celts and the Mexica maintained schools wherein sacred history was locked into poetic and lyrical form and memorized.

Yet the inter-generational transmission of even the most sacred oral history had to remain somewhat akin to the children's game of telephone. Most of the detail was lost. The development of phonetic writing from glyphs (picture words) and pictograms (pictured events) was protracted and sporadic, and few primitive codices survived the conquests and conversions of the modern era. (Modern writing, first as cuneiform, was invented by the Sumerians circa 3200 B.C.) Given these prehistoric circumstances, don't expect to find color photographs, recorded testimony or any direct evidence, direct proof of the facts in question. We'll have to settle for circumstantial, hearsay evidence, indirect testimony of facts from which the material facts may be inferred.

Archaeology, the excavation and dating of structures, bones, artifacts, garbage, coprolites and plant pollen is a huge help; but archaeology rarely provides us with more than clues, clues that need to be interpreted. Perhaps I'm hopelessly prejudiced. I know that our

prehistoric ancestors were lacking in PhDs and child-like in their worldview. Nevertheless, I continue to have more confidence in what remains of *their* statements about *their* contemporary world than the speculations about that world by modern archaeologists and geneticists.

Aside from this personal prejudice, the only real weaknesses of my theories, the only two principal facts or serious shortcomings that I must attempt to overcome are: 1) Richard Leakey's observation that the bones evidencing massacre that ought to be there aren't and 2) the apparent lack of evidence for an enabling weapon for *Homo sapiens*, the only candidate being the bow and arrow. If I can eliminate these shortcomings through the psychoanalysis of our heritage of myth and ritual, then I submit that the scientific community must accept my theories. They must accept them until better (more comprehensive theories that are consistent with all the known facts) are propounded.

Sociologist A. L. Kroeber once criticized Freud's interpretation of the primordial deed for lacking historical evidence! Kroeber's demand for direct evidence was absurd!

This sort of naive or "scientific" empiricism has always found a sizable following in Britain and America. (See *The Need for Interpretation* by Mitchell and Rosen.) This attitude says, "We can only trust what is immediately and directly given to us by our senses and must be suspect of any information requiring rational or psychological mediation." As if any evidence can be so direct as to bypass all cognitive processing! As if the world beyond our immediate senses is alien and unknowable! As if Neanderthal, Berkeley, Kroeber, you and I weren't of the same material universe! I suspect that this alienation and self-doubt derives, in large part, from the very events (primordial father murders, the Species War and the Great Flood) and the legacy of trauma and obsessional neurosis with which this book is concerned.

Fortunately, J.J. Thomson did not wait for the electron microscope to be invented before hypothesizing the electron. Nor did Karl Schwarzschild have to see a black hole before calculating the size our sun will have to shrink to before becoming one. Neither shall I be in violation of sound scientific standards by hypothesizing the Species War before obtaining color photographs.

I shall decode our heritage of primitive myths and rituals that refer (however symbolically) to primeval "animal people," "giants," "snakes," "earth-born men" or "black-headed people" who dominated the earth before men and who were defeated in battle by men or were

victims of a deluge. This heritage of Deluge mythology contains contributions from all over the world. The richest mines of these Deluge myths and rituals are invariably in the Near East and those geographic cul-de-sacs, especially the western ones, where we might expect *Homo erectus* to have been cornered and forced to fight. These Deluge myths (with or without a flood) follow the creation myths of various peoples.

This family of primitive, sacred myths and rituals is analogous to the thin layer of iridium-laden, gray clay that covers the earth and is the boundary between the Cretaceous and the Tertiary geological periods. This layer enabled Walter and Luis Alvarez to hypothesize that a gigantic meteorite struck Earth 65 mya. (See Hildebrand and Boynton.) There are no living eyewitnesses for either the meteorite or the Species War. Yet unique layers of Deluge myths and iridium-laden clay are both there, all over the world. We can no more wish away the myths than the iridium, and I know of no other way to account for them.

In analyzing myths and rituals and, to a lesser extent, the archaeological record, we're going to be relying upon circumstantial evidence to answer the principal questions, "What was the enabling weapon," and "What happened to the bodies?" Now obviously, direct evidence is preferable to circumstantial evidence -- but only if both types are of equal reliability. Permit me to offer a mundane example.

Consider two different cases of a mother leaving her three children home alone and instructing them not to eat the chocolate fudge in the refrigerator. (When we speak of our primitive ancestors, we speak of people who in many psychological ways were little children.) In each case, mother returns to find that all the fudge has been eaten. In the first case, the older two children hand mother a signed statement detailing how at a twelve noon, while sitting in the living room, they witnessed the youngest child devour all the fudge. In the second case, all three children greet mother at the door with chocolate goo smeared all over their fingers and faces and unanimously swear that they have no knowledge of what happened to the fudge.

Now, only the first case comes complete with the sort of evidence that the Alfred Kroebers of the world would deem conclusive -- direct (recorded) evidence of several eyewitnesses detailing the date and the place for a historical event. Yet it is the second case and its circumstantial evidence that would provide any sane person with the greater certainty of what actually happened.

To this argument, the Alfred Kroebers and Richard Leakeys might object that our two cases do not constitute a fair analogy because all the children are obviously guilty. Yet it is only our own identification with our immediate *Homo sapien* ancestors and our adoption of their defense mechanisms that prevents us from seeing that their (our) guilt is as obvious as that of the children in my example.

If we are dispassionate and scientifically indifferent in using our psychoanalytic tools, we ought to be able to discern the blood-smeared fingers and faces of our ancestors in the pages ahead, in our reading and re-reading of the Deluge myths. This time we'll be able to read them as neurotic symptoms, as dream-like screen memories containing elements of underlying trauma. We'll search these screen memories, an obsessive-compulsive chant and pictographic history of the Delaware Indians, the *Walam Olum* (the only pre-Columbian recorded history of non-Mexican, North Americans) and primitive potlatch, *impichiuma* and initiation rituals for evidence supportive of my hypotheses, evidence of massacres, cannibalism, the bow and arrow, *Homo erectus*, etc. As we do so, these most familiar fairy tales just may decode to reveal some thrilling, suspenseful and tragic prehistory.

Get ready to meet your ancestors.

PART II: DECODING THE DELUGE



CHAPTER 12: MANU AND VISNU: *HOMO SAPIENS* GATHER STRENGTH

We don't know who we are until we see what we can do.
--Martha Grimes

Return first to the Hindu myth of [Manu and Vishnu](#), and reread it.

Who might be the small fish that needs the protection of the man from the bigger fish? Wouldn't the first *Homo sapien* man and wife or fledgling society have been in dire need of protection? As I've insisted, being small or different is not easy, especially in a cannibal culture.

The same little fish promises to provide protection to his protector when the Deluge comes. Moreover, the little fish says, "As soon as I have reached my full growth the Deluge will happen." *Homo sapiens* could have promised the coming of a deluge upon reaching "full growth" (i. e. group military superiority over *Homo erectus*).

Who might have formed such an alliance with the fledgling *Homo sapien* society? Answer: mixed *Homo erectus/Homo sapien* couples or, more likely still, their hybrid offspring. Moreover, it is the females from among the first *Homo sapien* mutants who would most likely have survived. *Homo erectus* men who desired them and mated with them would have protected them. (Many myths ahead of us will confirm this.)

Most of the hybrid offspring of such mixed marriages would have had *Homo sapien* mothers and would have been especially sympathetic to mom's species.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, war polarizes people and would have forced the hybrids to repress their love for one of their parents. Mythology suggests that the hybrids fought with the *Homo sapiens*. (Include the hybrids in Paul's composite of the killers, in "Jesus.") In repressing their love for (usually) their *Homo erectus* fathers, these male hybrids, *Homo sapiens'* Species War allies, would have developed severe paranoid delusions and manic-depressive symptoms. Here's why.

¹⁰⁸ The Jewish people learned, possibly from hybrids, that one's strongest emotional attachment is generally to his mother. The rabbinical scholar of the Middle Ages who articulated the law that says that one cannot be a Jew unless one's mother is a Jew (or unless one is converted) did it based on Deuteronomy, Chapters 1-4. As we shall see, these chapters refer to the last days of *Homo erectus*.

Consider first paranoid delusions. Severe repression (e. g. of homosexual impulses or the love that our Paleolithic boundary ancestors felt toward *Homo erectus*) is often enabled by an opposite thought. That thought, when taken up by the conscious mind, is externalized. For example: “I (a man) love him (another man)” becomes unconsciously converted into any or all four contradictory impulses that repress the original love. They are: 1) “I hate him” (often projected as “He hates me”); 2) “I love her” (often projected as “She [or women generally] love[s] me” [*erotomania*]); 3) “She loves him” (jealousy with respect to a third person of the opposite and originally undesired sex); and 4) “I love only myself” (*megalomania*, an intensification of and regression to infantile narcissism). Each of these expressions of paranoia involves a withdrawal of *libido* (of love energy) from the outside world and a returning of that *libido* in a partial, distorted and negative way. (Cf. Freud, 1911; 29-48.) *This “abnormal” psychology is the norm among those men who are always fighting or searching for enemies.*

With respect to manic depression, notice that severe mood swings and melancholia result from contradictions within the superego. During the Species War, the portion of the hybrid’s superego that represented his *Homo erectus* father would have been at war with the rest of his superego. Severe depression results from opposing parts of the superego punishing each other in this fashion.

A popular character in Irish mythology, Conan Maol Mac Morna, clearly is a hybrid and is consistently described as morose, disagreeable and suspicious of everyone. Search for *Irish Mythology: Passageway to Prehistory* and “Mac Morna” in the e-book versions of my books.

The hybrids [e. g. Manu, Conan Maol Mac Morna, Heracles, (as you’ll see) the “Nephilim” of Genesis, etc.] would have protected *Homo sapien* as Manu protected the little fish. Of course, like the little fish, *Homo sapien* was later able to protect his protectors from “the Deluge.”

Notice too that India is one of the Asian peninsulas in which *Homo erectus* would have been trapped. Also, the Indo-European peoples who stormed over the passes of the Hindu-Kush Mountains and conquered India at some time in the second half of the second millennium B.C. added their own Deluge tales to Hindu mythology. For both these reasons, we would expect Hinduism and Jainism (one of the two religions that Hinduism spawned and the one that became very

popular in southern India) to reflect a very traumatic Deluge experience. As we'll discover in a later chapter, they do.

We'll discuss a more complete version of the Manu and Vishnu myth in Chapter 33. It will provide us with very concrete information about the Species War in India and one of the general trends in the Species War throughout Eurasia. What remains of this fragmentary myth about "Manu and Vishnu" is even more concrete and practical in its meaning than we can possibly appreciate at this point.

Finally, notice that although this Hindu flood appears brief and tame in comparison with what has come down to us from the Mid-East, it is a thousand times more potent than anything to come out of China.

Consider next the Chinese myth material that I introduced [above](#).

CHAPTER 13: KUNG KUNG AND YAO: ‘WE STAYED ALOOF’

As nations improve, so do their gods. --G.C. Lichtenberg

*The failure of learning in the East has been as inevitable as
The failure of love in the West.¹⁰⁹
--An obscure New York City taxi driver*

The first of the two Chinese deluge myths from Campbell, “The Deluge of Kung,” says, “After the time of the Fire Drillers...the waters occupied *seven* tenths and the dry land three tenths of the earth.” Interpretation: *Homo sapien* and *Homo erectus* were at war over most of the planet. This war came after the time of the Fire Drillers. The Fire Drillers, the discoverers of fire, were *Homo erecti*. We know from the archaeological record that *Homo erectus* used fire. The Greek myth of Prometheus (v2, Chapter 25) and others confirm that *Homo erectus* discovered and gave our ancestors fire. One Chinese tradition also refers to a first “Yellow Emperor” who invented fire and whose descendant saved the world from the flood of water. (Cf. Vidal: 384.)

This Kung myth continues with, “He (Kung) availed himself of the natural conditions and in the constrained space ruled the empire.” Interpretation: “We tried to avoid war, killing only those hapless *Homo erecti* who virtually dropped into our kettles.” Campbell notes that this is a basic Chinese theme. The Eastern worldview holds that, “Virtue consists in respecting those [*H natural*] conditions; competence in making use of them” (Campbell, 1962: 381).

The other Chinese deluge myth from Campbell and Karlgren, the legend of the great Yao, praised Yao for having made peace with the “black-haired people.” Now, as I’ve said, no people among us are more black-haired than the Han majority in China. Their hair is uniformly black. Yet no people describe themselves by features that are normal for their population. We’re not wired to even notice such things. We’re wired to perceive change, to perceive the unusual. Evolution made us that way. It was and is essential for survival.

Homo erectus, on the other hand, was probably darker than any of our ancestors. He was an earlier branch of our hominid line and walked slightly stooped. He was more ape-like and hairy than our immediate

¹⁰⁹ Here *learning* refers to Learning I, discovering and inventing, as opposed to Learning II, learning from others.

ancestors. You will see more references to “the black-headed people” when we return to Mesopotamian mythology. Both these terms originally referred to *Homo erectus*.

Far more important than what Chinese mythology says is what it doesn't say. There is an absence of detailed and traumatic myths, an absence of geographic cul-de-sacs and a *relative* lack of powerful, vivid, anthropomorphic gods. All this suggests that original and second sin violence was not as great here. Is this the basis for China's traditional prejudice against “barbarians”? We are ready now to answer this and other questions about East-West cultural differences.

EAST-WEST DIFFERENCES

Let's add some insights to the General Outline of Our Prehistory of Chapter 11. As soon as our ancestors developed the military confidence to voluntarily divide and expand their territory, they had to do it for at least two reasons.

First and as previously mentioned, they knew that the Species War was inevitable because the hybrids were sterile. (The two subspecies could not share grandchildren.) Therefore, they had to grow their population as quickly as possible and were periodically subject to overcrowding within their own territory.

Secondly, *Homo sapiens* had to fear that the *Homo erecti* would acquire and use the bow and arrow, that they would turn our own weapon against us. Therefore, once the war started, the enemy had to be kept off balance, on his heels. In later mythology, our ancestors tell us that *Homo erectus*' hands weren't good enough to make the bow; but this was learned only later, over the course of the Species War.

Note too that the Species War, the struggle against a common enemy, had a unifying effect upon our ancestors. It encouraged them to eat communally and live polygamously within the long house longer than what otherwise would have happened. This made even the later divisions of the tribal family difficult, *emotionally difficult*. Indeed, our ancestors lamented this separation in myths that are still recognizable as referring to the fanning out of the Species War victors. The resultant loss of a common language and estrangement became attributed to God's departure from the world (e. g. in the Micmac, “[Glooskap's Departure from The World](#),”) or to God's punishment (e. g. in the Assyro-Babylonian, “[Tower of Babel](#)”).

The most female-dominated and inveterate fishing people ended up in China, opposite the Yellow Sea, the world's most productive fishery. Y-DNA researchers now say that a large migration also occurred out of Africa 45 kya, and part of this group followed the south Asian coast eastward. (See Wells, Spencer.) Indeed, the principal totem animal and mythical parent of the Chinese people, the dragon, is a composite of Chinese totem animals that include several sea creatures. Dragons are usually depicted with scales, and some have webbed feet. As you can imagine, fishing peoples have less ambivalence and acquired guilt for the fish that they kill than do hunters for the killing of mammals. Fishing is also passive relative to hunting. Early Egyptians and other primitive men believed the sun appeared to die each evening in the West.¹¹⁰ Only the testier and more contentious were apt to wander toward what some primitives referred to as "the sun's house of death." The more protein-rich diet of European hunters (and Westerners generally) would also explain why both modern and archaic Europeans are and were larger than their eastern counterparts.

Fishing, in Pleistocene times, was not as dangerous or as athletic as hunting. The most clever, confident and independent women, the women who didn't want to depend upon a male hunter, would have become fishers and would have dominated these marine groups. With primitive technologies, women might even be better fishers than men. Their subcutaneous (below the skin) tissue is fatter; their pelvic bones are less pointed; they can sit longer without fidgeting.

Eastward traveling, female dominated fishing groups would have been family oriented, relatively afraid of and resistant to change and egalitarian and unconditional in their motherly love of children. As small animals and insects do, they tended to reproduce for quantity, to have lots of offspring, to pursue the R reproductive strategy.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ "In Ancient Egypt, the necropolis or cemetery was situated in the desert to the west of its attached settlement. This was for three reasons. First, by placing the cemetery in the desert, essential good farming land was not lost. Secondly, as good farming land symbolized life, so the desert came to represent death and was a natural place to house the dead. Thirdly, the gate or entrance to the realm of the dead was believed to lie in the West. Ra [*H a creator and sun god*] in the form of the setting sun was seen to die there each day. He slowly descended into the underworld" (Barrett: 43).

¹¹¹ Now here is where Atkinson's theory (page 102, above) applies. The less violent participants in Atkinson's original sin scenario would strongly correlate with the less violent nature of marine (as opposed to hunting) peoples. The peoples who eventually migrated eastward would have been, in large part, peoples who preferred to live on

However, boats sturdy enough for whaling weren't built until the Iron Age; and the fishers' catch was paltry compared to that of the hunters. Feckless women unable to provide for themselves gravitated to the male-dominated, hunting community. Feckless men lacking the right stuff to be hunters gravitated to the female-dominated fishing community. Female versus male domination became and remains the essence of East-West differences respectively. The first out-of-Africa division of our tribal family predestined the later MK and FR extremes.

Over the next 60-70 ky, from then till now, the dominant sex of each group maintained its control by shaping its group's religions, languages and customs pursuant to its own interests and values. We're creatures of habit. These three cultural spheres govern our strongest and most basic habits. Let's see how the three of them differ east and west.

Traveling west from Mesopotamia, languages become ever simpler. Western, male leaders relied only on their arms for security and used language only for communication. The most extreme and western-most MKs ultimately developed the trade and port language that is easiest to learn as a second language and most useful for business -- English.¹¹²

Traveling east from Mesopotamia, except for Farsi, the language of the Persian Empire, the languages are ever more difficult. The dominant women of eastern societies relied on their greatest strength, language, for their security. A difficult language keeps spies and foreigners *per se* at bay. The greater difficulty of eastern languages and the greater need of children to learn them from the mother assured women of continued dominance in these societies. In China, where the women developed mutually incomprehensible, regional dialects to keep out foreigners, language-born security had a steep price. It became impossible to create a phonetic, written language comprehensible to any dialect speaking group other than the one that the written language reflected. Therefore, the common written language could only be a non-phonetic, picture language. But graphic

marine life. Evidence of modern humans at Still Bay and Blombos Cave on the south coast of South Africa extends to 75 kya. See the works of Christopher Henshilwood.

¹¹² "The Dream of Maxen Wledig," the fifth story of the *Mabinogion*, the bardic tales of Wales, concludes, "And they took counsel and cut out the tongues of the women, lest they should corrupt their speech. And because of the silence of the women from their own speech, the men of Armorica are called Britons. From that time there came frequently, and still comes, that language from the Island of Britain."

linguistic imagery interferes with the imagery that must precede language for creative thinking. *Picture languages are terribly inefficient and ultimately become a barrier to learning.* By 1400 A.D., imperial civil service exams were testing only for the candidate's ability to use the language. Spoken Chinese (Mandarin, the dialect that everyone speaks today) is beautiful and poetic; but everything we do, including our thought processes, tends to become habit. Learning Chinese requires such strict adherence to listening, imitating and remembering (Learning II skills) that it virtually punishes creativity and imagination. Spoken and written Chinese became so difficult and unwieldy as to be barriers to further learning; but, again, the language gives the mother absolute power within the family.

The key to understanding East-West, religious differences is "perfection." This attribute of "gods" has two component parts. A perfect god (or person if there could be such) would 1) do nothing wrong (be infallible) and 2) be able to do everything right (be omnipotent).

Infallibility is a passive, female value. A woman must not err in choosing her man. Infallibility is what easterners refer to in describing *their* ancestors or *their* gods as perfect. Learning a Chinese language involves such strict and continuous listening to and imitation of the mother, that the child is virtually forced to believe that she is infallible. By association with her, ancestors become infallible too. Confucianism, China's national religion, articulates and reinforces these beliefs and esteem for everything that is traditionally Chinese.¹¹³ Credit not Confucius but females for this religious ideology. Credit this ideology with the "loss of face" suffered when fallibility is revealed. The over generalized belief in and valuation of infallibility also dooms discovery and invention because they require experimentation and mistakes.

Omnipotence is the active, male component of perfection. Westerner gods and heroes possess this one. Western gods can do anything and everything but are violent and exhibit every human vice.

These differences are consistent with what we've found above: eastward- moving groups were female dominated and usually drove the *Homo erecti* out of their territory without killing them.¹¹⁴ Consequently,

¹¹³ Search the Conclusion in Volume 3 for "national religions."

¹¹⁴ In particular, the oldest legend of the New Year Celebration that precedes the week-long Spring Festival confirms this. *Guonian* means both *pass year* and *pass (dragon) monster*. It is said to have been shouted by the villagers who long, long ago chased a dragon out of China and into the North using sticks. The dragon's long body

Asian peoples (the cul-de-sac peoples of India, Siberia, Australia, Korea and the Malay Archipelago notwithstanding) never became as ambivalent toward the objects of the Fraternal Complex, toward *Homo erectus* and associated ongoing genetic competitors.

Shintoism and Taoism are more like a philosophy than a religion. Japanese Shintoists worship nature and very positive ancestors. “All Chinese philosophy...is essentially the study of how men can best be helped to live together in harmony and good order. Every Chinese philosophy is formulated not as an abstract theory but as an art of ruling” (Campbell, 1962: 410).¹¹⁵

The “perfect,” nonviolent, female-dominated East more easily forgot *Homo erectus*. Foreigners and strangers (especially crazy, violent hunters or their descendants) were avoided. Less ambivalent toward the gods and less guilt-ridden and troubled by them, the female-dominated eastern cultures concentrated on love, marriage, family life and avoiding potentially disruptive changes that might cause women to err. Accordingly, their focus was on honoring the ancestors and worshipping the gods of the Oedipus complex, gods associated with home and hearth.

Westerners and other fierce barbarians from beyond the Khyber Pass and the Great Wall did occasionally invade the East. Joseph Campbell theorized that the different character of eastern religion resulted from violence and suffering. He lived for only six months in India and six months in Japan. He totally missed the point.

The violent barbarian invaders of India and China were absorbed by these female-dominated cultures and had little, if any, long term impact. Just as females seek always to avoid and moderate conflict; in the East, myths and rituals were systematically moderated to encourage people to forget about the traumas of the past and discourage the development of powerful gods. The powerful gods that the Aryans brought with them to India were systematically emasculated.

The creators of Jainism and Buddhism seem to have understood that humanity has been deeply traumatized. These religions are tranquilizers, and Buddha is androgynous. Most of the images depict “him” (?) with a soft, fat face and body that looks feminine. Jainism and Buddhism developed an abstract, meditative and nonviolent

symbolizes a long column of *Homo erecti* marching out of China. Like the dragon’s head, the head of a column contains the commander and launches offensives.

¹¹⁵ Of course, too often the harmony prescribed was a status quo satisfying only to ruling elites. Nevertheless, extremely powerful, western-like gods just weren’t there.

philosophy that offered yet another method for dealing with believers' guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia. Campbell believed that this alternative method was driven *on the demand side*, by sorrow, by the overpopulation of the east, the laborious production of rice and the despairing submission of peaceful, tropical gardeners and peasants to horse mounted, bloodthirsty barbarians. I disagree. It was driven *on the supply side* by cunning easterners who subdued and reformed their violent conquerors.

To understand this alternate philosophy, realize that all religions attempt to quickly and easily satisfy what I have dubbed "the innate religious demand," the individual's wish to avoid death and suffering, a wish that science and society are slow to satisfy. Westerners appeal to their powerful gods, propitiating them in the hope that the gods (now "God") will "save" them. Easterners gradually forgot the gods. We'll discover in India, the birthplace of Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism, that this forgetting involved reinterpreting mythology to attribute its most violent events and characters to mere illusion. It took but another logical step or two to deny the reality of all things and the separate self. This philosophy, in various forms, spread rapidly eastward. It said that cycles of birth and death are mere illusions in an endless and eternal oneness. Physics and chemistry confirm this message. The world is unified materially. But physiology and psychology contradict it. Each of us has an *individual* nervous system ending in our fingers and toes. We are conditioned by the pleasure and pain that it registers.

Notice too that the hypocrisy and exploitation characteristic of organized religions in general enters eastern religions when the "all is illusion" message is supplemented with two others. One, the first chronologically, contradicts the other two and must remain unconscious. It reminds the believer that he is guilty by showing him images of "Buddha" as a subtly compromised *Homo erectus*. The last message expressly tells him that the path to enlightenment or Nirvana begins with the renunciation of worldly desires (Buddhism) or the practice of self-denial, self-deprivation or asceticism (southern Indian and Tibetan religion). Once equipped with these contradictory messages, a believer only needs to be confronted with a pot or pool associated with the god(s) or offered incense or other religious items for sale; and he will automatically cough up his money. Mothers of Jainist and Buddhist priests may have provided the inspiration, if not the design, for this cunning and manipulative new philosophy. Notice too that the Roman Catholic counterpart is Paul's insistence that

salvation comes not through good works but faith in Jesus (the best evidence of which is one's contribution to church coffers).

Having lived in China for only ten years and not knowing the language, I undoubtedly have much to learn about Chinese customs. But I can tell you of three that debilitate and degrade men. First, the *ostensible* purpose of *Qing Ming*, "Grave-sweeping" Day, is to honor the ancestors. The *real* purpose is to reject all change (that men are likely to inspire) by pretending that the ancestors were (and the China that they have bequeathed to us is) perfect. Proof: my campaign to convert Grave-sweeping Day into Grandparent Video-taping Day (*which would enable us to really know and remember our ancestors*) was met everywhere in China by scorn, hysteria and derision!

Second, the Chinese custom of the bride becoming a *permanent* member of the groom's family degrades the first husband and (in the event of divorce) any later husband. It amounts to the first guy's family saying, "She is more important to us than that feckless man we reared." It amounts to her saying to any later husband, "His family (which you can only despise due to it being associated with a competitor) is more important to me than you or any other feckless man."

Third, bride wealth (as opposed to the reverse-flowing, dowries of the West) enriches the bride and her family at the groom's expense. It also creates the usually-fictitious presumption that she doesn't love him, enabling her to better manipulate him.

With respect to political economy, the slave, feudal and capitalist eras involved rapid property accumulation and male dominance. Yet even in these eras, Chinese women used customs, language and religion to control home, hearth and purse strings.

With respect to our achievements and as could have been predicted, MK, western societies prioritized science, technology and the forces of production. They gave us the automobile, the airplane, the computer -- and every kind of weaponry. Violence has not only ill-effected western religion. It has had devastating *psychological* effects upon the West too. Negative feelings toward our ancestors, even unconscious ones, are especially damaging to our sense of self. Lifting the repression of them and eliminating the automatic guilt that is due to the repression itself only elevates guilt to the conscious mind. Because we tend to see ourselves in others and especially in our children, thinking or feeling ill toward ourselves also means thinking and feeling ill toward them.

In hating themselves and each other, westerners were also (prior to all things being made in China) more inclined to destroy their

environment. In the United States, we have depleted approximately three fourths of our topsoil since the Europeans arrived. Over the same time, Easterners took better care of their soil.¹¹⁶ Why? Easterners, relatively free of guilt and self-hatred and genetic hostility, lack our contempt for our own fecal material. By allowing the worms, insects, humus and microorganisms of their soil to decompose their own waste, they maintain the quality of their topsoil.¹¹⁷ Moreover, the artificial NPK fertilizers (nitrate, phosphate and potash fertilizers that are burned from rock and increasingly used in America to compensate for soil depletion) increase non-renewable petroleum consumption. They also upset the delicate balance of minerals in the soil, degrade the vitamin, mineral and protein content of our foods and leech into ground waters, rivers and streams where they (due to their high solubility) cause the rapid growth of algae and plants. Waters without dissolved oxygen fail to break down pollutants and support microorganisms and fish. (Cf. Null: 146-165.)

In Chapter 25, we'll discover a more direct sense in which Western Man's annihilation of the Deluge victims caused him to become alienated from the rest of nature and deny his animal being. This denial of or estrangement from our animal being produces or aggravates a host of other problems in the West. For example: 1) Western Man has taken the lead in committing dietary suicide by "refining" his food; 2) thinking it is "beneath him" to lie on the ground at night like the other animals, Western Man sleeps on an elevated, soft mattress. In so doing, he foregoes daily physical therapy for his back. He fails to straighten out the most vulnerable part of his anatomy, the upright spinal column that is still one of nature's experiments.

In the East, FR societies (especially China) learned how to live and govern themselves harmoniously. Chinese people have strong families and relatively happy marriages and a society free of *overt* violence. Yet China, the most overtly civilized country in the world, still suffers from the female form of violence -- lies, trickery and

¹¹⁶ China's acute soil *erosion* is due mostly to the lowland and coastal floods that result respectively from highland and inland deforestation.

¹¹⁷ Human manure is more difficult to degrade than the manure of other animals, and the lack of controls upon its disposal causes perennial hepatitis in China. Nevertheless, scientists are discovering plants and bacteria that kill the harmful *E. coli* bacteria and degrade human waste. Unless we learn how to recycle it, we shall someday find ourselves in the unenviable position of having no tillable land that is above water.

repression. Chinese children must accept their mother's lies and trickery to obtain her constant help in learning the language. Lies and trickery thus become pervasive, overflowing their customary spheres of love and war. Witness the very cunning *modus operandi* of Buddhism or the lax attitude in Chinese schools toward cheating.

Chinese people, abhorring violence and confusing it with conflict *per se*, tend to repress all controversy -- even the dialectical clash of ideas. They tend to fear and oppress anyone who is less repressed than themselves. This pervasive repression/oppression, self/socially-inflicted, psychological violence, stifles personal growth and social change.

Lies, trickery, repression, and female-shaped religion, language and customs discourage imaginative thinking, experimentation and creative behavior. When Rudyard Kipling said, "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," he saw the size of the challenge.

We have eliminated our archaic ancestors, our only genetically incompatible rivals. We have circled and inhabited the globe. In every sphere of life, modern communications are bringing us, Easterners and Westerners (both proud of our accomplishments), into contact with our opposite halves, our long-lost relatives. We must learn from each other. The great task of this century, our foremost challenge, is to reunite the human family. Our happiness, our success as a species and all the breathtaking possibilities that lie before us, from colonizing the stars to designing and controlling our own evolution depend upon this, upon reuniting the human family. Those ancestors who waged the most difficult and decisive struggle in the life of man, the ancestors who have long been our principal gods, the ancestors to whom we owe the most, would have wanted us to do this. All future generations are depending on us. We cannot and we shall not fail.

But success requires a rare and different kind of courage. It requires the humility to see ourselves as we really are, as others see us, with all our shortcomings and imperfections. It's not a matter of "saving face," for our monkey faces have never been perfect and worth saving. The Orwellian problem (homophobia/latent homosexuality) is the same everywhere, and prevents us from dealing with the other problems (K and R and East-West differences). Westerner problems are obvious. The stupid television sitcoms and romantic comedies that America exports fool only the very young. Everyone else knows what an insecure, violent, lawless and loveless place America is. It's a land

where the children of outcast and downtrodden immigrants resolve to succeed (i. e. “make money”) by any means -- and end up as gangsters and prostitutes. It’s a land where anything and everything can be discovered or invented -- but where everything ends up as the property of corporate gangsters who only put into production what enables them to best prey upon the public. America is exactly what the Gershwins called it: *a rhapsody in blue*.

China, on the other hand, has only recently opened to the world. Its women rule subtly. Chinese women shrewdly and Chinese men embarrassingly deny that China is female dominated and beset with female and language-related problems. Here are their 4 best arguments:

Argument #1: except for Empress Wu Hou, who ruled for fifteen years in the mid *Seventh Century A.D.*, men have always ruled China. Most emperors had harems with hundreds of wives and concubines.

China did usually appear to be ruled by a man with superhuman ability to satisfy women. But what was really the main function of all those imperial eunuchs, and who do you think chose them?

Argument #2: Chinese women traditionally were (some still are) forced to marry men chosen by their parents. Chinese women are slaves to their husbands. (If you believe this, reread the previous three pages.)

Argument #3: the power and authority of Chinese women is necessary to keep women secure and marrying for love rather than for security, as Western women do. We don’t want to reduce our women to prostitutes officially cloaked in marriage licenses.

Apt as this comparison may be, the false conclusion drawn from it indicates a total lack of understanding, creativity and imagination. Women don’t have to be empowered with the control of a dinosaur (Chinese) language to be secure. My new plan for marriage and child rearing that is outlined in *Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution* will empower women as never before within the family -- where they must be the leaders. The *Stage II* program, in addition to solving all our family problems and making geniuses of our children, will also enable women giving birth to return to work as soon as they are physically able to return, thus minimizing women’s major disadvantage within the career world. Laws and subsidies to help and protect child-bearing women can erase the remainder of that disadvantage.

If we start to minimize K and R, as we must for *Stage II* to be feasible, then our media and public dialog won’t have to be dominated

by their dreary mainstays: crime, catastrophes and political strife. Fully half of all the mass media can then be devoted to women's issues. Family and community news should share prime time and occupy not the back pages but the left half of every page of our newspapers.

Argument #4: Chinese women are not Amazons. Men occupy and always have occupied the positions of power in China and earn, on average, more money than women do.

Again, to understand China, one must penetrate the surface! For Chinese women to be out front would be suicidal in the military and inconvenient in politics and business. Why should they? They control their men from behind -- even better than western capitalists control their politicians; but the control means are not ownership, money and general elections. They are custom, religion, motherhood, love, and language.

Unlike western languages, which have accented syllables but no necessary tonality, Chinese has four tones and a neutral tone. *Every syllable in Chinese must be sung with one of these five miniature songs.* The same syllable can have four or five completely different meanings depending upon which *tone* it is sung with, and there is no discernible logic that can inform the speaker of which tones to use. He can only learn the tones by committing to memory the sound of his mother's voice saying each and every Chinese word. This process of listening to and memorizing mother's voice consumes the better part of every Chinese person's first *seven* years of life. Via the learning of the Chinese language, the mother, not the father, disciplines the child. The Chinese mother disciplines the child not by spanking, by conditioning the child with and to physical violence, but by merely closing her mouth. She can terrorize the child just by threatening to close her mouth! She dictates absolutely over the child's life. The child has no choice but to accept all her lies and manipulations, to adopt her repression and to obey.¹¹⁸

But how, you might ask, can the mother dominate the father? It's simple: she merely marries the right man, the man who loves her most,

¹¹⁸ We can discipline children without resorting to violence or the Chinese language, lies, trickery and repression. To do so, we must have the means to use rewards (positive reinforcement) more than punishments. Of course, if human reproduction were a social honor or a privilege decided politically and not a private right, if we raised fewer children, children with equal opportunity, and raised them primarily in school academies; then disciplining them would not be a problem.

the man whose mother she most strongly resembles, the man who will always think of her as his mother *and expect her to be like his mother!*

Moreover, although both are necessary for lovemaking, the “Mommy and her baby boy” incest psychodrama, the dominant one in the female dominated East, is more satisfying and effective for all of us than the “Daddy and his baby girl” alternative, which predominates in the male dominated West. We are all familiar with mother’s physical love. We spent a lot of time at her breast. Most of us can only speculate about father’s physical love; so even in the West, the “Daddy and his baby girl” psychodrama is less real and satisfying and more like play-acting. So, the Chinese woman merely needs to marry the right man to dominate him as effectively as his biological mother did.

Still not convinced? Want more proof? Imagine this. You’re in a rowboat far from shore. In it with you are your mother and spouse. Neither can swim and they are of the same weight. Suddenly the boat springs a serious leak and is sinking fast. You can only save one of them. Which one do you save? Westerners all say, “My spouse, of course.” Chinese people say, “My mother, of course.” Only if you tweak the scenario to make the wife twenty years old and pregnant and the mother ninety and terminally ill, will a Chinese man say, “Gee, tough decision.”

Please don’t think that by launching this dissertation I am picking on China. In my opinion, the West has more and greater problems. On the other hand, China may be the most conservative society on Earth. It is unlikely to change until it hits bottom and is forced by circumstances to change. But its national socialist policies are still working for China, so the bottom and change are nowhere in sight. The next big crisis for the Far East and Southeast Asia that will force easterners to change will be the coming flood. They will be among the worst victims.

The strength of the LGBT rights movement in the West, the greater openness of male-dominated society to ideas and to *theoretical* change would seem to be an advantage for the West. But the right of same-sex marriage won’t bring social change if ever-growing homophobia prevents most people from exercising that right. Ever-increasing differences in wealth and income continue to create ever-increasing pressure for monogamy by default. The monogamy continues to generate homophobia, which in turn causes all the people with same sex siblings who can hide their homosexuality to do so, to wear the Third Mask. Savagely-high birthrates require men to be killers, which also generates homophobia. It’s a vicious circle that legal rights alone

cannot break. As I said above, for positive change and civilization to triumph, we need a socio-political revolution that triumphs on four fronts simultaneously: 1) against K (for equal opportunity), 2) against R (for population control), 3) against fundamentalism (for education about our prehistory, human psychology and the meaning of our religions) and 4) against homophobia (for LGBT rights and same sex and group marriage). Ending homophobia may also require a 25-year, global moratorium on new births. (If no one can procreate, then monogamy will cease to put homosexual folks in a double bind; and declining population will reverse the compulsion for men to kill [generating homophobia]. More on this moratorium in the Conclusion.)

CHAPTER 14: THE DELAWARE TELL IT AS IT WAS

I am the egg-man, I am the walrus. --John Lennon

*All of us are crazy, but a few of us have advanced
to being open about it. --An obscure New York City taxi driver*

Reconsider the *Walam Olum* of the Lenni Lenape (“Original People,” as they called themselves), known as the Delaware Indians in English. I introduced them, above. I gave you only a small fragment of it then. Now we will be able to more easily interpret Part II, its Deluge myth; Part III, their collective journey into North America; and Part IV, their conquest of the Aboriginal African Americans, the mound builders. (See Figure 123a.) To Donnelly and most modern men, who’ve read or heard the *Walam Olum* translated, it must have seemed like a lunatic’s hallucination. To the “experts” in the paleo sciences, experts who aren’t sufficiently well versed in any of them, and to the Third Mask, Orwellian, homophobic, latent homosexuals, who fear change and new knowledge that might stimulate change or threaten to overthrow conventional wisdom; the *Walam Olum* is a forgery. The “experts” who make such claims are the best proof of the proverb, “A little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing.” Without an understanding of the Species War, the experts had no chance of understanding the minds of our primitive ancestors. The Third Mask, homophobic, latent homosexual scoundrels who disparage the *Walam Olum* are projecting their own warped personalities onto the Delaware Indians and the great naturalist, Constantine Rafinesque, whom we must thank for the treasure of antiquity that you are about to read. I can’t remind you often enough that the greatest threat to humanity is posed by the Third Mask people who can’t love, are angry, motivated only by fear, value only money, power and their own offspring, fear all change because they associate change with the removal of their masks and spend their lives trying to get even with the rest of us. Ignore them.

All oral histories and the recognized mythologies that descend from them have been compromised. In Neolithic times, priests, individuals charged with retaining sacred histories and tribal majorities demanded that references to cannibalism be edited out. The same was true at the start of the modern era for all references to polygamy, prostitution at temples, and bisexuality and homosexuality. No people

have preserved a fully authentic and uncompromised record of their ancestors.

As for the integrity of Rafinesque, the *Walam Olum*'s transcriber, I've already lauded him, [above](#). Like all people of his time, he was a fundamentalist believer. He was often unable to distinguish between myth and fact. But born in Istanbul, raised in France and immigrated to the United States; he was much worldlier, less dogmatic and open to new learning than his contemporaries. He was often prone to exaggeration and puffery, but no more so than the less knowledgeable and more venal publishers with whom he was competing. He, or his Delaware informants, did contaminate their translation with a few modern terms, such as "jin" or "fairies;" but it is outrageous to suggest that this man, who dedicated his life to learning, who was the renaissance man of his time, would have fabricated the *Walam Olum* and perpetrated a fraud upon the public. People who make such claims know next to nothing about Rafinesque or primitive people and tend to be modern fundamentalist believers (who fear anything that challenges their religion's dogma) or latent homosexuals (who fear all new knowledge that might spark social change) or both.

One last comment should forever dispense with the claims of the idiots and scoundrels who deny the *Walam Olum*'s authenticity: I discovered the meaning of the flood myths before I started my studies of antiquities. This was the biggest piece missing in the center of the puzzle of who we are. In it, I had a skeleton key to easily and quickly unlock the meaning of all the mysteries of our prehistory. Not only did Rafinesque not have this key, he didn't even have the benefit of dating techniques, the modern fossil record or psychoanalysis. Yet, if he did fabricate the *Walam Olum*, he did a much better job than what even I could do!

The one plausible-sounding alarm that the doubters raise concerns the identity of "Dr. Ward of Indiana" from whom Rafinesque claimed to have received the Lenape's painted branches. Dr. Ward disappeared and for a long time was untraceable. But in modern times, we have discovered who he apparently was and what happened to him: he moved to Georgia where he became the first professor of natural history at the University of Georgia. You can read about Malthus Ward here:

<http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/science-medicine/malthus-ward-1794-1863>. If, after reading all three volumes of this book, you have any doubts about the *Walam Olum*'s

authenticity; send them first to me in an [email](#). Don't embarrass yourself by publishing them.

Before starting, be aware that there is no evidence within the archaeological record of *Homo erectus* ever having been in the Americas. As far as we are told as of December 20, 2019, the first people to make their appearance in North and South America were modern men. *But all information about the first-arriving African Americans was suppressed until very recently, so don't rely on the official record for anything.* By 30 kya, Amerindians were occupying parts of Eastern Siberia closest to North America. By 13,200-12,850 cal ya, they occupied many Western Hemisphere sites. (Cf. JN&T: 490.)

This latter period, 13,200-12,850 cal. ya, is known as the Clovis Period, after a prolific site near Clovis, New Mexico, where Amerindians mined flint and chert for their arrow heads. It is the period to which the vast majority of the earliest American artifacts date. Scientists believe that, during this Clovis period, the ice sheet that covered Canada was divided, leaving a north-south corridor through which most of the Amerindians walked. Smaller groups of Amerindians may have arrived earlier by sea; but as we'll see, very few of these groups would have chanced migration in Paleolithic times; and very few if any that did would have survived. The earliest sites suggesting human habitation are hearths. One in Pennsylvania dates to 16 kya. One at Tlapacoya (near Mexico City), complete with stone tools, radiocarbon dates to 20 kya. *One at Pedra Furada, Brazil dates to 65 kya.*

As I said in Chapter 6, in the early Twenty-First Century, it is being reported that the earliest American skulls (all those pre-10-kya in North America and all those pre-9-kya in South America) are all Negroid and that the Mongoloid People from Asia (the "Indians") presumably exterminated most of the Aboriginal African Americans. Knowing as I do how politically controlled academia is, it is infuriating to wonder how long this fact has been withheld from the public. But as we'll see, the first academic to try to report this, Constantine Rafinesque, paid with his career and material well-being. No doubt, he also feared for his life. We shall strengthen this scenario in this chapter and prove it in Appendix H.

We'll discover, momentarily, other reasons why all or almost all the Amerindians did not enter America until 13,200-12,850 ya. This was long after they had eliminated the last of the *Homo erecti* in

northeast Asia and long after they knew this abundant land to exist. To understand these other reasons, we must back up a bit.

Groups of *Homo erecti* were gradually driven across Asia. Ironically, they were driven by people whose descendants would be similarly driven in an opposite direction across North America thousands of years later.¹¹⁹ We'd expect to find, among these migrants to the Americas, some very traumatic deluge myths evincing the end of the Species War. They would tell of the furious efforts of *Homo erecti* to survive, probably with their backs up against the glaciers or the water.

Part II of the *Walam Olum* does indeed tell of battles. The Delaware victors of the Eastern Siberian chapter of the Species War were numerous enough and stayed in situ long enough to perform talk therapy upon one another. It was only to the extent that they and their descendants needed to obscure the identity of their victims that one of Freud's descriptions applies to them. Picture in your mind how we know the Indians to have danced as they chanted the *Walam Olum* and know that, "the unconscious mind works to avoid or forget what is painful or unpleasant... People whose unconscious is heavily burdened with such tasks are characterized by nervous behavior... [and] seem physically to be doing what their minds are doing – "taking flight in the face of 'danger'" ([Freud](#)).

Donnelly introduces the *Walam Olum* saying, "After describing 'a time when there was nothing but sea-water on top of the land' and the creation of sun, moon, stars, earth and man, [H their creation myth] the legend depicts the Golden Age and the Fall in these [H Figures 17&18] words..." For Donnelly, "Golden Age" meant Atlantis.

I say, after Martin and others, that with respect to mere material prosperity, their golden age was the time when they first crossed Beringia (the Strait or the Isthmus, depending upon the sea level) with bows and arrows and found a land teeming with large, now-extinct, Pleistocene mammals. Their fall from material prosperity would refer to the hard times following the extinction of their game animals.

But as we are beginning to see, guilt and fear are passed from generation to generation. Their effects last longer than non-fatal hunger pains. Therefore, their "Fall" must be interpreted either as their fall

¹¹⁹ Does this sound like blind speculation? It's not. In a later chapter, I'll show you another North American myth that says as much. It describes how *Homo erectus* was driven across Asia and probably Europe too.

from the unconscious, pre-linguistic (animal) state and their “fall from innocence” following the primal deed or the Species War. By the time we leave the Judeo-Christian Garden of Eden in Chapter 37, you’ll have no doubt as to which of these possibilities “The Fall” usually refers.

Because none of my predecessors, Rafinesque included, were fully conscious of the Species War, they were hopelessly unable to identify the original “snakes” and thus hopelessly unable to understand Part II, its prelude and its aftermath. However, because Rafinesque was more of a naturalist and less influenced by modern religion, he had more respect for the Indians and was less apt to compromise what his informants sang and interpreted for him. That is another reason why his translation is superior to all the others. The Society notes that the two scholars who seem to have been his apprentices, Ephraim Squire and Edwin Davis, also followed Rafinesque closely in their translation of the *Walam Olum*. (Squire and Davis also co-wrote *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*, 1848, the Smithsonian’s first publication and the first comprehensive attempt to describe the American monuments.) As we’ll see, all three of them knew that the first Americans, the original mound builders, were dark-skinned people who had come directly from Africa. (For an image of the great American mounds, see Figure 123a.) But, as we’ll also see, in their antebellum time, they dared not insist on this. Judging by the amount of time he wasted at Christian conferences, Daniel Brinton was a Christian believer. Joe Napora, an Amerindian, tends to be prejudice in favor of his own people. Except when I say otherwise, I’ll be giving you Rafinesque’s translation.

My figure numbers are followed by the Roman Numeral Part number of the *Walam Olum* and the sequence number of the glyph in that part. Let’s look first at the end of Part I. It sets the Deluge scene.



Figure 17 (Glyph I, 20): “All were willingly pleased. All were easy thinking. All were well-happified.” When the weather was predictable and game was plentiful, even Paleolithic men did not kill each other for food.




Figure 18 (Glyph I, 21): “But after a while, the snake priest (Powako) brings on earth secretly the snake worship of the god of the snakes (Wakon).” Carlton Coon and I have already told you all you need to know to figure out why our ancestors everywhere referred to the *Homo erectus* people as snakes.

Try to figure out why before I explain it in Chapter 34. Of course, if you get too frustrated, steal a peek at Chapter 34. *Homo erectus* not only had language, he also had his own totem religion. Numerous artifacts recovered from *Homo erectus* sites evince a widespread bear cult. A wealth of mythology also suggests that *Homo erectus*' religion was like that of our earliest, immediate ancestors. Here the Lenape are saying, "As times got tough, the *Homo erectus* priest started calling



secretly for sacrifices to their gods." The Delaware are blaming *Homo erectus* for the fighting that is about to be described. Lilly adds, "In this pictograph the evil serpent appears under the land lines [H the horizontal lines], which position, together with the particular curve of his body, is said to imply secrecy. The three vertical lines stand for peril" (W.O. [a]: 29).

Figure 19 (Glyph I, 22): "And there came wickedness, crime, and unhappiness..." The protracted and sporadic Species War resumed.

Figure 20 (Glyph I, 23) "And bad weather was coming, distemper was coming, with death was coming." A severe and sudden downturn in prosperity has caused the most genetically diverse people (the two



subspecies) to start looking at each other as dinner. Eli Lilly adds: "A glyph very much like this one, reported in the literature, means 'bad.' The lines and circles in the original pictographs were red, the color for war and the color that captives intended for the stake were painted. The red circles might represent dead or slain persons" (W.O. [a]: 31). Lilly: "The fang-like sign for evil is predominant in this figure, being repeated four times. The three small semicircles above the ground line probably represent clouds (of evil). A figure below the ground line implies death or absence (Ibid.)." The Indiana Historical Society says references to starvation in pre-agrarian times, due to heavy snowstorms that made hunting impossible, are common in Ojibwa tales. Add over-hunting and over-population as starvation causes.




Figure 21 (Glyph I, 24): "All this happened very long ago, at the first land (Netamaki), beyond the great ocean (Kitahikau)." All this happened in Asia, before the Clovis period, before the crossing over. Here Lilly notes that, "The long parallel lines mean bonds of relationship. Larger squares are used in the *Walam Olum* to represent 'great' and smaller ones, dwellings or villages. In this case, they mean villages. The symbols of the turtles are perfectly

plain, yet it is hard to understand why the evil or lying-tongue symbol should be attached to the turtle to the right..." Asia is a turtle. North America, "Snakeland," is a snake. Continents were thought to move as they changed their shape, as the ocean level rose and fell. Not only is there a connection between the continents, but Asia seems to be pulling North America closer. This suggests that the ocean level was dropping as the average temperature dropped and ice accumulated at the poles. North America became associated with the snakes (*Homo erectus*) because the Asians drove *Homo erectus* in a northeasterly direction, toward Beringia. Snakes have forked tongues, so the speech of *Homo erectus* and other enemies, lying and hateful speech, became associated with a forked tongue.

Surviving *Homo erecti* were believed to be (at first consciously feared, then unconsciously hoped to be) alive in North America. Remember, primitive men did not have anything comparable to a global news network. They all believed and feared -- and another part of them hoped -- that *Homo erectus* was still alive in the world. (We will see this quite clearly in another Indian myth that I will show you later. You have already seen one primitive myth that demonstrates it quite clearly, the myth of the Ona men's lodge [or Hain]. My comment that follows that myth was only an abstraction when you first read it, but now it should be perfectly clear to you.) Even modern men could not be certain of *Homo erectus*' extinction until only recently, until Sarich and Wilson proclaimed that *Homo erectus*' genes are not among us. The appellation, "snake," for *Homo erectus*, was used consciously at first. Later, murdered Deluge victims were thought to have turned into various totem animals because Indians had obsessively prayed to the souls of both the animals (needed for food) and the (propitiated, befriended and magically-manipulated) *Homo erectus* gods for their assistance. The similarity of the wishful appeals to both *Homo erecti* and animals caused their condensation into "animal people." At this stage, it was indeed the "animal people" from whom the Indians were descended. Facilitating this condensation was 1) *Homo erectus*' greater similarity to the other animals (i. e. great apes) and 2) the need to compromise his identity owing to the guilt from having exterminated him. This post-Deluge, originally-conscious process of totemic transformation will become clear when we study the *Popol Vuh* in Chapter 35 and the impichiumas of the Australians in Appendix B.

Homo erecti believed to be still at large were viewed differently. Incarnate *Homo erecti*, whose souls could not be plied with sacrifice

and supplicated, became the repository for the negative side of our ancestors' ambivalence toward *Homo erectus*. Owing to guilt, their identity also had to be compromised. During the period of totem religion, they became the fearsome or hated animals. In the Neolithic, they were reconfigured into hominid embodiments of *Homo erectus*' most fearsome, ugly and hateful characteristics. First, they became "monsters," "giants" and "demons." Later they became the main component of the "Devil" and "witches," "trolls," etc. To make a long history short, the only truly good *Homo erectus* -- was a dead one.

All this mythological development resulted from the semi-conscious and inter-generational dialogue that went on everywhere and concentrated men's minds upon the most universally shared experiences with the most ambivalent ancestors and relatives. The



obsession with both the primal father and *Homo erectus per se* was also fueled by the closely associated obsessions with the competing parent and the ongoing genetic-competitors, respectively. Unconscious fears and paranoia developed conscious replacement ideas (of what one must do to avoid "evil"). Unconscious guilt created conscious reaction formations of how one must present one's self to the world. The "God" and "Devil" that haunt today's fundamentalists are the slightly modified outgrowth of what occurred in Upper Paleolithic times.

Figure 22 (Glyph II, 1) "There was, long ago, a powerful snake (Maskanako), when the men also had become bad beings (Makowini)." Here we start Part II and the song of the flood. "Maskanako" (H the first masked man?) must have been a *Homo erectus* chief. Lilly adds that the long vertical line symbolizes the great power of whatever is connected to it. He suggests also that power is indicated by parallelograms whose long axis is vertical, such as the one that makes up the man's torso. The Delaware ancestors might also be telling us exactly what Mr. Trinkaus and other physical anthropologists have discovered: that *Homo erectus* had very powerful bones and musculature. In a Species War context, square-chested men tend to be "snakes," *Homo erecti*.

As we shall see, birds were also associated with the gods. Especially black birds, waterfowl, parrots and woodpeckers became associated with *Homo erectus* spirits. Bird feathers in an individual's hair were symbols of his spiritual power. The snake flag on the pole doubly assures us that *Homo erectus* is intended. Lilly adds that the two horizontal lines show that starvation and calamity prevailed. He

suggested that three feathers on a man's head ordinarily proclaim him a Lenape, but even Lenape (Delaware) can have 4, 3, 1 or no feathers. You'd expect the number to indicate relative power or authority vis-à-vis one's fellows and to say nothing about one's tribe or clan. But lack of prejudice, objectivity, is a rare commodity. Moreover, individual feathers in a crude pictograph could not be drawn to look different enough to represent different peoples.

Homo erectus' shorter stature may also be suggested by references to the "little people" or the "dwarfs" in myths of the Mohegans (Fawcett: 49-51) the Nez Percé, the Kalispel-Flatheads, the Coeur d'Alènes, the Spokane, Arapaho and Shoshoni Indians of the Northwest. (Cf. E.E. Clark: 50-51, 114-118, 180-183-.)¹²⁰ In Appendix E, we'll discover that some of the "little people" mythology was objectively accurate. The Nez Percé term, "Stick Indians," probably refers to the stick-figure drawings of *Homo erectus* in numerous North American rock drawings, the glyphs of the *Walam Olum* and perhaps the lost but similar recordings of other tribes. (Cf. E.E. Clark: 50-51.) Again, because their range was like ours, and their lifetime was ten to twenty times that of ours; we must assume there to have been great physical diversity among *Homo erecti*. To what extent mythological characterizations are based on subjective or objective appraisal only time and the expansion of the fossil record will tell.

The Society adds another learned comment to this glyph: "In Seneca and Shawnee mythology two powerful grandsons are born to the female Creator. One is helpful, the other wantonly destructive. The wicked son is envisaged as a great snake by the Shawnee" (W.O. [a]: 35). If only one is a snake, or if they are described as physically different; then one is *Homo erectus*, and the other is *Homo sapiens*. Otherwise, the wicked grandson represents the *Homo erecti* still at large that were to become the demons or the Neolithic giants; and the helpful son represents the murdered and cannibalized *Homo erecti* that our ancestors hoped to have manipulated with magic and befriended with propitiation. As we'll discover in Chapter 26, these types of myths were common throughout the Americas.

¹²⁰ As of the discovery of the one-meter-tall *Homo erecti* on Flores Island by Peter Brown *et al.*, we must ask ourselves, "Had these North Americans come across islands, perhaps on partially submerged isthmuses like the Bering or peninsulas like the Kamchatkan or the Alaskan, where they had met miniaturized *Homo erecti*?"

Figure 23 (Glyph II, 2) This is the glyph wherein Rafinesque's translation includes the word "Jinn." In Mesopotamia, "Jinn" (singular=Jinni) referred to "hidden beings" that could assume human or animal form. As Professor Langdon explained:

The Arabians said that there were forty troops of Jinn, and each troop consisted of six hundred thousand Jinn. This word is an abstract noun meaning "the hidden." The Jinn were said to have inhabited the earth before man... [T]hey rebelled against the gods, and angels [H the "good" veterans of the Species War] drove them to the waste places of the earth [H emphasis mine]. They have the power to change their forms in the twinkling of an eye and rarely appear visible to man, although animals can detect them. When the cock crows or the ass brays, they have seen a Jinn. The Jinn have animal forms and appear as snakes, dogs, cats, swine and infest the waste places of the desert. They roam by night and disappear at dawn... The Jinn ride abroad on animals, preferably on ostriches and foxes... --Langdon: 352.

For the Lenape to have carried this word out of Mesopotamia, the hominid transformation of the gods would have had to have started before they left, or the word would have had to change in its meaning. The Society translation for Glyph II, 2 strikes me as being so far off base that I won't even mention it. Rafinesque was at least on the right track, so I'll try to improve on his translation with: "This strong chief, Maskanako, our *Homo erectus* enemy and his followers, had become the foe of the snake spirits. They became troubled, hating each other." Whether you call them Jinn or spirits, the point is that the Indians were afraid to fully admit that they had killed the parent species people who later became their gods. So, they wishfully blamed the killing upon the "spirits" of already-dead or later-killed *Homo erecti* whom they made sacrifices to and hoped to have won over. In later stops on this prehistoric tour of the world, we will see the same psychology at work time and time again. You saw it in the Hain myth.

The guilt and fear are owing to the ambivalence felt toward our parent species. The tendency would have been to first vent all the repressed anger and hostility toward *Homo erectus*. Next the pendulum swung the other way: there was a tendency to consider *Homo erectus*' positive aspects, to condemn his *Homo sapiens* killers as villains and to point fingers. Finally, the universally satisfying form (of balanced ambivalence) was ossified into myth. At this stage in the mythology of some peoples (e. g. Germanic and Irish mythologies that we'll come to in




later chapters) the *Homo sapiens* victors in the Species War became elevated to the pantheon; and the entire Deluge cast of characters was divided into good guys and bad guys, with belligerents from each subspecies assigned to each subgroup. The malicious or negative aspect of the *Homo sapien* belligerents often condensed into a single scapegoat god or trickster. We are about to discover an early example of the trickster in the Lenni Lenape version of prehistory. Once the oral histories of the Deluge had been constructed to perfectly balance our ancestors' ambivalence toward the victims and to obscure their identities, then the popular and sacred form of the myth had arrived. Only then had the gods been fashioned in such a way as to perfect them



as objects for the displacement of ambivalence felt toward the ongoing objects of the godhead. Only then did oral history satisfy the democratic majority, and the tribe then went to great ends to petrify and preserve myths in this sacred form. Ambivalence also gave rise to the various triads in mythologies, the triad being a dialectical solution for ambivalence.¹²¹ Lilly adds that the line crossing the figure of the man once more indicates starvation or calamity. There are weapons in the man's hands, indicating violence.

Figure 24 (Glyph II, 3) “Both were fighting, both were spoiling, both were never peaceful.” Eli Lilly notes that the “X” is a sign of war. Full war has broken out between the *Homo erecti* (the man with weapons in hand) and the *Homo erectus* spirits (the snake). This message may be repeated in the squaring of the man's torso from the trapezoidal form in Figure 23. Our primitive ancestors were childlike in their naiveté and the transparency of their lies.

Figure 25 (Glyph II, 4) “And they were fighting, least man (Mattapewi) with dead-keeper (Nihaulowit).” Finally, they admit that at least one of them fought the *Homo erecti*. The taller one is the more newly-evolved, gracile southerner. This figure confirms what Allen's Rule would assure us



¹²¹ There are many examples in mythology of gods or goddesses being used to represent three different aspects of the same phenomenon. One such triad is that of Athena, Hera and Aphrodite. When Eris, the trickster, threw an apple with the inscription “for the fairest” into their midst, Paris was asked to choose the most beautiful. Aphrodite won the nod because, here, she represents woman as nymph and rewarded Paris with sexual love. The other two represent virginity and motherhood. In Irish mythology, Brigit's sons represent a triad. For other examples, see the introduction of Graves.

about the body types of Pleistocene-adapted *Homo erectus* and newly-out-of-Africa *Homo sapiens*. This testifies to the extreme antiquity and authenticity of the *Walam Olum*. It was recorded before the gods had become inflated into giants by guilt, wishful thinking, the sharing of myths and perhaps the finding of dinosaur bones. The “X” indicates that he is at war with shorter but more powerfully built, ice-age adapted *Homo erectus*. Both are starving. Notice too that the *Homo sapien* here is referred to as “Least Man.” Our early ancestors condensed their ignoble traits into a scapegoat who evolved into the trickster. Although his trapezoidal torso shows that he is physically less powerful than his square-chested foe, his four feathers indicate that he has more spiritual power than *Homo erectus* (who has only three feathers).

Why is *Homo erectus* called “dead-keeper”? As you will see (v3), the Orunchas or horned devil-men of the Koories are believed to carry their victims around on their horns until they have finished eating them. This image descends from the mid to late stages of the Species War when *Homo erectus*, fearing defeat and extinction, would have desperately hoped that his dead would return to life. Ice Age *Homo erectus* had no doubt discovered cases of animals’ (especially fish) and men’s lives being suspended in the ice. He could only be certain that a body was dead if the head was removed.¹²² [ref_e123](#) We’ll see yet another, astonishing reference to *Homo erectus* carrying the dead around when we come to the Kwakiutl Indians of the Pacific Northwest.



Figure 26 (Glyph II, 5) “And the strong snake readily resolved to destroy or fight the beings and the men.” This one says that the *Homo erectus* spirits have decided to destroy living men. So ...



Figure 27 (Glyph 11, 6) “The dark snake he brought the monster (Amanyán), he brought snake-rushing water, he brought it.” Again, “the dark snake” refers to the *Homo erectus* spirits, our first gods. They brought the flood as punishment, or so everyone would have thought. Now we see why Figures

¹²² Mark Roth, the founder of Ikarria Inc, and fellow researchers discovered that low but quickly administered doses of H₂S (hydrogen sulfide, a colorless gas that our bodies make and that smells like rotten eggs) replace oxygen by binding at the same places within the mitochondria where oxygen is metabolized. With the demand for oxygen thus reduced, life becomes suspended. For an inspiring presentation, see Mark’s Ted talk at http://www.ted.com/talks/mark_roth_suspended_animation.

23 and 24 (Glyphs II, 2 and II, 3) are so crazy! This Part II of their history was revised after the Flood, which so terrorized them that they refused to admit that anyone, except “Least Man,” had fought with the *Homo erecti*. For the same reason, fear of more punishment, they couldn’t acknowledge that the Flood was brought to punish them. Terror would have induced similar responses everywhere, except among the early Mesopotamians who felt no need to be ashamed of their Sumerian ancestors’ opening role in the Species War. Lilly says that the “evil, lying and sinister” serpent is shown here in the water (the bowl-like figure). He thought that the small semi-circles above the bowl are clouds and that the three vertical marks indicate peril. He was correct about all but the “clouds.”

The complete set of stripes marks this snake as the ultimate evil and says that their death toll must have been staggering. The semi-circles on the water are people that have been swept out to sea!

The Society adds: “The association of a snake-monster with the Deluge is paralleled in Shawnee accounts of the culture hero piercing a transparent headless snake and releasing a flood of water from inside the monster's body. As in the Delaware account given above, the water bursts forth in great quantities and quickly covers the earth” (W.O. [a]: 40). These accounts of the Great Flood are perhaps



the best that we have. The Flood became a symbol and screen memory cover for the Species War because our superstitious ancestors all thought it to be punishment for the Species War. In their minds, the two were so closely connected as to be one and the same.

Figure 28 (Glyph II, 7) “Much water is rushing, much go to hills, much penetrate, much destroying.” Confirms how traumatic and destructive the Flood was and what we can expect from the next one. The snake in the water looks like a dead *Homo erectus*. It in combination with the rainbow would seem to be sending the same message that was everywhere intended to calm and console people: “It will never come again because they’re all in heaven now. They will look out for us in return for us worshipping them.” But there is still more meaning here, a dirty secret. Do you see it? Try to figure it out before I tell you. Let the question simmer in your unconscious mind. Think about it before going to bed at night. Here’s a hint: water bodies and turtles were everywhere sacred for the same reason that the dead snake is in the water.



Next the Society confirms that, “the Deluge story, brief or detailed, is widespread in North America (Bering Strait Eskimo, Mackenzie River tribes, Plateau peoples, North Pacific Coast, California, Southwest, Plains and Eastern Woodlands groups)” (W.O. [a]: 41). All the children have besmirched fingers and faces! I’ve tried to single out the most filthy-looking, the peoples with the most-developed mythologies; but the selection is largely arbitrary. Is it any wonder that our world is in the shape it’s in -- our traumatic prehistory and mental health being as it is?

Figure 29 (Glyph II 8) “Meanwhile at the turtle (Tula), at the island, Nana-Bush (the great hare Nana), became the ancestor of beings and men.” Notice that Tula was the early Amerindian name for Asia. It also became the name of the Toltec capitol. Least Man (Mattapewi) of Figure 25, has evolved fully into the trickster. As our ancestors started to feel remorse for the elimination of our parent species, they felt guilty about the hit and run, guerilla tactics that complimented their archery and superior running ability. So, the ignoble, scapegoat/trickster became identified with the rabbit. At least one myth, an Egyptian Osiris myth (in Appendix C), suggests that the primal father was eliminated with trickery. But many myths (and as you’ll see, all our earliest literatures) suggest that the Species War was won by means of trickery or tactics and advantages of which our ancestors were not altogether proud. There is another reason why the trickster was most often associated with the rabbit. See if you can figure it out before I tell you in Chapter 35. Rafinesque informs us that “Nana” was their word for hare, and “Maskaboush” meant string (sinew, bow string?) or hare. The other animal most often represented as the trickster -- as the totemic condensation of our *Homo sapien* ancestors who won the Species War through fleetness of foot and the ignoble (guerilla warfare) use of the bow and arrow -- was the coyote. Coyotes, though not as fast as hares, are notorious for their wily stratagems for stealing poultry. Coyotes and wild cats were generally the most sacred animals to the North Americans. Tricksters became the subject of countless African and North American tales. As we’ll see, the tricksters, the *Homo sapien* leaders of the Species War, continually grew in stature and became associated with the primal fathers, the creators, because the Deluge victory, the “second sin,” brought changes akin to those following the first or “original sin.” It opened new opportunities for expansion and population growth and encouraged new levels of cooperation, etc. Can

you see that these fleet-footed, trickster winners of the Species War had to have the bow and arrow?

Napora translates Glyph II, 8, my Figure 29, as: “O Nanabush, O Nanabush (so clever), O Nanabosho (the liar), O Nanahare (trickster), O Nanabozo (grandfather).” The Society says, “Nenabush [H or Nanabush] stayed on Turtle Island” (W.O. [a]: 42). Conditions returned to normal in the interglacial period that followed the coastal inundation until...

Figure 30 (Glyph II, 9) “Being born creeping, he is ready to move and dwell at turtle (Tula).” The Society’s translation credits Nanabush with already having even more power, “The wind was blowing but he crept along and untied the young turtle.” Notice the subtle difference between this glyph and the last one. There, he was just sitting on the turtle. Here, he’s riding it. The currents have started up again, and the Holocene (present interglacial) is continuing to raise the ocean level. It appeared to these migratory hunter gatherers that Asia (Tula, the turtle) was moving. Notice too that he has a weapon in hand. It is just a knife – unless his bow is disguised as the turtle’s back. The fact that he is armed also tells us something important that modern anthropologists and archaeologists often forget: even during good times, Paleolithic men probably didn’t leave their tribal campfires to go anywhere without their weapons. As I explained in Chapter 7, fellow tribesmen were family; but outsiders, strangers, were game. To migrate to a new and unknown territory, you wanted to have the largest force possible. You couldn’t just visit a new and unknown people. Migrating to a new and unknown territory meant conquer and cannibalize or be conquered and be cannibalized. To be assured of victory you needed either the element of surprise or twice as many warriors as the defenders.¹²³ But the distant-neighbor savagery of Paleolithic times created this dilemma: large populations meant eating up the animals quicker and needing to expand territory or migrate in search of food quicker!

¹²³ At the LGM, 22 kya, the ocean level was over four hundred feet lower than it is today. There were many islands that are submerged today in the Pacific and one or two between West Africa and the eastern-most tip of South America. But in cannibal out objects for trade, late comers were unlikely to survive unless they en the Viking colonies in America and at least one British colony were he natives. China’s American colonies were withdrawn due to lack of ie enormous cost of maintaining them. See Menzies.




Figure 31 Glyph II, 10 “The beings and the men all go forth from the flood creeping in shallow water or swimming afloat, asking which is the way to turtle-back (Tula-pin).” Sea level rise is causing landmarks and the old shoreline to disappear. But sea level rise from meltwater alone is gradual. They can adapt to it, and they are enjoying the warm sun. Their heads are all above water.

Figure 32 Glyph II, 11 “But there are many monsters in the way, and some men were devoured by them.” Many of the people who waded into the water became shark bait. This glyph’s water monster is referred to as Amanyan in Glyph II, 6. It was brought by the evil snake (*Homo erectus*) spirits and is evil (striped). *Homo erectus* was thought to lurk in every shadowy place, every pool of water, everywhere where danger might lurk or where memories and associations of him are evoked. Can you see why they’re in the water?


The Society adds: “The water monster mentioned here may be akin to the transparent headless snake monster that the Shawnee refer to as the Water king. In its cannibalistic propensities, however, the Delaware water monster bears more of a resemblance to the Potawatomi great horned water-panther, which maliciously sucks people into the water and drowns them” (W.O. [a]: 45).




Figure 33 (Glyph II, 12) “But the daughter of a spirit helped them in a boat, saying, ‘Come, come;’ they were coming and were helped.” I can assure you that this one refers to sexual relations between female, *Homo erectus* Species War survivors and *Homo sapiens* men, but no doubt you’ll think that my imagination is running wild. It’s not. We’ll see enough other examples to convince you. The *Homo erectus* females posed no threat so long as they did not mate with *Homo erectus* men, and they desperately needed and wanted *Homo sapiens* men to marry them and protect them. Naturally, this type of war story would not set well with the Delaware women, but many men would have taken delight in conjuring up these memories. So, a clever compromise would have been to refer to these consorts as goddesses who rescued them, forced the men to stay with them, etc. The modern analog is a country song entitled “Don’t pay the ransom, Honey. I’ll escape.” Take note also that this “daughter of a spirit” is the daughter of “Manito.” In Glyph 9 of Part I (the creation myth), “Manito” is translated as “he [Kitanitowit or the Great Spirit] made.” Later, we’ll discover that the Great Spirit refers to *Homo erectus*; so, a



being that was made by the Great Spirit would be another *Homo erectus*; and the daughter of a *Homo erectus* could only be either a *Homo erectus* or a hybrid.

of  Figure 34 (Glyph II, 13) “O Nana-Bush, grandfather of all, grandfather of beings, grandfather men, grandfather of the turtle.” Joe Napora translates “grandfather of beings” here as “grandfather of animal people.” This would have been his status after the Species War victors contracted the ambivalence of their victims, became “animal people” too and eclipsed their victims in the Delaware pantheon. By calling the trickster/hero of the Deluge the “grandfather of all beings,” the Delaware are starting to confuse and amalgamate him with the primal father, the Great Spirit. Here we clearly see an example of syncretism. “God” is in the making, and “He” was everywhere made this way. Napora also says that the Delaware were perhaps the most senior of the Algonquin peoples in North America. They had the best stories and were called the grandfather people. I believe him. In this glyph, the Lenape are speculating that their god is all powerful and escaped the flood by paddling furiously. They want him to grant them the same power to escape and find dry land when they need it.

 Figure 35 (Glyph II, 14) “Lenape, the people, we’re talking, now together now on Turtle Island, we Turtle Men on Turtle Island.” This one describes stable and uneventful times. The Society confirms: “the turtle had a tie-line about the waste.” Then, very suddenly, things changed again...


 Figure 36 (Glyph II, 15) “Time of fear on the Turtle, time of offending on the Turtle, time of cleansing, time to cleanse what has been spoiled.” The turtle’s legs are out of his shell. He’s moving again, which signifies another onset of rapid climate change, probably the last ice age before the Clovis Period, the Older Dryas that began not long after the Great Flood (of 14,634 BPE [before the present era, 2000 AD]) stopped the ocean currents. It lasted roughly 200 years. The proliferation of glyphs for this post-Flood period reflects the trauma and tumult of the time. Lilly adds, “The uplifted arms of the figure of the Lenape indicate that he is praying, while the dot in the circle marks him as a hallowed being” (W.O. [a]: 49). The turtle is shown from above because they are appealing to the gods in heaven. The wrathful gods, the snakes, are punishing them again.



Figure 37 (Glyph II, 16) The Society's translation is better for this one: "As the water rippled on, long extended areas became dry, even where there were hollows and in caves: the powerful snake went someplace else." Again, this is in logical sequence with the glyph that comes before it. It got colder and the sea level fell. The snake spirit left, or so they thought.

The changes in sea level are greatest in the extreme latitudes. Why might they have wanted to live for so long in Eastern Siberia, at or near the sea and Beringia? Why were they willing to tolerate the extreme swings in temperature and sea level? It may be that the hunting was good during the coldest times when the land bridge was exposed for animals to cross over. We'll see a suggestion of this in the next part. When the animals weren't abundant, *Homo erectus* may have been. The oldest Chinese mythology talks about chasing the Guanian Monster (*Homo erectus*) northeast and out of China. While we can reason that these gracile Davids must have had a superior weapon to defeat men who were built like LeBron James, the Lenape made no mention of it. Joe Napora, a Lenape Native American with his own translation of the *Walam Olum*, insists that at Part III, Glyph 9, (shown below) after the freezing-cold weather comes, the Delaware break a bow as a sacrifice to the gods before migrating to Snakeland. This would have been at the beginning of the Clovis time, circa 13,200 ya. The other two translations make no mention of this. Neither did any of the characters in the glyphs appear to be holding bows. But I can assure you that -- like the children with the gooey, chocolate fingers and faces -- the evidence of it is all over them!

Freud devoted a book to the eruptions of repressed, unconscious impulses: "Freudian slips" of the tongue, bungled actions, jokes, etc. These eruptions that break through or suddenly circumvent repression differ from repetition compulsion mainly in that the conflict in the former tends to be short-lived and easily recognizable. These parapraxes usually involve unconscious impulses that are closer to being conscious than are the more deeply buried traumas that produce repetitiously compulsive actions. I mention parapraxes because they are so much more common, and your understanding of them will help you to understand the repetition compulsion that I detected in the above glyphs.


As of glyph II, 5, where all-out war between the "snakes" and the "good" Delaware is implied, every glyph except glyph II, 12 (wherein the mood seems to switch to sex) and glyph II, 15 (wherein the mood

switches to one of fear and propitiation) contains at least one symbol that approximates the shape of a bow. Glyphs 6, 7, 8 and 9 all contain two or more simple “D” shaped or Asian bow-shaped figures. See Figure 38 below.

Figure 38

A strung Korean bow, very similar in shape to the brackets in the *Walam Olum*.

Picture provided by the Missouri Archaeological Society.



The “horizontal end brackets” such as the one in glyph II, 16 resemble the shape of a powerful Asian bow. They aroused Lilly’s curiosity too. He noticed that these “horizontal end brackets” are oddities that occur, “at the end of the first and second songs, after the 16th, 32nd, 48th and 64th verses of the fourth song and after the 20th and 40th verses

in song five. Thus, at every 16 to 24 lines there is a bracket. Most of these are at natural breaks in the story but it may be that they marked ten bundles of record sticks” (*Walam Olum* [b]: 32). But even if a notation of some sort was logically appropriate at these places, it was repetition compulsion and the repression of the deeply traumatized bow that determined the bow-like shape of that notation.

Similarly, it was repetition compulsion with respect to the horn bow that caused our ancestors from India to equip the fish, Vishnu in the myth of Manu and Vishnu, with a horn. (As in the bow’s horn laminate.) How many fish have horns? In the absence of this repetition compulsion, wouldn’t it have been more likely for the fish to pull Manu’s boat rope with its mouth? You’ll be surprised to discover in other chapters that several very familiar and universal religious symbols also appear to be repetition compulsion for the bow and arrow. As an old proverb says, “The truth has a way of staying, like oil on water.”

But the Lenni Lenape, the Delaware Indians, have a lot more to teach us about prehistoric America. Let’s turn now to Part III of the *Walam Olum*, their migration story.



Figure 38a (Glyph III, 1) “After the flood, the manly men Linapewi, with the manly turtle beings dwelt close together at the cave house, and dwelling of Talli.” This one needs no explanation. The Society adds that turtles

reports of how bountiful the land was, how rich in game it was. If they found no Snakes, it would not have been because the Lenape had driven our parent species to extinction. No one wanted to believe that. Instead, it had to be because the Snakes were in hiding. Also, the hunter, on the right, has a weapon. The tiller, on the left, has a digging stick.



Figure 38e (Glyph III, 5) “The strongest, the best, the holiest, the hunters they are.” The Indiana Historical Society adds: his importance is shown by the size of the pictograph, and the circle within his powerful chest is a brave heart. He appears to hold a snare in his left hand and an arrow is in his right hand. Atlatl darts that are cast less than 50 yards don’t need fletching. This is their first fully open admission of having the bow and arrow. This one also seems to bear a message to anyone that sees through the previous lie: “If we didn’t till the land, it’s because hunters are superior to tillers.”



Figure 38f (Glyph III, 6) “And the hunters spread themselves, becoming northerlings, easterlings, southerlings, westerlings. Lowaniwi, Wapaniwi, Shawaniwi, Wunkeniwi.” Eliminating *Homo erectus* meant that all the territory that had been his was now theirs. Even a slight change in the translation, such as that offered by the Society (e. g. “To the North, South, East and West the hunters traveled.”), causes one to entirely lose the meaning because the key word is becoming.

Figure 38g (Glyph III, 7) “Thus the white country Lumonaki, north of the turtle country, became the hunting country of the turtling true men.” Confirm the previous translation of Rafinesque. Here again, the Society completely loses the meaning with their translation: “In the land of long ago, the north land, the turtle land, there the Turtle Delaware were hunting.” It required an enormous part of our primitive ancestor’s meager resources to set their history into pictographs, poetry and song, or even metrical verses – and to memorize them, passing them on from one generation to the next. Only the most important events merited such preservation. The mundane translation of the Society shows that they lack a basic understanding of what oral history/sacred mythology is all about; and they are, probably, afraid to learn.



Figure 38h (Glyph III, 8) “Meantime all the snakes were afraid in their huts, and the snake

priest Nakopowa said to all, let us go.” Confirm what I said earlier about ambivalence, guilt and wishful thinking. Clearly, the Lenape are speculating here that the disappearance of the *Homo erecti* is due to them being in hiding or having left. They don’t want to believe that they have killed off the last of our parent species. The Society translation (“All the other hearths in the land were troubled: everyone said to the pipe bearer, “Let us depart.”) is even worse than usual. It ignores the wording of the song and seems to be based entirely upon a speculative interpretation of the glyph. Were they deliberately attempting to destroy prehistory? Or does the Newspeak of latent homosexual people demand a total elimination of all distinctions between people and events? *Understanding our past is not a game. It’s an essential part of learning who we are and what we must do to improve ourselves and secure our futures.*



at Figure 38i (Glyph III, 9) “Easterly they go forth Snakeland Akhokink, and they went away earnestly grieving.” As you’ll see, the Chinese speculated about “Chu yuan” in the same manner. He (the *Homo erecti*) left us reluctantly due to not being appreciated. The Society translation, “And all these went on in another direction to the Snakes in the east: they were in earnest and they were grieving...,” makes it sound as if, not *Homo erectus* but, some of the Lenape are leaving. This erroneous conclusion misses the whole point of Part III! Again, the Society was ignoring the song translation of Rafinesque and his 1836, Delaware informants and relying entirely upon Eli Lilly’s speculation about the meaning of the glyph! While some of Lilly’s contributions are interesting and may be correct, they generally don’t fit the contexts of the *Walam Olum*, contexts that he and the Society were nowhere close to grasping.



Figure 38j (Glyph III, 10) “Thus escaping by going so far, and by trembling the burnt land Lusasaki is torn and is broken from the snake fortified land. Akomenaki.” The *Homo erectus* gods are greatly feared. The superstitious Lenape are speculating that the continents separated due to the Snakes, the *Homo erecti*, their gods, leaving. The burnt land, Asia, where sacrifices were made, is trembling in fear, the Lenape are trembling, now that the gods have deserted them. The Society persists with their misinterpretation: “...and they were weak and worried and trembling: tattered and torn, they went off to Snake Island.” As you should see, to infer multiple exits from Asia is to miss the whole point

of this sequence of glyphs. They're telling us the various arguments in favor of going or staying.




Figure 38k (Glyph III, 11) “Being free, having no trouble, the northerlings all go out, separating, at the land of Snow Winiaken.” This says, with the *Homo erecti* gone, the northern Lenape were free to spread out in Northern Siberia and occupy the arctic coast that had previously been possessed by *Homo erectus*. Brinton’s translation is close to the original, “Those from the north being free, without care, went forth from the land of snow, in different directions.” But again, the Society translation (“There were still free people who were well cared for in the north. They were the next to go away from the snow country”) makes it sound as if a third Lenape migration to North America has occurred. It is not until the thirteenth glyph/song, two to come, that they mention a non-superstitious, realistic reason for leaving.



Figure 38l (Glyph III, 12) “The fish resort to the shores of the gaping sea, where tarried the fathers of white eagle and white wolf. Waplanewa, Waptumewi.” This sounds mundane at first glance but is actually quite newsworthy. It says that because the Lenape now control the prime coastland, they can learn to build and use boats for fishing. The Society blows it again with: “Where fish were in clear water in a hollow well by Snow Mountain, there were the fathers of Bald Eagle and White Wolf.” Rafinesque and his Lenape informants clearly applied the prefix “wap” to both the eagle and the wolf. Why does the Society assume that the bald eagle, which has only a white head, is intended? Paleolithic hunters destroyed many North American species (Martin). What makes the Society so sure that white eagles didn’t exist in Siberia over 13 kya? It looks to me as if they could all be wrong, because the animal between the bird and the fish (in the glyph) looks more like a turtle than a wolf. The earliest division of the Lenape, and perhaps the Algonquin people per se, was into bird, turtle and wolf clans.



Figure 38m (Glyph III, 13) “While our fathers were always boating and navigating, they saw in the east that the snake land was bright and wealthy. (Here begins a fine poetical rhyming narrative).” This is the first non-superstitious indication that any of the Lenape might be contemplating going to the feared Snakeland. For economy’s sake, I’m going to ignore most of the

Society's translations/interpretations from here on out. I strongly advise you to do the same.

Figure 38n (Glyph III, 14) "The head-beaver Wihlamok, and the big-bird Kicholen, were saying to all, let us go to the Snake Island Akomen." Two clan leaders campaigned for going.




Figure 38o (Glyph III, 15) "By going with us, we shall annihilate all the snaking people, Wemaken." Here they are admitting to their most sober conclusion (that the only truly good *Homo erectus* is a dead one) and realizing that by staying united in the largest possible group, they will maximize their chances of defeating *Homo erectus* (the snakes) in Snake Island (North America).




Figure 38p (Glyph III, 16) "Having all agreed, the northerlings and easterlings, went over the water of the frozen sea to possess that land." The Society notes that the higher head represents the northern people, the lower one to the right, the eastern people. Also, the line connecting them shows a bond of close relationship or purpose.



Figure 38q (Glyph III, 17) "It was wonderful when they all went over the smooth deep water of the frozen sea, at the gap of the Snake Sea in the great ocean."



Figure 38r (Glyph III, 18) "They were ten thousand in the dark, who all go forth in a single night in the dark, to the Snake Island of the eastern land Wapanaki in the Dark, by walking all the people." The first to go were probably the bravest and best hunters and warriors. The exodus of these northern and the eastern people started a stampede. Fear of being left behind exceeded the fear of Snakeland. Remember what I said in Chapter 7: all Paleolithic men were cannibals. You were secure only in your own tribal group and the bigger it was the better. Although Rafinesque's notes clearly say "in a single night" and "by night or in the dark," the Orwellian masked men and women of the Society insisted upon replacing history with meaningless banalities; they suggested that "one year" was needed for the crossing. The ice was unlikely to last a year. You only want to walk on it when it is stone hard. Moreover, they wanted to go quickly and at night to not be



spotted at this strategic area where scouts were likely to be posted. Notice also that the glyph seems to be saying there were too many people to walk in the same latitude!




Figure 38s (Glyph III, 19) “They were the manly north, the manly east, the manly south; with manly eagle, manly beaver, manly wolf; with manly hunter, manly priest, manly rich; with manly wife, manly daughter, manly dog. (12 words all homophonous rhymes.)” This glyph/song repeats and confirms that they came to Snakeland not as a war party but as a total people, as migrants. Everyone was laudable for his or her bravery. Few stayed behind.



Figure 38t (Glyph III, 20) “All coming there, they tarry at Firland Shinaking. But the western men doubtful of the passage, preferred to remain at the old turtle land.” The western Lenape remained in Asia. Rafinesque adds, “Thus end these interesting and positive ancient traditions, by a fine poem on the passage to America over the ice; the Shawanis [H Shawnee] have a similar poem: the Illinois had also one, and almost every Lenape tribe. They are perhaps lost; but this being at last rescued, will preserve the memory for ever. Now begin the second series of songs, in a different style, seldom rhyming, but made metrical by an equal number of words in each verse, 4 in the 4 first... but only 3 in the 3 later poems on the subsequent history. Thus, these songs diminish in detail as they advance; but they are mere abridgment of better annals now probably lost.”

So, Part III of the *Walam Olum* explains why none of the Asian people came to North America before the Clovis Period when they came en masse. To get here, they had to first annihilate the *Homo erecti*, who had been pushed into Northeastern Siberia. The earliest Chinese myths tell of peasants using sticks to drive the “Guanian Monster” north and out of China. After the Indians did kill all the “snakes” that were between them and the Bering Strait, guilt caused them to strongly want to believe that many of our parent species escaped across the water, that they had not driven them all to extinction.

As we shall discover, next, in Part IV, the Western Hemisphere was already occupied; so, any small groups of Amerindians who did come prior to Clovis (13,200 ya) in Paleolithic (cannibal) times would have had to stay well hidden in remote places to stay alive.



Figure 38i (Glyph IV, 1) “Long ago, the fathers of men were then at Shinaki or Firland.” Now they are in Alaska.



Figure 38ii (Glyph IV, 2) “The path leader was the white eagle (Wapalanewa 1), who leads them all there.”



Figure 38iii (Glyph IV, 3) “The Snake Island was a big land, a fine land, and was explored by them.”



Figure 38iv (Glyph IV, 4) “The friendly souls, the hunting souls, the moving souls, in assembly meet.” Primitive men were very religious – respectful of their ancestors. They wanted the spirits of their ancestors to be with them at all important conferences for guidance. That’s why the first meetings were in groves or caves, the former because trees remind us of the ancestors, the latter because our ancestors lived in caves. (You don’t see the connection between trees and ancestors? I’ll explain in Chapter 34.)



Figure 38v (Glyph IV, 5) “All say to him, beautiful-head (Kolawil 2) be thou king there.” They didn’t want to think that their leaders were any less powerful or important than the white men’s leaders, so the chief was later upgraded to a “king.” But this is the really touching part: in the new land, they wanted to make a fresh start. They wanted to heal their relations with *Homo erectus*, so they chose a beautiful (kind) person to be their chief.




Figure 38vi (Glyph IV, 6) “The snakes are coming, thou killest some, to Snake hill, let them all go.” Something happened to incite fear, perhaps the sight or sound of something new or unfamiliar; and the negative side of their ambivalence for our parent species came to the fore.




Figure 38vii (Glyph IV, 7) “All the snakes were quite weak and concealing themselves at the Bear



Hill.” Aha! They spotted a grizzly bear. That’s enough to scare the hell out of even the bravest man. So, the Snakes (*Homo erecti*) were in hiding because the Lenape were too numerous for them.



Figure 38viii (Glyph IV, 8) “After Kolawil, white owl (Wapagokhos 3) was king at the Firland.”

Figure 38ix (Glyph IV, 9) “After him there Ianotowi (true maker) was king, and many things he did.”

Figure 38x (Glyph IV, 10) “After him there Chilili (snowbird) was king, who says let us go south.” Of course, in primitive times, there were no centrally-heated homes, heated cars, Gore-Tex clothing, etc. Everyone wanted to live where it was warm. Their fear kept them in the north until now. Perhaps they hadn’t seen anyone yet.




Figure 38xi (Glyph IV, 11) “To spread the fathers of men Wokenapi, and to be able to possess much more.” They decide to divide the tribe to lay claim to more land. They are no longer thinking of who might be lying in wait ahead of them, only of who might be coming behind them. This tells us for certain that throughout their time in Alaska, or maybe Alaska and Canada, they saw no other people. They would not have divided if they had seen others.




Figure 38xii (Glyph IV, 12) “South he goes the Snowbird, but east he goes the beaver-he Tamakwi.” The first, western hemisphere separation of the

Algonquin people has occurred.



Figure 38xiii (Glyph IV, 13) “A beautiful land was the southland, the big Firland and the shoreland Shabi-yaki.” Now they have walked as far as California and

seen the sequoia trees and perhaps Big Sur – still without seeing any other people.



Figure 38xiv (Glyph IV, 14) “But the eastern land was a fish land, and a lake land, and a cattle land.” The deer and buffalo were their cattle. They learned that eastern North America was richer in fish and game.



Figure 38xv (Glyph IV, 15) “After Chilili, the great warrior (Ayamek 6) was king, when all the tribes were at war.” Scouts or frontiersmen of the aboriginal Black Americans would have seen the Lenape first and would have reported their whereabouts to their leaders. The Lenape, on the other hand, were like tourists, in awe of the new scenery and expecting only to find *Homo erectus* people. Even if they did see Black Americans, they would not have been able to fully believe their eyes. As an old African proverb says, a stranger has eyes for everything but sees nothing. For all these reasons, they were taken by surprise, caught off guard in the best locations for ambushes. Their first losses would have been staggering.




Figure 38xvi (Glyph IV, 16) “There was war with the robbing-men, snaking-men, blacking men, strongmen. Chikonapi, Akhonapi, Makatapi, Assinapi. Thus, ends the first song with civil strife and great wars, dividing some tribes probably.” The x symbolizes war, and connecting lines show commonality. They are saying that their enemies all have at least one of these four characteristics. Notice that robbing (one o’clock) and strength (five o’clock) are mutually exclusive characteristics. “Snaking” (*Homo erectus* status, eleven o’clock) and “blacking” (African status, seven o’clock) are also mutually exclusive characteristics. This tells us that they encountered no black (*Homo sapiens/Homo erectus* hybrids), which suggests that the Blacks had killed off all the *Homo erectus* people at least one generation before the Amerindians got to the Americas. I’d say the Amerindians were pretty good psychologists!



Figure 38xvii (Glyph IV, 17) “After Ayamek came ten kings, in whose time there was much warfare south and east.” Both groups of Amerindians must have suffered heavy losses because, as we’ll see, they were not initially

able to defeat the Olmecs or the Cahokians. Warfare being confined to the south and east tells us that, at this time, the Amerindians were only fighting the Blacks and not each other. It also confirms what we would expect of Aboriginal African Americans: they were marine people from a warm climate who preferred the coastlines and the rivers of mild or warm areas.


I'll leave out all the song/glyphs that simply name chiefs and record the passage of time. There followed a succession of many chiefs in peaceful times when the Amerindians had apparently retreated to the north to lick their wounds and regroup. But all things tend to turn into their opposites. Amerindians, living as hunters, perfected their stone and bone weapons and fighting skills. The descendants of Snowbird, who had gone south and west, gradually fought their way ever closer to San Lorenzo, the Olmec capital, the climatic paradise for primitive men. But the Black Americans were much too densely populated in Central America, so the Amerindians first sailed around them and managed to slowly populate the interior of South America. Tamakwi's eastern group drew ever closer to the North American heartland of the Blacks. A marine people, the Black Americans did not heavily populate many parts of frigid or arid North America or the interior of South America. The Amerindians, the Mongoloid people from Asia, were gradually but easily able to displace them in these areas. Rafinesque made a brilliant observation that could have assured us of this, even before anthropologists announced to the world that pre-9-kya skulls in South America are all Negroid and post-7-kya skulls are all Mongoloid (10 and 8 kya, respectively, for North America). He noticed that (a few island and swampy areas notwithstanding) the tropical people of the Western Hemisphere are brown-skinned and not black-skinned as in Eurasia.

In North America, the Lenape and other Indians underwent a long period of adaptation. They learned to find berries, improved their glyph writing and made towns. Next, Glyphs IV, 24 and IV, 25 tell us why it was possible for them to develop settled communities, towns.



Figure 38xviii (Glyph IV, 24) King afterwards was Takwachi (who shivers with cold) who went south to the corn land Minihaking.

Figure 38xix (Glyph IV, 25) King afterwards was Huminiend (corn eater) who planted much corn there.



of

To modern men, the above two glyphs might seem unimportant, but they are two of the most important pieces prehistory for the Lenape and the Amerindians per se. To give you yet another example of how authentic the *Walam Olum* is and how superior Rafinesque was to all the masked, latent homosexual smart Alecks who accuse him of fabricating the *Walam Olum* or who think they can improve upon his translation, look at the corresponding translations of the Society and Daniel Brinton. Although they had Rafinesque's notes right in front of them, notes that said all the above, the Society distorted these into: "After him the chief, Old One Who Is Cold, went south to the berry country," and "The chief after him was Berry Man, who started the custom of gathering berries." Brinton reproduced Rafinesque's translation of Glyph 24 word-for-word and preserved the meaning of Glyph 25 but distorted the language with: "After him Corn Breaker was chief, who brought about the planting of corn." Rafinesque's translation of what the Lenape said proves the authenticity of the *Walam Olum* because his translation is exactly how the Indians would have said it. They wouldn't have wanted to lose face by admitting that prior to this time they hadn't known how to grow corn.

Why, in their material and military situation, was this knowledge of horticulture, their transition into Neolithic men, so all important? Think not of what might be in my mind (I'm not giving out any paychecks or gold stars) but of their reality! Try to figure out why the acquisition of corn decided their fate before I tell you. By song/Glyph 41, they were once more at war.




Figure 38xx (Glyph IV, 41) "Waptiwapit (white chicken) was king; again, there is war north and south." The many Lenape names with "white" in them are sure signs that they were distinguishing themselves and allies from black enemies.



Figure 38xxi (Glyph IV, 42) "By the wise in assembly Tamaskan (strong wolf) was made king."




Figure 38xxii (Glyph IV, 43) "He was able to war on all, and he killed the strong-stone"

Maskansini.” It is only by looking at this one in succession with the next four that it becomes apparent that now the Indians, over-crowded within the western tectonic plate of North America, are making war on each other.



Figure 38xxiii (Glyph IV, 44) “Messissuwi (whole-he) was king and made war on the snake-beings Akowini.” It sounds as if they are blaming the Snake (*Homo erectus*) spirits for their troubles, because they don’t want to recall being disunited. The glyph confirms the song: the Lenape (three feathers and a brave heart) is at war with the being with the forked (snake) tongue. How do you make war on spirits? Too bad Frazer isn’t here. He’d know.




Figure 38xxiv (Glyph IV, 45) “Chitanwulit (strong and good) was king and made war on the northern foes Lowanuski.” The Amerindians were warring with each other because they were disunited and still afraid of the Aboriginal Black Americans who had beaten them so badly and who controlled all the prime land from the Mississippi Valley eastward. Again, the glyph confirms this: the great Lenape warrior (three feathers, large and brave-hearted) is at war with someone to the left, to the west, which could only mean later-arriving Mongoloid people.

Although Rafinesque’s notes say nothing about possessions, the Society suggests that glyphs 44-47 refer to the Lenape destroying things belonging to other people (i. e. the vacant lodges of peoples who migrated between summer and winter hunting grounds). This sounds very likely for five reasons. 1) Others might think the Snakes caused the damage. 2) If accused, they could plausibly claim that they thought the lodges to belong to the Snakes (*Homo erecti*). 3) The destruction would have lessened competition from ongoing, genetic competitors. 4) It would encourage others to plant corn and form settled communities, and 5) by making other Indians less comfortable and complacent, it would have been easier to unite them for war against the Black Americans.

The Lenape habit of calling all enemies snakes may have started at this time. Confirm that our ongoing genetic competitors are one of the original four, ambivalent elements of the godhead and associate closely with the Deluge victims, forming what I call the Fraternal complex.



Figure 38xxv (Glyph IV, 46) “Alokuwi (lean he) was king and made war on the father snake Towakon.”

Again, and as we'll soon see, unity was vital to Amerindian success; so, after succeeding, they didn't want to recall that they were ever disunited. It's simply NOT possible that *Homo sapiens*, of any ethnicities, could have been fighting *Homo erectus* AND each other.




Figure 38xxvi (Glyph IV, 47)

“Opekasit (east-looking) was king, being sad at the warfare.” This chief was wise and knew that the Indians needed to unite (not fight each other) to defeat their common enemy and take his land, the richer land to the east.



Figure 38xxvii (Glyph IV, 48) “To the sunrise he said let us go, and they are many who together go east.” Opekasit (east-looking) has achieved his purpose! He has united the Algonquin on the warpath against the Aboriginal Black Americans.



Figure 38xxviii (Glyph IV, 49) “The fish river Nemasipi separated the land, and being lazy they tarry there.” While the glaciers were still melting, Fish River would have been teeming with fish whose lives had been suspended in the ice. They have amassed across the river from Cahokia, the capital of the northern empire of Aboriginal Black America. (See Figure 123a.)



Figure 38xxix (Glyph IV, 50) “Yagawanend (hut maker) was king, and the Tallegewi (there found) possessing the east.” There is an anonymous PDF on the Internet entitled, “Original People – Indian People.” “Original People” is the English translation of Lenni Lenape (the Delaware), but the document appears to be from the Iroquois and is in perfect agreement with the *Walam Olum*'s account of what follows.



Figure 38xxx (Glyph IV, 51) “Chitanitis (strong friend) king was, and he desires the rich land of the east.”



Figure 38xxxii (Glyph IV, 52) “To the east some did pass, but the head of the Talegas, Talegawil killed some of them.” He must have killed a lot of them because, as we'll see, the Amerindians thirsted for revenge.




Figure 38xxxii (Glyph IV, 53) “Then of one mind, all say, warfare, warfare.” Add one to each side and it’s five to one.




Figure 38xxxiii (Glyph IV, 54) “The friends of the north the Talamatan (who are not like the Talligewi, the Hurons) were coming to go altogether united.” The Iroquois document cited above suggests that all the Iroquois (Mengwe) united with the Lenape.




Figure 38xxxiv (Glyph IV, 55) “Kinehepend (sharp looking) was king, and leader, over the river against foes.” War with the “Telega” (Black Americans) has begun.



Figure 38xxxv (Glyph IV, 56) “Much was there possessed by them, and much spoiling and killing of the Telegas.”



Figure 38xxxvi (Glyph IV, 57) “Pimokhasuwi (stirring about) was king. He found the Telegas too strong in the war.”



up Figure 38xxxvii (Glyph IV, 58) “Tenchekensit (opening path) was king, and many towns were given to him.”



Figure 38xxxviii (Glyph IV, 59) “Paganchihilla (great fulfiller) was king, and all the Telegas went away to the south.” The war lasted through the reign of at least five Lenape chiefs before the Telega were fully routed and sent south. While most of the aboriginal, Black American men would have been exterminated, many of the women survived and intermarried with the Mongoloid people, which is why there are so many dark-skinned people among the Amerindians and why L (African) types of mtDNA are common among at least several modern, Mexican peoples.



Figure 38xxxix (Glyph IV, 60) “He-has-pleasure was chief; all the people rejoice.



Figure 38xxxx (Glyph IV, 61) The translations of both Brinton and the Society agree and appear to be better than Rafinesque’s for this one: “They stay south of the lakes; the Talamatan (Iroquois) friends north of the lakes.” The Iroquois web document says that their lot was the land “around the lakes.” Since the lakes don’t lie in one latitude, who was to get New York and New England? Predictably, soon after defeating the Blacks, the Lenape and the Iroquois were at war with each other. When the white men arrived, they were able to take full advantage of Amerindian disunity.

But within the reigns of only five chiefs, they wiped out a civilization that had existed for at least 53,000 years! (The earliest American occupation date of 65 kya is holding up for the charcoal at Pedra Furada, Brazil.) How was this possible? Think about it.

Now, it was partly due to my preference for fellow North Americans that I chose the Delaware as our sample for Eastern Siberia. Curtin wrote an excellent work on the mythology of the Mongols (the modern-day Buriats, *A Journey to Southern Siberia*, 1909). They also participated in the Siberian Species War, as is clearly implied by his pages 121-124. But I’ve adequately proven my point for Siberia, so you can read the other book on your own time, and we’ll move on.

CHAPTER 15: THE SCANDINAVIANS, MASTERS OF WISHFUL THINKING

*I regard the existence of an afterlife as irrefutable.
The only question is: how far is it from Manhattan,
And how long does it take to get there? --Woody Allen*

The symbolism here, in the “Sons of Borr” ([introduced above](#)), is clear. In this myth, the “giants” were killed and their bodies eaten. Some of the Neanderthals may have escaped a holocaust, a massacre at the hands of our immediate ancestors, by escaping in a boat. Yet we know that the giant Bergelmir and his wife did not reproduce their race. There are no “giants” (Neanderthals) left among us.

More likely, the thought that two Neanderthals escaped in a boat and that they just happened to be man and wife and reproduced their race is a wishful afterthought. It is wishful thinking designed to soothe the guilty realization that massacres, in Scandinavian parts of westernmost Europe, resulted in the extinction of our parent species. Like the belief in an afterlife or souls, it is totally unsupported by empirical experience.

Notice too that this myth may be a super condensation of the outline of our prehistory. “Ymir” may represent the primal father. Like the mythologies of several peoples that we shall study below, this myth may be combining the first and second sins into one tale in which the first (or “original” sin) “causes” the second sin (the Deluge). *In other words, just as our primitive ancestors thought that the Great Flood was brought by the gods as punishment of Homo sapiens for exterminating Homo erectus in the Species War, they thought that the Species War was punishment of the Homo erecti for them having killed the primal fathers.*

In Part III, when we seek to prove our (What-the-Deluge-means) argument in reverse; we shall find that the whole of Scandinavian mythology, including the most interesting myth of Balder, totally confirms what we’ve already surmised about the Species War and much, much more.

CHAPTER 16: DEUCALION AND FERTILITY GODS

Your children are not your children. --Kahlil Gibran

Recall the Greek Deucalion myth, [above](#). The flood survivors are said to re-people the earth by throwing behind them “the bones of the earth -- namely, stones that change into men.” This is simply a veiled way of saying that *Homo erectus* people were cannibalized to make *Homo sapien* babies.

In a still more figurative sense, Neanderthal bones changed into men to the extent that eliminating *Homo erectus* competitors for resources (“producing *Homo erectus* bones”) made it possible to raise more *Homo sapien* babies. *No doubt this association of dead Homo erecti with increased food supplies and Homo sapien reproduction initially provided a realistic and concrete basis for the universal association of the gods (Homo erecti) with fertility.* Although most of the fertility myths and their gods are too fragmentary to clearly verify this interpretation, a myth from the coast of the Andean Cordillera, a myth that is the converse of the standard type of fertility myth, does clearly verify this (Fraternal Complex) interpretation. Here is the tale, as it appeared in Markham and Alexander, a tale from Pedro de Cieza de León who traveled the region from 1532-1550 A.D. Cieza de León’s native informants insisted that the tale descended from their ancestors of a very remote time:

There arrived on the coast, in boats made of reeds, as big as large ships, a party of men of such size that, from the knee downwards, their height was as great as the entire height of an ordinary man, though he might be of good stature. Their limbs were all in proportion to the deformed size of their bodies, and it was a monstrous thing to see their heads, with hair reaching to the shoulders. Their eyes were as large as small plates. They had no beards and were dressed in the skins of animals, others only in the dress that nature gave them, and they had no women with them. [*H A paragraph of little note intervenes wherein natural features near Santa Elena are said to be the remains of the houses built by the giants; and the giants are credited with having built the earliest, stone-lined wells that were probably built by ayllus, work groups that succeeded the tribal moieties.*]

Having built their village and made their wells or cisterns where they could drink, these great men, or giants, consumed all the provisions they could lay their hands upon in the surrounding country, inasmuch that one of them ate more meat than fifty of the natives of the country could. As all the food they could find was not sufficient to sustain them, they killed many fish with nets and other gear. They were detested by the natives because in using their women they killed them, and the men also in another way; but the Indians were not sufficiently numerous to destroy this new people who had come to occupy their lands... All the natives declared that God our Lord, brought upon them a punishment in proportion to the enormity of their offence... --Alexander: 204-5.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ A similar myth that is obviously a metaphor for the Species War came out of Wales or Ireland. In it, Bendegeid Vran, the king of the "Isle of the Mighty," and Matholwch, king of Ireland, are uniting their peoples through the marriage of the latter to the former's beautiful sister, Branwen. On the second day of the wedding feast, which is held outside because "no house could ever contain Bendegeid," Matholwch is given a cauldron, "the property of which is that if one of thy men be slain today and be cast therein, tomorrow he will be as well as ever he was at the best, except that he will not regain his speech. Matholwch then asks Bendegeid where he got the cauldron, and Bendegeid answers that he got it from Llassar Llaesgyvnewid and Kymideu Kymeinvoll, a husband and wife who escaped with it from the Iron House in Ireland. Matholwch then admits having met this giant and giantess couple of yellow hair and horrid aspect coming from the Lake of the Cauldron in Ireland. This pair said that they were journeying because of the cauldron and her pregnancy. At the end of a month and a fortnight, she expected to give birth to 'a warrior fully armed.' 'So,' said Matholwch, 'I took them with me and maintained them. And they were with me for a year. And that year I had them with me not grudgingly. But thenceforth was there murmuring because they were with me. For, from the beginning of the fourth month they had begun to make themselves hated and to be disorderly in the land, committing outrages and molesting and harassing the nobles and ladies; and thenceforward my people rose up and besought me to part with them, and they bade me to choose between them and my dominions. And I applied to the council of my country to know what should be done concerning them; for of their own free will they would not go, neither could they be compelled against their will, through fighting. And [the people of the country] being in this strait, they caused a chamber to be made all of iron. Now when the chamber was ready, there came there every smith that was in Ireland and everyone who owned tongs and hammer. And they caused coals to be piled up as high as the top of the chamber. And they had the man, and the woman, and the children, served with plenty of meat and drink; but when it was known that they were drunk, they began to put fire to the coals about the chamber, and they blew it with bellows until the house was red hot all around them.'"

You'll have to wait till a later chapter to discover the "punishment that god inflicted upon these giants." For now, I'll assure you that it was the same fate that most of the *Homo erecti* suffered at the hands of our immediate ancestors.

So, the dead, propitiated *Homo erectus* gods became associated with fertility. Their untamed spirits, the "Jinn," became associated with death, famine and resource loss.

As our ancestors entered the modern era and priests of competing cults were striving to amalgamate the gods into their respective cult figures, some of the *Homo sapien* gods also became fertility gods. These tended to become the supreme beings of their respective pantheons. Some of these gods may have originally represented Species War leaders before symbolizing Species War victors as a whole. The original logic of these *Homo sapien* leaders' service as fertility gods is probably this: by being sacrificed (by their personators being sacrificed), these gods slaked the *Homo erectus* gods' thirst for revenge and secured the latter's assistance in making nature perform as desired. Thus, the sacrificial deaths of Ninurta, Marduk and others served as models for the Fraternal Complex aspect of Paul's Jesus. (See for example Marduk in Langdon, pages 155-6, 322, 342 and 344 or Cooper's translation of "Ninurta's Return to Nippur.")

In the Near East and the Mediterranean area, a popular, standard fertility myth involved someone, usually an Earth Mother (or her lover), having to spend part of each year in the underworld and taking the verdure with her (or him). In the drier parts of the Near East and northern Africa, this loss of the verdure does not occur in winter, as it does in the extreme latitudes. It occurs in summer. Listen to Professor R.T. Rundle Clark describe these severe, dry summers.

Oriental man, and the Egyptians and Sumerians in particular, experienced the climatic changes of the seasons in a more dramatic form than did the peoples of Western Europe. In the West one can speak of a "dead season" but

Naturally, the giant and his wife were the only two to escape the fire, escaping to "the Isle of the Mighty," where they propagated their race (*Mabinogion*: 19-20). This myth is also like others from the British Isles that we will analyze below. It suggests that the *Homo erecti* are still living in or near these Isles. The British Isles were closely associated with the *Homo erectus* gods because they were the scenes of the last battles of the Species War. Britons identified more closely with them too.

with us the expression is a mild one, almost a harmless metaphor. The agricultural year is a round of tasks, each suitable in its proper season, and there is an unspoken confidence that there will be no absolute failure in the order of natural events. In the East [*H Mid or Near East*], however, the heat and drought of summer reduce the country to something indistinguishable from the surrounding desert. The vegetation is almost completely burnt up; the animals grow listless from heat and lack of water. The desert has always been, to Eastern peasants, the place of death, the abode of wild animals, evil spirits, terror and chaos. During the high summer the difference between the valley lands of life and order, and the desert with its terrors, has ceased to exist. --R.T. Rundle Clark: 99

The seasonal descent to the underworld was, in late Neolithic times, described as punishment that another god or divine king inflicted upon the Earth Mother or her lover. This was usually due to there being a love triangle in which the most powerful one became wrathful. For example, earthly kings, in love with Ishtar (Babylonian counterpart of Sumerian Ininni), killed her lover Tammuz (Babylonian Dumuzi) out of jealousy (Langdon: 337). Or in Syria, Tamuz and Hephaestus fought over Ba'alti (Langdon: 339). Or in Phoenicia, Tammuz, Dumuzi or Adonî was slain by the husband of Astarte. In at least one version of this myth, the beautiful Adonis is fought over by both Aphrodite and Persephone, queen of the underworld. Zeus decrees that Adonis must spend half of each year with each woman. Langdon shows that all these myths are traceable to a Sumerian original, the best-recorded Babylonian version of which has Ishtar trying to usurp the throne of her sister Ereshkigal, the queen of the underworld. Failing in her attempted coup, Ishtar is confined to the underworld until the gods secure her release upon the condition that she pays a ransom and Tammuz is made to winter in the underworld. The exact how and why of this outcome is not clear owing to different Babylonian accounts and the illegibility of the Sumerian tablets. (*Cf.* Langdon: 326-335.) *We shall discover that the lacunae (holes in the cuneiform) in these tablets were probably deliberately made with hammers and chisels. In earlier pagan times, the descent of fertility goddesses to the underworld had an entirely different meaning, a meaning that had nothing directly to do with punishment.*

Freud believed that these fertility myths were symbolic of the Oedipal Complex. The confinement to hell was, in Freud's opinion, necessary punishment for the violation of taboos. (Cf. Freud, 1913: 152.) These myths do often feature incestuous marriages. In the earliest known versions of Tammuz and Ishtar, he is her son by virgin birth. (Cf. Langdon: 98, 113.) At least one of them, starring Cybele and Attis, involves Attis being castrated. Yet the greater part of them involves either no incest or incest between siblings. (I shall show you why the Babylonian priests changed Tammuz from a son to a brother.) The punishable deed that sends the god to the underworld varies so widely as to appear incidental and incorporated in the myth only to complete a metaphor that purports to explain the changing of the seasons.

To the extent that the Oedipal Complex enters some of these myths, it is only part of a modern gloss or frosting that was meant to cover-up the Paleolithic original. I will show you what the original, Paleolithic cake, the original and quintessential, Sumerian fertility myth looked like in a coming chapter. First, we must learn a bit more from our Germanic and our Mesopotamian ancestors. We are going to have to listen very closely to these ancestors. We're going to have to listen to what they tell us consciously *and unconsciously* because the original myth was even more X-rated than any of its modern counterparts!

Before we leave this Deucalion myth, notice that the bones of the Deucalion flood victims that change into men are also (in the line that is repeated at the top of this chapter) equated with stones. In later chapters, as we analyze the mythology of other peoples, especially in Chapters 23, 26 and Appendix D, we'll discover that stones reminded our Neolithic ancestors of *Homo erectus*. In and of itself, "stones turning into men" would refer to *Homo sapiens* growing out of, branching from or being a genetic mutant of *Homo erecti*.

Does the mention of *Homo erectus* bones in Deucalion bring us any closer to satisfying Richard Leakey's demand for the evidence of massacres? Not much. Some of the bones that were left over from cannibal feasts would have been used as fuel during cold winters or on relatively treeless steppes.¹²⁵ Wherever the victims were few relative to desperately hungry *Homo sapien* victors, the bones would have been

¹²⁵ Kostenki hunters in the Don River Valley are known to have used the bones of large animals for fuel. See Prideaux: 53. The Scythians of the steppes were also said to have used bones for fuel (Herodotus, Book IV, Chapter 61).

cracked open and stripped of their marrow. Broken or partially burned bones would have decomposed more quickly. This would *partially* explain the lack of evidence of massacres to which Richard Leakey and others have referred. As has already been mentioned, heads/brains were valued for both their nutritional value and the “mana” or power of the spirit that was believed to be recoverable from the head of the dying person. So, heads too would have been broken open and discarded. In this condition, all but those more expertly stripped of their contents through the foramen magnum would have been subject to greater exposure to water and would have decomposed more quickly.

But these anomalies are hardly adequate to explain the overnight “disappearance” of the bones of tens -- or more likely *hundreds* -- of thousands -- maybe even millions -- of prehistoric people. Is there yet another explanation?

Yes, it turns out that there are at least two other, much more important and convincing explanations. We shall discover them anon. We will also discover two more versions of this Deucalion myth when we come to our chapter on Greek mythology. They will confirm the interpretation given here and add interesting information about the literal, Great Flood, the second worst trauma of our prehistory that became the screen memory cover for the worst trauma. The more modern Deucalion mythology will enable us to discover the exact date (already given as 14,634 BPE) and the cause of the Great Flood. You have read enough to know that “the gods” or “God” didn’t cause it.

CHAPTER 17: ATLANTIS: THE OVERVIEW

Order and simplification are the first steps toward the mastery of a subject -- the actual enemy is the unknown. --Thomas Mann

The Atlantis tale is reviewed in Chapter 1 and begins [here](#).

I spent thirty-six years struggling with this myth. As Thomas Mann suggested, in the above quotation, I dissected it to discover three places and four events to which the myth refers. But it is only now, in Version 27.1 of this three-volume book, that I am confident to say that I understand who wrote the version we know and why. While I still can't guarantee you that all of the details, as I describe them, are correct; having the overview, seeing the forest, enables me to confidently say that now, for the first time ever, we know what this tale is mainly about.

Understanding it requires an understanding of history in its broadest outlines. See Figure 39, at the end of this chapter, maps of the Persian, Greek and Roman empires. The Persian (or Achaemenid) Empire, Figure 39a, expanded from its origins in southwestern Persia (now Iran). It was founded by Cyrus the Great in the 6th Century BC and lasted about 200 years, until the death of Darius III, in 330 BC, following his defeat by Alexander. This empire (see the map) straddled what we discovered in Chapter 13 to be the East-West culture divide. About one third of it was in the West. (Recall that Ur, at the mouth of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, was the site of our first out-of-Africa settlement, from which male-dominated hunting groups migrated northwest and female-dominated fishing people migrated eastward after the opening battle(s) of the Species War. Obviously, the more similar peoples are, the easier it is to unite them; and the converse is also true.

The Persian Empire would have become unity-challenged after expanding beyond Mesopotamia. But every ambitious statesman and philosopher dreams of reuniting the human family. The unification of different peoples into empires requires either their pagan religions to be very similar or a modern religion to which they can all subscribe, feel equally loved and be equally blessed. The Persians did develop the first modern religion, Zoroastrianism. But instead of holding itself above adjunct, national religions; Zoroastrianism became infected with Persian national religion. Truth and light, its abstract God, became

depicted as anthropomorphic Ahurra Mazda, a winged man, *whose bearded head and hat were indistinguishable from those of Darius I.*

It doesn't require a lot of forethought to conclude that the political unification of humanity, global unification, requires global trade, global means of communication, a most simple, word-order-dependent, trade and port language and the replacement of all religions (the hallucinatory versions of our basic psychology and horrific prehistory) with social science. Implementing social science, minimizing the K and R Class Struggle, will also require effective means of birth control and the perfection of marital match-making. As *Stage II of the Nonviolent Rainbow Revolution*, a sequel to this book shows, this last requirement for global unification is the only one that we now lack; and it can be developed as soon as an enlightened government or wealthy individual, another James Smithson, decides to finance its development. (See Appendix H for Smithson.)

The Greek Empire is said to have lasted 350 years. But it only reached a great extent under Alexander. Alexander conquered all of the Persian Empire and even continued beyond the Indus River Valley into India. The greater part of his empire was in the East! He bit off much more than he could chew. His Greek comrades rankled at the admission of Persians into the army, and Alexander died of fever shortly after ending his campaign of conquest. His empire fell apart when he died in 323 BC.

Only a few words about the Romans will be necessary before we return to our main subject – the Greeks. The Roman Empire didn't have a modern religion. But at its height, circa 350 CE, it was still almost entirely outside of the East. (See Figure 39c.) It included the culture divide but went no further. It lasted from 31 BC (Octavian's victory over Mark Anthony and Cleopatra) to 380 CE (the fall of the Western Empire to Germanic Kings and the Hellenization and Christianization of the Eastern Empire, later the Byzantine Empire). The Western Roman Empire lasted 411 years, over twice as long as the Persian Empire.

Now look at Figure 39b, the Greek world of 550 BC. Notice that the Greeks were, like the Phoenicians before them, sea-faring peoples. They developed trading colonies along the Egyptian coast, the northern and eastern Mediterranean coasts, and surrounding the Black Sea. They thrived from trade, especially the trade in metals. During the Bronze Age, the Second Millennium and latter half of the Third Millennium B.C., they had ranged much, much further. During the Bronze Age, the

ancestors of the Athenians developed a distant and fabulously rich empire by finding and ultimately monopolizing the resource that was, for the Bronze Age, what oil and coal were for the Industrial Age, tin. The ancestors of the other Greek city states had fought against the ancestors of the Athenians in what was, after the Species War, the Second World War in the West. Although 683 years had elapsed between the end of this second world war and 500 BC (the rough start of the classical Greek era) and although a 400-500-year dark age had intervened, the most educated Greeks and inquisitive leaders knew much of what that second world war was about. Homer's *Iliad* reminded them of it, the Trojan War. Much rancor still existed between disunited, classical Greek city states.

But during the Greco-Persian Wars and the periods before and after them, the sovereignty of all the Greeks was at stake. These wars, also called Persian Wars, (492–449 BC), were a series of wars fought by Greek states and Persia over a period of almost half a century. The fighting was most intense during two invasions that Persia launched against mainland Greece between 490 and 479. *It was of strategic importance, during this era, to project the Trojan War between the ancestors of Athenians and the ancestors of the other Greeks as far into the past as possible and to pretend that they had all fought on the same side.* Such lies were as patently false as the Greek claims of having been autochthons, born of the soil, lies that, as Professor Tyrrell showed us in Chapter 6, were exemplified in a speech of Demosthenes.

Socrates refused to support this strategic campaign of lies. True to his calling, as a philosopher, as one who seeks to uncover and promote basic truths, he refused to tell what he knew to be bold face lies. Yet he knew of the emergency situation that prevailed. He and his author/pupil Plato apparently regarded wars as inevitable. Much of the *Republic* is devoted to describing the cultivation of the Guardians, a class of warrior/philosophers who defend the state (government and polity). The closest they apparently came to even imagining a world with population control (minimized K and R strategies) and without war was their observation in the latter part of Book II of *The Republic* that the intemperate pursuit of wealth and luxury requires an abundance of specialized craftsmen and thus the enlargement of the state. This, in turn, necessitates geographic expansion and war. Although they had the proper love and respect for truth and justice, they struggled unsuccessfully to define both. (Not until 19th Century Frederick Huxley was truth defined as the knowledge and information

that advances human evolution. I may have been the first, as late as the early 21st Century, to define justice as the outcomes that truth demands.) According to Plato, Socrates believed that the Greeks could be united against “the barbarians” by discrediting and censoring Homer’s error-ridden works and by creating a new myth. Such Homeric “errors” would have had to include the Greek names of the “Atlanteans”/Trojans. The new myth, a “noble lie” ...

“...will teach that all of the members of the community are brothers, born of Mother Earth and forged within her womb. Some were forged with gold in them, some with silver, and the rest with bronze. The metal within each determines his place in society; those with gold are the Rulers, those with silver are Auxiliaries, and the others are the laboring class.” (enotes.com, Plato is torturous to read in English)

Of course, such an elitist myth would never win the hearts and minds of the “Auxiliaries” or the “laboring class,” which must make the greatest sacrifices in war. This proposed, new myth shows the inconsistency of these aristocrats, their failure to acknowledge what the rest of us know intuitively: the inequities of diet and pre-natal care notwithstanding, and with few genetically-mutated exceptions; all men are born equal and need equal opportunity to function as we did at Lake Victoria and Ur, as one loving and fully-united family.

We’ll analyze *Atlantis*, line by line, in Appendix G. Now let’s reconsider the Noah’s Ark myth, subjecting it to our “Deluge” hypothesis.

CHAPTER 18: A NEW WINDOW ON THE ARK

A live mind can see a window onto a world of possibilities.

--Douglas R. Hofstadter

We come now to the Bible and the myth in which most of you will be most interested. Genesis and the four books of the Bible that succeed it are known as the *Pentateuch or the Book of Moses*. Biblical scholar Jerome Kodell tells us that the Pentateuch consists primarily of four historical sources or traditions: the Deuteronomic, the Priestly, the Elohist and the Yahwist. The Yahwist and the Elohist are exclusively oral traditions that are as old as the oldest Sumerian mythology. The Yahwist and the Elohist traditions derive from the southern-most Semitic people, people whose origins are traceable to Arabia.

Stephen Herbert Langdon was the scholar who wrote the volume on Semitic mythology within the thirteen-volume



series, *The Mythology of All Races*. He persuasively argued that South Arabia was once home to all the Semitic peoples, peoples who later divided philologically and geographically into eastern (Akkadian),

western (Canaanite), northern (Aramaean) and southern (Arabic) groups (Langdon: 1, 4).¹²⁶ The eastern group adopted the entire Sumerian pantheon and virtually all Sumerian mythology. The northern and western Semitic groups subsequently adopted the resultant “Babylonian” mythology. Within the original Arabic group, the sun god (an appellation that we shall learn to thoroughly understand over the course of this book) was a female deity. This, as you’ll see, is an anomaly that, as far as I know, is limited to the early Hebrews, the Japanese and possibly the founders of Teotihuacan. This female sun god and the wholesale adoption of Sumerian mythology suggest that the Semitic peoples were *relatively* uninvolved in the *opening battles* of the Species War. Somehow, they managed to escape the violent eruption of the Species War at Ur. As you’ll see, they were major players in the *final* chapter of the Species War. A Sumero-Babylonian myth that we will interpret in Chapter 36, one that Professor Langdon was unable to correctly interpret, will support his speculation that the Semites -- and almost all our out-of-Africa, *Homo sapien* ancestors at some time prior to the outbreak of the Species War -- were in southernmost Mesopotamia.

Be that involvement as it may, in the Yahwist tradition, Yaw was the rain and thunder god. We can assume this from his identity with the god Adad, one of the two principal deities of all west Semitic peoples. Yaw appears to be a west Semitic deity unknown to our earliest Hebrew ancestors, the *Habiru*, until they entered Canaan. (Cf. Langdon: 73-74.)

On the other hand, the Aramaic deity El, Elohim and the North Arabian Alilah (Allah) all derive from Ilâh or Il, the common Semitic word for “god” that was also the name for the South Arabian moon god (Langdon: 5). So, it appears that the Elohist tradition of the Bible is the oldest Semitic tradition. Supporting this etymological speculation is some other information that we will glean from a myth in Chapter 37: settled, out-of-Africa, *Homo sapien* civilization began in what was the southern-most part of the Tigris and Euphrates River Valley at an anti-diluvian Ur (the former capital of Sumer).

The Baal-Hadad cycle and Canaanite mythology found at Ugarit, on the north coast of Syria, is much like that of the eastern Semites,

¹²⁶ Here “Akkadian” is used generically to refer to all the Semitic peoples of Mesopotamia, the pre-Babylonian kingdom of Akkad in the northern part of the lower valley, the Babylonians and the Assyrians.

which was largely adopted from the Sumerians. For example, the primal father (Uranos,¹²⁷ Apsû in Sumero-Babylonia) appears to have been killed by two of his three sons, (Dagan, Hadda and El [An, Enlil and Enki in Sumero-Babylonia]). Like the latter group, the Canaanite brothers sire their race with their father's spouse, the Earth Mother. Hadda, "Thunderer," child of Dagan, is (like Sumerian Ningirsu or Ninurta whose totem representation was the "thunderbird" [Jacobsen, 1987: 243]) the leader of the Species War victors. (Cf. Eblaitica: 84-85.) So, Yaw or Yaweh, hurler of lightning bolts, was Hadda, leader of the *Homo sapien* Species Warriors, by another name, as was Adad, the Syrian rain and thunder god. (Cf. Langdon: 39.)¹²⁸ The whole library of Eblaite inscriptions found at Ebla (northern Syria, 100 km east of Mount Casius) in 1974 and 1975 by Professor Paolo Matthiae of the University of Rome has added little if anything to what is known of Canaanite mythology.¹²⁹

The Hebrews, the people to whom the Bible is attributed, were apparently named after the Habiru. Langdon tells us that the Habiru were a people who appear in various kingdoms and local city dynasties of Babylonia and Assyria from the twenty-second century until the Kassite period. They also appear among the Hittites and as an invading warlike tribe in Syria, Phoenicia and Canaan in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries. If this is true, said Langdon, then the Hebrews had served for six centuries as mercenary soldiers and traders among the Babylonians, Assyrians, Hittites, Mitannians and Aramaeans before they entered and occupied Canaan. (Cf. Langdon: 72.)

¹²⁷ Uranos, as you'll see in Chapter 25, was also the name of the Greek primal father.

¹²⁸ Notice also how many of these supreme gods (*Homo sapien*, Species War leaders) of Western Asia and the Mediterranean were thunder and rain gods. You should be able to guess immediately what the thunderbolts of Jupiter and Zeus *et al.* symbolize.

¹²⁹ The 1800 complete tablets and 4700 fragments, etched in the mid-third millennium B.C., included bilingual word lists in Sumerian and the local Eblaite. These enabled scholars to clarify their understanding of Sumerian and increase their appreciation of Eblaite, one of the earliest and most reader-friendly scripts, which was transcribed with a minimal number of Sumerian logograms and phonetic signs. However, the main focus of the tablets was, "economic records, inventories recording Ebla's commercial and political relations with other Levantine cities and logs of the city's import and export activities... There are king lists for the city of Ebla, royal ordinances, edicts, treaties. There are gazetteers listing place names, including a version of a standardized place-name list that has also been found at Abu Salabikh (possibly ancient Eresh) where it was dated to ca. 2600 BC. The literary texts include hymns and rituals, epics, proverbs." (See [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ebla_tablets.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ebla_tablets))

But more recent scholars are painting a much grimmer picture of our Habiru ancestors and the Mesopotamian world that they fled. Conditions appear to have steadily worsened in Mesopotamia throughout the second millennium B.C. Overpopulation, deforestation, drought and salinization of the farmland worsened the economy. The regional decline was greatly aggravated by the growth of the palace (military) sector. This expansion of the palace sector came at the expense of the free infrastructure that sustained it, “and led to considerable impoverishment and dislocation of the rural population” (Foster: 11). As is often the case in political-economic matters, what appears to be sound policy from the microcosmic point of view (e. g. increasing the military and police budget, the protection business) produces disastrous results in the aggregate (e. g. by increasing poverty and insecurity due to a decrease in the ratio of economically productive to unproductive people). Of course, at some point, the productive citizens conclude that the burden caused by their protectors is equal to or greater than that posed by foreign powers and population collapse results. This is the scenario created by the continuous warfare of the second half of the second millennium in Mesopotamia and most of the known world at that time. Our Habiru ancestors were among those who fared the worst for it. By the Middle Babylonian Period (the Kassite invasion of 1600, see the chronological table for Mesopotamia above), the small kingdoms and principalities of Mesopotamia had been conquered and annexed to large nation states. Taxation and tribute created ever-larger estates owned by the king or his men and worked by teams of indebted, conquered or otherwise-displaced persons. These were little better than slaves. (Cf. Foster: 12-13 or Brinkman: 17-22.) As such were the Habiru. The Habiru or Hapiru were displaced, landless persons that lived off banditry and the occasional hiring of its services. (Cf. Foster, page 27, *op. cit.*, citing Botteró: 14-17)

In Chapter 20, I shall attempt to convince you that the Biblical accounts of the house of Abraham -- through and possibly including Joseph’s sojourn into Egypt -- refer to much more than just the invasion of Canaan by these eastern Semites, the Habiru, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Underlying and permeating that oral history is a much older Species War history, a history so traumatic that it tended to overshadow and become confused with every other prehistoric conflict between genetic competitors in the Levant.

Returning to our consideration of Biblical traditions, presumably, the Deuteronomic and Priestly traditions were, like eastern, western

and northern Semitic mythology *per se*, derived largely from Sumerian mythology. The earliest authors of all these traditions were men and women who composed chants and stories. For thousands of years, the prehistoric Semites and Sumerians (like the Delaware and other primitive people) carried their history only in their heads in the form of these chants and stories. Our task is to try to reverse the process by which these chants and stories were progressively compromised and to extract the basic and original oral history.

Unfortunately, even Genesis, the book that most concerns itself with the earliest prehistory, has been much compromised. Biblical scholar, Jerome Kodell understates the case when he says that:

Few of the biblical books, especially those in the Old Testament, came to us straight from the pen of an individual writer. Many of them were edited and re-edited over the course of several generations... This participation of many different people [*H especially scribes of "prophets"*], sometimes over a period of many years and in more than one place, in the production of a certain writing, is a major characteristic of the Bible. (*Ibid.* p. XXI)

Yet understanding resistance and repression (defense mechanisms) as we do, we may be able, in some cases, to surmise what the original material was. In other cases, later authors may have edited out the most ancient material simply because no one could fathom what it meant!

Let's pick up approximately where Freud left off (in *Totem and Taboo*), at Genesis, Chapter 6. Assume, for now, that the Master's interpretation of original sin encompasses the "Fall" from the "Garden of Eden." These are the first chapters of the first book of the Bible and Freud assures us (*Totem and Taboo*: 154-) that the original sin refers to the killing of the primordial father and -- by association -- the biological father. After all, convergent thinking helps us read fast, get good grades and score high on standardized tests. Right?

So, for the time being, we'll forget about "The Garden of Eden" and skip to Genesis Six. If you read it as I do, you'll find it to be loaded with what we're looking for!

"Origin of the 'Nephilim' (prehistoric giants of Palestine)"

Who but Neanderthals or hybrids could the “prehistoric giants of Palestine” be?

When men began to multiply on earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of heaven saw how beautiful the daughters of man were, and so they took for their wives as many of them as they chose.

One or two terms notwithstanding, this (and all of chapter 6, verses 1-4, “Origin of the Nephilim”) sounds as if a twentieth century cultural anthropologist wrote it! Here’s my interpretation of the above passage: Neanderthal, who is now dead and in heaven, had the hots for our women and took them as he pleased for wives.

Then the Lord said: “My spirit shall not remain in man forever, since he is but flesh...”

Interpretation: We’re not going to tolerate Neanderthal forever. He’s dead meat as far as we’re concerned.

“...His days shall comprise one hundred and twenty years.”

Interpretation: Our (*Homo sapiens*) “God” is going to give “man” (Neanderthal) only so much time in which to reform. (Here are the usual defenses: denial, rationalization and projection. Though he’s been around longer than anyone can remember, the Lord has decided that his days are numbered.)

“At that time, the Nephilim appeared on earth (as well as later), after the sons of heaven had intercourse with the daughters of man, who bore them sons. They were the heroes of old, the men of renown.”

Interpretation: The now dead *Homo erecti* (the “sons of heaven”) had sons by our (*Homo sapien*) women. These hybrid sons were the Nephilim who became our heroes. They were like Manu in the Hindu myth. They protected us when we were vulnerable (like little fish in danger of being eaten by big fish).

“Warning of the Flood”

“When the Lord saw how great was man's wickedness on earth...

Interpretation: We’re the descendants of the good people, the blameless ones who God spared. If you can believe this, I’ve got a bridge to sell you. Here’s the same neurotic mass of resistance again. There’s reaction formation in here too. Now jump ahead in your Bible to the “Covenant with Noah” (Genesis 9):

“God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, ‘Be fertile and multiply and fill the earth.’”

Interpretation: With *Homo erectus* out of our way, we multiplied like crazy. It was not due to lack of consciousness and responsibility, lack of environmental awareness and political organization. It was because “God” willed it.

“Dread fear of you shall come upon all the animals of the earth and all the birds of the air, upon all the creatures that move about on the ground and all the fishes of the sea; into your power they are delivered.”

Interpretation: Now that we have the bow and arrow and our only competitor is eliminated, we are sovereign on this planet. Even the birds must fear our arrows.

“Every creature that is alive shall be yours to eat; I give them all to you as I did the green plants.”

Interpretation: We no longer need have any guilt about killing and eating the animals. God is allowing us to eat them. All the same, we’ve only eaten plants up to now. (If you can believe this, I’ve got a bridge *and a battleship* to sell you.) This line reflects total alienation from the rest of nature, the *Second Mask* that all of us acquire. It is especially characteristic of ultra-violent westerners. Do you see what created it?

“Only flesh with its lifeblood still in it you shall not eat.”

Interpretation: It’s cruel to eat any creature while it’s still alive. (Apparently, many of our saintly ancestors did this too! Why else would they mention it?)

“For your lifeblood, too, I shall demand an accounting: from every animal, I shall demand it, and from man regarding his fellow man I shall demand an accounting for human life.”

Interpretation: Men shall no longer kill each other. We don’t want to suffer the same fate as our victims. (*Our wishes betray our fears, which betray our deeds.* If “the Flood” did not refer to a whole lot of killing, why else did “God” prohibit homicide, the murder of man by man and threaten to punish murderers immediately *after* the Flood?)

“If anyone sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God has man been made.”

Interpretation: Henceforth, murderers shall not be permitted to follow our example of disavowing responsibility for their crimes by projecting that responsibility onto “God” or other animals. Also, we’re special; we’re not animals. (More alienation from the natural world.)

Next comes another verse wherein “God” encourages man, who has slain his only competitor, to “multiply; abound on earth and subdue it.” It is most important to note here that this alienation from nature (even better expressed in Genesis 1) is especially characteristic of Western and Near Eastern religions and culture.

It is an accidental consequence of the Species War. This accidental alienation from nature is an unintended but inevitable consequence of our ancestors having eliminated our parent species, our link with the animal kingdom, and having expunged the memory of him. After *Homo erectus*’ elimination, our immediate ancestors mounted a reaction formation to every aspect of their natural animal being because our animal functions reminded them of *Homo erectus*. We will see a clearer expression of this animal alienation when we come to Greek mythology.

Next comes the covenant, the promise not to bring another “flood.” As I mentioned in Chapter 1, Alexander Heidel incorrectly assumed that the flood could not have been punishment due to this covenant, which precluded the possibility of influencing behavior by threatening to repeat the punishment. It didn’t occur to him that the alleged perpetrators of the Flood were not the same as its chroniclers and that the Flood/punishment *would not* be repeated because the Species War/crime *could not* be repeated. There’s no other species that competes with us! The Covenant is, of course, intended to relieve the psychic trauma of the Species War and the Great Flood by assuring men that they won’t come again.

Moving on, we come to a gem of Genesis that I was late to appreciate only because we are not accustomed to thinking of the original meaning of words. Its significance in revealing the meaning of these myths is almost as great as the image of the flood itself. It unequivocally connects the bow and arrow with the traumatic events underlying the Deluge myths:

And to remind himself of this covenant to man, “God established his bow, the rainbow, in the sky.”

The association with the rainbow is, in and of itself, a very positive one for the bow, the Deluge weapon. Yet this association of the bow with the rainbow is made even more positive by the *way* the rainbow is incorporated into the myth. The rainbow is God’s promise that the flood will not come again. By association, the bow, the Deluge

weapon, is a promise that the Deluge will not come again. The bow is thus brought full circle. The weapon that brought the Deluge is turned into its opposite, into a symbol for peace.

It's probable that Species War veterans or an early, post-deluge generation that knew precisely what this history was all about consciously added the rainbow innovation. In any case, the effect was to help neutralize the traumatic charge that the bow and arrow had acquired. The bow was given a new, secure, pain-free and positive meaning! It was a brilliant innovation, and it would have been great therapy for everyone who had experienced the Species War.

This innovation is an example of the processes that Freud called *repetition compulsion*, repeated reference to the repressed elements of a trauma but in positive contexts that drain off their negative, psychic charge. Indeed, the incorporation of the rainbow into this myth is so creative and effective that it almost had to originate as the creation of some ancestor's unconscious mind (as a dream). Notice that the bow, lying on the ground against an object, such as a shade tree, bares the same geometrical relationship to the ground as does a rainbow. After the Species War had ended, one of our traumatized ancestors probably laid his bow against something as he lay down to sleep. He looked up through the bow toward the horizon before he fell asleep. That image became one of the day's residues that his unconscious mind ingeniously employed as a screen for personal traumas involving the bow and arrow, traumas derived from his participation in the Species War.

As Frazer tells us, for the earliest and most primitive men, dreams were as real as waking life. If the dream took one to a far-away land to do strange things, it was because one's soul went there as he slept and did them. Eventually, the most popular and therapeutic dreams became "messages from the gods." (The monotheistic "God" was a later invention of the Bronze Age.)

That is exactly what this wonderful, euphoric, tension-relieving screen memory seemed to be for a war-traumatized ancestor who dreamed about the rainbow. It was a message from the gods. The message spread throughout the community because it had the same therapeutic effect for others. Eventually, it was incorporated into their deluge myth specifically as a message from "God," as "God's" covenant that the flood would never come again. Assume that this has always been a major fear of our ancestors because there never was a global news service that could assure them that the last *Homo erecti*

had been eliminated. They were never certain that *Homo erecti* would not return to avenge the murder of their relatives or that “God” wouldn’t do to us what we did to others.

Right up to the present day, mankind has been haunted by ghosts, living with unconscious obsessional fear of a vanished species. We are more than just a little bit crazy.

In the next chapter, the last chapter of Part II, I’m going to depart from my formal plan of analyzing only flood myths in this Part. After we answer the more obvious questions that we raised earlier about Gilgamesh, I’m going to show you some of the Mesopotamian archaeological evidence that -- per my formal plan -- belongs in Part III. I believe that my analysis of this very graphic archaeology will convince you of *Homo erectus*’ presence and extermination in Mesopotamia. This evidence is the closest thing we’ll ever have to color photographs of the Species War. Covering it and the very important material that remains of Gilgamesh in this next chapter will save us from having to return to Mesopotamia until Chapter 36. (And with the price of gas these days! Whew!)

So, let’s get this taxi in gear and headed for the birthplace of out-of-Africa, *Homo sapien* civilization. Our next stop is the lands between the Tigris and Euphrates River Valleys, Mesopotamia.

CHAPTER 19: MESOPOTAMIA: THE MOTHER OF ALL BATTLES

*Men stumble over the truth from time to time,
But most pick themselves up and hurry off
As if nothing happened. --Winston Churchill*

I'm going to have to make an exception to the plan for this book. Mesopotamia is so important and there is so much essential Mesopotamian material that I'm going to have to include some of the non-deluge-myth, Mesopotamian material in this chapter. However, I shall introduce here only the rest of the Gilgamesh Epic and material to which the Deluge clues directly lead.

We will analyze the principal Mesopotamian gods; almost all of them adopted Sumerians, in Chapter 36. For most of that chapter and part of this one, we will rely for our data on one of the most eminent Sumero-Akkadian scholars, Stephen Herbert Langdon. Although Professor Langdon died in 1937 and although his inability to understand "the Deluge" core of our religions prevented him from correctly interpreting most mythology, his volume on Semitic mythology, Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races* series, is still second to none as an English-language summary of the data. Langdon was Shillito professor of Assyriology at Oxford from 1908 and associate editor of *Babyloniaca*, Paris 1908-1914. He was the curator for the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Babylonian section, 1916-1918. He directed the Oxford and Field Museum Expedition in Mesopotamia, 1923-1932; and he authored more than twenty books on Sumero-Semitic mythology. Langdon will be our principal translator.

Another scholar, a contemporary scholar, Thorkild Jacobsen, offers a colorful and humorous explanation for the abundance of Old Babylonian tablets. Despite their fragmentary condition, they have provided us with a treasure trove of information. Following the Old Babylonian period and with the invasion of the Mitannians and Kassites, the flood of Sumerian literary texts from the schools of the post-Third Dynasty, Isin-Larsa period, dwindled to "a mere trickle." Yet these Isin-Larsa schools of the late Old Babylonian Period had created a coterie of literati living within an otherwise dark and barbaric age. Theirs was an "in-group" literature, "of partly satirical, partly moralistic compositions, known by modern scholars as *Edubba texts*

from the Sumerian term for school, *é-dubba*. The flourishing of these schools and the enormous number of indestructible exercises and copies of literary works they produced is a main reason that we know as much about Sumerian literature today as we do. The discards from the schools were carted away by citizens who needed fill for their houses, so that now almost any excavation in private houses of Old Babylonian and slightly earlier periods is likely to produce such discards, supplementing and enhancing our knowledge” (Jacobsen, 1989: XII).

So, one era’s neurotics and their garbage can become another era’s greatest treasures. There’s hope for all of us!

Scholars pieced together the basics of classical Sumero-Akkadian mythology by the end of the first third of the Twentieth Century because the narrative documentation for the classical Middle Babylonian period is even greater -- about *seventy-five* times greater -- than for the Old Babylonian period. Most of the Middle Babylonian material has still not been translated and published owing to the lack of scholars fluent in Akkadian. (Brickman, J.A.: VII) (Review the chronological outline of Mesopotamia, [Table 1](#), if these names for peoples and periods don’t tell you anything.)

Not all literature was intended for the edification of the public, as was the lengthy Creation Epic that was enacted during the New Year’s Festival. In addition to the epics and myths intended for *public* performance, some were performed by blind rhapsodists as entertainment at royal feasts. Tablets typically contain laments for destroyed temples, praise hymns to the gods, and royal love songs and works describing Dumuzi’s (the fertility god’s) wooing and wedding. (Cf. Jacobsen, 1989: XII.) Among these are many that were produced in more than one language, and from these scholars have been reconstructing several dead and forgotten Mesopotamian languages.

But because none of the experts have understood the meaning of the Deluge, they have left the easiest and fun part of the work, interpretation, to us. Let’s get on with it.

FOLLOWING CLUES FROM THE FLOOD IN GILGAMESH

Mesopotamia, the land within the Tigris and Euphrates river system, encompasses Southeastern Turkey, Northeastern Syria, Southwestern Iran and most of modern-day Iraq. The first human civilizations sprang up here. The Bible unequivocally locates the

Garden of Eden in Iraq near the Persian Gulf head (Genesis 2: 10-14). The independent flood myths and those that have come down to us in the Gilgamesh Epics and independent Gilgamesh tales are surely the oldest Deluge myths.

It should interest you to know that, even between these Mesopotamian versions, there are some significant differences. Especially important are the differences between the flood in the second and first millennium epics (tablet XI) and the earliest Gilgamesh cuneiform flood tablets that have been discovered in recent decades. Some of the most recently discovered tablets would have been, like the Sumerian originals of the independent Akkadian tales, composed before 3200 B.C. Jeffrey Tigay has catalogued these differences between the early stand alone and the late Gilgamesh stories. Because he is not aware of my Species War thesis, you can't suspect him of exaggerating my point. I'll let you hear it in his words. You be the judge:

Differences in wording between the Old Babylonian Atarhasis flood story [*H of the earliest, 2,000-1,600 B.C., Akkadian versions of the epic*] and that in GE XI [*H tablet eleven of the late Babylonian-edited epic known as Gilgamesh, highly standardized and dating to the first millennium B.C. which started with a 500-year dark age that followed the fall of Troy and its Eastern Mediterranean allies*] are of the same types encountered among the different versions of Gilgamesh. --Tigay: 218

As to the nature of these differences:

The omission of OB Atr. III, iv, 16-17, 19b-20, and 22-23 after GE XI, 124, 125, and 126 respectively, at the end of the lament scene, seems to call for a more specific explanation [*H than a mere change in the opinion of what is interesting or important*], for *the dropping of individual lines right in between others that are preserved but are not synonymous with them appears to be more a deliberate editorial act. The surgery is too delicate to be accidental. These lines share a common theme, the hunger and thirst of the gods during the flood. In fact, every passage in the [H old] Atarhasis version that mentioned or implied*

hunger has been dropped or modified in GE XI [H the latest and most popular Gilgamesh flood account]. --Tigay: 226, H emphasis mine

Here are the lines that were omitted or altered out of all recognition:

“The great gods...were sitting in thirst and hunger...She [*H Nintur*] was surfeited with grief and thirsted for beer...Their lips were athirst with fever. From hunger, they were suffering cramp...After they had eaten the sacrifice...”

Surely our ancestors were supremely guilty from the end of the Species War forward and extremely afraid of the *Homo erectus* gods from the Great Flood forward. These presumed takers of men’s lives (ultimately the “Holy Ghost”) were thought to have brought the Great Flood as punishment for the Species War. In the minds of our ancestors, the two became synonymous as “the Deluge.” I’ve informed you that the Great Flood came in 14,634 BPE. That was a long time ago, but *every* increase in ongoing Fraternal Complex strife *also* tends to associate with and pique Species War guilt. I’ve also told you, in my analysis of [Heidel’s observations and failures](#), that the primary task of the post-Great Flood priests was to administer to trauma, to help people overcome their fear and forget without totally obliterating all prehistoric truth. The task changed only very slowly as time healed the trauma. It is only as of the industrialized era that social science and the need to know the truth has outweighed the need to administer to trauma.

What did change relatively rapidly and forced the flood myths to be transformed were (1) the analytical ability of modern men and (2) their conception of the godhead. Number 1 was of course due to the ever-increasing division of labor and application of science and technology in our production. As for number 2, not only did modern religion amalgamate the gods and the demons and extend and promote the golden rule as described in Chapter 7; but also “God” became much more transcendent (remote) and powerful as humanity (i. e. our ongoing genetic competitors, one of the elements of the godhead) became more hierarchically organized and powerful. These rapid changes, (1) and (2), especially the invention and spread of writing, necessitated the rapid, Neolithic and ancient world changes to “the

Deluge” myths. The unveiling of their actual meaning (what we are doing herein) could only proceed as quickly as time alleviated trauma.

From our detached and relaxed point of view, not just the Babylonian priests but all the priests actively involved in the transformation of oral history and mythology were pathological liars! You’ve read enough to know that Judeo-Christian priests were no exceptions. *But after the Great Flood, most people were so certain that the Homo erectus gods had sent it as punishment that they forced the priests to camouflage the Species War. People forgetting would help the transcendent gods to forget, or so they would have thought. But we are soon to pay the ultimate price for those lies, for ignorance, avarice and our failure to function as one unified and loving family. Our failure to replace malicious, latent homosexual Ks with leaders able to love and care about society will soon bring another flood.* Reconsider the Gilgamesh flood clue I showed you in Chapter 1:

When the tumult of the people of the earth has become
(too) painful for thee, and thy heart moves thee to set the
snare, to kill the black-headed (people), to lay low the
beast of the plain, (then) let these be thy raging weapons
and let them go at thy sides. --Heidel: 226

Notice that the wisest people would have recognized -- even at the Paleolithic boundary -- that humanity was overpopulated relative to Earth’s resources and their technical ability to utilize and re-concentrate resources. We find this observation (of overpopulation) in the last three books of the long Akkadian poem of Ea and Atarhasis. The poem is Langdon’s Chapter 8. It describes four fragmentary cataclysms that preceded the Great Flood. The human protagonist, by various names, is invariably called *Atarhasis-amelu*, “He who knows exceedingly much.”¹³⁰ The major breaks are indeed in parts describing an early drought, overpopulation and famine (conditions during the depths of the last Ice Age, 75 kya when the Species War apparently began). The four cataclysms appear to be different peoples’ similar accounts of the Species War and Great Flood but could possibly refer to four early Species War battles in Lower Mesopotamia.

¹³⁰ Incidentally, Langdon says, page 270, that Adapta, the hero of another Sumerian myth that we’ll be looking at, was also referred to as *Atarhasis-amelu*. One must wonder why scholars didn’t see, based on this clue, that the Adapta myth is also a flood myth without a flood. It too is a metaphor for the Species War.

In the Standard Version, the *Homo erectus* creator gods secretly plan the Flood; but Ea (Enki) breaks faith with them by warning Atarhasis/Ziusudra/Utnapishtim/Noah. Ea (Enki), who rules the waters and is said to be a friend to man, also ends the flood. (Cf. Langdon: 270-275.) Enlil gets most of the blame. In later times, *Nergal* (or *Irra*) became the initiator of all collapses, the repository for the *negative* side of Sumero-Akkadian ambivalence with respect to Ninurta, the Sumerian leader of the victorious, *Homo sapien* forces of the Species War. The *positive* side of Ninurta became “Marduk” to the Babylonians, Ashur to the Assyrians. (We will analyze the principal Mesopotamian gods; almost all of them adopted Sumerians, in Chapter 36.) Nergal was the negative sun god, the cold sun of winter and the scorching sun of summer that destroyed all living things. He embodied the negative side of our Fraternal Complex. In what I have generally described as the second phase of attitudes toward *Homo erectus*, wherein the Species War myths emphasized the positive side of our ambivalence toward him, Nergal (Irra) was the symbol for villainous *Homo sapiens*. Whenever war or revolution was felt to be impending and inevitable (especially in the declining centuries from 1600 to 500 B.C.), Nergal was likely to be projected as the bearer of ill fortune and to be revered above Marduk or Ashur, his positive twins. (Cf. Langdon: 137-146.) With the approach of modern times, he journeyed to the underworld, tamed the willful *Ereshkigal*, took her to wife and displaced this *Homo erectus* goddess as the lord of the underworld -- the evolving “Satan.”¹³¹ Similarly, his positive twin, Marduk eclipsed *Homo erectus* gods, Ea, Enlil and An, as lord of the heavens. Some of the world’s best interpreters of mythology (Marduk’s Babylonian priests) were turning him into “God.”

Be their origin as it may, the tradition of these myths of world destructions that preceded the Great Flood was apparently carried to the Americas. When we get to *Mesoamerica*, in Chapter 35, we’ll see that our *Mesoamerican* ancestors also told of four or five eons and cataclysms that preceded the flood. These *Mesoamerican* eons are

¹³¹ Ereshkigal’s pedigree is revealed by her description. She was identified with the constellation Hydra. Her head had the form of a turban. She had the snout of a *pagû* [*H pig?*]. She had one horn on her forehead and another on her back. She had a sheep’s ear, a fish’s body, a hairy back and dog legs. She stood slightly stooped and was covered with serpent scales (Langdon: 164-165). Chapter 36 will prove the *Homo erectus* pedigree of Ea, Enlil and An.

described differently from their Mesopotamian counterparts. They are more obvious metaphors for the Species War.

Mesopotamian tales also describe Enlil's destructiveness. Among other things, Enlil was the earliest *Homo erectus* sun god of the Sumerians, perhaps a fierce *Homo erectus* leader into whom the rest of the *Homo erectus* Species Warriors condensed. He was later co-opted by magic and propitiation. In these tales, he was used as an early cover for traumatic deeds of our immediate ancestors, deeds for which they felt guilt and shame. "Enlil" destroys "mankind" for a third time,

Because of their uproar, he was troubled.
Because of their multitude, he had no quiet.
He held his convocation (of the gods),
Saying unto the gods, his sons:
Oppressive has become the uproar of men.
By their uproar, I am troubled.
In their multitude, they maintain not silence.
Let...there be fever.
Quickly, let pestilence still their uproar.
Like a cyclone, may there blow upon them
Sickness, ague, fever and plague. --Langdon: 273

Again, notice the indirect reference to the overpopulated "multitude"! More references to overpopulation precede Enlil's fourth destruction: "He complains that the sins of men have not diminished but have become greater than before. He was disturbed by their clamor, and in their multitude, they kept not silent" (Langdon: 273).

The next clue that I want you to notice, within my indented passage from the flood, is the reference to "[the black-headed people](#)." Who were these people of Mesopotamian myth who failed to fully succumb from disease, starvation and the cannibalization of their own children? Might they not be the same people whom we detected in the Chinese inundation legend of the great Yao?

Langdon records a fragment of a flood myth from a Sumerian tablet found at Nippur of the 23rd Century B.C. This fragment features Nintur, not Ninurta but his wife and the wife of other condensed gods (Langdon: 110). She was earlier known as *Ninhursag*, the Earth-Mother goddess, *Ishtar* to the Babylonians. Nintur mentions the "calamity" (the Flood) that had befallen mankind. Her father and

occasional spouse, Enki, lord of the waters and one of the principal (*Homo erectus*) creators, replies:

Oh Nintur, what have I created...
The Land in its foundations will I restore.
Cities, wheresoever they be, shall they build, and I cause there
shelter to give them rest.
In my city, they shall lay its brick in a holy place,
And my dwelling in a holy place they shall set.
Brilliantly, with all things fitting, shall they finish it.
The rituals and ordinances they shall fulfill magnificently.
The earth I will water and provide them counsel.

Next, the narrator of this tale, *Atarhasis* (originally *Ziûsudra*, Sumerian Noah) says:

After Anu, Enlil, Enki and Ninhursag
Had created the dark-headed peoples
Creatures with the breath of life on earth he made plentiful.
The cattle of the field, them that are four legged, on the plains he
Called into being as was fitting.

Now, as you'll see when we are ready to study the Sumerian pantheon in greater depth in Chapter 36, Anu, Enlil and Enki (or Ea) are the victorious sons of the primal father. They are credited with having sired the rest of "the dark-headed people" by Ninhursag, the Earth Mother. Do you have any idea as to why they are a triad representing sky, earth and water, respectively? I'll give you a big hint: it is *not only*, as the naturists would like to believe, simply because these three combine to form the totality of the universe. Enki, whose floodwaters symbolically destroyed *Homo erecti* and spared *Homo sapiens*, is credited with having sired the latter. Saying that *Homo sapiens* were "Creatures with the breath of life" implies that "the dark-headed people" did not "have the breath of life." It implies that our immediate ancestors were superior, were without competition from *Homo erectus* and were destined to out-survive him. Recall that a pre-deluge passage of Genesis (Chapter 2: 7), wherein God breathes into his new creation's nostrils the breath of life, borrows the same language from its Sumerian forerunner.

Homo sapiens most recently out of Africa were probably as dark-skinned and as dark-haired as any *Homo sapiens* on Earth. Still today, the people of the Mid-East have almost uniformly dark eyes and hair. Yet the *Homo erecti* (e. g. Neanderthals), having evolved earlier, more nearly resembled our ape ancestors. They were not as adapted for travel on the arid plain, had more body hair and probably darker hair than our immediate ancestors. They stood slightly stooped and a bit shorter. From the front, one would have seen more of the top of their hairy heads. Perhaps, when viewing them eyeball to eyeball, their sloping foreheads didn't reflect as much light as did our protruding foreheads, thus: "the black (or dark)-headed people." There is a still more important reason why the *Homo erecti* were everywhere remembered as "the black-headed people." I'll share it in a later chapter.

Further assurance that the "black-headed people" are synonymous with the *Homo erecti* comes from the use of the term "pale-faced people" in Mesopotamian mythology. Consider the lengthy Assyrian version of the poem that is the "Legend of Etana and the Plant of Birth." A pithy passage describes our immediate ancestors after the Deluge, their religion not yet well formed. Ishtar, the Mother Goddess, "desired a shepherd for men," a king:

The pale-faced people, all of them, had not set up a king.
Then no tiara was worn nor crown.
And no scepter was studded with lapis lazuli.
Throne-rooms had not been created at the same time.
The *seven* gates were locked against the hosts of mankind.
Scepter, crown, tiara and staff
Were still placed before Anu in Heaven,
And there was no royal direction of her people.
Then kingship descended from Heaven. --Langdon: 167

Notice that the *seven* gates to the sole original afterworld, Arallû, are locked to *Homo sapiens* because all the gods are still angry over their annihilation. The priests who invented kings did not describe them as I did in Chapter 3, as the supreme magic trick. Yet these clever rogues certainly did not want to disavow responsibility for this innovation. It was their patrons and successors -- and especially the kings of a more benign period -- who claimed that, "kingship descended from Heaven." Priests would have eventually claimed that

the dead *Homo erectus* gods permitted and wanted men to have leaders, kings, who represented them on earth, fed them (the gods) with their sacrificed bodies and, accordingly, satisfied the gods' thirst for revenge.

Obviously, kings did not rule the *Homo erecti*. They ruled our *Homo sapien* ancestors. They are the ones who are also described here as the "pale-faced people." The converse, the "black-headed people," can only refer to *Homo erectus*.

We find the "pale-faced people" referred to again in inscriptions on the heads of amulets and figurines of the Babylonian wind demon, *Pazuzu*. Although you have not yet seen many examples of totem animals, recall that in Chapter Four I insisted that most of the totem animals in our mythologies represent the Deluge victims and not -- as Freud believed -- the primal fathers. Take my word, for now, that the following description assures us of "Pazuzu's" *Homo erectus* pedigree:

[He was] the four-winged demon of the winds, a monster with half human, half canine head and wide grinning mouth. The hands are those of a savage wild animal, the legs terminate in talons of a bird of prey, and are covered with feathers. The monster has a scorpion tail. Three similar figures of this demon of the winds are known... A curious figurine of Pazuzu in crouching position is also known, the body covered with [serpentine] scales... --Langdon: 371.

And whom does this *Homo erectus* monster attack? That's right -- the "pale-faced people."

Inscriptions on similar heads also describe this demon as a raging wind, descending on river and desert, spreading abroad fever and cold, smiting man and woman, and when it blows disease falls upon the pale-faced people. -- Langdon: 372, citing several other sources

Sylvester Fiore's *Voices from the Clay* is a study of Assyro-Babylonian Literature that is much more recent than Heidel. Fiore draws upon a greater volume of excavated material. He cites several other references to the "black-headed people."

In royal inscriptions, the Mesopotamian ruler frequently claims that he has been selected, through the decree of the gods, to be the “shepherd of the black-headed people” (Fiore: 72).

Hammurabi [H *eighteenth century B.C.*] was especially eloquent regarding his pastoral achievements. The primitive task [H *of sheep-herding*] is recalled in his assertions: “I am...the one...who assigns the pastures and watering places for Lagask and Girsu... I am...the founder of the dwelling places for them. The shelterer of the land, who gathered and scattered the people of Isin... I did not neglect the black-headed people whose shepherdship Marduk had entrusted to me, I sought peaceful regions for them. (Fiore: 74, quoting Deimel, *Codex Hammurabi, Prologue and Epilogue*)

The first statement, the shepherding of the “black-headed people” by the Mesopotamian rulers, tells us nothing. Those being shepherded by the rulers could be either the Mesopotamian citizenry or, as I believe, *Homo erecti*. Fiore apparently never consciously considered the possibility that the “black-headed people” were *Homo erecti*. We know from tablet VI of the *Babylonian Creation Epic* that the gods charged Marduk, heroic conqueror of Tiamat and her monsters and newly appointed ruler of the pantheon, with shepherding the “dark-headed peoples.” Yet, unless you guess them to be the survivors of the race that Marduk conquered, this reference still fails to identify them.¹³²

The second statement offers a hint. That Hammurabi sought “*peaceful* regions for the black-headed people” suggests that they were a different people who once fought the Babylonians.

If I am correct in interpreting “black-headed people” as *Homo erecti*, then the statement further suggests that not all the *Homo erectus* people were killed during the Deluge. Some were allowed to survive on reservations. This interpretation is even more likely when we realize, as Fiore does, that Hammurabi’s laws were benign, protective of “the weak, widows and orphans, and the black-headed people.”

¹³² The hymn by the gods to Marduk, the hymn that so charges him appears in Langdon, p. 308. In Chapter 36, we will be able to decode the Babylonian Creation Epic and all the basics of Mesopotamian mythology.

On his page 117, Fiore suggests that the “black-headed people” were the Mesopotamian people. This interpretation is supportable in a later period when it issues from the mouths of horse-mounted Aryan conquerors such as the Meades who swept out of the Caucasus region to conquer darker peoples in Persia, Mesopotamia and India. By the late second millennium B.C., “black-headed people” may indeed have come to mean “Semite” or “Dravidian.” (See for example Vidal: 60- or Jacobsen, 1987: 119, 122, and elsewhere.) But 18th century B.C. Hammurabi and the Babylonians were themselves Semitic.

Jacobsen accepted that interpretation but had his doubts: “the Sumerians referred to themselves as ‘the dark-headed people.’ Why, and in contrast to whom, is not known” (Jacobsen, 1987: 114). Yet the same page and the ones before and after recite the *Hymn to Nanna/Ishtar*, the war goddess. This hymn reveals the identity of “dark-headed people” and “Anunnaki.” Anunnaki were the “sons of princes, the high-born and the aristocracy among the gods” (*op. cit.*: 240). In this hymn, they are paying tribute and obeisance to Inanna, parading before her, petitioning her and *playing their harps for her!*

Fiore and Jacobsen were apparently mimicking the conventional interpretations of these “black-headed people” who were made famous by the Babylonian Creation Epic. This *seven-tablet* myth is believed to have been composed at the start of the second millennium B.C. (Fiore: 116). In it, “The gods assemble and, pronouncing a solemn oath, they accept Marduk's hegemony. Anshar [*H one of the earliest descendants of Apsû, the primal father*] declares the young god's name supreme. He praises Marduk for having caused the black-headed people to support the gods with food and incense offerings, to tend their sanctuaries and to improve the cultivation of the lands” (Fiore: 148). The same black-headed people are also referred to as “savage man” (*Ibid.* 146). Marduk is said to have created them in order for the lesser gods to be able to throw off their burden of having to serve the high gods by substituting the “black-headed people” for themselves.

The picture is coming into focus! At the start of the first Neolithic, our Homo sapien ancestors at the center of Homo sapien civilization (Mesopotamia) preferred to enslave Homo erecti rather than cannibalize them. Then the Great Flood and fear of punishment caused our ancestors to abort the first Neolithic and stop Homo erectus persecution. When the Neolithic resumed, 4 or 5 ky later without disastrous consequences; the Species War victors (e. g. Marduk) overshadowed their victims in the pantheons and contemporary Homo

sapiens (the “lesser gods”) deemed themselves entitled to enslave the remaining *Homo erecti* (the “Black-headed People”).

They became servants at temples, actors in the negative roles of their *Homo erectus* ancestors during the New Year’s Day, public enactment of the Creation Epic. As late as the second millennium B.C. they were still used as slaves. Undoubtedly, they also supplied the labor for public works, levees and sluices needed to channel the rivers and use them for irrigation, works undertaken in the name of the gods! When, in the history of the world, have any people referred to themselves as savages? Mesopotamians weren’t referring to themselves as savages. The savage slaves of the “lesser gods” were the “black-headed people.”

Moreover, as we’ll see, Marduk is a late sun god, the *Homo sapien*, Species War leader. It is the *Homo erecti* that would have been subjugated by him. So, if he subjugated the “black-headed people” as the inscription implies, then the “black-headed people” are *Homo erecti*.

Especially in the days before seafaring and irrigation, Lower Mesopotamia was an undesirable place. The winter rains in the lower valley are inadequate for farming. Dense and stable settlement required a massive initial investiture and collective effort for the building of artificial banks and the diversion of spring floodwaters into irrigation canals and reservoirs. (Cf. Woolley, 1935:20-21.) *Homo erecti* that survived the Species War, would have been put to these tasks. Professor Albright says lower valley irrigation began no later than 5,000 B.C.

The New Testament Book of *Revelations* records early Christian fears of divine retribution (them doing to us what we did to them). Within it are a few, very conscious, obsessional fears that must have derived from accurate accounts of, or accurately interpreted myths of, the Species War. Two of these fears allude to *Homo erectus* slavery.

Before I tell you what they are, it may still be necessary to add a disclaimer: even the present-day Catholic theologians acknowledge that the Book of *Revelations* is not to be taken literally. Embarrassed by the vituperative and very un-Christian rhetoric, they admit that the author was probably not “the apostle John,” but a man who had been persecuted for his Christian faith and confined to a Roman penal colony on the Island of Patens. That he may have been a follower of Paul is suggested by the author’s familiarity with the messages to the early Christian churches. So, in addition to helping us to identify the

“black-headed people,” the following passage expresses the rage of its author and other early Christians and their desire for vengeance vis-à-vis the Romans. Moreover, as the scholarly notes of the Catholic priests suggest, most of John’s images are borrowed from the speeches of Old Testament prophets. So, please, reader/passengers, don’t become “born again” due to what I now show you:

Then the sixth angel blew his trumpet, and I heard a voice coming from the [four] horns of the gold altar before God, telling the sixth angel who held the trumpet, “*Release the four angels who are bound at the banks of the great river Euphrates.*” So, the four angels were released, who were prepared for this hour, day, month, and year to kill a third of humanity. The number of cavalry troops was two hundred million; I heard their number. Now in my vision this is how I saw the horses and their riders. They wore red, blue, and yellow breastplates, and *the horses’ heads were like heads of lions, and out of their mouths came fire, smoke, and sulfur. By these three plagues of fire, smoke, and sulfur that came out of their mouths a third of the human race was killed.* --Revelations 9:13-18, H emphasis mine

The first, emboldened passage probably refers to the enslavement of *Homo erectus*. Individual *Homo erecti* became compromised as, and ultimately unconsciously identified with, “angels.” If you think that the image of “bound angels” referred originally to Jewish slaves of Nebuchadnezzar II or any of the peoples who were relocated and enslaved by the Kassites or later the Assyrians (during the seventh and late eighth century B.C.), this is only because we have not advanced far enough for you to identify the “Lord,” the “angels,” and the lion-heads. Coming chapters will verify this interpretation of the passage.

The Bible tells us (Judges 13-16) that Samson was also enslaved, and he obviously symbolizes the hybrids. ¹³³

¹³³ Samson, the Hebrew folk-hero whose tales occupy Judges 13-16, the nemesis of the Philistines, was a typical “hero of old,” a hybrid. At his birth, an angel (ex-soldier in the army of the sun god) announced that he would be a “Nazarite,” a person consecrated to the service of the Lord. In addition to the many Philistines he kills before and after being enslaved by them, he wrestles and kills a lion, which is (as you’ll see) another symbol for *Homo erectus*. Assisted by wild animals, he destroys

Before we finish with the flood myth in Gilgamesh, we must scan the myth material for oblique and creative references to the bow and arrow. Look again at the Gilgamesh clue from Chapter 1 that I reprinted, above. Do you see any such references? How about, “[L]et these be thy raging weapons and let them go at thy sides”? Indeed, we shall discover that serpents, totem monsters of all kinds and the bow and arrow pop up all over Mesopotamian mythology. Here are just a few examples. Ishtar holds a longbow (Langdon: 25-26). When the gods install Marduk as the supreme god in the Babylonian Creation Epic, Anu the god of the “highest heaven” and the band of constellations immediately overhead, Anu the sky god, one of the sons of the triad of three sons of the primal father who sired one third of the subsequent *Homo erecti*, kissed Marduk’s bow, the bow that Marduk used to kill “Tiamat and her monsters.” Anu gave this sacred weapon three names. One name is lost on the tablets. The others are “Long Wood” and “Bow Star.” “Bow Star” corresponds to Canis Major, the bow of the hunter Orion. (Cf. Langdon: 295-308.) The name “Long Wood” associates the bow with the “tree of life.” We’ll discover other occurrences of this association in Chapters 25 and 36.¹³⁴

Marduk’s symbol (which looks like an upright arrow without fletching) is said to be a *marru*, spade or digging tool. This was said to be remnant of “Marduk’s origin as an agricultural deity” from Eridu. (Cf. Langdon: 295-308 or Black and Green: 96.) Don’t bet the ranch on this. In fact, I’d bet all my chips against it. Marduk acquired his role as a fertility god only in the Neolithic, and the role was derivative of his original and principal role as the victor in the Species War. Recall that I outlined the logic of the fertility myths in the first two pages of Chapter 16. The oldest fertility gods were all *Homo erecti*. *Homo sapiens* acquired this status only when they were later admitted to pantheons. They acquired it due to having eliminated a competitor for food and resources. Moreover, Marduk’s Sumerian counterpart and predecessor, Ninurta, was identified with the complex of stars referred to as Sirius, “the arrow.” The bow that both Ninurta and Marduk used to kill the “monsters” of Tiamat became the Bow Star or Canis Major.

their crops and takes refuge in a cave. He loses his Herculean, Neanderthal-like strength only when, due to Delilah’s treachery, his hair is cut (causing him to look more like *Homo sapiens*). For a similar North American myth, see the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, vol. 15, p. 176-178 or Hardin, Terri: 177-9.

¹³⁴ The southern band of stars was dubbed the Way of Ea and the northern the Way of Enlil (Langdon: 306).

(Cf. Langdon: 135, 233, 308, 317.) The “*marru*” was originally -- an arrow.

So here, in the Akkadian and Sumerian flood myths (stand alone and the standard Gilgamesh epic), are the bloody faces and fingers. It could hardly be clearer if they had left us color photographs. There was at least one great massacre followed by a colossal barbecue. But it was not beef that they roasted; it was the “black-headed people,” *Homo erecti*. Later, submissive *Homo erectus* captives were imported, used as sacrificial victims and temple workers and -- still later -- exploited as slaves and retired on reservations.

In addition to the general reasons, there is a very specific reason why the earliest Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian flood myths were less guilty about “the Deluge” and less inclined than the Standard, Akkadian Gilgamesh Epic’s Tablet 11 to describe the Great Flood as punishment. It was here in Mesopotamia, at Ur, that the Species War started. Even with a superior weapon (the bow and arrow), the first *Homo sapien* Species Warriors had to be extremely brave. They were vastly out-numbered. For a long time, the Mesopotamian oral histories that evolved into Species War mythology would have celebrated the first positional warfare battle with the parent species that had dominated us.

Whenever they openly seized the offensive, they risked uniting the enemy; so, they planned to fight *their first battle* on defense and counter-attack ferociously. The first battle to defend our first out-of-Africa, *Homo sapien* settlement would have been, to use a stone-old Iraqi expression, “The Mother of All Battles.”

The recently excavated and less-edited versions of the Mesopotamian flood myth assure that what followed was “The Mother of All Barbecues.” Indeed, Babylonian priests referred to the “gods” as 65,000 in number! Langdon said that a simple list of the deities would fill a large volume and contain more than 5,000 names (Langdon: 88).

Later, as the Species War radiated outward from Mesopotamia (the first liberated territory) and as the *Homo erecti* failed to master the production and use of the bow and arrow, later *Homo sapien* warriors felt assured of victory. That’s why, as the war and the myths radiated outward, with the partial exception of the peninsular areas where the *Homo erecti* were densely populated, the fighting was less traumatic. Later Species War battles and the *Homo sapien* oral histories of them tended to become increasingly guilt-laden.

This was especially true of the final chapter of the Species War. It too was in the Middle East and not far from where the Species War began. But by then, circumstances had dramatically changed. The first liberated territory, Mesopotamia, and its regional environs had become our population center, the most secure place for us to live; and the last surviving members of our parent species were only a shadow of their once proud race. *The Standard Gilgamesh Epic and its flood myth, Tablet 11, was written after this final chapter of the Species War.* We'll learn all about it in the next chapter.

From here on, we'll focus mostly on the peninsular cul-de-sacs of Eurasia where *Homo erecti* would have been densely populated, trapped and forced to fight. These cul-de-sacs were Western Europe, Italy, Greece, India, Scandinavia, the Malay Archipelago (especially Australia), Korea and Siberia near the Bering Strait. Except for Italy and Korea, which don't require it, we'll look closely at all these areas.

Italy's participation in the Deluge is readily evinced by the Roman Saturnalia rites of Appendix A, the close resemblance of Roman mythology to Greek mythology and a revelation from Diodorus Siculus.¹³⁵ Diodorus Siculus confirmed that the Species War came to Italy and Greece with these words: "Zeus also had other wars against the Giants, we are told, in Macedonia near Pallene and in Italy on the plain that of old was named *Phlegraean* ("fiery") after the region about it that had been burned, but that in later times men called *Cumaean*" (Diodorus V.71.3-72). We'll see that this critical information, plus the geographic settings of the *Cumaean Plain* in Italy and the *Phlegraean Peninsula* in Macedonia leave no doubt as to what happened in both places.

As readers of appendix "D" will see, Korea was also a traumatic Species War theater. Tabletop dolmen, monuments to "the Deluge," abound in northwestern and central Korea. These and numerous other Paleolithic monuments prove the once-numerous presence of *Homo erectus*. (See Kim.) Geography proves the same. So too does the Korean people's receptivity to Christianity. These facts -- despite the

¹³⁵ Sicily's enormous contribution to organized crime cannot be mainly attributed to a reservoir of *Deluge* guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia. The same geography that probably made Sicily one of the sites of *Homo erectus*' furious, last struggles to survive, also made it the beachhead for at least nine invaders since the Deluge. Phoenicians, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans, Saracens, Norwegians, Normans, Austrians and the belligerents of World War II all invaded and violated Sicily.

typically eastern lack of rich mythology – point unmistakably to “the Deluge.”

Mongols, aboriginal North Americans, aboriginal Australians, Western Europeans and many peoples of the Near East long remained nomadic or semi-nomadic. Scandinavians, Greeks and the people of the British Isles became avid seafarers. All these victims of Species War trauma did with their bodies what their minds kept doing – taking flight in the face of (subconscious) danger.

Again, as a rule, the more peaceful, inwardly focused, female-dominated, fishing peoples moved eastward and generally avoided conflict, psychological repression and self-hatred. Their handling of the dominant males of the primal horde would have less traumatized the eastern *Homo erecti*. Their experience with the primal fathers would have accorded more with the [scenario described by Atkinson](#) than the one described by Darwin and Freud. Eastern *Homo erectus* women probably played a peacemaker role in the conflict between primal males and subdominant sons and brothers.

The initial breakup and movement of both *Homo* subspecies and a more moderate experience of both the original sin (the primal father murders) and the second sin (the Deluge events, Species War, fraternal violence) by the marine peoples provided the basis for East-West differences described in Chapter 13, above.

ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Professor Fiore had unconscious suspicions of who the original “black-headed people” were. On his page 116 he states and then questions his belief that the “black-headed people” were Sumerians:

The pictorial arts bear important witness concerning the problem of the ethnic situation of early Mesopotamia.^{136, 137} In the representation of human figures

¹³⁶ Fiore is referring to artwork on a chest from the Royal Cemetery of Ur (about 2750 B.C.) and on the votive tablet of Urnanche and her family (first dynasty of Ur). I was unable to find these works, but I found many others that are very clear representations of what Professor Fiore was talking about. You’ll see some of them below.

¹³⁷ Archaeologists believe that Ur may have been the first city. The German language virtually assures us of this. Homonymous *Uhr* means clock. *Ursprünglich* means original, and *uralt* means “as (immeasurably) old as Ur.”

we find principally two types. One is brachycephalic [H *a short, wide head*], low browed and with flat occiput [H *the back part of the head*] and a strongly curved nose [H *This is Homo erectus. Bill Turnbaugh says his nose must have been wondrous to behold.*]. The other type, less frequent in the early period, is dolichocephalic [H *a long or high head, like ours*], high browed, with prominent occiput and a slightly aquiline nose. The latter type probably represents the Semitic part of the population in ancient Mesopotamia.

But it is doubtful that the personages with the globular heads represent Sumerians. The measurements of skulls found in southern Iraq dating from the beginning of the third millennium B.C. indicate, on the contrary, that the brachycephalic type was extremely rare in Mesopotamia in that period. Archaeological evidence then would favor the assumption that the Sumerians belonged to the dolichocephalic type attested largely all over the Mediterranean area. But the consistency of pictorial representations, almost invariably showing personages with globular heads and strongly curved noses during the Pre-Babylonian period, speaks against such a deduction.

The pictorial art to which Professor Fiore refers describes characters of a much older vintage than he suspects. If the brachycephalic skulls to which Mr. Fiore referred are *Homo erectus* skulls, then their replacement by dolichocephalic skulls in post-3000 B.C. art and architecture has very simple and rational explanations, explanations consistent with the identification of these skulls as *Homo erectus*. First, the explosion of science, technology and human population made possible by the Neolithic--and especially by the invention of written language--augmented our immediate ancestors' confidence in themselves and their civilization and caused the *Homo sapien* gods to overshadow their *Homo erectus* counterparts after they contracted the ambivalence that was felt for them. (The mythology of Chapter 21 will verify this.) Second, a drastic reduction occurred at about this time in the surviving *Homo erectus* population. Amorites (northwestern nomads) and other Semites were flooding into the lower valley as of 3000 BC (due to deforestation and drought). They would have displaced many of the *Homo erecti* who had been used there as slaves to build irrigation works. By 2300 B.C., the Semites constituted

a majority in the lower valley and reconsolidated the Sumerian kingdom under Sargon of Akkad. (See Albright or Woolley, 1961: 21, 30 or Wilford, 1993b on Semitic emigration and rule.) Finally, and most importantly, after the Great Flood, it was feared that even thinking about *Homo erecti* might anger them and elicit more punishment, might elicit another Great Flood.

As I said earlier, the more significant cranial index for distinguishing between *Homo sapien* and *Homo erectus* is the BBH/GOL index (basion-bregma height over glabello-occipital length). Physical anthropologists generally ignore this index and look only to the cephalic index (frontal breadth over frontal height), the index most useful for comparing *Homo sapien* groups. The archaeological record of *physical Homo erectus remains* in the Mid-East -- as far as I know -- consists only of sites in Israel, two or three in Jordan and Syria and the Shanidar site in the mountains of northeastern Iraq. (See Bar-Yosef in Mellars and Stringer: 591 or Figure 16a, herein.) Other brachycephalic skulls were found at Kish, but Dr. Buxton analyzed them to be within the *Homo sapien* range for brachycephaly and of the Alpine type still found in the European Alps and some parts of Asia. (See Buxton: 55-56.) Yet, Fiore was absolutely correct in referring to “consistency of pictorial representations, almost invariably showing personages with globular heads and strongly curved noses in the pre-Babylonian period.”

Even up to year 2017 and this 25th edition of *Decoding the Deluge* and with the only exceptions being me and Bill Turnbaugh (my early collaborator); *everyone in archaeology and anthropology appears to still assume that the globular head and curved or beaked nose figures pervasive in Sumerian iconography represent the Sumerians themselves! If you think there's even a .1% chance of them being correct, look at the curved and beaked nose of Quetzalcoatl (“Plumed Serpent,” the Aztec god symbolic of Homo erectus) in Figure 63f of Volume II. This image is from Durán’s 1581 work.* The situation seems not to have changed since 2004 when Arkadiusz Sołtysiak wrote, *Physical Anthropology and the “Sumerian Problem,”* which chronicles the endless academic efforts to identify Sumerian correspondents to these images!

Identifying these images will end all the religious ignorance upon which Big Brother’s world depends! The masks will all come off! But by no means will that stop us, even if we don’t find the *Homo erectus* skulls that (as you already suspect) correspond to those images.

As we'll see, *Homo erectus* was present in Mesopotamia in large numbers as late as the second half of the second millennium B.C. Several factors could account for the lack of *Homo erectus* remains within the Mesopotamian fossil record.

First, Moslem law discourages the disturbance of gravesites.

Second, most of the human remains removed from the lowest levels at the cemetery at Ur and from Tape Gawra were very poorly preserved and immeasurable. Bodies had been interred in reed mats or in the open ground. Remains in urns at higher levels were only slightly more preserved. (Cf. Speiser: 140-143; Woolley, 54:58.) Tepe Gawra contained sarcophagi, but they were at higher levels and presumably only for *Homo sapien* burials. Most of the well-preserved hominid remains that archaeologists do find are found on the edge of present or past lakes and streams, where water can slowly dissolve bone matter and replace it with heavier minerals to produce a fossil. There are few water bodies in the Mid-East, and the ground around these tends to have been disturbed by constant human activity.

Third, after the Great Flood and especially after the massacres of the last of our parent species in the late second millennium, the "dark-headed people" would have been buried separate and apart from everyone else, probably in remote and undesirable locations, like our city-operated paupers' cemeteries. Remember, although they probably lost consciousness of the Species War and whom their *Homo erectus* slaves represented, *unconsciously* the Mesopotamians would have known who these people were. They would have found these people -- especially their corpses -- to be a source of tremendous guilt and shame. Finding the location of a *Homo erectus* graveyard from this late period would be like looking for the proverbial needle in the haystack.

Fourth and most importantly, archaeology and physical anthropology have always been two of the disciplines most tightly controlled by the elite Big Brothers (latent homosexual Ks). *They are, as can't be repeated often enough, terrified of truth and of change because both associate with the removal of their Third Masks. And as George Orwell told us, "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past."*

Much is deliberately withheld to keep the public ignorant and controlled. For this they need to restrict these fields to neurotics like the archeologists in Mesopotamia (in the pre-World War II days when the British more or less did as they pleased). Listen to how Winstone described Leonard Woolley, discoverer of ancient Ur and Director of

the Joint Expedition of the British Museum and the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania to Mesopotamia in 1922:

Like others before him, Woolley embarked on his chosen task with a passion born of literary preconception. [H *He studied theology at Oxford.*] His guiding light was Genesis. As a junior member of his team explained, he chose to “bring to life the Old Testament.” Perhaps the thought was invested with a certain worldliness, for the same assistant remarked that “There was still a wide Bible-reading public.” A very similar thought was in the mind of the American biblical scholar Dr. Edward J. Banks when he tried unsuccessfully to obtain a permit to dig at Ur twenty years earlier. --Winstone: 300

Iraq had been a British protectorate. All the same, in the mad rush to locate biblical names on the map and to beat the grave robbers to the gold and the lapis lazuli, Sir Leonard was not one to throw all the best finds out with the garbage. Without appreciating the significance of most of the finds, Sir Leonard came up with and reported some bombshells. Just listen to this observation on the antiquity of Mesopotamian civilization and what we may infer to be the probability of prior *Homo erectus* dominance there:

At Warka [H *Uruk, 50 miles northwest of Ur on an ancient course of the Euphrates*] where a shaft was sunk through the middle of the town ruins, an enormous accumulation of al Ubaid debris was found to rest ultimately on virgin soil.¹³⁸ In this case the first example of worked metal was recorded at no less than 33 feet above the bottom of the deposit and in the intervening layers only stone implements were encountered. --Woolley, *Development of Sumerian Art*: 33

Though archaeologists to this day have only begun to scratch the surface of the dead worlds lying beneath Mesopotamian sand, Woolley also came up with plenty of the kind of artwork to which Fiore referred:

¹³⁸ “Ubaid” refers to one of the first periods of Mesopotamian art and civilization. “This is a period characterized by an easily-recognized type of painted pottery that was named after the place, al Ubaid, near Ur, where it had been found in great quantities by Dr. H.R. Hall in 1918” (Woolley, *D.S.A.*: 30).

The earliest settlers possessed a Neolithic culture of no mean order. As farmers, they were breeders of domestic cattle and growers of domestic grain; their pottery was excellent, and their hand-modeled clay figurines, the only free works of art of the period that are known to us, have distinct merit. The figures, nearly always nude female figures, are very carefully made and highly finished; the bodies, subject to certain conventions, such as the marked angularity of the shoulders are realistic, whereas the heads, with their high headdresses of bitumen, ***are more reptilian than human***, a quality that is perhaps due to the artist's lack of skill, but may equally well have been intentional. -- Woolley, A.M.E.: 43, *H emphasis mine*

For the man sees what he wants to see
And disregards the rest... lidee lie.
--Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel

Absolutely amazing! To paraphrase Churchill: Sir Woolley's team stumbled upon the truth, but they grabbed up the gold and the lapis lazuli, and Archaeology hurried off as if only another heist had happened! Commodity producing K and R society conditions us to this.¹³⁹




Figure 40 a: This Eridu, clay figurine, though male, is typical of many found at the earliest levels in both Europe and Mesopotamia. (See Fig. 1c.) Note the grotesquely misshapen head and the (barely visible but) bulging eyes. Photo courtesy of Iraq Museum, Baghdad.



Fig. 40b: More reptilian, clay figurines, female, of al Ubaid I and II. After Woolley.

**Figures 40 a-d:
"REPTILIANS" AND "JINN"**



Fig. 40c: Also al Ubaid I & II. After Woolley.



Fig. 40d: Also al Ubaid I & II. After Woolley.

It was just below the old guy's consciousness. Look at an example of one of these figurines; see my Figure 40. This artist's conception of a *Homo erectus* woman clearly shows why all our ancestors referred to the *Homo erecti* as snakes. As these figurines suggest and my Figure 11 verifies, the *Homo erectus* skull was elongated from front to back like that of a snake. Now just look at the rest of it:

The human figures (Pl.6, a-d, f and h [*H See my Figure 40a-d*]) are much more remarkable [*H than the animal ones*]. On them considerable care had been expended, and the modeling of the bodies is, despite certain conventional exaggerations, skillful and pleasing; *the heads, on the contrary, are grotesque, with enormously elongated skulls and reptilian features quite at variance with the rest. This appearance is not an accident due to want of skill on the maker's part [H emphasis mine]*. It is true that on early seals the human figures have bird-like heads, mere circles with a central dot for the eye and a prominent beak-like nose and that is a technical accident. -- The engraver was working on a very small scale, in a hard material, with a drill and a V-shaped chisel, and this was the easiest way in which the salient features of the face could be rendered [*H I thought that Woolley was correct, that the globular heads AND the beak-like noses were technical accidents, accidents excusable due to the Homo erecti so depicted being in the spirit world and associated with birds. (All the persons depicted in Figures 41 and 42 have these noses.) Years later, I got hold of Friar Durán's censored-for-400-years, History of the Indies of New Spain and saw his transposed image of an Aztec painting of Quetzalcoatl (Homo erectus); and now I'm not so sure of the extent of our ancestor's proboscis. See my Figure 63f in Volume II.*]; but here [*H in Figures 40a-b*] the modeler has plastic-clay to shape according to his pleasure; he has taken as much care with the heads as with the bodies, and that he is not limited by incapacity is proved by the fact that we found in the house ruins two figurines (Pl.6, f, h) of which the faces each treated in a different style, are round and flat and definitely those of human beings. --Woolley, D.S.A.: 37

Woolley was forced to conclude, at least with respect to the clay figurines, that, “The monstrous aspect is intentional (presumably the figures represent some kind of demon), and the more monstrous it is the more does it do credit to the artist's skill” (*Ibid.*). See the figure above.

Artifacts unearthed from the Royal Cemetery at Ur show that, as late as the early third millennium, *Homo erectus* was still being clearly represented in visual art. Yet by this time the victorious veterans of the Species War had undergone deification:

Various objects, harps, gaming-boards and articles of furniture were enriched with inlaid plaques cut from the solid central column of the large conch-shell; the plaques were necessarily small but took an excellent surface, in texture and in color not unlike ivory. Sometimes the pieces were cut into silhouetted figures, their inner detail rendered by engraved lines, which were set against a background of lapis-lazuli mosaic in the old tradition of the wall decoration [*H frieze*], here reduced in scale. As such is the remarkable “Standard” (Pl 42-frontispiece) with its frieze-like rows of men and animals picturing the field of battle and celebration of victory. --Woolley, D.S.A.: 79

See Figure 41, below. Fragments of mosaics, like the Standard, were found at Kish and Lagash. Figure 42A, “The Dairy Scene,” is from the al Ubaid temple. Figure 42B shows shell plaques from a lyre also found by Woolley’s excavation of the al Ubaid temple. Parrot reconstructed some that were found during his excavations at Tell Hariri (Mari), a dynastic city and great center of art and civilization in the third and second millennium. (*Cf.* Parrot’s figure 324.) All the heads in these figures are globular, technical accidents, and not indicative of subspecies. Subspecies is indicated in these figures by their height, body build, posture or clothing.

The Standards (e. g. Figure 41) are often found in important, pre-Babylonian, contexts such as over a chamber inside a royal tomb at the Royal Cemetery at Ur and the Ishtar Temple at Mari. They embody a wealth of talent, labor and precious material. The experts intuitively understand these Standards as being central to Sumerian prehistory and religious belief. Yet they have all failed miserably to interpret their meaning because *they have all failed to understand the primitive*

psychology and events upon which their own religious beliefs are based.

Contrary to what the academics that are still trying to solve the “Sumerian Problem” want to think, the people of Sumer, who possessed all the best mythology that other peoples copied, would have been the descendants of our first out-of-Africa family that fought the opening battle of the Species War at Ur. All were governed by the “founder effect.” We’ll see other examples of it on this prehistoric, world tour.

Again, early, pre-Neolithic Sumerians didn’t have to be guilty about their role in the Species War because they were not assured of victory in their opening battle(s) and needed extreme courage and audacity. Even after the Great Flood, they may have been proud of having enslaved *Homo erectus*. Moreover, in early Neolithic times, a slave owner was an enlightened and progressive person and not a Paleolithic cannibal.

This “Standard” quite simply and honestly depicts *Homo erectus*-*Homo sapiens* relations as the Sumerians wanted to remember them. The bottom panel shows the *Homo erecti* being beaten and many of them (on the ground) being killed by *Homo sapiens* in chariots. The middle panel shows *Homo sapiens* infantry rounding up the surviving *Homo erecti* (on the right). The top panel shows the survivors (on the right) being organized for agricultural or public works.

The tallest figure, on the top panel, who is handing the *Homo erecti* a digging stick/ “marru,” is *Ninurta* (later *Marduk* to the Babylonians and *Ashur* to the Assyrians). *Now we see the logic by which the marru supplanted and concealed the arrow. Ninurta, with whom we all identify, used the arrow to conquer them and the marru to employ them.*

Strange as it seems to see *Ninurta* and the Bronze Age chariot in the same context, remember that the former is an immortal god, ghost-like, dressed all in white; and the latter could have been used to round up *Homo erectus* people as late as the Bronze Age.



Figure 41: the "Standard," found at prominent locations in temples and over the gates of the Royal Cemetery at Ur, depict *Homo erectus*-*Homo sapiens* relations as the Sumerians wanted to remember them. -- After Woolley

As the Species War victors were elevated to pantheons during the Neolithic, their leaders replaced the *Homo erectus* leaders as the sun god, the supreme god of the pantheons. When created by Mummu (the "magical creative word of Ea) and Ninurta/Marduk, the three hundred Igigi were assigned to sit in the Upper Heaven and dwell in the Middle

Heaven. The Lower Heaven was that of the planets, and the three hundred Anunnaki were assigned by Marduk to dwell in the underworld. (Cf. Langdon: 94-95.) With the approach of modern times, the underworld and its inhabitants became associated with “hell” and the wicked that deserved punishment. Heaven, the reward of the righteous, had to be in the opposite direction.

Assyro-Babylonian scholar L. C. Geerts has helped me to fill in the details. The Igigi gods were the Species War victors, originally “the lesser gods.” “Anunnaki” literally meant “the children of An and Ki.” An or Anu we already know. “Ki” was the Sumerian earth mother. So, “Anunnaki” referred to the *Homo erectus* gods. Numerous Sumerian texts described how, after a long period of unpleasant labor, the Igigi gods, tired of digging for gold and digging the riverbeds as the Anunnaki had commanded, revolted. The solution that the Anunnaki found was to create an advanced primate to take the place of the “lesser gods” (*Homo sapiens*). This they said, was how “the black-headed people” had come into being! Human wishful thinking and rationalization knows no bounds! Public acceptance of this gigantic lie required (1) the expunction of the original gods’ identity and (2) the Second Mask, which masks our animal/primate status.

Apparently, unless my informants and I have overlooked something, all 300 of the Anunnaki of the Lower World, the offspring of An, Enlil and Ea, the original *Homo erectus*, Mesopotamian gods, transitioned into “Jinn” or “demons.” The former were said to be alive and at large. In combination, they became the “Satan” of modern Islam, which carries on the strictly-dichotomous, Mid-East attitudes toward the gods, which attributes all misfortune to Satan and all good fortune to Allah.

The *Homo erectus* gods ceased to enjoy the high status that they continued to enjoy everywhere else. The Lower Valley was the place of their first defeat, which made it the center of our civilization for a very long time, which caused *Homo erectus* to be enslaved there for a very long time. Slavery degraded *Homo erectus*’ epitaph.

To discover the logic of it, look at the southern United States, where African American slavery lasted so long. Race relations, especially the attitudes of the European Americans toward African Americans are still much worse there than in the north. Why? *Because the slave owner and all who benefit from slavery must convince themselves that the slave is inferior AND not entitled to ethical reciprocity to avoid conscious guilt. But as our parent species, Homo*

erectus – no matter how inferior – had to be entitled to ethical reciprocity (the golden rule). That’s why most ordinary Mesopotamians had to believe that “the black-headed people” were an inferior race and **not** our parent species.

We’ll discover in Appendix H that Americans also had to believe in a huge lie to disenfranchise African Americans, to conclude that they too were not entitled to the golden rule and were eligible for slavery. It is a lie that almost all Americans still believe!

Notice one more thing about *Homo erectus* slavery before we leave the subject. The fledgling Ks and their priests who made the myth of the Anunnaki creating “the black-headed people” as an inferior race or primate had to know that it was a lie. Why else would they *simultaneously* have demoted the Anunnaki from the highest heaven to the underworld? Their guilt must have been boundless. It’s no wonder that all the Mesopotamian kingdoms were conquered as easily as they were. Their leaders had to be begging for punishment. Muhammad’s message to forget the past must have come as a tremendous relief. Yet, as the Greek myth of Typhon will tell us, the relevant past cannot be buried without paying a big price for it.



Figure 42a (left) : "The Dairy Scene," an Ubaid frieze. The "gods" were credited not only for nature's beneficence, but (rightly or wrongly) for anonymous discoveries and inventions. After Woolley.

Figure 42b (below): A Mosaic Set in a Lyre. Like Figure 41, the objects are carved from shell and set upon a stunning background of lapis lazuli. Music too was a "gift of the gods". After Woolley.



We will analyze the Mesopotamian pantheon in greater detail in Chapter 36. For now, do you see the historical connection between the "Jinn" and the guilty, all male, religious cults such as that of the Ona men's lodge (the Hain, page 153, above), the Aboriginal Australians (Appendix B) and those of other primitive societies? Let me rephrase the question in a way that will give you an additional hint of its answer:

can you see the subtle reason why the “Jinn,” the “bands of *Homo erecti* still at large,” *had to be* invented? (I’ll tell you in the conclusion.)

We can only hope that, as absolute dating techniques are perfected and as more sites are excavated, archaeologists will be able to tell us how long the “Jinn” or “demons” survived in remote and isolated pockets as refugees or as enslaved, “black-headed people.”

Now, if these “Standard” mosaics don’t make the picture clear enough, just look at Figure 43A-E and Figure 43F-I. This relief,




Figure 43 A-E: The Bronze Doors of Balawat (east of Mosul) Rassam (1882) and Mallowan (1956) excavated this site, finding the remains of a palace and a temple built by Shalmaneser III and Assurnasirpal II. See Parrot's interpretation of the frames on the next page. I am unable to comment on his learned remarks, but I wish to point out that the little men in Frame E (especially the one to whom my white arrow points), the men in F and the women prisoners in H -- all appear to be "Black-headed People" -- descendants of our archaic ancestors. Unlike mythological figures, these are all realistic. (Cont. next fig.)

now in the British Museum, is on the bronze doors found at the remains of the palace and temple to the god Mahir. The site, east of Mosul, was excavated by Rassam (1882) and Mallowan (1956). The engraver was so skilled, that he has virtually produced for us a black and white photograph. The women in this convoy of prisoners (Figure 43-H) have heads that are uniformly different from those of their captors. They most certainly are not *Homo sapiens*. They are *Homo erecti*. The same is true




Figure 43 F-I: (continued from the previous figure) This was possible because the "Black-headed People" had become completely disassociated from their militant forbears. --After Parrot

of the men in Figure 43F and the little men in 43E. Although some of the frames are not very clear, if you hold a magnifying glass up to each of them, I think you will agree with me that all except frame D feature

people who appear to be either *Homo erectus* war prisoners or *Homo erectus* servants or slaves.

As our examination of the Gilgamesh flood material and Mesopotamian art and archaeology has shown beyond any reasonable doubt, as I suggested earlier in the chapter on cannibalism and as the cannibalism of Greek and Scandinavian myths suggest, those who were enslaved and confined to reservations where the lucky ones!

Joseph Campbell and Robert Graves, two of the best and most widely read mythographers of our time, tried to connect religious myths -- even the most dreamlike first and second sin myths -- with events from the Bronze and Iron Ages. They tried to connect religious myths with peoples who either had or were only several thousand years away from having written language with which to fix their histories. Both men failed to understand that religious myths are essentially what remain of our Paleolithic ancestors' attempts to understand and orally convey their most traumatic, "sacred" history. The lengthy hymns, sagas and narratives that were first recorded during the Bronze and Iron Ages were not the starting point for mythology. The modern religions notwithstanding, they are the end point. These myths and rituals were produced by condensing their Paleolithic counterparts and recasting the totem characters into hominid form. The written recording of history put a virtual end to the process by which religious myths were made.

There is another obvious reason why neither the Bronze or Iron Ages of invasions nor the Neolithic (stone age of agriculture, which came to stay circa 10 kya) could have given birth to our hallucinatory and fantastically-heroic, religious myths. There's another reason why sacred mythology can only descend from the Species War or earlier.

Later wars were not nearly as violent and traumatic as the Species War. Prisoners weren't all eaten. We can be sure of this because, in an age of agriculture (except, as we'll see, in Mesoamerica), most of the vanquished *Homo sapien* men would have been more valued as slaves or vassals whose labor could be exploited. Vanquished *Homo sapien* women would have been more valued as slaves or concubines. Furthermore, in all *Homo sapien* conflicts, the enemy was not immediately recognizable by his physical characteristics or despised (as was *Homo erectus*) for innately inferior aptitudes.

By far the most convincing evidence of the unparalleled terror and trauma of the Species War is that handed down to us in mythology. One of the most common myth-tales that has come down to us in

versions that differ from country to country (and from county to county in Ireland) is the tale of the *Black Thief*. Each tale creates a situation in which the *Black Thief* is about to be killed. At that point, his captor asks, “Has ever a man been closer to death than you are now?” The Black Thief then replies, “Most certainly, and if ever there was, that man was I.” Then he begins to spin a terrifying Species War tale.¹⁴⁰

Less violence meant less guilt and less of a tendency to repress and distort the objects of ambivalent feelings. Even when that guilt and ambivalence was created with respect to fellow *Homo sapiens*, it was not the same. It did not involve the fear of another species believed to be still at large and eager to prey upon anyone and everyone. Neither did it involve patricide in any form.

Note again that I am not referring here to fictional stories that were intended only to either entertain or to explain the unknown. We are interested only in religious myths, sacred myths, myths pertaining to universal elements of the godhead and dealing metaphorically with taboo subjects, myths about which our ancestors were “dead serious.”

By insisting that most religious myths *originated* in the Species War, I am not saying that other scholars are not usually correct in their identifications of Neolithic, Bronze and Iron Age references within the myths. These references to things and events of later ages *were assimilated* into religious myths that are of a much greater antiquity.

To his everlasting credit, Mr. Graves recognized religious myths as concerning themselves with the practical and concrete. He scoffed at the vacillating, semi-religious interpretations of Jungian psychoanalysis. But he often confused Jungian analysis with the consistently materialistic psychoanalysis of Freud.

Here’s the difference: people who think in an uncritical, religious manner, believe that there are things unchanging and immaterial. This metaphysics and philosophical idealism (respectively, as opposed to dialectics and philosophical materialism, respectively) originates in the wishful belief that the ego, the “soul,” is independent of the material organism. It is not. “It,” self-awareness, is the evolutionary and phenomenological effect of the closing of a neuro-electric circuit that has no priority above self-preservation and that can maintain a steady state between adjusting output to input and storing and retrieving

¹⁴⁰ To verify my interpretation, *after* you have finished reading this volume, see “The Black Thief and King Conal’s Horses” in Curtin, 1894: 93. For an inferior version of this myth, see Dillon.

information. This naive and wishful belief in the “soul” gave rise to the false philosophies of metaphysics and philosophical idealism.¹⁴¹

¹⁴¹ For a fuller exposition of these philosophical distinctions and some history of philosophy, see either V.I. Lenin’s *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* or F. Engels’ *Anti-Dühring*. It is probably one of the great ironies of history that Marxists-Leninists, who were so keen as to correctly analyze the distinctions between philosophical idealism and philosophical materialism and between metaphysics and dialectics, proved incapable of recognizing the distinction between altruism and egoism. Life becomes meaningful and fully satisfying only as we fully realize our potentials to pay back all the people living and dead who have helped us and as we can expect to be loved and remembered for our works. Those whom we do love and remember were *not* altruists. The falsity and hypocrisy inherent in alleged altruism, in the belief that we should or even can sacrifice our own self-interest for *strangers that will never know us, identify with us or remember us* is sufficient to explain why the practical men who shaped the English common law evolved a rule that said that mutual consideration had to be evident within a contract if the contract was to be credible and enforceable. The falsity of the hypocritical belief in altruism explains why capitalist owners will always tend to exploit the workers and socialist workers will always tend to work unprofitably. But a civilized society that minimizes the K and R strategies ought to be able to keep these tendencies in check (i. e. regulate investment, labor supply, demand for foodstuffs, inflation, etc.). See page 20 above or the Conclusion in v3 for these strategies.

Orwell devoted a whole book, *Animal Farm*, to the belief in phony altruism. He tried, no doubt, to set the Marxists straight. But they had other, big problems. Also fostered by religion was the erroneous belief that central planning could fully substitute for the market in allocating resources. Central planners attempt to predict the infinite number of unpredictable, largely unconscious and constantly changing market decisions as any a transcendental “God” could hope to do. (See von Mises or von Hayek.)

Most problematic of all was Marx’s one-sided definition of the class struggle. It was great for energizing the Rs to break the Ks’ monopoly upon state power; but it and the labor theory of value (borrowed from Adam Smith and further exaggerated by Marx) proved disastrous in trying to build a socialist economy. My alternative (K vs. R) theory of the class struggle and the reforms advocated in the Conclusion systematize and advance the social science learning of the post-1917 era.

My study of political history in general and the class struggle convince me that overt, physical violence is often the inevitable result of the covert forms of violence: lies, trickery and censorship. But in the long run, no form of violence does any good for anyone. It creates more anger, suffering and misery and retards human evolution. *The win-win political change that can bring permanent peace and progress cannot be accomplished by violence and necessitates, instead, that we become totally honest with ourselves and one another. That’s why all five of the masks that I describe must come off. That’s why the Third Mask people, the Ks who have ruled and dominated every walk of social life throughout the era of class society, are the least capable of*

The literal belief in “God” further promoted these false philosophies. “God” (the positive aspect of five ambivalent objects of the Fraternal and the Oedipal Complexes, three of which are prehistoric and two of which are ongoing and universal) powerfully reinforces the wishful belief in an eternal and an immaterial “soul.” “God” reinforces the belief in metaphysics and philosophical idealism. “God,” the amalgamation of the primal father, the *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapien* Species Warriors, the competing parent and our ongoing genetic competitors, inherits their attributes of timelessness and universality. Timelessness and universality are equivalent to eternity and invisibility because no time is equivalent to all time and everywhere is equivalent to nowhere.

Here in Mesopotamia, there is one more subject that we must cover before we move on. Recall that I promised to show you that in *his* effort to consolidate the gods, in creating the enormously successful Christian myth, Paul learned from the Mesopotamian Gilgamesh Epic.

GILGAMESH RECONSIDERED

Let’s look closer at the complete *Gilgamesh Epic*. With all the new and exciting discoveries that we’ve got under our belts, probing the depths of any area of mythology is like looking under the back seat of a double-shifted taxi. We’re bound to come up with something valuable.

Gilgamesh is especially likely to contain gems because the epic is the most widely distributed and long-lived of the region’s unearthed literature. It probably found its way into every historical Mesopotamian culture and was, along with the *Babylonian Creation Epic*, one of the two most significant literary works produced by the region.

The two different second millennium Akkadian versions were based upon independent tablets that were apparently transcribed from third millennium Sumerian Gilgamesh tales. You’d expect the unification of them to be disjointed, but scholars have discovered otherwise: “the fact is that, apart from Tablet XII, the epic reads as a consistent and well-ordered whole, with unified structure and themes. The unity of the first eleven tablets is expressed, among other ways, by

leading us politically. Angry people, who cannot love and spend their lives getting even with the rest of us, are the most dishonest; and their Third Masks are the hardest to remove.

their prologue and introductory hymn, which looks ahead to events at the end of the epic (I, i, 5-7, 38-40); by the repetition of part of the prologue at the end of Tablet XI (XI, 303-7 = I, i, 16-21); and by retrospective summaries of important incidents of the epic in various speeches by Enkidu and Gilgamesh (VII, VIII, X). The episodes follow each other in a meaningful sequence, gradually developing the main theme of the epic, Gilgamesh's quest for immortality. This is equivalent to a quest for divinity, as only our gods are immortal. The building of the walls of Uruk and the temple Eanna, mentioned in the prologue (I, i, 9-19), is represented as having taken place before the events of the epic begin, since their existence is presupposed throughout (I, iv, 37, 44 [Cf. Gilg. P. ii, 16, 18]; VI, 157; XI 303-7)" (Tigay: 5-6; Jacobsen, 1976: 217). Since the building of the temple and the walls could only have followed the Species War and the primal deed, this Gilgamesh of priestly construction had to follow them too. This, of course, precludes Gilgamesh symbolizing any of the prehistoric elements of the godhead and ever becoming important enough to us to achieve immortality, a permanent place in the memories of men.

For the benefit of any of you that still don't see it, the deeds of the original and the second sin are unlikely to ever become equaled in the life of our genus and species respectively. The former included the supreme compromise and cooperation that launched *Homo's* civilization. The latter eliminated the competitor that blocked *Homo sapien's* ascent to the top of Earth's food chain.

But the Gilgamesh priests, as we'll see, weren't even conscious of what "creation" and "the Deluge" symbolized. That's why their experiment could not succeed – even within the realm of make-believe. They could never produce a god as powerful or important as Paul's Jesus. Neither were they consistent in their treatment of what they did understand of our prehistoric traumata. At times, they struggle to create an omnipotent, western god that can be propitiated. At other times, they deny the reality of the traumata as is characteristic of eastern religions. We'll be forced to conclude that *Gilgamesh* is the work of a committee.

References to the walls of Uruk and the temple Eanna refer to the accomplishments of a historical Gilgamesh. "According to the Sumerian King List, Gilgamesh was the fifth king of the first dynasty of Uruk, which historians place in the Second Early Dynastic Period of Sumer (ca 2700-2500)" (Tigay: 13). Various sources also credit

Gilgamesh with rebuilding the shrine of the god Enlil in Nippur (Tigay: 14; Black and Green: 73 and Campbell, 1964: 87-88). By 2600 or 2500 B.C., texts indicate that Gilgamesh was regarded as a god; but, at best, he could only have been a local god.

But don't assume that this early Bronze Age king was the original Gilgamesh. In Chapter 23, our Kwakiutl North American ancestors will teach us otherwise. King Gilgamesh was, like most kings, only a personator of the gods. He was named after a Species War god. Modern scholars have plenty of Mesopotamian evidence to verify this: "His [*H Gilgamesh's*] name is of a type that is characteristic of this approximate period" (Tigay: 13, citing others). No doubt the pre-existence of both a historical and a mythical Gilgamesh added to the priests' confusion.

Like Paul's Jesus, the Gilgamesh of priestly construction had to have a historical counterpart. To become a God, he had to be both historical and mythical, had to be both in the world and in the spirit world. As I explained in Chapter 7, the ongoing universal elements of the godhead (competing parent and ongoing genetic competitors) are universal and in the world. The prehistoric elements (primal fathers and Species Warriors) are timeless and in the "spirit world."

As you can begin to appreciate, an enormous amount of research by linguists and archaeologists has been devoted to Gilgamesh. Constructing the different circles of traditions and trying to ascertain all the various sources of the changes from one version to another has demanded life-times of pains-taking effort from experts who are the very best at what they do. Yet they have been unable to see the forest through the trees. As Tigay freely admits on the last page of his introduction, "The more important question, admittedly not always answerable, is why a source was drawn upon, how it was used in the epic, and what it contributed to the epic."¹⁴² This brings us once again to the mind of the author and subsequent editors of the epic. Both main lines of research thus lead back to the mind of the writers. Ultimately this must have been the decisive factor in the shaping of the epic, but it is the most elusive factor of all. We cannot really 'explain' why these writers presented the epic as they did" (Tigay: 22).

Ge, it's a good thing we decided to return for more site-seeing! What would have become of Assyro-Babylonian studies if I hadn't left my Time magazine on a ziggurat? Jeffrey: like all the creative, myth-

¹⁴² Here Tigay cites Jacobsen, 1976: 208-9.

maker priests, they hoped to create a supreme God that everyone would believe in, a God about whom they would be the ultimate experts and privileged to serve as everyone's intermediary with the divinity.

Since we already know what is essential to the gods, what they all have in common, on both the demand and the supply sides, our challenge is to learn exactly how the Gilgamesh priests succeeded and failed in supplying the demand. No doubt, Paul of Tarsus, the most successful priest/scholar of his time studied Gilgamesh for the same purpose. Paul was in hot competition with countless others to create the modern God, a God that would – if not unite the Roman Empire's subjects -- at least save the hides of its patrician Ks by giving them an ideology with which to convince the plebian Rs and oppressed barbarians that fortunes in “the next life” are the reverse of what they are in this one.¹⁴³

As for what, if anything, was going on in the minds of these Gilgamesh priests, at various stages of their work, we'll probably never know. Nor should we care because, to paraphrase Mark Twain, their work compares to Paul's as the camel compares to the rest of creation. The former were products of committees.

Despite the Gilgamesh Epic failing to produce a universal and immortal “God” (in whom the primal deed and the Deluge are united), the epic was popular in Mesopotamia *for almost 2000 years precisely because it satisfied the needs and dreams of Mesopotamian people better than any of the other literary works of its day. Let's scrutinize Gilgamesh now, always with an eye to how he compares to Jesus.*

Heidel provides an insightful story about the Gilgamesh Epic. He attributes the story to a Roman author of the second century A.D.:

When Senechoros ¹⁴⁴ reigned over the Babylonians, the Chaldeans said that the son that would be born of his daughter would wrest the kingdom from the grandfather. At this he was alarmed and, to express it jocularly, became

¹⁴³ Very little is known about Paul of Tarsus, the author of the Christian Myth. It could be that successive generations of Big Brother Ks corrupted his work. I am doing everything I can to prevent them from corrupting me and mine, but I won't live forever. You and your family can help by purchasing and preserving copies of my books.

¹⁴⁴ Heidel notes here that Senechoros is identified with Enmeker, king of Uruk and cites Jacobsen, Thorkild, *The Sumerian King List*, Chicago, 1939, p. 87.

an Acrisios¹⁴⁵ to the girl; for he guarded (her) very closely. But without his knowledge -- for fate was more ingenious than the Babylonian -- the girl became a mother by an obscure man and bore a child. Her guards, in fear of the king, threw it from the acropolis; for it was there that the mother was imprisoned. But an eagle very quickly saw the child's fall, and before the infant was dashed upon the ground got underneath it and received (it) on (his) back, and carrying (it) to an orchard, he set (it) down very cautiously. The caretaker of the place, seeing the beautiful child, loved it and reared (it); it was called Gilgames and reigned over the Babylonians. --Heidel: 4, citing others

This sort of story was not limited to Acrisios of Argos and Gilgamesh of Sumer. Freud (1937) found it to occur universally. Similar birth myths were applied to Hebrew Moses, Irish Lugh, "Milesian" (Goidelic Celt) Tuathal Tecmar, Cyrus the Great, Aslaug (daughter of Sigurd and Brunhild), Zeus and -- of course -- Paul's Jesus.¹⁴⁶ The motive for this recurring theme is not only to create sympathetic heroes whose deprivation deflects resentment and whose loss of patrimony justifies ambition. This conflict usually begins with the cruel abuse of a child and ends with the child killing and displacing the ancestor/abuser. This type of *persecuted-child* myth reminds us of *both* the first and the second sins. As such, it is one of the devices by which popular writers and ambitious priests at the dawn of the modern era were everywhere attempting to syncretize mythology, to condense all man's most important prehistory into a simple allegory and consolidate the gods.¹⁴⁷ But again, Gilgamesh couldn't be unequivocally associated with the (partially remembered) Primal Deed and Species War due to his clear association with more recent events.

To all cosmopolitan people, the need for a universal God must have been obvious. Ethnically diverse peoples needed a common god

¹⁴⁵ Heidel describes Acrisios as a king of Argos, of whom a similar story is told in Greek literature.

¹⁴⁶ For the tale involving Cyrus, see Herodotus, Book I, Chapters 108-118.

¹⁴⁷ Occasionally, the persecuted child is one of the last survivors of a people threatened with extinction (e. g. Aslaug, see Guerber: 251-297). This type of persecuted-child myth assures us that in the latter days of *Homo erectus*, our immediate ancestors turned the tables on him. They prohibited the conception and survival of *Homo erectus* babies.

to promote their social, political and economic integration. Anyone (naturist or sincere believer) might have a dream that creatively and economically assembled sacred symbols to create an allegory for our prehistory and a newly condensed god who could be associated with some social or natural force or serve as a foil for some already-notorious “demon.” Once armed with the theoretical nucleus for a cult, an ambitious person could readily produce an image of the god and parade it through the streets soliciting funds for his temple. (If they don’t stop censoring this book soon, you might see me doing the same.) “Altogether the names of over 3000 divinities are preserved in the cuneiform records” (Black and Green: 147). This implies an enormous population of priests and priestesses that at some point must have approached the population of domesticated animals available for sacrifice. This clerical sector was, like the palace economy, an enormous burden upon the population. The need for a shaking out forced priests into a competition that automatically led to syncretism and -- however unconsciously -- a race to create a “God” popular enough to eclipse all others. Let’s look at the progress that other Mesopotamian cults had made toward this end.

In this region that had absorbed so many different migrations and conquerors, at the close of ancient times, the gods became lumps in a long-simmering stew.¹⁴⁸ Few came out of the Mesopotamian kettle looking as they did when they entered it. All the universal symbols are to be found in abundance; but if one had only first and second millennium Mesopotamian religion with which to try to decode those symbols, one wouldn’t have a chance of succeeding. The following gods are some of the most logical products of religious syncretism.

“According to the Babylonian Creation Epic, Apsû was the name of a primal creature, the lover of Tiamat, and when Ea [*H Enki*] killed Apsû, he set up his home on the dead creature’s body, whose name was then transferred to Ea’s residence [*H the ocean that Mesopotamians believed to be beneath the Earth*]” (Black and Green: 27). If you still don’t see why, take my word for it that Ea (Enki, whose home is in the water) later became symbolic of the Deluge victims. He (or more precisely, his triad) symbolizes all the *Homo erecti* that came after the primal father. The *Homo erecti* (“Enki”) did kill the primal father

¹⁴⁸ Here’s a partial list of Mesopotamian peoples: Sumerians, Amorites, Elamites, Hurrians, Kassites, Mitannians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Medes, Gutians, Aramaeans, Hittites, Persians, Parthians and Greeks (who followed Alexander).

(Apsû, Tiamat's lover). Marduk, Ea's son, was also referred to as "first born son of Apsû" (Black and Green: 27). Marduk was also the patron god of Babylon. His early title "bull-calf (of) the sun" suggests that he was once a sun god or had absorbed a sun god, and as such he was the condensation of the Species War belligerents. He is the son of Apsû in the sense that *Homo sapien* is the son of *Homo erectus*. Consistent with this identity is his symbol, an arrow (an arrow that archaeologists, taking the Babylonians at their word, are still naively calling a spade or hoe). Take another look at the tall figure in the top panel of Figure 41 and confirm my speculation that this person is Ninurta/Marduk holding his compromised arrow/spade. Also, consistent with this identity is Marduk's later appellation, Bél (Lord). "The rise of the cult of Marduk is closely connected with the political rise of Babylon from city-state to the capital of an empire. From the Kassite Period Marduk became more and more important until it was possible for the author of the Babylonian Epic of Creation to maintain that not only was Marduk king of all the gods but that many of the latter were no more than aspects of his persona -- hence the hymn of the Fifty Names of Marduk incorporated into the Epic, to which a contemporary list of gods adds sixty-six more" (Black and Green: 128). The Marduk cult was the culmination of Mesopotamia's efforts to create a modern, monotheistic "God" that synthesized his predecessors and our prehistory. Many peoples adopted Marduk. Yet the cult never denied the existence of other gods who remained in the national and city-state pantheons. The Assyrians, for example, adopted this god of the Old Babylonian Empire that they conquered; but they continued to put *seven* or twelve principal gods with him in their pantheon. Similarly, all the Babylonians retained the Sumerian gods An, Enlil, Ea and even Utu, an early sun god from Sippar. (Cf. Black and Green: 30, 76, and 182-4.) We'll examine Marduk more closely in Chapter 36.

The most successful cults that ultimately became our modern religions 1) balanced our strong ambivalence toward the five universal elements of the godhead, 2) creatively explained away the need for blood sacrifice, 3) symbolically combined the elements into as few gods as possible, and 4) created a resultant "God" that embodied Man's past and His hopes for the future. Such a "God" had to be prehistoric and ongoing, eternal and universal, omniscient and omnipotent (the West) or infallible (the East). The resultant "God" also had to enjoy what our ongoing genetic competitors are slow to produce -- immortality.

Finally, after this lengthy introduction, we are ready for a summary of the most recent, well-developed, standard Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh Epic. For an expert translation and summary of the late Babylonian Standard Gilgamesh Epic, we'll rely verbatim upon Alexander Heidel: 5-10. This reliance upon Heidel's choice of words should assure you that the summary you are reading is not skewed to support my interpretations. My interspersed, interpretive remarks will be, as usual, bracketed and italicized. Take it away... Alex:

Like the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid*, and the *Nibelungenlied*, the Gilgamesh Epic opens with a brief résumé of the deeds and fortunes of the hero whose praises it sings. It first extols the great knowledge and wisdom of him who saw everything and knew all things; who saw secret things and revealed hidden things [*H Here's an attribute of the combined, universal objects of the godhead: omniscience. Our collective, species-wide knowledge approaches omniscience. Moreover, Homo erectus -- as we've inferred from physical anthropology and as we'll confirm from mythology -- had extraordinary sensory perception. In ascribing this quality to Gilgamesh, the authors are telling us right from the start that they are attempting to syncretize the gods in him.*]; who brought information of the days before the flood [*H a clumsy and transparent attempt to associate G with the Species War*]; who went on a long journey (in quest of immortality), became weary and worn [*H These last two clauses constitute a virtual admission by the authors that they failed to syncretize "God." They failed to create an allegorical symbol for Man. The first clause also suggests a probable reason for their failure: their own egos were too closely bound up with their character, a character that didn't survive the flood but only "brought information about it." Their god was limited by their own imaginations.*];¹⁴⁹ who engraved on a tablet of stone an account of all that he had done and suffered [*H had to sing his own praises*]; and who built the

¹⁴⁹ I say Gilgamesh authors, plural. You'll soon see why I believe Gilgamesh to have been composed by a collegium of priests.

walls of Uruk and its holy temple, Eanna. [*H These are modest accomplishments for a Supreme God, but put yourself in the authors' place. The worldly aspect of "God" had to be powerful, preferably superhuman, at least as powerful as any known king; and Gilgamesh, the legendary King of Uruk, fit the bill better than anyone they knew of or could imagine. Paul better met this task by inventing a historical god with a fictitious history. Fictitious witnesses and humble origins made the history credible. "Son of God" status, the symbolism to confirm that status and imputed miraculous works like those of the Hebrew prophets completed Jesus' resume.*]

After these lines the text in the Assyrian edition, of which alone the poem has been preserved, breaks off. But, to judge from the first two lines of the next column and from the Hittite recension, the epic went on from here to relate the story itself. When the text again becomes fairly connected, the epic has already turned to the oppressive reign of Gilgamesh.

In his exuberant strength and vigor, his arrogant spirit and undisciplined desires, Gilgamesh apparently carries the maidens of the city off to his court and drives the young men to such heavy labors on the city walls and the temple Eanna that the inhabitants at length invoke the gods to relieve them of their unbearable burden. [*H Here they've got him imitating the negative aspect of the primal father. But he's not a prehistoric Homo erectus. A historical Homo sapien who acts like this is just a lout.*] At last, the gods listen to the cry of the oppressed and tyrannized population and decide to create a counterpart to Gilgamesh to divert the latter's attention to other matters, by having the two constantly strive or wrestle, with each other. [*H If there are other gods above Gilgamesh who can control him, then forget him and tell us about them! Obviously, the authors had not fully grasped the basic outline of our traumatic prehistory. They still believed literally in gods, so they were nowhere close to being able to create an effective one of their own.*]

The resultant creation is a wild-looking human being of titanic strength called Enkidu. His whole body is

covered with hair; the hair of his head is long like that of a woman, and the locks of the hair on his head sprout like grain. He knows nothing about land or people and is garbed like *Sumuqan*, the god of cattle and agriculture. With the game of the field, he ranges at large over the steppe, eats grass and drinks water from the drinking-places of the open country, and delights in the company of the animals. [*H Now they've borrowed someone else's Homo erectus god, renamed him and made him a friend of Gilgamesh. What klutzes!*]

First through dreams, and then through a trapper, Gilgamesh learns of this unique individual and sends out a courtesan to enchain Enkidu with her charms and to bring him to Uruk. [*H The Babylonian authors had read enough mythology to know that the "imperfect men," "animal people" or "giants" had fought with our men over our women. They may also have realized that women were used as spies even during the Species War.*] There, at the entrance to the community house, Gilgamesh and Enkidu meet. This place was to be the scene of one of Gilgamesh's nocturnal orgies. But Enkidu is so repelled by this unseemly affair that he tries to block the passage to prevent Gilgamesh from entering the house. [*H Here, the author-priests are registering -- not Homo erectus mores, but -- the evolving monogamy of the modern age.*] Thereupon a bitter struggle ensues. The two fight with each other like infuriated bulls. They shatter the doorpost of the community house and cause the wall to shake. They fight in the doorway of the community house and they fight on the street. Finally, Gilgamesh succeeds in forcing Enkidu to the ground, whereupon the fury of Gilgamesh abates and he turns away. Enkidu acknowledges Gilgamesh as his superior, and the two, admiring each other's strength and prowess, form a friendship. [*H It sounds as if the same evolving monogamy that caused polyamory to be shunned earlier in the myth has also caused homophobia sufficient here to edit out homosexuality.*]

At first thought it might seem that the purpose of the gods has been frustrated. But it has not, for Gilgamesh now devotes his attention to his newly won friend and dreams

of adventure that is to ensure everlasting fame for himself and his companion. [*H The priests are trying to come out of the closet – vicariously. The authors have now made Gilgamesh a bloodless Species War victor. But a bloodless Species War would have meant eliminating all the ambivalence felt toward the Species Warriors, preventing most of the gods from ever becoming gods. That would have been great, but that’s not what happened. That these guys ever could have become priests proves the old adage, “It’s not what you know, it’s ...”*] Soon the two, armed with gigantic weapons, are found on a dangerous expedition against a terrible ogre, whose name appears as Huwawa in the Old Babylonian and Hittite versions and as Humbaba in the Assyrian recension. Enlil, the lord of the gods, had appointed this ogre as the guardian of a distant and almost boundless cedar forest, but in the pride of his heart he evidently overshot the mark and is therefore deserving of punishment. After a long journey the two companions arrive at the gate of the forest, which is guarded by a fearful watchman placed there by Humbaba. The watchman is killed, and Enkidu opens the gate to the beautiful cedar forest. But alas! The gate is enchanted, and as Enkidu opens it, his hand is paralyzed, and he hesitates to proceed. However, upon the urgent plea of Gilgamesh, who may have resorted to magic and thus may have restored Enkidu’s hand to its former condition, Enkidu follows Gilgamesh, and the two go into the depths of the forest together. [*H The description of the characters makes little prehistoric sense and doesn’t even provide the basis for a good myth-tale. But the reference to Enkidu’s bad hand is a bingo. Take note of our second mythological reference to Homo erectus’ inferior hands. Are you ready yet to trust your taxi-driver and his divergent views, or are you still putting your faith in the conventional wisdom of Mr. Trinkaus, Mr. Leakey and other experts?*] After another long journey, they arrive at the sacred cedar of Humbaba. [*H The authors also knew that hardwood trees were universal symbols for the gods. Primeval forests and caves were their dwelling places*] Gilgamesh takes the ax in his hand and cuts down the cedar. The resounding noise

of the strokes of the ax brings fierce Humbaba to the scene. [*H Cutting down a hardwood tree is symbolic of killing gods.*] At the sight of this frightful ogre Gilgamesh is terror-stricken. He breaks into tears and cries to Shamash, the sun god. [*H The mention of a sun god here beside a god that hopes to become his functional equivalent suggests that these warm-weather priests did not understand the origins of the sun gods either. You'll understand in coming chapters.*] Shamash hears his prayer and from all eight major points of the compass he sends mighty winds against Humbaba, so that he is neither able to go forward nor able to turn back and has to surrender. Humbaba pleads for mercy, but no mercy is granted. Gilgamesh and Enkidu cut off his head and victoriously return to Uruk. [*H They kill the primal father, a primal father that is unmistakably Homo erectus.*]

Upon his arrival in Uruk, Gilgamesh washes his hair, polishes his weapons, and garbs himself in festive attire. As he puts on his tiara, Ishtar, the goddess of love, looks with admiration upon the young and handsome king and, with many attractive promises, offers to be his wife. But Gilgamesh, knowing the wiles of Ishtar, rejects her proposal in the most scathing terms.

Excuse me Professor Heidel, but we must let Professor Langdon interrupt to expound upon Ishtar and her wiles. He has some information that will prove crucial in enabling us to decode the original meaning of the quintessential fertility myths (those that featured seasonal migrations with the verdure to the underworld). We're so lucky to be riding in a big Checker Cab! Your turn Professor Langdon:

Capricious in love and willful in action, Ishtar was a constant source of trouble to the gods. She had no consort and really loved only the unfortunate youth Tammuz, who perished annually with the dying corn. Her beauty seduced demigods, men, and beasts to their destruction. In the sixth book of the Epic of Gilgamesh is told a legend of how she yearly sends Tammuz to his doom and then decrees wailings for his departure. [*H These wailings over the forced separation of lovers are a universal feature of these*

myths and offer a clue as to their original meaning. Think of the wailing viewers as viewers of soap operas who are bewailing the sexual misfortunes of characters with whom they identify. They are really bewailing their own sexual frustration and misery -- especially at the beginning of modern times when polygamous, tribal life was still remembered but no longer attainable. Ishtar and other Earth Mothers suffered a similar loss of sexual freedom due to the rewriting of these myths. Have you got it now?] A bird of many colors she loved... She loved a lion, and then dug *seven* and *seven* pits for him, and a horse, honored in battle, and then smote him with whip, spur, and lash. [*H Ishtar having loved a lion and a horse is still another hint, a strong hint, of whom she was originally sent to the underworld to love. Got it yet?*] She received homage and worship from a herdsman, and smote him, turning him to a jackal. Ishullunu, the gardener of her father (the Heaven-god), had been one of her devout worshippers. Him she beheld and desired greatly, proffering rich repast and voluptuous pleasure. Ishullunu rejected her shameful advances. Him she turned into a hog, and caused him to live in misery. --Langdon: 28.

So, Ishtar had loved totem animals! What might this suggest about the lady's past, and do you see now the meaning of her descent to the underworld? If not, don't worry. As I warned you in Chapter 16, this is super-X-rated material; and we have a lot of resistance to it. You'll have it before we come to this work's conclusion. Please continue your summary of the Gilgamesh Epic Professor Heidel.

Enraged at this crushing humiliation, Ishtar mounts up to heaven and goes before Anu, her father, with the plea: "Create for me the bull of heaven [that he may destroy Gilgamesh]!" [*H Apparently, our authors couldn't agree on how to represent the primal father; or they hoped to increase their following by incorporating various, popular versions of the primal deed. Notice that the bull may also represent the biological father and the father species, Homo erectus. But this second sin symbolism of the bull was apparently not intended by the authors of Gilgamesh*

because later in the epic, they have Gilgamesh looking for Utnapishtim, seeking the immortality of this Babylonian Noah -- and Gilgamesh is denied it. If Gilgamesh had replicated Utnapishtim's second sin feat, then it would be only logical to entitle Gilgamesh to Utnapishtim's reward. The Species War was, by far, the most important event in the life of our species and genus. It over-shadowed the primal deed and absorbed "creation" in every people's mythology.] After considerable hesitation, Anu consents. The bull is created and sent down upon Uruk. [*H Anu or An was one of the Sumerian sons of the primal father, Apsû. Neither he nor anyone else can create the creator! Now the priests are thoroughly confused.*] A whole army of men [*H extras*] rush out to dispatch him, but it is of no avail. One snort from the bull, and the king's men fall by the hundreds! Another snort, and additional hundreds fall to the ground! Then he rushes upon Enkidu, but Enkidu gets hold of the thick of his tail, while Gilgamesh comes running along, thrusts his sword into the nape of the bull, and kills him. Foiled in her plans, Ishtar ascends the wall of Uruk and utters a curse upon Gilgamesh. But Enkidu tears out the right thigh of the bull of heaven and tosses it before her, amid vulgar taunts, while Gilgamesh dedicates the bull's horns to his tutelary god, Lugalbanda. [*H Lugalbanda and Ninurta are older, Sumerian names for Marduk, and bull horns were part of one of the Egyptian crowns. See Langdon: 40 and my Figure 87a.*] Thereupon Gilgamesh and Enkidu wash their hands in the Euphrates, on whose former banks Uruk was located, and then ride in triumph through the thronged and lordly city, as Gilgamesh calls out in exultant gladness: "Who is the (most) glorious among heroes? Who is the (most) eminent among men?" and an enthusiastic crowd responds in joyful acclaim: "Gilgamesh is the (most) glorious among heroes! [Gilgamesh is the (most) eminent among men!]"

That night Enkidu has a dream foreboding his own speedy end. He sees the gods assembled together, as they deliberate which of the two who killed Humbaba and the bull of heaven should perish. The lot falls on Enkidu. Subsequently he takes ill and dies, at the decree of the gods.

[H Here is a clumsy, slip shod, first attempt to attribute Homo erectus' extermination to them having killed the primal father. Syncretism of our prehistory required a single god or totem to represent the primal father. It required Gilgamesh, a Homo sapien, to have done the actual killing of Enkidu.]

This has an overpowering effect on Gilgamesh. He cries "bitterly like unto a wailing woman." For *seven* days and *seven* nights he weeps over his friend and refuses to give him up for burial, hoping that he will rise after all at his lamentation. Finally, he reconciles himself to the fact that the life of his friend is beyond recall, and Enkidu is buried with honors *[H This appears to be reaction formation to the second sin reality and fear of the Homo erectus gods].*

Steeped in sorrow at the death of his friend who has turned to clay, Gilgamesh leaves Uruk and roams over the desert, *[H After the killing of the Enkidu, after the outbreak of the Species War, our immediate ancestors did fan out from Mesopotamia to roam the earth]* lamenting: "When I die, shall I not be like unto Enkidu?" His grief-stricken spirit is obsessed with the fear of death and finds no comfort in the glory of his past accomplishments. His sole interest now lies in finding ways and means to escape the fate of mankind; he is willing to go through the greatest perils and the most extraordinary hardships to gain immortal life! *[H Here they articulate every mortal's wish to be immortal. Religions provide infantile believers with the false promise of a quick and easy escape from death and suffering. Moreover, patricidal Homo sapien has always feared that an apocalypse will do to us as we did to Homo erectus. We've seen one example with the Christian Book of Revelations. We'll see several more examples.]* He thinks of far-away Utnapishtim, the Babylonian Noah, who, Gilgamesh has heard, has received blessed immortality, and decides to hasten to him with all possible speed to obtain from him the secret of eternal life. *[H As symbols for the Species War victors, the Utnapishtims contracted their divinity. As symbols for the survivors of the Great Flood, they had to be juxtaposed to "evil" flood victims to*

convince the gods that their punishment had worked and that another flood would not be necessary. Clearly the Gilgamesh authors lacked both these insights because they didn't equip him with either of these attributes. Their sending Gilgamesh to Utnapishtim to learn the secret of immortality is symbolic of going themselves in search of this knowledge. Why else would they send him instead of just having him do something symbolic of winning the Species War or surviving the Flood?]

But to reach the dwelling place of Utnapishtim, Gilgamesh must go on a long and arduous journey fraught with many dangers [*H, dangers worse than any undertaken by all those caravan drivers who were still looking for Utnapishtim*]. He arrives at the towering mountain range of Mâshu, probably the Lebanon and Antilebanon Range. Here is the gate through which the sun passes on his daily journey. A terrifying pair of scorpion-people [*H deadly animal-people*], “whose look is death” and “whose frightful splendor overwhelms mountains,” guard the gate. At the sight of them the face of even a demigod like Gilgamesh becomes gloomy with fear and dismay, and he falls prostrate before them. But the scorpion-people, recognizing the partly divine nature of Gilgamesh, receive him kingly and permit him to enter the gate and to traverse the mountain range. After a journey of twelve double-hours of utter darkness, which does not permit him to see what lies ahead of him or what lies behind him, he comes out on the other side and stands before a beautiful garden of precious stones, with trees and shrubs, fruit and vines, all of glittering stone. [*H He goes through the underworld, the Mesopotamian afterworld. God must be able to do this and return to give hope to the infantile believer's demand for a quick and easy escape from death. In raising Jesus from the dead, Paul had Gilgamesh, Odysseus and, as we'll see, many other models. Gilgamesh comes out 12 anxious hours later, like the sun, on the edge of the Eastern world.*]

And there in the distance, at the edge of the sea, probably the Mediterranean Sea on the Phoenician coast, dwells Siduri, the divine barmaid. [*H Heidel is mistaken here. Gilgamesh's journey was “12 double hours.”*]

“Double” probably means hours that subjectively seemed to take forever. For Mesopotamians and for our Neolithic ancestors generally, the underworld was a gloomy place. It was where, as you’ll see, the Neolithic demons dragged the sun each day, before the sun-god and his army hoisted it back into the heavens. To travel 12 hours through the underworld meant to travel like the sun and to come up on the other, eastern side of the world.] Gilgamesh hastens thither and inquires of her how he can get to Utnapishtim, to obtain from him the secret of immortality. The barmaid at first tries to persuade him that his quest is vain, for there is no escape from death. [*H Despairing of the attempt to create an immortal god, the author-priests are ready to tell their infantile clients to grow up. Immortality in the literal sense that they want it is not possible. The authors are saying to their clients, “OK, so we failed, but we are at least smart enough and honest enough to know what you can’t admit.”*] She therefore advises him to enjoy life in full measure and to abandon his hazardous, yet hopeless, undertaking. Nevertheless, Gilgamesh persists in his plan, and at last the barmaid directs him to Utnapishtim’s boatman, who has come across from the other side of the sea, where Utnapishtim dwells, and is now in the woods, in search of something. “Him let thy face behold,” she tells Gilgamesh. “[If it is possible,] cross over with him; if it is not possible, turn back (home).” Gilgamesh leaves the goddess and goes to the boatman, who at length agrees to take him along. With much difficulty, the two cross the sea and the waters of death and finally arrive at the shores of the land of blessed Utnapishtim.

When Gilgamesh sees Utnapishtim and notices that this ancient sage is not different from him but that there is, in fact, less life and energy in Utnapishtim than there is in himself, his hope of gaining immortality undoubtedly rises, and he asks Utnapishtim how he entered into the company of the gods and obtained everlasting life. [*H Confirm the motive for this journey: the author/priests are speaking through their protagonist, asking the secret of the gods’ immortality, confessing their own ignorance.*] Thereupon Utnapishtim relates to him at great length the story of the

Deluge, which we [*H have already considered*], and tells him how *he* obtained the boon of immortal life. After that he turns to Gilgamesh and says to him, in effect: “But now as for you, who will assemble the gods to you so that they may confer immortality on you?” [*H This is another admission of failure by the Gilgamesh authors. They appear not to know what Gilgamesh could do to convene the gods and receive their bestowal of immortality as they did with Marduk in the Babylonian Creation Epic. Failing to decode the Deluge, the Gilgamesh authors were also hopelessly unable to syncretize the murderous (figurative) son (Jesus) from the sons of the primal father, Homo sapiens (son of Homo erectus) and the individual as son of both his ongoing competitors and same sex parent.*] After a moment’s reflection, Utnapishtim offers this suggestion: “Come, do not sleep for six days and seven nights.” The meaning of this line appears to be that if he can master sleep, the twin brother of death, he may then be able to master also death itself. [*H Mastering sleep is also symbolic of being as omniscient as “God.”*] But hardly has tired and exhausted Gilgamesh sat down when he falls asleep and sleeps for six days, until Utnapishtim finally wakes him. [*H Here the priests have completely thrown in the towel: “We can’t figure out how to consolidate the gods into one, two or three, and -- because actual immortality is in any case just a hoax -- don’t make childish demands of us.”*]

There now seems to be nothing left for Gilgamesh but to return home. However, just as he departs and his boat is already moving away from the shore, Utnapishtim calls him back and reveals to him a secret of the gods: There is a thorny plant of wondrous power at the bottom of the sea; if he will obtain that plant and eat it when he has reached old age, his life will be rejuvenated. [*H Here the priests are thinking, “If we don’t leave these suckers with some hope of an afterlife, we’re gonna be unemployed! Water bodies and water animals -- especially turtles, water birds and snakes -- have always been sacred for some reason, so the cure for mortality is an herb that grows in the water somewhere.”*] Gilgamesh descends to the bottom of the sea

and obtains the plant. [*H Have you figured out yet why my last statement is true, why the Walam Olum's snake was in the water?*] In the joy of his heart, he now sets out for Uruk, accompanied by Utnapishtim's boatman, who evidently has been banished from the land of Utnapishtim for having brought Gilgamesh to its shores. [*H "So don't any of you fools try to retrace his footsteps."*] However, on the way home Gilgamesh sees a pool of cold water and goes bathing. While he is thus engaged, a serpent perceives the fragrance of the plant, comes up from the water, snatches the plant from him and eats it, and thus gains the power to shed its old skin and thereby to renew its life. [*H Notice that both characters who reject Gilgamesh's bid for immortality were already immortal in myths. But in suggesting that the snakes were a universally sacred symbol of immortal gods owing to their ability to shed their skin, the authors are showing their ignorance again. This is not the reason why snakes were sacred. They were everywhere sacred because they were a symbol for Homo erectus, whose skull looked serpentine from either side.*] Gilgamesh sits down and weeps bitterly, for his last ray of hope has disappeared, his last chance of gaining continued life is gone. But since there is nothing he can do about it, he returns to Uruk; and since he cannot change the course of destiny, he decides to be content with his lot and to rejoice in the work of his hands, the great city that he has built. [*H Perhaps the authors are also hoping to dissuade their king from any foolish beliefs in immortality, beliefs that prompted many a king to leave instructions that wives and courtiers were to be buried alive within his tomb.*]

To this material was added in later days, as we shall see shortly, a story that in some respects is quite incompatible with what precedes. Per this tale, recorded on Tablet XII, Gilgamesh makes two wooden objects of some kind, called *pukku* and *mikkû*, respectively. One day they fall into the underworld, and Gilgamesh is unable to get them up. Finally, Enkidu descends into the underworld to bring them up for him. But unfortunately, he fails to follow the instructions that Gilgamesh has given him and therefore is unable to return to the land of the living.

Gilgamesh then goes from one god to another to have Enkidu released from the realm of the dead so that he may commune with him and find out the worst that is in store for man. At long last Enkidu is permitted to ascend, and, in answer to the questions put to him by Gilgamesh, he tells his friend a rather gloomy tale concerning the conditions in the dark abodes of death. On this sad and somber note the Gilgamesh Epic ends. [*H Though clumsy and contradictory, Tablet XII is an essential element of modern religion. It's an attempt to strengthen the fear of the gods and promote ethical reciprocity. It says, "Do unto others as... or the gods will send you to hell, as they sent Enkidu for killing the bull of heaven."*]

The Gilgamesh Epic was an early attempt to consolidate the gods into "God." But the authors incorporated popular gods only (and inappropriately) into the tale, not into the person of their protagonist. Although Paul could reduce them only to a trinity, he won the cigar for the best effort. Paul, living as he did in Cilicia, the hub of the East-West trade and communications of his day, absorbed the mythology that was carried out of the East -- mostly by soldiers and slaves. He would have learned not only of Gilgamesh but also of *Mithra*, an extremely popular God whose cult goes back at least as early as 1400 B.C. *Mitra* was one of five Indo-Aryan gods mentioned in a treaty between the Hittites and the neighboring Mitanni (Campbell, 1964: 121). Other Aryans brought their Vedic gods to India and Persia.

In Persia, *Mitra* became *Mithra*, the god of goodness, truth and light. His mysteries flowered in the Near East during the Hellenic period,

[A]nd in the Roman period [*H Mithraism*] was the most formidable rival of Christianity both in Asia and in Europe, reaching as far north as to the south of Scotland. In it were offered *seven* degrees of initiation. In the first, the neophyte was known as "Raven" (*corax*), and in the rites the celebrants wore masks representing animals of the zodiac... The orbits of the *seven* visible spheres -- Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn -- were conceived as so many envelopes around the earth, through which the soul had descended when coming to be born.

The individual had derived from each a specific temporal-spatial quality, which on the one hand contributed to his character, but on the other, was a limitation. Hence, the *seven* stages of initiation were to facilitate passages of the spirit, one by one, beyond the *seven* limitations, culminating in a realization of the unqualified state. -- Campbell, 1964: 255-6

Here we see a magical, astrological attempt to unite the gods and the individual ego into "God." Perhaps it was from this astrological array of sacred animals, that Paul sensed that the gods included an enormous number of ancestral *victims*.

In any case, the greatest assistance that "Mithra" provided to Paul and his "Jesus" was the aspect of Mithra's birth and lineage. Like Jesus, like the combined would-be and actual killers of the ongoing and the prehistoric objects of the godhead, Mithra was half earthly and half divine, half man and half spirit. He was said to have sprung as a naked child, with knife in hand, from a generative rock that was beside a sacred stream and beneath a sacred tree and upon which a virgin sat. Like three universal objects of the godhead, Mithra was prehistoric and of the "spirit world." He was said to have been fathered by the sun god. This supernatural birth and divine parentage begs the question as to the new "God's" immortality and powers. *With this device, the Mithra cult solved one of the two great problems that had beset Gilgamesh.*

Other cults had similarly celebrated "Virgin births" occurring on December 25 -- winter solstice time when the providence of the gods was most needed to bring back the sun, which until then arises and sets further away on the horizon each day. *Dusares*, a Greek and Roman deity, was said to have been born of a sun god and a virgin Earth-goddess. The similarity of *Dusares'* festival at Petra (southwest Jordan) to one at Alexandria, Egypt divulges its meaning. The rites of *Dusares* and the *Cronia* both occurred on the night of December 25; and, in the *Cronia*, "an image of a babe was taken from the temple sanctuary and greeted with loud acclamation by the worshippers, saying, 'the Virgin has begotten.'" (Cf. Langdon: 18.) This ceremony was preceded on the fifth of December by one in which the Virgin was magically inseminated by "a god of the underworld." An image of "Aion" was dug up from beneath the ground, paraded *seven* times around the inner sanctuary of the Virgin's ("Core's") temple and then returned to its place beneath the surface of the earth. (Cf. Langdon: 18.) In the ancient

kingdom of Nabataea (West Jordan), where the same rite was celebrated, Langdon determined that the Virgin there, "Allat," had originally been Ishtar. This is another, very strong clue as to the original, quintessential fertility myth that featured this same Ishtar or Ininni annually commuting to and from the underworld. For the benefit of those of you who still don't see it, I'll spell it out in Chapter 36. Even the Sumerians knew of this device. "Sumerian kings frequently proclaimed themselves to be sons of the Virgin-goddess and not infrequently assumed the title 'god,' and even identified themselves with Tammuz," who, in the earliest known of his myths, had a virgin birth by Ishtar. (Cf. Langdon: 157, 98, 113.) This virginal Ishtar sure doesn't sound like the one described in the Gilgamesh Epic and elsewhere does it.

Don't even try to remember all these alleged virgin births. They're not important. What is important is that you know two things. First, the virgin birth was obviously a common device within the mythmaker's bag of tricks. Second, and less obviously, a perfectly syncretized, monotheistic God *must* be born of a virgin. Recall that two of the four universal components and the derived component of the godhead (the primal fathers and the Species War victims and victors) are extinct or dead and of the spirit world. The other two universal components (the competing parent and ongoing genetic competitors) are in the (temporal and material) world. By having a spirit father and a worldly mother, Mithra, Dusares, Jesus or whomever can be associated with all five components of the godhead.

Before leaving Gilgamesh forever, here's a scholarly reconstruction of Enkidu's last days.¹⁵⁰ Before being killed by a mythological primal male, Enkidu is described as follows:

The whole of his body was hairy and his locks were like a woman's, or like the hair of the goddess of grain. Moreover, he knew nothing of settled fields or of human beings, and was clothed like a deity of flocks. He ate grass with the gazelles, jostled the wild beasts at the watering hole, and was content with the animals there. But then a certain hunter came face to face with Enkidu at the

¹⁵⁰ An Assyrian recension of the Gilgamesh epic (c. 650 B.C.) collated with fragments of an older Akkadian (c. 1750 B.C.), as well as a fragmentary Hittite translation of the latter, enabled Campbell to construct this rendition of Enkidu. Campbell relied upon Heidel, Speiser, King and Langdon.

watering place, and beholding him, the face of the hunter became motionless. He returned in fear to his father. "My father," he said, "there is a man with the strength of a god who ranges with the beasts over the hills, whom I dare not approach. He has torn up the traps that I set for the animals of the plain." The father advised going to Gilgamesh for aid, and when Gilgamesh was apprised of the marvel, "Go, my hunter," he said; "take along with you a temple prostitute, and when he comes to the watering hole, with the beasts, let her throw off her clothes, disclose her nakedness, and when he sees, he will approach her; and the beasts that grew up with him on his plain will thereafter desert him." [*H Confirm the purpose of the temple prostitutes.*]

The hunter and temple prostitute set forth, and...reached the watering place. One day they sat; two days; and on the next the beasts arrived, Enkidu among them, "There he is," the hunter said. "Make [*H love to him*] ...His beasts that grew on his plain will desert him when he is knowing you in love." The woman [*H disrobed; and after six days and seven nights of making love,*] ...he turned his face toward the beasts. But on seeing him, they ran off... It was not as before.¹⁵¹

Enkidu returned to the woman and, sitting at her feet, gazed up into her face; as she spoke, his ears gave heed, "You are beautiful, Enkidu, like a very god," she said to him. "Why do you run with the beasts of the plain? Come, I will take you to the ramparts of Uruk, the holy temple city of Anu and Ishtar, where Gilgamesh dwells, unmatched in might, who, like a wild bull, wields power over men." And as he heard, his heart grew light. He yearned for a friend, "Very well!" he said. "I shall challenge him. Shouting, I shall cry out in Uruk: 'I am he who is mighty and changes destinies, he who was born mighty on the plains!'" --Campbell, 1964: 88-9

¹⁵¹ As we'll see in Volume 2, the mythmakers are projecting unto the other animals and Enkidu the changes that occurred in us due to exterminating *Homo erectus*, our link with the animal kingdom, and expunging our memory of him.

This anecdote is all about our animal/great ape alienation. Once the other animals associate Enkidu (a *Homo erectus* man) with the (*Homo sapien*) prostitute, they all fear him as they fear us. I have already described this alienation as our Second Mask, which masks our animal being and makes us the monsters of the natural world. These authors are aware of that alienation, but they are so crazy as to suggest that it's a virtue! I've told you that this alienation, this Second Mask, resulted from the Species War, but I did not explain precisely how. Have you connected the dots? If not, our Greek ancestors will help you do so when we get to their Chapter 23. (You should thoroughly understand that the First Mask, which masks our greatest love [for our siblings and opposite-sex parent], resulted from our imperfect transitions to exogamy [following the primal deed] and monogamy [during the Neolithic]. The First Mask enables us to pretend that our love for an outside-the-family partner is greater than it is and prepares us for our unhappy marriages.)

As a final and summary reflection upon Gilgamesh, notice that it describes nothing but friendship between Gilgamesh and Enkidu, the symbols for the two subspecies. They share responsibility for the primal deed. No Species War metaphor is mentioned except "the Flood," a screen memory; and the source of Utnapishtim's immortality is ignored. I have underestimated the insight of the Gilgamesh priests. They tried to root the Species War out of our memories by writing it out of our mythology (oral history). Of course, this was too obvious and gigantic a lie for the ids, the truth-demanding agency, of most ancestor's minds, to tolerate. Moreover, the K and R class struggle, the ongoing aspect of the Fraternal Complex, daily reminds us otherwise. But this gigantic religious lie, expunction of the Species War, was initially motivated by fear of the Homo erectus gods after the Great Flood of 14,634 years BPE, a catastrophe thought to have been brought by them as punishment. Several thousand years later, during the permanent Neolithic, it was necessary to support the huge lies about Homo erectus survivors ("the black-headed people," "primates newly-created by the Anunnaki") and their enslavement. Finally, it is unlikely that churches will ever be separate from the states that tolerate them.

To syncretize our mythology and our complexes, it only remained for Paul to combine the above devices and to improve upon them. He had to condense the actual and potential victims into "the Father," condense actual and potential killers into "the Son," authorize the

universally adopted “Holy Spirit” to enforce the dead fathers’ will, and slake the Father’s thirst for revenge by sacrificing the Son. As we’ll see in Chapter 36, the Babylonian Creation Epic, which summarized prehistory amazingly well and was known throughout the old Persian Empire, showed why this condensation of victims into Father and victors into Son was logical and historically accurate.¹⁵²

Jesus eclipsed Gilgamesh and Mithra in the West. Fraternal, all-male Mithra cults began to rapidly close their sacred caves when, in 353 or 354 A.D., Pope Liberius rescheduled Christmas to absorb the festival of Mithra’s (winter solstice) birth from the rock.

In the Mid-East, it was a different story. The popularity and familiarity of Gilgamesh, Mithra and the Apsû-Tiamat-Enki-Anu-Enlil-Marduk series (the Babylonian Creation Epic, which did a consummate job of summarizing our prehistory) posed a barrier to the spread of Christianity. These cults kept Jesus from capturing the imaginations of Mid-Easterners. *It was simply too easy for Mid-Easterners to see how “Jesus” had come into being.* In fact, cosmopolitan Mid-easterners were so familiar with priestly attempts at syncretism that they had probably developed immunity to all creative mythology. Yet, for the sake of trade and empire, an abstract, non-cannibal and monotheistic “God” was still needed. Consequently, the monotheistic God of western Asia could only be created by virtually discarding our mythological heritage (oral history) and installing “God” by fiat. This is exactly what Muhammad did. He simply insisted *ad infinitum*, “There is no other god but Allah.” Muhammad’s only bases for the monotheistic fiat were two claims: that the angel of “God,” “Gabriel,” had come to him in his cave and told him as much; and that all the other popular Judeo-Christian figures were prophets with the same message. (This late into the historical period, circa 610 A.D., belief in traditional, faith-confirming miracles was waning.) So, Muhammad said it; the angel had told him, and that’s that. Case closed. Nomads of the season-less desert, with little sense of history but recently and fortuitously drawn into the commercial world, believed it and imposed it upon the most ancient but tired civilizations that were

¹⁵² Cyrus the Great and his successors granted Babylonians and other conquered peoples religious freedom. This Persian respect was due, at least in part, to Persia also bordering upon and ultimately absorbing the mountains where Ninurta slayed all the various monsters (prosecuted the Species War). Although I lack the space for a chapter on Iran, be assured that Ahura Mazda’s pagan predecessor and the monsters he killed are the counterparts of Sumerian Ninurta and the dragons of primeval chaos.

their neighbors. Educated and thinking people of Islamic countries who dared to question the faith have been getting killed for their apostasy ever since.

This completes our interpretation of the world's deluge myths. We have found much to verify what we deduced from our first proof by contradiction. We have every reason to believe that these various deluge myths screened out the memories of the Species War of circa 75-35 kya. We already know that the enabling weapon was the bow and arrow. I've told you and shown evidence to suggest that the Great Flood actually occurred, that everyone believed it to have been brought by the *Homo erectus* gods as punishment for the Species War. This close connection between the two traumas in the minds of our ancestors and their fear of the gods is what caused the later trauma (the Flood) to be used as a cover for the earlier one (the Species War).

Let's seek now to verify the reverse line of reasoning that our proof by contradiction logic suggests. Let's start now with the recognition of a crime. Tens, probably hundreds of thousands, maybe even millions of *Homo erecti* have disappeared. They certainly haven't been in hiding all this time. They couldn't have all been wiped out by disease. Any natural calamity that eliminated all of them would have eliminated our immediate ancestors too. Their only competitor and potential predator was *Homo sapien*. We must assume that they were murdered and our only suspect is *Homo sapien*.

Let's filter the rest of the suspect's religious myths and rituals, concentrating on the cul-de-sacs, paying special attention to peoples and regions that have given us Deluge myths. If our Deluge hypothesis is correct, we'll be able to build a compelling case against our suspect.

We hope to find additional evidence indicating that the bow and arrow was the murder weapon. We hope too to discover what happened to the victims' bodies. We know that many of the corpses were eaten; and in the colder climes, some of the bones would have been used for fuel. But there had to have been an awful lot of bodies and bones. Why are there, as Richard Leakey points out, no *Homo erectus* bone piles? Where is the archaeological evidence for the massacres?

On our stops in the Americas, we'll also be looking for more proof that the half of our first family that we left in Africa didn't just huddle around campfires, smoke dope and chase the animals. We'll be looking for more proof that they were the first people to migrate to and settle the Americas. In the coming chapters, I will also show you the exact date and the actual cause of the Great Flood.

PART III: WHODUNIT



CHAPTER 20: THE BIBLE OR ‘NEVER PLAY POKER WITH A PRIEST’

It ain't necessarily so... --Ira Gershwin

Let's go further in Genesis and the Pentateuch. Our Hebrew ancestors must have had something more to say about *Homo erectus*. After all, the Biblical flood myth indicates more than just a Great Flood. It is also a screen memory that completely blocked out the most decisive events in the life of man, the Species War that started in Lower Mesopotamia. The Hebrews were probably descended from individuals who were peripheral to or supportive of the first Sumerians. The first Sumerians -- from what the mythological record suggests -- waged the first victorious positional warfare battles against *Homo erectus*.

In the Marduk myth, the biblical book of *Revelations* and in the archaeological artifacts for lower Mesopotamia, we've seen unmistakable evidence that the *Homo erecti* were not all immediately eliminated. Some were used as slaves and survived for many thousands of years. Whether the intervening years between the Deluge and the final elimination of *Homo erectus* were peaceful or involved continuous violence to which most *Homo sapiens* had become habituated, *Homo erectus'* final elimination would have been assimilated into the oral history of Near-Eastern peoples.

The *last* massacres of *Homo erectus* had less time for telling and retelling. Fewer generations and fewer superegos would have distorted this more recent oral history. We can expect to find such myths about the last days of *Homo erectus* in the later chapters of Genesis and the other books of the Pentateuch (the "Book of Moses," the most sacred oral history of the Hebrews). We can expect these myths to be less like fairy tales or screen memories and much more like rationalized but detailed accounts of genocide. In examining them, we will be looking for bloody deeds, embellished with defense mechanisms and described in such detail as to relate everything but the identity of the victims.

There was only one way to hide the Homo erectus identity of victims and simultaneously make the Pentateuch appear to be an honest, well-written, chronological history beginning with the first people ("Adam and Eve"). To continue the cover-up, Homo erectus victims had to appear to be either descended from Adam and Eve or their sole flood-surviving descendants, Noah and his wife. In the very

first (floodless) Species War myth, the story of Cain and Abel, that is exactly what the authors of the Pentateuch did. The two sons, Cain and Abel, were said to have been born to Adam and Eve. Here's the story:

Two sons, Cain and Abel, were born to Adam and Eve. Cain, the eldest, became a tiller of the soil; Abel became a shepherd. Cain made sacrifice from his field; Abel from his flock. But Cain's sacrifice was not accepted. Enraged, Cain slew his brother Abel. The Lord then punished Cain by making the earth, which had received his brother's blood, unfruitful, by condemning him to wander and by hiding his (the Lord's) face from Cain.

Laughably transparent! Except for the age switching explained below; this story is a perfect Species War allegory. *First*, Abel, the victim, symbolizes Neanderthal. Both were hunters. His murderer, Cain, symbolizes *Homo sapiens*. Both Cain and *Homo sapiens* were closely related to and more modern than their victims. (Cain's farming post-dates Neanderthal's hunting.)

Second, as I've said, obsessional deluge fear, guilt and paranoia haunted many of our prehistoric ancestors and made nomads of them. Like "Cain," they wandered longer than necessary for subsistence.

Third, God's face must be hidden from Cain and his descendants, as it is from all religious peoples. This is so because "the gods" have always been neurotic symptoms, compromise formations, projections of ancestors and relatives toward whom we have repressed ambivalence. To identify these ancestors and relatives is to bring "God" and "Devil" down to Earth, to force believers to recognize our most universal problems, our strong ambivalence toward the elements of the godhead. Basic insights such as this require immediate change in the individuals who make them. Yet, as we'll see, the changes necessary to resolve our ambivalence toward ongoing genetic competitors (an essential element of the godhead) were not possible until recent times. Moreover, "God's" face is not a very pretty one. In part, it is a Neanderthal face. So, "God's" face has had to remain hidden. Forgive me if I'm killing your "God," but we're approaching a point where it's either "Him" or us.

Continuing with the story, when Cain protested that anyone who encountered him in his wanders would kill him, God put a protective mark on him. Although a more detailed description of the mark is missing, religious fundamentalists all over the world have filled in the blanks. All over the world, religious fundamentalists have been known to put marks --especially black (guilty) marks --on their foreheads. Cuchulain, the mightiest Irish hero, "when his battle rage is on him,"

has a light that shines from his forehead. (Undoubtedly, *Homo erectus*' forehead was different than ours.) "God" is thus expected to protect or cause his wrath to pass over the person whose forehead is marked. The rationale for this is that "God" will recognize him as a pious person who has made his sacrifices, admitted to his guilt and implored mercy of his primordial and would-be, contemporary victims.

Turbans are a variation of the same obsession. The first turban-wearers were personating the head-injured *Homo erectus* gods to avoid their wrath. If you think that this statement is purely speculative, notice that a whole class of Species War victims are said in the lengthy myth of *Lugal-e* to have "had their heads beat in" with maces. (See the myth, which is too long to be included in this work; or see footnote 104.)

Yarmulkes help God spot his chosen people. Similar to turbans, the first ones may have simulated the bun at the back of *Homo erectus*' head.

Observe one final thing about the myth of Cain and Abel. Cain's sentence indicates ambivalence. "God" condemns him to struggle and to wander --but he is not to be killed. As I've explained (after Maccoby, above), the ambivalence that is felt toward the victim rubs off on his killer. To the extent that the *Homo erecti* were loved, we hated our own champions who killed them. To the extent that the *Homo erecti* were hated, we loved our champions who killed them. Thus, the Species War victors joined the ranks of the ambivalent and immortal gods. Similarly, owing to our ambivalence toward other human beings, executioners are always somewhat sacred (objects of extreme ambivalence). Like Jesus, they contract the ambivalence we feel for their victims.

Finally, Yoel Rak justifies the myth naming Abel as the younger brother. Rak and other paleoanthropologists have concluded from their excavations at Tabun and Skhul caves in Israel, that Neanderthals came flooding out of Europe and into the Levant during the glacial phase that lasted from 90-70,000 y. a. (Practically speaking, the Mid-East and Africa were one during the cold parts of the Ice Age when much more water was locked up in polar ice caps. See V2, Figure 46a.) Rak *et al.* believe that Neanderthals displaced our immediate ancestors from the prime living sites over which they had enjoyed exclusive possession at least during the last few thousand years of this time period.

That Neanderthal came pouring out of the northern-most latitudes as the depths of the Ice Age approached is likely. That he displaced *Homo sapiens* at this time in the prime living sites to which *Homo*

sapiens had had *exclusive* control seems most *unlikely*. I very much doubt that, from 90-75 kya, there would have been enough of us, *in Homo sapiens-dominated groups, to take and retain possession of any site outside of our first settlement at Lake Victoria*. When *Homo sapiens* did take exclusive possession of preferred Levantine living sites, it would have had to have been after our victory at and dissemination from Ur. That could only have been in the last few thousand years of the 90-70 kya period he mentions. To suggest otherwise is to play to the peanut gallery, to the Zionist wishful thinking and denial syndrome that says, “God ordained that the ‘Holy Land’ be ours.” As we shall soon discover, this wishful thinking and denial syndrome has been characteristic of the Habiru/Hapiru (Hebrews) since they first became constituted as a group.¹⁵³ Going forward in Genesis and the Pentateuch...

Many of the stories that are compiled in Genesis appear to describe the fourteenth and fifteenth century migration of the Habiru from Mesopotamia to Canaan. (See pages 310 to 311, above.) Langdon and more recent scholars have been able to infer this from fragmentary Mesopotamian records and what is emerging as a worldwide population collapse in the second half of the second millennium B.C. At that time, for reasons still unknown, the growing season shortened, crops failed and peoples invaded and toppled their neighbors in domino-like fashion.

Yet, as I argued during my introduction to the popular, European myth about the Black Thief, none of the violent crimes that men have perpetrated upon one another were as traumatic as “the Deluge.” In prehistoric times, the oral history of violent events between ethnically diverse peoples tended to become blended with unconscious, mythological memories of “the Deluge.” As we might expect, the first part of the Pentateuch appears to have done the same. It appears to blend the memory of the migration of fourteenth and fifteenth century, warlike Habiru, out of Mesopotamia and into Syria and Canaan, with

¹⁵³ Modern humans have been dated by thermoluminescence dating techniques to 92 kya at Qafzeh and Kebara Cave, sites in Israel. The record indicates also that Neanderthal didn't come to stay in the Levant until 74 kya when he poured out of Europe fleeing the glacial cold. See Bar-Yosef (p. 604 in Mellars and Stringer) and Shreeve's article in Smithsonian, Dec. 91. However, Professor Bar-Yosef hasn't answered my email; and I suspect that any *Homo sapiens* whose out-of-Africa bones predate 75 kya were not autonomous but lived within *Homo erectus*-dominated groups.

the migration of a much earlier generation of bow and arrow-armed Semites over the same route. This earlier migration was a current in the Deluge of *Homo sapien* civilization that, at the Paleolithic boundary, inundated Eurasia and swept *Homo erectus* from the earth. The loss of oral history over time and the editorial labor of many generations of priests and scribes has left only what appears to be a threadbare representation of this earlier Semitic migration. *As you shall see, this thread is the life and travels of Abram (Abraham) and three generations of his descendants.*

There may indeed have been a Semitic warrior named Abraham who was instrumental in directing the war effort. Genesis may contain what remains of his true-life story; but it was not desirable for the compilers to describe, in any detail, “Abraham’s” enemies. That would have undermined the screen memory of the “flood” and threatened to expose the people to a burden of guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia that was apparently too great for their fragile egos.

To understand how traumatic the Deluge was for the early Hebrews, recognition of a single fact suffices. Circa 1300 B.C., when Moses and his followers were supposedly wandering in the Sinai desert, at least 62,000 years after the start of the Species War, “Their religious rites centered on the *Dwelling* (a portable shrine where Moses spoke with God) and on the *Ark of The Covenant* (a portable throne for God’s invisible presence)”¹⁵⁴ [*H emphasis mine*].

The “Dwelling” and the “Ark of the Covenant” constituted a unilateral Hebrew offer to *Homo erectus*: “If You don’t seek vengeance, we will remember You and worship Your spirit.” Even after Moses was allegedly killed and his body disposed of in an unmarked grave somewhere in the Sinai,¹⁵⁵ the Ark of the Covenant was preserved and, several hundred years after Moses’ use of it, surrounded by the immovable temple that Solomon built at Jerusalem. We’ll consider the Ark of the Covenant in greater detail, anon.

The broadly based and widespread enemies of both the Hebrews and the Israelites are all those peoples, genetic competitors, toward whom their myth-makers consciously felt hostile. These enemies could not be described by a common name because they had only two things in common: 1) they were objects of fraternal hostility that men were

¹⁵⁴ See “The Bible and History,” by Paul Jurkowitz, in the *New American Bible*, p. XIV. See also, Exodus 25: 8-22, and 37: 1-9.

¹⁵⁵ See Deuteronomy 34:1-8; and, especially, Freud’s *Moses and Monotheism*, p. 42-43

not conscious of and could not objectively describe; and 2) they all tended to be associated with *Homo erectus*, the prehistoric and emblematic object of our Fraternal Complex. Even if the mythmakers consciously understood this second common attribute of the Hebrew enemies, they dared not divulge it in describing these enemies. The straightforward identification of *Homo erectus* would have killed “God” and would have blown the lid off the Noah's Ark screen memory, off “the Deluge.” This rise in consciousness would have necessitated changes that these primitive ancestors were not able to undergo. Nor could the mythmakers clearly describe any of these various enemies as *Homo sapiens* because many (probably even most) of them weren't. Moreover, to describe them as fellow humans, descendants of “Noah,” would still have caused the Hebrews to acquire guilt, obsessional fear and paranoia--for the murder of other (partially) “chosen” people.

Inevitably the re-tellers and compiling editors of these myths solved their dilemma with compromise formations, names and descriptions that partially describe *Homo erectus* and partially distort him and his place names. Another defense mechanism was to provide all the enemies with ignoble pedigrees. For example, we are told that the Moabites and the Ammonites are descended from Abraham's nephew Lot, due to incestuous relations with his daughters. The non-Jewish Semites are descended from Abraham's son Ishmael whose mother, Hagar, was a secondary wife or concubine. Canaanites, a catchall label for the non-chosen of Palestine who were to be dispossessed, are automatically associated with Cain, another discredited individual, due to the similarity of their names. (See Canaan's brief biography on page 388, below.) This observation leads us directly to another.

Notice that the Hebrew mythmakers gave Adam and Eve a third son, Seth, so that Noah (Seth's descendant) and all the faithful survivors of “the flood” could be disassociated from Cain, a recognized murderer. So, the biblical flood myth dealt in a unified way with both of our great traumas and more metaphorically capped the Species War. The actual Great Flood begot the flood myth, caused the older Cain and Abel myth to become more compromised and isolated its guilt-piquing protagonist (“Cain”) on a barren branch of our mythical, ancestral tree.

Real and distinct place names for places where peoples were exterminated were changed and ultimately forgotten -- except perhaps in the religious accounts that thoroughly rationalized the genocidal acts.

Although I may be the first writer to explain the necessity of the confusing names for peoples and places in the Pentateuch, I am hardly the first to recognize the problem:

The word “Canaanite” is used in the Bible (and today) to denote the non-Israelite population of the land of Canaan. Such a population, however, was neither racially nor politically homogeneous. Culturally and religiously the distinction between “Canaanites” and “Israelites” is hardly less problematic. No racial, material-cultural, or linguistic distinction between “Israelite” and “non-Israelite” is archaeologically or historically meaningful. The only possible definition, that is religious, poses huge problems since many “Israelites” worshipped Baal, while many “Canaanites” may have worshipped Yahweh... The “Canaanites,” as biblically defined, are, frankly, a product of biblical ideology, and they become a problematic entity outside that context. --Rogerson and Davies: 70

Interpretation: “We biblical scholars have despaired of all attempts to define the ‘Canaanites’ and, as you shall see, numerous other groups that are named in the Bible.”

Continuing with Rogerson and Davies (p. 70):

The only workable definitions of “Canaanite” are (a) those born in the land of Canaan (i. e. Palestine), whether Israelite or not [*H e. g. Langdon’s use of the word in Chapter 18*]; or (b) The Phoenicians who were the culturally dominant element in the land of Canaan before the existence of Israel and a major element thereafter, although they were centered outside the land, to the north... This population existed before, during, and after the period of the Israelite and Judaeon monarchy, and consisted of many different racial elements. “Canaan” never made up a political state but it did form prior to the advent of Israel, a social and economic system.

The different racial elements in the land of Canaan are sometimes simply called “Canaanites” (e. g. Judges 1), sometimes Amorites (Genesis 15: 16), and are sometimes enumerated in lists of *seven* (e. g. Deuteronomy 7: 1;

Joshua 3: 10--that gives the inclusive category of “Canaanites” as one of the *seven*!) or even of ten -- including both Canaanites and Amorites as members of the list (e. g. Genesis 10: 15; 15: 19)! Of most of the members of these lists, we know either little or nothing. Of Girgashites or Perizzites, for instance; mention is totally lacking outside the Bible. Jebusites, so far as we can tell, are the pre-Judaeen inhabitants of Jerusalem. [H *This Canaanite sub-group merged with the Hebrews after David conquered them.*] Hivites may be Hurrians (non-Semitic, originally from far to the Northeast); Horites may not be a racial term; some think it derives from the Hebrew word for “cave” and denotes cave dwellers. [H *Of course, in mythology, caves are everywhere associated with Homo erectus because he lived in them.*] Hittites, of whom we do know a great deal, seem to dwell in the Judaeen hills and to have Semitic names (e. g. Uriah, the husband of Bathsheba). Many scholars doubt whether they are the Anatolian Hittites... It is not impossible that Horite, Hivite, and Hittite are somewhat confused in the Bible. *We are left, out of this confusing potpourri of names, with Amorites, Phoenicians, and Philistines as the major elements of the population of Canaan.* --*Ibid.* p. 70, H *emphasis mine*

“Amorite” is also indefinite. “In the Old Testament, the distinction between Canaanites and Amorites is blurred. Sometimes the term Amorite is a synonym for Canaanite, and sometimes it indicates a separate group. Certain passages suggest that the Amorites were mainly concentrated in the hill areas and the Canaanites on the coastal plain. The Trans-Jordan kingdom of King Sihon that was overrun by the advancing Israelites was termed an Amorite state” (Comay: 348-349).

So, the only well defined, distinct peoples out of all these Canaanite sub-groups are the Philistines and the Phoenicians. The former were Celts and other Indo-European sub-groups who were part of a western-worldwide conflagration that erupted between 1450 and 1150 B.C. We shall discuss this conflagration in greater detail in another chapter. For now, here is Woolley's description of the Philistines and the Phoenicians:

Just after 1200 B.C., there flowed into Asia Minor, from the north, a vast horde of land-seeking immigrants, warriors armed with iron weapons more effective than anything the bronze-users had known, who swarmed across the country killing those who opposed them and forcing into their ranks those who surrendered; their wives and children came with them, carried in heavy covered wagons, for they were seeking a new home in the land of their choice. Hattusas [*H the Hittite capitol in what is now Turkey*] fell before them and was burned, and the Hittite power in Anatolia was wiped out. The invaders crossed the Taurus [*H mountains of southern Turkey*] and marched south, their fleet keeping pace with the land army.¹⁵⁶ Already ‘the islands had been disturbed’ and the northern sea-captains, hiring themselves out as mercenaries, had served under the king of Libya in war against Egypt [*H Woolley is reading Egyptian records. This last statement is the understatement of all time. It now appears that all Crete’s palaces, except that at Knossos, were plundered and burned in 1450. Knossos was only plundered and then reoccupied by Mycenaeans. They made it the capital of new Crete until it was toppled and the palace burned again in 1375. The understatement, “the islands had been disturbed,” no doubt reflects the fact that Troy was apparently not overthrown until later, until 1183 B.C. (Eratosthenes). You will be quite surprised to learn in a later chapter that Homer’s Troy, the original Troy, was not the city that Heinrich Schliemann uncovered on the western coast of Asia Minor. Hissarlik was a latter day Troy. As suggested here, the original Troy was the capitol of an island empire. Note also that the Egyptians refer to “northern” sea captains. As you’ll see, these “sea-captains” and their crews were from an entirely different*

¹⁵⁶ King David may indeed have risen to fame due to a showdown with a champion of the Philistines. The champion may indeed have been a man named Goliath from the city of Gut or Gath; and, if so, it is likely that this Celtic invader possessed iron equipment superior to that of his Hebrew rivals. But the author(s) of the Book of Samuel undoubtedly amalgamated David’s military history with still-extant and grossly compromised oral history of the Species War to produce the disparities in size and weaponry of these two combatants.

neighborhood.]; but now they came with their kinsfolk and their allies, and their aim was not to sack but to seize for themselves that rich Nile land that was a paradise for landless men. They were a mixed crowd, Dananns (Celts) from Cilicia Peleset or Philistines, some of whom had come from Crete [*H after its fall*], the Sherden and the Shekelesh, Turshu and Ekwesh, Lycians and many others unknown, 'their hearts relying on their arms.' They burned Aleppo and Alalakh, Carchemish and Ugarit; they sailed to Cyprus and wasted it, and they made havoc of the Amorite kingdom of southern Syria; only on the borders of Egypt were they defeated, the glory of the day going to the Egyptian bowmen, who shot the enemy down in swathes before they could come to close quarters with their iron rapiers. Egypt was saved, but the invasion, though it failed, had changed the face of the whole Middle East. The epic of Troy deals with one incident of the wars that shook the Aegean world, but the real drama was set upon a far wider stage and had consequences that Homer could not guess. [*H We shall redefine the word "Aegean" in an appendix.*]

In Syria, the Philistines, beaten back from Egypt but not broken, settled down in the fertile coastland of Palestine, leaving only the hill country to the Israelites, who had arrived with the Habiru in the time of Akhenaton and were in possession of the uplands during the reign of Merneptah.¹⁵⁷ In the seaport towns, the old Canaanite-Phoenician population remained, but with a strong leavening of Mycenaean; the latter, inheriting the traditions of Minoan and Mycenaean sea power, virtually took command in such matters and persuaded the Phoenicians to abandon the modest cabotage that had contented them in the past, when Egypt was their main market, and to risk the overseas routes that led to the western Mediterranean, establishing commercial exchanges in Marseilles, Cartagena and Carthage. --Woolley, 1961; 30-31

¹⁵⁷ See the previous footnote about David and Goliath.

Overpopulation and environmental degradation reduce men to unvarnished savagery. The apparent collapse of European agriculture between 1450 and 1100 B.C. precipitated the equivalent of a World War.¹⁵⁸ How much of the world's agriculture was affected by the worsening climate is still unknown. But this social climate of upheaval and the conquest of the Levant by iron-bearing Celts and Cretans is the context within which the Habiru (Genesis) and Israelite (Numbers and Deuteronomy) conquests described in the Pentateuch must be viewed. These migrations and conquests were backwater events that history could easily forget *were it not for another aspect of them, an aspect about which these ancestors virtually confess.*

Now we are ready to review the various conquests of the Habiru and, allegedly, the Israelites (Moses' people) that later books of the Pentateuch (Numbers and Deuteronomy) refer to, conquests in and around the Trans-Jordan area. Except for the addition of Moses and the Israelites and their flight out of Egypt, these more recent accounts of the Pentateuch appear to me to be little contaminated with myth and history from other eras. They are historical -- except for the abuse of names to hide identities and the invention of Moses and the Israelites. In any event, the actual dates are not as important as what is implied about the victims: *most of them appear to have been Neanderthals.*

The peoples most clearly Neanderthals (western *Homo erecti*) are those described as subgroups of the Rephaim -- the "giants." We'll probably never know how late in history pockets of the "Rephaim" may have survived in the Palestine area. But even as late as 1700 B.C. the Trans-Jordan was a sort of no man's land. Five centuries later, the conflagration in and around the eastern Mediterranean enabled the little nation of Hebrews to wax supreme within a power vacuum.

"The records of Egyptian raids in Palestine, with their lists of booty, imply that the southern towns were richer and more prosperous than the results of excavation suggest; but for some reason or other the country had deteriorated; and while the Trans-Jordan had become almost entirely a nomad land, the Canaanite towns, except for those on the coast, were much reduced in status" (Woolley, 1961: 26).

It is the "nomad lands," least accessible to navigable waterways and least arable that would have afforded *Homo erectus* his last sanctuaries. *These are the kinds of lands that Hammurabi would have*

¹⁵⁸ Although the details and the extent of it are still sketchy, a similar collapse probably occurred in the fourth century B.C. (See footnote 58 of v2.)

so generously set aside for “the black-headed people.” These were also the lands that the Habiru and alleged Israelites, fleeing military caste societies or slavery in Egypt and starvation in the desert (respectively), stormed.

Allow me to summarize this amalgam of early Species War and late second millennium B.C. [Habiru and (allegedly) Israelite] conquests that are reported in the Pentateuch, conquests that we are about to consider. Except for the Phoenicians (a largely-Semitic and early sea-faring people who absorbed the survivors from Crete and many of their Mycenaean, pirate conquerors) and except for the Philistines who were the iron-possessing, Celts and other Indo-Europeans who had overrun Asia minor and the Levantine coast; almost nothing is known about the *seven* peoples that the Bible refers to as Canaanites.¹⁵⁹ According to the Bible, many of these Canaanite groups were slaughtered and dispossessed by the “chosen people,” our Habiru and Israelite ancestors.

The mystery of these peoples’ identity is no accident. The greater our ambivalence toward an associate the greater is our need to repress the negative impulses or, once turned into deeds--the identity of the victim. Most of these victims of the Habiru and alleged Israelites are vaguely categorized as (or as allies of) the *Rephaim* -- a race of giants. The Rephaim had to be Neanderthals.

As we read on in the Bible, we’ll find numerous accounts of peoples victimized by genocide, victims described as giants in accounts that include sundry subtle references to a Species War. All these accounts support my theses. OK, back to Genesis now for the life of Abraham, the apparent John Wayne and Adnon Cashogi of Hebraic prehistory.

Chapter 10, the “Table of the Nations,” seems to tell us not just of the spread of Noah’s descendants but of the spread of the bow and arrow. Wherever the weapon went, *Homo erectus* was conquered and permanent *Homo sapien* settlements were established.

Chapter 11, “The Tower of Babel” myth, seeks to explain the rapid loss of the once-common *Homo erectus* language (Sanskrit or something close to it). “God’s anger or jealousy with their growing powers” is said to cost *Homo sapiens* their once-common language.

¹⁵⁹ Professor Albright informs us that “Amorite” probably was a Sumerian word meaning “westerner.” The nomadic Semites who started pouring into the lower Tigris and Euphrates River Valley circa 3000 B.C. were apparently *not* the same people as the “Amorites” who are slaughtered in the book of Deuteronomy.

This is a compromised way of saying that the loss of the common language was punishment for the Species War. Of course, this loss was an accidental but inevitable result of the holocaust and of bow and arrow-armed *Homo sapiens* fanning out in different directions and settling in isolated communities.¹⁶⁰ In “[Glooskap’s Departure from the World](#),” which we read above, our Micmac ancestors confirmed what our Semitic ancestors are telling us here. Later generations of Micmacs projected our loss of a common language onto the animals: “And after they ceased to see him, they still heard his voice as he sang; but the sounds grew fainter and fainter in the distance, and at last they wholly died away; and then deep silence fell on them all, and a great marvel came to pass, and the beasts, who had till now spoken but one language, were no longer able to understand each other, and they fled away, each his own way, and never again have they met together in council.”

This interpretation of “The Tower of Babel” is supported by the name of the tower. “Bel” was Babylonian for “Lord,” for the sun god. “Babel” meant “the gateway of the sun god.” (Cf. Comay: 24.) As subsequent chapters will clarify, the “sun god” was the *Homo erectus* or (later) *Homo sapien* chief or symbol for the Species Warriors.

In Chapter 12, in “Abram’s Call and Migration,” Abram (Abraham) leaves Haran (a place to which his father, Terah, had apparently uneventfully migrated from Ur [our first city, near Babylon]). He goes as the Lord directs him, to the land of Canaan. He goes with his wife/sister Sarai,¹⁶¹ his brother’s son Lot, his possessions and “*the persons they had acquired in Haran.*”¹⁶² Was he going with an army?

Canaan is first introduced as the discredited son of Ham (Genesis 9:22-7). Canaan was condemned to slavery for his father’s failure to cover his grandfather’s naked body. Slavery and the designation of his father as “Ham,” suggests that the Bible is referring to the Hamitic-speaking people of Northern Africa.¹⁶³ “Naked body” undoubtedly refers to the tendency of primitive savages in tropical and subtropical climates to remain unclothed. It subsequently appears that the name “Canaanite” becomes loosely used to refer to anyone who is disliked

¹⁶⁰ In Chapter 36 we will discover that an Akkadian myth carries the same message in different metaphors.

¹⁶¹ Sarai, later “Sarah,” was Abram’s half-sister and wife. In primitive and ancient times, it was commonplace for pharaohs, kings and other powerful persons to marry their sisters. This ought to tell us something about us.

¹⁶² Haran was an ancient city in the upper valley of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

¹⁶³ Compare the footnotes to Genesis 9, 18-27; and 10, 1-32 in the Catholic text.

by the Jews or stands in their way or whose ignoble pedigree makes him a candidate for slavery.

Reading on, in Genesis 12:10-20, or more precisely, in an earlier myth, the history of which forms the substrate of this one, did Abram originally go to Egypt to deliver the bow and arrow? Perhaps it was for this service to “Pharaoh” (the Egyptians), and not for the loan of his beautiful wife/sister to the royal harem (as stated), that Abram “received flocks and herds, male and female slaves, male and female asses and camels” (Upper Paleolithic rewards of some kind). After all, Abram and Sarai supposedly went to Egypt because of the famine in Canaan. How beautiful can a starving female be? How much can one starving female be worth? And why would Pharaoh feel obliged to reward her starving brother so dearly for her? There is at least one other possible interpretation of this story.

Instances of Sarai going as Abram's “sister” into the households of other leaders (Genesis 20:1-18; and 12:10-20) may have originally told of subversive activities of *Homo sapien* women within the *Homo erectus* camp. The same story line is repeated in Genesis 26: 6-14, this time with Isaac's great beauty, Rebekah. We have every reason, archaeological and mythological, to believe that Neanderthal had the hots for our gals. In each passage, Abram (or Isaac) grows rich in land and animals at the expense of the alien ruler who has been entertained by Sarai (or Rebekah). Perhaps fear of the *Homo erectus* gods after the Flood prompted the editing, and the original war and espionage story was overwritten with the theme of the evolving injunction to be monogamous. Our pagan ancestors generally wanted no part of monogamy. Their polygamous marriages are evinced everywhere by the lodge-houses of primitive group marriages and by matriliney.

Later, when Abram's wife/sister Sarai gives birth to Isaac, she insists that Isaac shall be Abram's sole heir. This meant that Abram's older son Ishmael had to go. Abram begot Ishmael by Sarai's maidservant, Hagar, after childless Sarai gave Hagar to him. (There are only good people in the Bible!) So, Hagar and Ishmael, cast out in the wilderness, are saved by God. God promises to make of Ishmael a great nation. Then Genesis 21: 20 concludes, “God was with the boy as he grew up. He lived in the wilderness and became an expert bowman...” Did Ishmael make a great nation by using his bow to hunt prairie dogs, or did he use his bow to eliminate *Homo erectus* and take his land?

Every passage in Genesis, wherein sacrifices are made to the Lord, and wherein the Lord promises vast lands and the progeny of nations to his chosen favorites, is likely to suggest a battle over territory -- the earliest of which would have been between bow and arrow-armed *Homo sapiens* and *Homo erectus*. We find such passages in Genesis 10:11, 12:1-9, 13:14-18 and 19:23-29. (In this last instance, Abram and his people had made the sacrifice of their foreskins in Chapter 17.)

That this was so with respect to Abraham and Genesis 12:1-9 and 13:14-18, and that Abram possessed an army is revealed by 14:14-15:

When Abram heard that his nephew [*H Lot*] had been captured [*H by an army of 5 kings*], he mustered three hundred and eighteen of his retainers, born in his house, and went in pursuit as far as Dan. He and his party deployed against them at night, defeated them, and pursued them as far as Hobah, which is north of Damascus.

The Bible lists the five kings whom Abraham defeated as Amraphel king of Shinar (perhaps Sumer), Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam and Tidal king of nations. Now, I have no idea who most of these people are. But five (5) associates with the five fingers of the hand, with work. Defeating them was apparently a tough job. Elam was a rich and powerful kingdom in southwestern Iran that dominated the lower valley briefly between the fall of Akkad c. 2180 and being conquered by Hammurabi c. 1750 B.C. Elam rose again to briefly share power in lower Mesopotamia with the Babylonians after they jointly overthrew the Assyrians (Sennacherib) in 691 B.C. (See Professor Albright.) It is probably this latter period wherein Elam would have been united with Mesopotamian kings and extending its imperial rule into the Levant. This is more than two centuries after the earliest known Hebraic writing. We are in the historical period here; a period totally out of joint with any myth concerning a father of the Hebrew peoples such as Abraham is supposed to have been. Nor could a man with a mere three or four hundred soldiers even dream of making enemies of kings whose armies numbered in the tens of thousands. So, *here we have hard evidence supporting my claim that these early Biblical tales involving Abraham are composites of several mythical (prehistoric) and historical events.*

The tendency of our oral historians to provide their mythical characters with fabulous life spans may reflect in part this

amalgamation of historically disjointed events. The tendency of priests to rationalize and edit out the uncomplimentary is exemplified by the Catholic text's ridiculous footnote for this passage:

Abram the Hebrew [H *appellation used for Abram in 14: 13*]: elsewhere in the Old Testament, until the last pre-Christian centuries, the term "Hebrew" is used only by non-Israelites or by Israelites in speaking to foreigners, since it evidently had a disparaging connotation -- something like "immigrant." The account in this chapter may, therefore, have been taken originally from a non-Israelite source, in which Abraham, a warlike sheik of Palestine, *appears as a truly historical figure of profane history*" [H! *emphasis mine*].

Assuming they're not psychotic, the good Catholic fathers are suggesting that, because this passage came from non-Israelite sources, it is false! The references to Abram and his nephew Lot in Chapter 14 are entirely consistent with 1) their separation in Chapter 13 and Lot's migration to the East, 2) their joint journey to and enrichment in Egypt in Chapter 12, and 3) Lot's introduction as Abram's nephew in 11: 27. Moreover, even if Chapter 14 was written by non-Israelite sources; and even if it were possible for these sources to be worse liars than the authors who wrote some of the other chapters of Genesis, what possible reason have we for not believing them in this instance?

Furthermore, if "sacred history" is totally separate from and independent of "profane history," then why should any of us who are just plain profane folks have ever developed any interest in it? In this footnote, the good Catholic fathers seem to be telling us straight out that, "We define what is sacred (as opposed to profane) history, and sacred history is whatever we want to believe." Here they have crossed over the line of neurosis into psychosis!

After the death of Abraham, in Genesis 25: 7, there appears to be only two more likely references to *Homo erectus* (Neanderthal) in Genesis. The first is Chapter 27, "Jacob's Deception." This is the story wherein Esau, Isaac's older son, becomes disinherited. Here's the story.

Jacob and Esau are the sons of Isaac and Rebekah. Isaac is dying. He favors the older son Esau whose skin is hairy enough for him to be confused with the game that he hunts. Moreover, Esau has married both a Hittite and a Hivite woman. Rebekah favors the younger son

Jacob. She overhears her dying husband instruct Esau to procure meat and prepare a meal to his (Isaac's) liking so that Isaac may give Esau his "special blessing" before he dies. Rebekah urges Jacob, her favorite, to appear first before his blind father, to take Isaac's favorite dish that she hurriedly prepares and to personate Esau by wrapping himself in kidskins. Jacob does so and obtains the special blessing that was meant for Esau. Unable to retract the blessing or bestow an equal one upon Esau, dying Isaac tells Esau to accept disinheritance as his fate.

Now, we know that, at least in one context, Esau is not a *Homo erectus*. Isaac and Rebekah were his parents. Even as a symbol for *Homo sapiens* who intermarry with *Homo erecti* (Hivites?) Esau is compromised because Chapter 36 tells of Esau's grandchildren by the Hittite and Hivite women, and the hybrid offspring of mixed marriages were sterile. Yet the naming of the grandchildren could have been added later due to psychological repression or to increase the descendants of Noah, whom everyone is supposed to descend from, and thereby further develop and support the Noah's Ark screen memory. Remember, the authors and editors of the Pentateuch could not possibly maintain the screen memory and identify subsequent victims of the Israelites without running into contradictions: were all these victims of genocide descendants of Noah or not? And if not, why didn't the flood eliminate them; and who were they?

But the grandchildren notwithstanding, Esau is an excellent metaphor for *Homo erectus*. He is the older of the two brothers, just as *Homo erectus* was the older of the two subspecies. He is hairy as an ape; he is a hunter; and he marries Hittite and Hivite women. As an unconscious metaphor, the whole story indicates repetition compulsion. As a conscious metaphor, the story serves as a rationalization for conscious guilt with respect to our exterminated parent species. ("You see, this sort of thing happens all the time. Jacob wronged his brother Esau. After it happened, Isaac the father upheld the outcome. So, why should God the Father punish us for what we did to Neanderthal?")

We expected to see such conscious and detailed rationalizations in the later part of Genesis, the part corresponding to *Homo erectus*' final days. An even more probable meaning of this story will become apparent later, when in Deuteronomy we discover the callousness with which the Israelites commit their atrocities.

The last story in Genesis that may relate to Neanderthal/*Homo erectus* is a most pathetic one, Genesis 34, "The Rape of Dinah." If it does reflect the desperate pleas of the last members of our father

species, pleas to be accepted and spared from extinction, then the guilt that our Hebrew ancestors subsequently acquired is awesome. Here's the story.

Dinah was the daughter of Leah and Jacob. Shechem, son of Hamor the “Hivite,” who was chief of the region, raped her. The footnote in our text for Genesis 33: 19 informs us that Hamor was regarded as the eponymous ancestor of the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Shechem.

Since he was strongly attracted to Dinah, daughter of Jacob, indeed was really in love with her, he endeavored to win her affection. Shechem also asked his father Hamor, “Get me this girl for a wife.” --Genesis 34: 3-4

Where have we heard this theme before?

Now Hamor, father of Shechem, went out to discuss the matter with Jacob, just as Jacob’s sons were coming in from the fields. When they heard the news, the men were shocked and seethed with indignation. What Shechem had done was an outrage in Israel; such a thing could not be tolerated. (Cf. Genesis 34: 6-7.)

Far be it from the good people that we’ve been reading about!

Hamor appealed to them, saying: “My son Shechem has his heart set on your daughter. Please give her to him in marriage. *Intermarry with us; give your daughters to us. The land is open before you; you can settle and move about freely in it and acquire landed property here*” --Genesis 34: 8-10, H *emphasis mine*

Doesn’t this strike you as somewhat unusual for the founders of a place to beg incoming immigrants to accept them and intermarry with them (the founders)? When has this ever happened in America or between *Homo sapiens anywhere*?

Then Shechem, too, appealed to Dinah’s father and brothers: “Do me this favor, and I shall pay whatever you demand of me. No matter how high you set the bridal price,

I shall pay you whatever you ask; only give me the maiden in marriage” (Genesis 34: 11-12).

Did Shechem actually rape her, or is she still a maiden? And if he didn't rape her, was that detail later prefixed to the story to assuage *Homo sapien* guilt? If you think this familiar theme is pathetic as is, just listen to the rest of it:

Jacob's sons replied to Shechem and his father with guile, speaking as they did because their sister Dinah had been defiled. “We will agree with you only on this condition, that you become like us by having every male among you circumcised. Then we will give you our daughters and take yours in marriage; we will settle among you and become one kindred people with you” (Genesis 34: 15-16).

So, all the able-bodied men of the town agreed, at Hamor's and Shechem's urging, to become circumcised.

On the third day, while they were still in pain, Dinah's full brothers Simeon and Levi, two of Jacob's sons, took their swords, advanced against the city without any trouble, and massacred all the males. (Genesis 34: 25)

Here is another indication that Abraham or his great grandsons had an army at their disposal. Surely Simeon and Levi did not defeat a city of men by themselves!

And for a single rape, would this degree of retribution be wrecked upon any *Homo sapien* community? Could these victims have been any people other than *Homo erecti*?

If my interpretation of Genesis is correct, if Abraham's conquests describe the start and the Israelite conquests the conclusion of the Species War in the Levant, then “Canaanite” was a catchall term for all the “non-chosen” (i. e. less criminally-inclined) who were either Homo erecti or were willing to live peacefully with the Homo erecti.

If so, then some of the other, less-used, unidentifiable group names in the Bible may describe people not per geography, ethnicity or culture but per their social or political relations with *Homo erectus*. A Delaware myth told us that they too lived peacefully with the “Jins” until the coming of hard times. The Chinese myth of the great Yao and

the Babylonian inscription about Hammurabi each claimed that these rulers had tried to live in peace with the (remaining) “black-headed people.” Supposedly, Hammurabi assigned surviving “black-headed people” to certain lands (inferior lands, of course).

Turn with me now to the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, the last two books of the Pentateuch. Here we’ll find more confirmation that some of our immediate ancestors were willing to live in peace with Neanderthal. *If, as I believe, the warfare described after the Exodus of the Jews from Egypt followed that Exodus historically, then Communities of Homo erecti lived peacefully with some of our immediate ancestors and survived --not only well into Neolithic (post 10 kya) times but also -- until the fourteenth century B.C., until almost the end of the Bronze Age!*

As Moses (Midianite Moses II) and the Israelites were leaving the desert and preparing to do battle with people whose land they needed, he sent twelve scouts ahead to reconnoiter:

Going by way of the Negeb, they reached Hebron, where Ahiman, Sheshai and Talmai, *descendants of the Anakim*, were living (Numbers 13: 22, *H emphasis mine*).

After reconnoitering the land for forty days they returned, [*H Perhaps they weren't sure which side of the coming battle lines they wanted to be on!*] met Moses and Aaron and the whole community of the Israelites in the desert of Paran at Kadesh... They told Moses: “We went into the land to which you sent us. It does indeed flow with milk and honey, and here is its fruit. [*H They hand Moses some grapes that they have stolen.*] However, the people who are living in the land are fierce, and the towns are fortified and very strong. [*H If they were so fierce, why did these scouts enjoy their hospitality for forty days?*] Besides, we saw descendants of the Anakim there. Amalekites live in the region of the Negeb; Hittites, Jebusites and Amorites dwell in the highlands, and Canaanites along the seacoast and the banks of the Jordan.”

Caleb [*H one of the scouts*], however, to quiet the people toward Moses, said, “We ought to go up and seize the land, for we can certainly do so.” But the men who had gone up with him said, “We cannot attack these people; they are too strong for us.”

So, they spread discouraging reports among the Israelites about the land they had scouted, saying, “The land that we explored is a country that consumes its inhabitants. And all the people we saw there are huge men, veritable giants [*the Anakim were a race of giants*]; we felt like mere grasshoppers, and so we must have seemed to them.” --Numbers 13: 27-33, *H emphasis mine*

It sounds as if all the scouts, except “Caleb,” want to dissuade their people from committing acts of aggression and genocide. But, of course, a starving man has no morals; so, they try to scare them into doing the right thing.

The Biblical footnote for this passage says that, “Anakim (were) an aboriginal race in southern Palestine, largely absorbed by the Canaanites before the Israelite invasion. Either because of their tall stature or because of the massive stone structures left by them, the Israelites regarded them as giants” [*H more wild priestly imagination*].

Isn't this charming! They are saying: they were aboriginal, and others absorbed them; so, forget about them, and don't call it genocide.

Regarding the massive stone structures, Appendix D will convince you that our *Homo sapien* ancestors built all but possibly the simplest of the stone circles. These are called cromlechs in Western Europe.

But why would the Israelites choose to pick on the Anakim, a race of giants, and choose their land to steal -- unless the Anakim were different enough as to not arouse sympathy and attract allies to their defense? And might that not just be because they were of a different sub-species? The only people who would be universally and inexorably perceived as genetic competitors by our ancestors and consequently as unsympathetic characters would be people of another subspecies, people incapable of permanently blending their genes with ours.

Deuteronomy reviews these events before carrying the history forward. Deuteronomy (1: 28) repeats that the scouts saw the Anakim in the land ahead. In Chapter 2: 4-9, Moses counsels the Israelites not to steal the property of or to fight with peoples that are kinsmen. Who are the kinsmen? Kinsmen are all the descendants of Noah. Non-kinsmen, those “destroyed by the Deluge,” Neanderthals and other *Homo erecti*, were fair game. Listen to the continuation of this same theme:

Formerly the Emim lived there [H in the land where the descendants of Lot, son of Haran, nephew of Abram, were found to be living], a people strong and numerous and tall like the Anakim; like them they were considered Rephaim. It was the Moabites who called them Emim. In Seir, however, the former inhabitants were the Horites; the descendants of Esau dispossessed them, clearing them out of the way and taking their place, just as the Israelites have done in the land of their heritage that the Lord has given them. --Deuteronomy 2: 10-13, H emphasis mine

The same theme is repeated in Deuteronomy 2: 16-23. Every existent group has replaced another group; and all the victors are related to one another; and all the vanquished were related to one another or were, as "giants," alike:

When at length death had put an end to all the soldiers among the people, the Lord said to me [H *This is Moses speaking, the Midianite Moses of the people who had joined the Jews in the desert at Qades. See Freud, 1937.*], "You are now about to leave Ar and the territory of Moab behind. As you come opposite the Ammonites, do not show hostility or come in conflict with them, for I shall not give you possession of any land of the Ammonites, since I have given it to the descendants of Lot as their own. [*This also was considered a country of the Rephaim from its former inhabitants, whom the Ammonites called Zamzummim, a people strong and numerous and tall like the Anakim.* But these, too, the Lord cleared out of the way for the Ammonites, who ousted them and took their place. He had done the same for the descendants of Esau, who dwell in Seir, by clearing the Horites out of their way, so that the descendants of Esau have taken their place down to the present. So also, the Caphtorim, migrating from Caphtor, cleared away the Avvim, who once dwelt in villages as far as Gaza, and took their place.] -- Deuteronomy 2: 16-23

Now we see that the whole point of Genesis 27 (the competition between Jacob and Esau for their father's estate) was to show

metaphorically that, regardless of what some *Homo sapiens* thought of Neanderthals, “God” has chosen others to displace and dispossess them as Jacob dispossessed the hairy Esau. This is the Hebraic forerunner of America’s “Manifest Destiny.”

In verse 24, at “God’s” direction, Moses and the Israelites resume their campaign against the giants, the various groups of Rephaim. This time their principal target is king Og and the Amorite land of Bashan, beyond the Jordan. But to get there, they must pass through another Amorite land, Heshbon, where Sihon is king. Sihon refuses to allow the Israelites safe passage, so:

[S]ince the Lord, our God, had delivered him to us, we defeated him and his sons and all his people. [*H Is it any wonder that virtually everyone in prison has found religion!*] *At that time, we seized all his cities and doomed them all, with their men, women and children; we left no survivor...*

From Aroer on the edge of the Wadi Arnon and from the city in the wadi itself, as far as Gilead, no city was too well fortified for us to whom the Lord had delivered them up. However, in obedience to the command of the Lord, our God, we did not encroach upon any of the Ammonite land, neither the region bordering on the Wadi Jabbok, nor the cities of the highlands. --Deuteronomy 2: 33-37

As they approach Bashan and the kingdom of Og, Moses quotes the “Lord” as telling him,

Do not be afraid of him, for I have delivered him into your hand with all his people and his land. Do to him as you did to Sihon, king of the Amorites, who lived in Heshbon.” And thus, the Lord, our God, delivered into our hands Og, king of Bashan, with all his people. *We defeated him so completely that we left him no survivor.* --Deuteronomy 3: 2-3

Would soldiers kill all of a people and annihilate all the women too if these women were fair-looking members of our own subspecies? Surely this has rarely, if ever, happened.

At that time, we captured all his cities, none of them eluding our grasp, the whole region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan, sixty cities in all, to say nothing of the great number of unwallled towns... [H Again, "sixty," as we'll discover in a later chapter, suggests that the Israelite men enjoyed themselves before all the killing was finished.] As we had done to Sihon, king of Heshbon, so also here we doomed all the cities, with their men, women and children...

And so, at that time, we took from the two kings of the Amorites beyond the Jordan the territory from the Wadi Arnon to Mount Hermon... comprising all the cities of the plateau and all Gilead and all the cities of the kingdom of Og in Bashan including Salecah and Edrei.

(Og, king of Bashan, was the last remaining survivor of the Rephaim... --Deuteronomy 3: 4-11) *H emphasis mine*

Here we see the true origin of Jewish guilt and persecution.

Here we see why the mythical Jesus had to be a Jew.

Our Jewish ancestors firmly believed that they had delivered the final blow, that they had killed the last of the *Homo erecti*. If these battles did indeed occur after the alleged exodus from Egypt, as late as the fourteenth century B.C., then they were probably correct.

Yet this late date for *Homo erectus*' final extinction and his enslavement in Mesopotamia through the 18th century B.C. reign of Hammurabi if not later (Chapter 19, above) is grossly inconsistent with the European fossil record showing his disappearance circa 35 kya and his similarly-early disappearance from the fossil record in Southeast Asia and other cul-de-sacs! How are we to reconcile this gap of 32 ky? It's not easy. Bill Turnbaugh found the answer and pointed it out to me.

Long after the *Homo erecti* were eliminated in the cul-de-sacs, small groups of them managed to survive by gathering and hunting small animals in Siberia and the remote, mountainous areas of central Asia --within the same band that continues to spawn "sightings" of "Yeti," "Almas," "Chuchunaa," *et al.* (See page 238, above.) Our Habiru ancestors, who as scholars have already assured us were landless, nomadic agricultural workers, bandits and traders (pages 313 to 314, above), would have been numerous among the groups who traveled north each spring to capture *Homo erecti*, especially the strong

Neanderthals who could be taken south to Mesopotamia and sold or traded as slaves for a handsome profit. This is not speculation on the part of Bill Turnbaugh and me. The Standard, Figure 41, confirms it!

Now, for slaves to be productive, they must have some hope of improving their station in life; and Hammurabi assured us in the Codex Hammurabi (page 329, above) that he had, “sought peaceful regions for the black-headed people.” I submit that those regions were to the west, which primitive peoples thought to be the land of the dead. The peaceful regions for the best-behaved black-headed people, the regions to which the good Neanderthal slaves were retired, were on the western fringe of Mesopotamian empires. This was the greater Palestine area.

I submit that our Habiru ancestors knew when the last of the *Homo erecti* had been captured in central Asia, and they also knew where the last of the Neanderthal slaves had been settled. When they inserted the phase that is emboldened above into their sacred, tribal history, they knew exactly what they were saying.

The Habiru wanted to allay their guilt and fear for killing the last of our parent species, and they wanted other people and “God” or the gods to forgive them and respect them. The best and simplest way to achieve these goals was to believe, with other common folks of the Middle East, that the Black-headed people were just an inferior race, to declare that they themselves were the leaders in the trend toward monotheism because they had picked it up in Egypt, where the priests of Akhenaton had indeed been the first to profess it before falling out of favor, Egypt, the common enemy of their neighbors and the place from which they had escaped slavery. After suffering in the desert for 40 years, their monotheistic God told them, his chosen people, to take the land of his least favorite people, an inferior race.

Before we dispense with the Bible (I’m tempted to throw mine out the window), I must make good on an earlier promise. When we were reviewing the findings of Lieberman and others regarding Neanderthal’s speech ability, I told you that the prevailing view that Neanderthal had speech but could not say certain vowels reminded me of a passage in the Bible. The passage is in Judges, a book following the Pentateuch.

Judges is one of several books that are said to derive from the Former (early) Prophets. These books are believed to be historical. Indeed, many of the facts mentioned have been proven historically accurate. Yet as I have argued above, the Species War was much more violent and traumatic than any other series of events that men have

experienced. For this reason, compromised Species War memories (mythology) got mixed in with the accounts of all other violent prehistoric and early historic events. As we are beginning to see, the Species War is really the basic stuff of religion all over the world. That said, I call your attention to Judges 12.

In this chapter, the Israelites, under Jephthah, have just routed and exterminated on their border the Ammonites, people who had threatened the people of Gilead. Gilead was the central Trans-Jordan area, and the Ammonites to the east had been harassing them from border forts. According to the Bible, the Ephraimites, a Hebrew tribe to the west of Gilead and on the other side of the Jordan, became indignant at Gilead for not having been invited to join the attack upon the Ammonites. The Ephraimites crossed into Gilead and were defeated. The surviving Ephraimites who attempted to re-cross the Jordan were halted; and if they denied being Ephraimites, they were asked to say the word for an ear of corn (“shibboleth”). If they responded “sibboleth,” in the Ephraimite dialect, they were killed.

Now, to this taxi-driver many things about this myth don’t add up. Why should kinsmen of the Gilead people (fellow Jews) become angry enough to invade over not being invited to join in a campaign on the far side of their neighbor's territory? And why should a people be so merciless as to murder all the survivors of a kindred enemy? Indeed, if hostilities between the Gilead people and the Ephraimites had been this great, why should they suddenly have ceased after this one battle?

Obviously, there is a more plausible setting for this dramatic story about the shibboleth: the Species War. A surviving fragment of a Species War myth told of the use of a password that Neanderthal could not pronounce. That fragment was refitted with the names of new belligerents, a new background and perhaps even a new password.

Decoding the Pentateuch is not easy or certain. Though the battles that the alleged Israelites who came out of Egypt fought to acquire land were chronologically separated from their acquisition of written language by no more than a few hundred years, the accounts of these battles have obviously undergone much censorship and rationalization.

Judging by the interpretive notes to Genesis in our Catholic Bible and what we have already seen of the editorial handiwork of Babylonian priests, we must assume that the Hebrew priests were not passive transcribers of their oral traditions either.

It may also be that the character of these first possessors of the written word tended to compensate negatively for their newfound

ability to record and accurately preserve history. Recall that Frazer characterized magician-priests as clever rogues. Even the most cursory review of the mythology in this volume almost forces an observation upon the reader: the more sophisticated and mature is a people's priesthood, the more artfully disguised and fraudulent is its mythology. The tribal historians, the keepers of oral myths, were selected for their exceptionally good memories. Homer is supposed to have attributed his fabulous memory to personal honesty. Could it be that modern era priests have been selected for...shall we say ... "other abilities"?

Fortunately, even what we want to believe has its own inner logic and can be filtered out of myths to leave a residue of valuable information or at least clues about our prehistory.

Most confusing is the gullibility of academics that -- still influenced by the edited and re-edited neurotic defenses and psychotic lies of millennia of priests -- make statements like the following:

The three strategies towards other peoples in the Bible may be called elimination, integration, and coexistence. Although elimination is the best known of the Biblical solutions, there is no historical evidence that it ever occurred -- unlike the other two. --Rogerson and Davies, 64¹⁶⁴

Anybody interested in buying the State of Pennsylvania?

Before we close the Bible, permit me to point out that the people who delivered the last blow were, in the broad scheme of events, no guiltier than everyone else. They were the scapegoats.¹⁶⁵ As I shall insist in the conclusion, periodic holocausts, catastrophic population collapses and suicidal and homicidal behaviors of all kinds were and

¹⁶⁴ Rogerson is Professor and Head of the Department of Biblical Studies at the University of Sheffield England and a noted authority on the Old Testament. Davies also teaches Old Testament Studies at Sheffield. He publishes the *Journal of the Society of Old Testament Studies* and runs the J.S.O.T. Press, which publishes many titles each year in the field of Old Testament Studies.

¹⁶⁵ Nor would it be fair to blame religion in general for all the conflict between Moslems and Jews in the Mid-East. Since the discovery of oil in the region, the western powers have had strong motivation to draw the map of the Mid-East so as to minimize the size and population of the states that sit atop and assert royalty claims to the oil. Minimizing royalty claims has also meant thwarting pan-Arab unity. Western powers have also divided the Arabs by placing in their midst a Zionist people who are threatened by Arab unity, and continually fanning the flames of discord.

remain the inevitable result of our failure to set limits upon our genetic competition. Everyone who is not actively working to set those limits, everyone who is not actively working for *both* equal opportunity *and* population control, must share the moral responsibility for the inevitable results -- for man's still-savage condition. Don't worry if the logic of this eludes you; you'll understand it in the conclusion.

Now let's say good-bye to the Bible. There's no need to belabor my point, and I don't wish to bore you. I have proven my deluge interpretation to all who are willing to open their eyes.

Freud was even more correct than he imagined in calling religion the "ready-made, universal form of neurosis."¹⁶⁶ The Bible is indeed a history of and catechism for obsessional neurosis. It is a continuous chain of screen memories for trauma, defense mechanisms for guilt; and behavioral compulsions and prohibitions that maintain ongoing neurotic Oedipal and Fraternal conflicts without resolving them.

This is true, and yet the Bible and our other sacred texts remain priceless treasures. They contain almost all of what remains of our prehistory. They are far and away the best source of information about the preponderance of man's existence.

But our "holy books" cease to be catechisms for neurosis and become treasure chests of prehistoric information *only as we begin to learn how to decode the texts*. Need I remind my countrymen that almost all our top politicians have not shared this *figurative* understanding of "the good book?"¹⁶⁷ They have all taken their oaths of office with one hand on the Bible. It is *the* book in which many governments around the world supposedly put their trust.

What does this say about the mental health of "mankind?"

If my thesis is correct, if our ancestors took the Earth from *Homo erectus*, fighting periodic battles to displace and exterminate him; then all our ancestors benefited and all had to know about the genocide. The

¹⁶⁶ See S. Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, lecture XXXV, "The Question of a Weltanschauung," trans. Strachey, Hogarth Press and The Institute for Psychoanalysis, London, vol. 32, 1932-36.

¹⁶⁷ There is at least one notable exception. George Washington won his first major battle by attacking the British at Valley Forge on Christmas Eve. Later he was urged to follow the crowd and attend church services at Saint John's Cathedral, following his inauguration in New York. He consented on one condition. He insisted upon having his own private, completely enclosed prayer booth, wherein he undoubtedly fell asleep. Moreover, like all founders of lotteries and other gambling institutions, he took advantage of the religious naiveté of those who hope that "God" will help them beat the odds. It's safe to say that George was not a literal believer.

Species War became the model and precedent for savagery. Not only the peoples of the cul-de-sacs, but all of us became conditioned to savagery.

But for the Species War and our continuing unconsciousness of it, could we remain the savages that we are? In the hope that the answer is “No,” I shall next draw your attention to the peninsular corners of Eurasia where we can expect the Species War to have been most violent. Many of our best mythologies came from these areas: Scandinavia, Western Europe (especially the British Isles and Ireland), Italy, Korea, Greece, India, the Malay Archipelago (especially Australia) and Eastern Siberia around the Bering Strait. Let's look for traces of the Species War and the symptoms of obsessional neurosis in the beliefs and customs of these peoples.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ We shall not devote separate chapters to Italy or Korea for all the reasons that I stated on page 336 to 337.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



David Huttner is the author of a comprehensive, new, social science. He grew up in Illinois and Indiana, acquired most of his education in New York and California, has lived and worked for eleven years in China and has traveled to thirty countries. Although he has trained for and flirted with several professions and has held more than a few professional licenses, his focus and main interest in life has always been social science research and dissemination.

CONNECT WITH DAVE

My connections are limited but very reliable:

Favorite my Smashwords author page:

<https://www.smashwords.com/profile/view/DavidHuttner>

Connect on LinkedIn:

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/DavidHuttner?trk=hp-identity-photo>

Visit the Peace Love and Progress Party where you can download FREE copies of my books and master social science. (Then build a party cell):

<http://www.PeaceLoveAndProgressParty.org/>

Email me: <mailto:Dave@DavidHuttnerBooks.com>.

