Karl Radl on Jewish Conspiracy Theories and Jewish Character

See also his blog: http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/

Comment 1

Well you see the problem there is assuming there is a big jew so to speak. It is an intellectualisation that is kind of unhelpful, although understandable (since Aryans would have to act in that way to achieve the same effect), because it presumes there is a central deciding point. I don't know if you mean the individual jews in charge of the corporation, but I'll assume for the way it is worded that it is meant as a conspiratorial point (i.e. one big jew not many different ones so-to-speak).

When you see a news program what you are seeing is the editors preference with the presenters charm. The Editor is of course behold to his manager and so forth up to the CEO who is appointed by those who own the corporation. It doesn't matter so much whether the jews own or the jews just are at the top levels of management, but the key is that they are in a position to impose their views and ideology onto their subordinates.

If you notice the media doesn't have one line, but it does have several different lines on any given news show, some cater to the communist, some to the weak-willed liberal, others to 'conservatives' and so forth. There is no central control of that, but that it is jews successfully selling their thoughts to others that is the problem. When a jew educates someone at university that jew will have instilled in them their fundamental ideology, and perhaps when they read another jews book and become converts to another ideology (sometimes the inverse of their previous one), and when they go into the media as a journalist, a manager or even as a owner. They take these beliefs with them that even with no jews at the top level or as owners: they impose these jewish-inspired beliefs onto their corporation in the same way that a CEO or a manager imposes their belief in restructuring onto a corporation.

It is a war of the mind and it doesn’t need a conspiracy, but when a jew imposes his thoughts on another race and there is a consistent imposition of jewish thought then that provides a non-deliberate, and more effective as it happens, control of the media by changing the poles within in which the media operates.

If we look at the Zionist jews as an example: we see that they are not in control of the media per se. They do have Rupert Murdoch, who despite claims to the contrary is not jewish as far as the evidence has been presented indicates, but he is only part of it. The jews know, and by jews I mean supporters of Israel trying to out do each other in their support of Israel in an eternal game of one-up-manship common to jewish culture, that in order to do this the most effective way is to set boundaries and to police those boundaries they use a series of organisations (sometimes jewish (some of which were originally anti-Zionist) and sometimes not) to attack the points at which they want the poles of discussion and acceptability to change and to engage in advocacy to support that change.

It is facilitated not as some conspiratorial behaviour on the part of jews, but rather as an appeal to each others ego in so far as a jew will suggest something to another, but do so as to suggest advantage and the ego trip of being given credit within the pro-Israel jewish community, and then the other jew will use it and so on. Jews propagandise each other in the same way they do gentiles, but they gain adherants by promising each other rewards and the supreme virtue of the jews is simply to become an earthly God, which they can only achieve in their mind (due to being brought up around jewish culture) by working to the benefit of jews.

The essence of jewish power in the media is not a conspiracy per se, but rather it is the jewish race infecting our folk through its mere presence and ability to spread its thought (like an infection). This infection allows them to non-deliberately control things, because the folk are bounced between one jew and another. That is the key to the media and the conspiratorial thesis as I have said a race-based intellecualisation of jewish behaviour, because the Aryan thinking it is presuming the jew thinks and acts in the same way they do (since that is how the Aryan would have to act to copy the behaviour).

The key is that the jew is an ego-based individualist and would happily betray jewry (and they often have: I can name numerous examples off the top of my head) if the thought it was to his advantage, egotistically, materially or spiritually, to do so. It is the mere presence of the jew that is the problem, because they infect others with their mindset and propagandising (as any good merchant would). If you need an example then I suggest reading the central theme of the Torah: the story of Moshe for that is the ultimate egoistic jew that every jew that has ever lived after his time aspires to imitate.

Comment 2

Now to understand jewish thinking if you will isn't nearly as hard as it sounds, but it does require you to think differently to what should be your natural inclination. Jewish thinking is almost entirely egoistic and self-centred. Aryan thought tends to be a reconciliation of egoism with altruism, but altruism is the defining trait of the Aryan (Mongoloids are actually similar to Aryans in this although their mentality and logic is very different).

Now to understand jews one merely needs to think in slightly wide egoistic terms i.e. what do I get out of this? Does this benefit me? [etc] Now this doesn’t just mean ‘how much money can I make’ as jews have been known to scorn money if they perceive it to be to their advantage to do so. Most of the time they will not, but they will if it is to their advantage to do so. For example a jewish communist (of which there are still a lot proportionally speaking [in terms of the number of communists in the US against the number of those communists who are jews]) will more than likely scorn money as part of their communist belief, because to them it is more important to be seen as ‘the best comrade’ and therefore build up a reputation so they can achieve power. This is what they regard as in their best interest and yes a jew will truly believe in something, but if it is not in his or her interest (as they understand it) to continue believing in it they won’t. In essence a jew will die for their cause if they believe they will be widely remembered as martyrs and therefore honoured thus achieving one of the ultimate egoistic fixes. An example of this is the

Rosenbergs (Soviet atomic spies) who are universally regarded as communist 'true believers' and died for it. Ethel Rosenberg almost explicitly said they would be remembered as martyrs after what she saw as the inevitable victory of Communism (and if you believe in orthodox Marxism then this is a religious given no matter how long it takes).

Another example of a form of jewish egoism is common among the ultra-Orthodox in so far as it is ultra-Orthodox doctrine that they should pay no heed to their material surroundings but should instead focus on their spirituality as the especially pious (Chassidim/Hassidim) [frum] jews. This doesn't mean they shouldn't be wealthy (many of them are very wealthy especially in NYC), but they cannot be ostentatious in their appearance and in their homes. That means that for these particular jews they cannot, for example, refurbish their homes if they are strict and live among filth and pests. This is regarded as being truly pious because they don't care for their material surroundings but rather focus on 'worshipping hashem'. The advantage for the jews here is to be seen as pious as possible by other jews and this enables them to possibly be seen as 'pillars of the community' etc, which may lead to them gaining followers (one of the most important parts of understanding the reason for jewish power actually: as I'll talk about latter) but most importantly fills their egoistic black hole.

What do I mean by egoistic black hole? I mean that jews naturally feel that they need reassurance about their own worth in the world. This is why jews are so egoistic and act the way they do, because they need to feel that they are superior and are worth something. In essence if you conduct some reading in Freudian psychology you will find the jewish mentality staring back at you, which makes sense if you think about it as Freud was simply assuming that the whole world thinks like jews (much like Aryans tend to assume, quite naturally, that everyone thinks like they do and this gets them into all sorts of trouble) and he also enacted his jewish mentality by his doctrine (i.e. becoming an 'authority on the mind') and his 'treatments', which allowed him (and still allow those of who endorse his theories) to dominate his patients (i.e. as an ego trip the Freudian psychiatrist comes to all but control his patient's, well his victim's, actions and thoughts) as well as keep the money flowing (Freudian treatments are notorious among psychologists for their length [often 10-20 years] and the huge bills the 'patient's' wrack up). In essence jews are a walking inferiority complex and their behaviour can be understood by comprehending this fact.

What about MacDonald's theories? Well quite frankly they are wrong, because MacDonald only studied external not internal jewish behaviour i.e. jews relations with gentiles, which narrowed his focus to permit his conclusion of jewish altruism. He also didn't focus on exceptions, which are important to explain in any theory like this and which my understanding explains without exception (myself and others have put it through numerous examples and it explains them all beautifully so far). An example is Nicholas Donin who was a jew who was expelled by the Paris ghetto in the mid-13th century who joined the Catholic priesthood and then proceeded to campaign for the extermination/forced conversion of the jews despite being a jew himself. You simply can't reconcile this with MacDonald's theory (which is also based on a very selective interpretation of jewish history and while I don't deny its intellectual importance as a theory it is not useful for understanding jews as a people IMO [unlike MacDonald I am somewhat fluent in Hebrew and Yiddish]), but with mine it fits perfectly. In so far as did Donin do it for altruistic motives? Obviously not: so then why did he do it? Because he was slighted and the Paris ghetto

forced him to go elsewhere for his personal benefit and he chose to go into the Christian clergy and then preach against the jews (becoming an ‘authority on jews’ at the same time). He in essence sought bloody revenge (he more or less caused the death of most of the jews in Paris and Northern France at this time as well caused the Talmud to be burnt in 1242) and did it in order to win personal domination over both gentile and jew therefore filling his deeply hurt inferiority complex (which his expulsion from the jewish ghetto had caused to go into crisis).

This leads us nicely onto your next question of understanding jewish power. Now if we apply what I’ve outlined above it becomes very clear that the jews are neither a conspiracy (that doesn’t mean jews don’t engage in conspiracies, but rather they are not a conspiracy as a people) or an ethnocentric group. What they are is a significant amount of extreme egoists if you will and all of them are looking for their ‘ego fix’ for lack of a better term. This usually manifests itself in their concentration of occupations and ideologies, which bring them perceived advantages and benefits from an egoistic standpoint. This particularly manifests itself in the need to be seen as important, an authority and as having power over others.

We can see this when data about jewish occupations is presented, because one notices fairly quickly that they generally choose professions where one can wield great amounts of practical and theoretical influence. For example as lawyers (lots of money to be made, fits natural legalism of jews, possibility of becoming pillar of community as a judge or supreme court justice etc), academics (in a position to inject others with your ideas and found your own school of thought so as to become important and well know, ability to influence opinions as an ‘expert’ on a variety of subjects etc) and media (ability to influence opinions as a provider of information to people, lots of money to be made, fairly glamorous industry with a seedy dark side [women have to literally sleep their way to the top in jewish dominated industries particularly the media and banking]). One also finds a similar motivation among the numerous jewish cult figures (for example jews who form their own ‘ideologies’ or religious groups around themselves) in so far as one finds the common factor in the ‘power’ they exert over their followers.

This also accounts for the multiplicity of jews in just about everything (their famous habit of wanting to be involved in everything characterises this quite well) and why they also like to be among gentiles. To explain briefly jews like gentiles for the very specific reason that they are far more malleable and less ‘bitchy’ (for lack of a better term: the jews call it ‘kvetching’ but that isn’t really covered by the literal translation ‘complaining’ so ‘bitching’ in my view is actually more appropriate). They tend to try to ‘convert’ gentiles into their followers in various ways for example a lesbian jewess told my wife about two years ago that jewesses preferred to ‘turn white girls into lesbians because they were easier to manipulate into doing whatever the jewess wanted them to do while another jewess would simply bitch about it the whole time i.e. she viewed Aryans, with some justification, as being far more submissive than jews. When the jewess (and this is particularly common among male jews especially medical students in my experience for what reason I couldn’t tell you) is finished with the Aryan then they will throw them aside (male jews like to try to impregnate and then marry an Aryan woman while they are a student and then they will throw her out when they are about forty and she has served their purpose so they can then marry their secretary who is likely a much younger Aryan woman).

Now after having taken all this into consideration: what are we left with? Well the simple reality

is that it is the presence of the jew in society that is the problem, because what happens is that gentiles (and some jews) are bounced between a lot of different jews propagandising their own ideas and beliefs as to fill their own egoistic black hole. If you think about the folk are bounced between different jews espousing different ideas, but hardly ever do you find a ‘movement’ that lacks a large proportion of chosen or mischlinge within its higher echelons. When people talk of the ‘jewish media’ etc that is what they mean, but because of all the jews and the lack of a system for understanding their extraordinary concentration and presence in specific areas of Aryan society one suggests a conspiracy, which is a racially-relative Aryan rationalisation of the observed behaviour of jews as that is what Aryans would have to do in order to achieve that same effect. In essence in my formulation the problem is simply the presence of jews (and Semites in general: Arabs are little different but a few decades behind the jews and are catching up fast now) that is the problem not that they are conducting a conspiracy: it is their biology that is the problem and that lends itself to a complete solution of the jewish question.

Comment 3

Jews are not 'all powerful' that is a strawman.

They are however extremely egoistic and will do anything, and I mean pretty much anything, to make themselves feel loved, wonderful and superior to everyone else, especially each other. That is channelled through the medium of jewish culture, ideology (say Zionism or Communism: accounting for the quick changes jews perform between ideologies) and Judaism into some seemingly ethnocentric actions, which are really about two things:

A) How much credit/reputation the individual jew gains by these actions

B) The protection of the individual jew's own interests by participating in a personal response as part of a group who are acting as part of a group.

It appears to be an ethnocentric action, but is really an individualistic one: built on the temporary fulfillment of the jewish ego.

The 'jews control the media argument' is a little badly phrased, because it actually refers to the extreme egoism involved in the jewish community where-by the big egoistic kick is to get everyone to believe what you tell them should believe (by manipulating the information given and the fundamental knowledge used to interpretation that information). This allows each jew to actuate their belief that they are the Messiah/Chosen one and are special. You have a similar point in academe to in that jews can manipulate opinion to their own personal advancement and egoistic interest.

Knowing this allows you to disregard the notion of a conspiracy in so far as it indictates that the reason jews gravitate (as Benjamin Ginsberg, for example, stated was the case, but didn't propose a reason why) to the media, film, art, finance, the law, academe, literature, politics etc is because it is opinion forming and therefore they get to fulfill their egos with a very powerful fix (the same reason for jews being so involved in pornography incidentally). It is also why all they seem

to think about is forms of sexual gratification and power (in essence it is a mixture of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis), which is well documented.

The jews then fight it out with each other and anyone else for control of these fields individually, which accounts for their extreme aversion to each other as well, and then you get this extremely odd laissez-faire anything-goes environment. With anti-Semitism kicking in when the jews go too far with schemes to out do each other (in essence as Sandor put it in another thread it is all about: 'how big is each jews penis or metaphorical penis'). You see this in the rabbinics as well with each commentator re-inventing the wheel and trying to be famous. Jews as parents are the same: their sons and daughters can be egoistically defined as extensions of 'look what I did'/'look how superior I am' etc. It is all about each jew individually.

In essence the idea of the 'Chosen people' is actually a generalisation for each individual jews own personal Messiah complex: the idea is meant to control and channel the Messiah complex into a group response in order to protect the jews as a people. Traditionally this has been ascribed to Moshe and I see no reason to remove that notion: since that is when you can trace it to.

There is no jewish conspiracy: that is an intellectualisation based on racial subjectivity (how Europeans would have to act to gain the same effect). It also explains the many different themes and conceptions of the jew used by anti-Semites through history for the western idea of a 'conspiracy/collective' to the Communist idea of 'rootless cosmopolitans' etc. There is only the jewish nature and it is far more appalling than any conspiracy: it also offers the best rationale for why the jewish problem has to be solved.

Comment 4

I believe that it can be evidenced that jews:

1) Primarily engage in selfish rather than altruistic behaviour.
2) When engaging in selfish behaviour cause it to take the external form, due to perceived and real social, cultural and religious pressures from the jewish group, of altruism towards other jews and causes in the jewish interest.
3) Associate altruistic behaviour towards jews with positive feedback from the parent of the relevant sex.
4) Associate the positive feedback from the parent of the relevant sex with the gratification of their sexual impulses towards that parent.
5) Associate altruistic behaviour towards non-jews with negative feedback from the parent of the relevant sex.
6) Associate non-jews with the competing parent of the relevant sex.

To begin with we will look at the ethnocentric theory jewish behaviour that is championed primarily by Kevin MacDonald. MacDonald’s argument regarding jewish ethnocentrism is detailed and far more expansive that I wish to engage in discussion here. So in order to understand the ethnocentric theory we will simplify it to jews act as they do out of a feeling (mutual or individual) of what benefits jews the most, as a biologically-based group. This

MacDonald contends finds expression in the organised nature of jewish culture and why jews, even if not outwardly identifying themselves as such, feel a close group solidarity with their kin.

In particular MacDonald points to jewish history to show that his theory is valid and in this discussion he also suggests that jewish groups have always sought to be at the head of all intellectual and political movements in their host societies since by being at the head of these movements: individual jews are able to defend the jews as a biological group from the potential threat caused by these intellectual and political movements. This group activity of achieving leadership positions in intellectual and political movements MacDonald contends can be considered the root of anti-Semitism, which occurs as a group strategy in opposition to the jewish group strategy. MacDonald's theory can be contended to be accurate in its external aspect, because it does of the face of it account for jewish behaviour.

However MacDonald's behaviour does not provide a cogent explanation as to the exception in the jewish group strategy. Since MacDonald's thesis, as he has himself simplified it, comes down to jews asking the question, consciously or unconsciously, of themselves: 'what is best for jews as a group?' This is an again an overtly accurate summation, but how does this reflect on jews who have caused much destruction to the jewish community: intentionally. This problem is exemplified by the origins of the condemnation of the Talmud in the jewish Christian converts of Nicolas Donin, Pablo Christiani and Johann Pfefferkorn. All three of these individual jews at different times made it their business to condemn jews for being jews to differing degrees.

Nicholas Donin, in particular, is infamous in this regard in as a jew from La Rochelle who converted to Christianity, becoming a Franciscan monk, after having been excommunicated from, and therefore dead to, the jewish community in Paris, by Rabbi Yechiel, approximately ten years earlier. Once Donin become a Christian and a Franciscan he solicited the murder of his fellow jews and launched attacks on the Talmud, which was and is a key book, which informs jewish law and by its writ he was expelled from the ghetto ten years before.

Donin proceeded in the 1240 disputation to successfully persuade the Pope, Gregory IX, that the Talmud should be burnt for blasphemies against Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary and the Christian religion. Donin's revenge against the Talmud, the very symbol of the jewish law that had excommunicated him, was complete later that year with the burning of over ten thousand jewish books, including many copies of the Talmud, in Paris by the authorities. Donin's revenge against the person of the jewish community was accomplished when Christians and in particular crusaders sought to cleanse France of jews. This crusade on French soil, avidly supported by Donin, lead to the deaths of approximately 3,000 jews and to the conversion to Christianity of 500 jews.

MacDonald's theory is not able to adequately explain Donin's actions and most importantly that why he, as a jew rejected by his ethnocentric group after spending ten years trying to keep up with jewish practices, then proceeded to devote the rest of his life to destroying his own kin. It could be argued that this was the inevitable result an ethnocentric group rejecting one of its own, but with other excommunications, formal/informal rejections and conversions to Christianity or Islam, for example relationships maintained by those rejected from the jewish community with their jewish families as well as often with the jewish community itself were relatively common.

This would seem to further MacDonald's argument, but yet it does not as it does not explain Donin's actions via the ethnocentric theory

MacDonald might suggest Donin was an aberration in jewish history in that his actions were unusual, but here again we must suggest that these kind of actions were not uncommon in the jewish community. We can see this in the responsa of the well known rabbinical authority: Solomon Luria. Luria's responsa assert that there is a special type of criminal in jewish law and that criminal is called 'the informer'. An 'informer' is a jew who informs, truthfully or falsely, the non-jewish authorities, in this case the Polish crown, of goings on in the jewish community. This responsum is targeted specifically at those jews who sought to convert to Christianity and then gain material advantage by using their authority and knowledge as a jew to gain wealth and power by writing condemnations of Judaism and jewish activities. Luria views this as a most dangerous offence and suggests that the 'informer' ought to be lynched by the jewish community. This form of decree is not unique to Luria and is not unique to the situation in Poland, but is characteristic of rabbinical group defence mechanisms.

This therefore suggests that jews like Donin were not so much an aberration as might at first be supposed, but rather that there was a genuine problem in the jewish community regarding jews 'informing' on jews for benefit to themselves as individuals. This can be thus put forward to suggest that Donin is not an isolated example, because legislation has been enacted a considerable number of years later many hundreds of miles distant to attempt to stem the flow of jews seeking wealth and power outside of the confines of the jewish community.

There is a long history of jews converting to Christianity/Islam and condemning their fellow jews quite intentionally for seemingly no other reason that they themselves wished to gain material advantage. There were some converts to both Christianity and Islam who once they were ensconced in positions of wealth and power proceeded to help their fellow jews in any way they reasonably could, but most important these jews who converted and then proceeded to help their kinsmen did not do so to an extent where it could effect them as individuals negatively in terms of their wealth and power.

This is a vital consideration since it suggests that the jews in question are behaving for the benefit of their individual interests and not the general jewish interest. This conclusion itself has considerable consequences for MacDonald's thesis in so far as that if jews were ethnocentric in the traditional sense of the term then jews should assist their fellows even when it poses considerable risk to their own power to do so. However since numerous converts to Christianity are not acting in this way, but are helping jews when and if they can without threat to their own wealth and power: then we can only posit that MacDonald is incorrect and that a considerable portion, as well as one of the most prosperous and powerful portions, of jewry was not acting as it should do if we are to suggest that MacDonald's theory of ethnocentrism is correct.

If MacDonald's theory is held to be true and jews are, consciously or unconsciously, asking themselves the literal interpretation of the question: 'what is best for jews?' Then it becomes very difficult to coherently suggest what internal answer they are giving to this question. Since we are faced with a contradiction: how can a jew give the answer that his own position and wealth are in the best interest of jewry if they are being ethnocentric? Since if the jew's kin are in

need of his aid, but yet this jew suggests that it is best for jewry that he increases his wealth and power rather than helping the rest of his kin when has the opportunity to do so. Then we can only conclude that the jew is thinking of his individual interests first and his group interests second.

In order to understand why this is so we must ask why some influential jews, such as Adolf Cremieux, are willing to risk their status as wealthy and powerful jews as well as potentially cause further serious repercussions in terms of stirring up of anti-Semitic feeling and violence, while the majority of jewish converts to Christianity have not done so. The answer here lies in how deeply the jew in question feels connected to the jewish community as a whole. This refers to how jewish a jew feels him or herself to be: it does not detract from their fixed biological status as a jew, but it affects how they view themselves in relation to the wider jewish community. A jew such as Adolf Cremieux or Benjamin Disraeli, who feel their jewish heritage very keenly, assisted their fellow jews at the risk of their own situation of influence and wealth.

The correspondence between the feeling of an individual's jewish status and their preparation to risk their own position for the sake of the jewish community is historically best demonstrated by Don Joseph Nasi, the Duke of Naxos, who was a jew who revelled in his jewishness who had started out life as a Portugese marrano, a secret jew, scion of the house of Mendes who was a friend of the nephew of Charles I of Spain. When Charles decided to suppress the house of Mendes and the Inquisition began to extend its operation to cover Portuguese marranos. Nasi fled to the Netherlands and then to the Ottoman Empire: where he attained great influence by supporting the successful candidate to the Ottoman throne.

Nasi, once he had attained a position of wealth and influence, acted as a great benefactor to the jews in the Ottoman Empire and helped to institute the Ottoman policy of moving large numbers of jews from the major cities into economically deprived areas to reinvigorate their economies. Instrumental to his success as both a diplomat and statesman was his jewish connexions in Europe, which allowed him to gain access to a considerable source of information regarding goings on at the European courts and the state of the realms in question. It also allowed Nasi to use jewish influence, which was even then considerable, to increase the likelihood of success in his ventures to please his Ottoman masters. An example of this is in his successful interference in the election of the Polish King in order to select the candidate who most benefited his and the Ottoman Empire interests in the Balkans.

These policies had a significant positive impact for jews across Europe since Nasi made sure that the Ottoman Empire kept its open door policy towards jewish migrants and allowed them to settle wherever they wished. The Sultan, as I have said, did move jews out of the major cities to economically deprived areas in order to revitalise them. We can however see this policy in a different light in so far as the prevention of the concentration of the jews in the cities was a preventative measure to decrease the likelihood of anti-Semitic feeling, becoming prevalent among the Ottoman Empire's majority non-jewish subjects. We cannot know whether this reasoning may have been conscious or unconscious, but it is reasonable to suggest that the court jews

This use of the jewish community was not without its cost to the jewish community however and in particular the jewish community on Cyprus whose negotiations with Nasi were discovered,

likely due to jewish ‘informer’ as per my comments regarding Solomon Luria’s responsum above, and who then suffered expulsion as punishment for their crimes. It is perhaps little wonder to note in passing that across the mediterrainian at this time: jews were justifiably considered a fifth column in the war with the Ottoman Empire and the forces of Islam. In fact Nasi’s nephew, rabbi Abraham Benveniste, was even arrested for having set fire to the Venetian military arsenal at Nasi’s instigation.

These intrigues although ostensibly beneficial to the Ottoman Empire were not without potential cost to Nasi in so far as he was playing a very high risk strategy with his own power in so far as that if he failed in his intrigues or was betrayed by the jews then he could potentially stand to lose his influence and his wealth, because of his failure and squandering of Ottoman resources, which perhaps could have been better employed elsewhere.

We also see this high risk aspect of Nasi’s behaviour in one of his most famous escapades where he planned to resettle the towns of Safed and Tiberias with jews and to begin to create a jewish state there as had been the case in the time of the patriarchs. Nasi secured a grant for control of the land from the Ottoman Sultan, after his Aunt Gracia Mendes Nasi (the mother of Nasi’s cousin and wife: Reyna) had leased Tiberias for 1000 ducats per annum from the Sultan, and then proceeded to attempt to promote immigration to these towns by corresponding extensively with and offering incentives to the jews in the Papal States. This plan was disappointed when Venice and the Ottoman Empire renewed hostilities. However we can see that this a highly risky course of action for Nasi to take: since the cost of purchasing the favour required to gain the grant of Safed and Tiberias to the jews was considerable and should the Sultan find out, perhaps via a jewish ‘informer’, that Nasi’s long term plans were not to benefit of the Ottoman Empire but to his jewish kin then it would result in the loss of everything that Nasi had worked to gain.

Nasi was, unlike many apparent jewish converts, highly connected with his jewish identify and strongly felt that he was jewish. Indeed his family, the jewish house of Mendes, were merchants and financiers of considerable wealth and power who used their contacts at the royal and ducal courts of Europe, North Africa and the Middle East, as well as their profits, to aid, abet and defend jews across Europe and the Middle East. They also contributed considerable sums of money to the furtherance of jewish communal interests for example by organising a trade boycott of the port of Ancona in the Papal States in order to gain revenge on the Pope for ordering the burning of several marranos in Portugal. It is therefore not surprising that Joseph Nasi and his Aunt Gracia (Mendes) Nasi were steeped in their jewish identity and acted contrary to their own personal interests at times in order to facilitate what they believed to be jewish communal interests.

This poses a conundrum in so far as Nasi and his Aunt’s behaviour would seem to confirm MacDonald’s theory of ethnocentrism. However what does not fit the pattern MacDonald describes is that Nasi has knowingly endangered the lives of his fellow jews in order to increase his own favour with the Ottoman Sultan as in the case of the jews of Cyprus. If Nasi was acting according to ethnocentric theory he should not have involved the jews of Cyprus in a plot to gain that island for the Ottoman Empire.

If Nasi was acting in the interest of the jewish community he would not have used them as an

active Ottoman agency on Cyprus and advised them to openly embrace the Ottoman cause once the Ottomans had invaded. Since Nasi would have been only too well aware from his own experiences of being hunted by the Inquisition and the secular authorities in Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands that any hint of such a conspiracy would potentially unleash vicious reprisals on the part of the secular and religious authorities there. This was the standard jewish pattern in other cases of Ottoman invasion in that the jews did not actively support the Ottoman cause until the Ottomans had invaded, but yet in the case of the jews of Cyprus Nasi encourages them to work actively for the Ottoman cause. This was, as I have said, an extremely risky strategy, because although Nasi himself was risking his wealth and influence to a degree: the jews of Cyprus were risking their very lives as well as their influence and power.

It thus becomes apparent that Nasi was not in fact operating in the jewish communal interest, but rather in his own interests. Since if Nasi was acting in the communal jewish interest, as MacDonald's theory would suggest, then he would not have taken considerable risks with the jewish communities that he sought to turn to the Ottoman cause. It might be objected here that Nasi probably felt what he was doing was for the jewish collective good, perhaps he did: but if he was thinking to act in the best communal interest of the jews it would have been more apt to try and preserve life rather than gambling with the lives of other jews.

This infers to us a very important point regarding MacDonald's theory in that it fails to account for the sheer egoism of the individual jew and assumes, incorrectly, that this egotism is set relatively aside for the interactions between jews that he suggests are jewish ethnocentric behaviour. Since at the heart of ethnocentric behaviour the motivation is altruistic rather than selfish: however if Nasi believed that it was in the best interests of jews to die for what he believed to be 'what was best of jews' then that requires an extremely large sense of egoism. Since it should be remember that Nasi was not the monarch of the jews, but rather, if we posit that Nasi believed himself to be acting in the communal jewish interest, an influential jew with no official mandate from the jewish community. For Nasi to take that responsibility on himself without consultation with the jewish community and to then risk the lives of the jews of Cyprus for his ideas is a supremely egoistic act: since by assuming apparent ethnocentric responsibility for the jews of Cyprus, without their consent, Nasi is simply assuming that their lives can be disposed of as he pleases.