

# **My Journey from Ethnocentrism to Egocentrism**

**By Karl Radl**

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2010/04/my-journey-from-ethnocentrism-to.html>

**Saturday, 3 April 2010**

Ethnocentrism as a framework or methodology for understanding jewish behaviour can be traced back over century in anti-Semitic, philo-Semitic and intellectually neutral literature on jews (1). However its current expression, and probably the most lucid expression of that particular thesis, is found and based on the work of Professor Kevin MacDonald who we cannot praise highly enough for actually having the fortitude to be critical of jews as a group and to try to place our understanding them in the context of an evolutionary perspective. MacDonald has taken a lot of flack from jewish and 'anti-racist' pressure groups about his theories not because they don't have merit, but because they are 'used by anti-Semites' (as if an author is responsible for how others use his or her work)! (2) However this, as some would have it, doesn't inform us that MacDonald was and is right, but rather that is work touched a sensitive subject for jews in general, which is a non-jew taking a critical perspective about the jews (i.e. jews are only allowed to be critical of jews and even then they get called anti-Semitic by other jews who they often in turn call anti-Semitic etc).

When I first began my research into the jewish question: MacDonald's trilogy on understanding the jews from the standpoint of evolutionary psychology were some of the first books that I read, reflected and made notes on. I thought MacDonald's work, and I still do today, is an excellent general introduction to the jewish question as it provides a way of making sense of jews in a relatively simple way without having to do a considerable amount of research to gain and insight into how the jewish mind works.

However over the period of two years after I first began my research and had been applying MacDonald's theories for sometime. I began to understand that MacDonald had, in fact, misunderstood the jewish mind. The reason that he had misunderstood it because he focuses primarily on jewish-gentile interaction as his gateway into the jewish mind rather than focusing on both jewish intraaction as well as jewish-gentile interaction to give a more rounded picture to understand the two faces, if you will, of the jew.

This lead MacDonald to the understandable conclusion that jews are as a group ethnocentric, because jews as a group tend to be very conscious of their status as jews or even if only part jewish, such as the British actor, comic and writer Stephen Fry (his mother was jewish hence in halakah he is actually a jew, but in biological terms he is only half jewish). MacDonald's thesis can be simplified down, as he has himself done, into the following question that he conjectures that jews consciously and/or unconsciously ask themselves: *'Is it good for jews?'*

When I began using this conjectural question and trying to explain the actions of what I have termed *'jewish 'traitors''* I found that the question did not really cover their actions since even if

one suggested that becoming a '*jewish anti-Semite*', if you will, could be understood in terms of '*what is best for jews*' (which is difficult to begin with) the fact that some of these jewish traitors had actually advocated and participated in the genocide of their own people after being slighted by them gave me pause for thought (3). Although I still believed the jist of MacDonald's argument: I found out that I could not reconcile it with this behaviour, even if that behaviour was perhaps an outlier. After all how did these actions benefit the jews as a group? They didn't and there was no way I could find of cogently interpreting such an event in MacDonald's thesis. The fact that the behaviour was unusual had caused MacDonald to overlook it or possibly not know of it, but it still existed and needed to be explained within MacDonald's theory, which I simply couldn't do.

This, of course, troubled me for quite some time in my studies until I hit upon a simple solution to the problem. The conjectural question '*what is good for jews?*' should be transliterated into '*what do I think is good for jews*' and then to simplify the emphasis '*what do I think is good for myself as a jew*' and then further simplified one gets the stark individualistic question: '*what is good for me?*' This allowed me to keep MacDonald's basic and correct observation that jews look ethnocentric as a group, but that there is another far more important motivational layer to their behaviour. That layer is their ego.

If one understood the jews that way then '*jewish 'traitors*'" made sense in that they had originally been conforming jews, whose conformation to the jewish group was a method of ego fulfillment by gaining laurels from the jewish community for being pious jews [and also believing that YHWH would allow them to go straight to Gan Eden (4), because they were particularly special and worthy], but when the community had rejected them in order to restore their damaged egos. These '*jewish 'traitors*'" sought to exercise power and control over the community that rejected them and gain acceptance into a new community by viciously attacking their kinsmen.

This also made sense of Judaism, among many other things in jewish studies, in so far as rather than interpreting Judaism as a method for keeping jews ethnocentric (but not being able to reasonably explain the extremely fractious nature of Judaism or its Diaspora origins) I began interpreting it as the assertion of elite jewish egos over other jewish egos. This is explained very simply by remembering that Judaism is not a religion in the sense of '*someone is saved by a metaphysical entity*', but rather that the metaphysical entity has laid down a large number of rules that have to be followed and thus are open to interpretation as required by the religious and/or charismatic authorities.

In essence then you have a religion that is not based on going out and '*saving souls*', but on re-enforcing a system of power, created and staffed by elite jewish egos, on both Israel and non-Israel. The individual and collective ego(s) of Israel are soothed by the assurance that they are YHWH's chosen people and that they are, in essence, already perfect souls that just need to keep their noses clean. They are also soothed by the knowledge that even if they don't keep their noses clean all that will happen is that they will go to Gehenna (similar to purgatory) and have to spend at most a few years repenting their sins against YHWH before being allowed to enter Gan Eden.

This is materially reinforced by Judaism's view of gentiles as being little more than animals and certainly far less worthy biologically-speaking than jews. This enables jews to believe they have

a dual materialistic and spiritual egoistic superiority over gentiles via the belief that they need only adhere to jewish law and that gentile laws do not mean anything (although this attitude is explicitly ruled against in Judaism: in both theory and practice it is commonly adhered to even if lipservice is given to this contra ruling) in addition to their belief that when the jewish messiah turns up: the whole world will submit to the rule of the jews from their rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem (in effect Israel is to rule non-Israel the latter being slaves separated into different classifications in halakah: the most favoured being the Noahides who are pledged, in theory and practice, to serve the jews and through them serve YHWH alone and any who are perceived to be Amalekites are to be exterminated as the deadly hated enemy of all jews).

In essence Judaism is a power structure that allows different classifications of rabbis, tzaddiks et al to rule over their communities like mini-dictators as the rabbi, particularly among the Ashkenazim, combines the roles of community leader, magistrate and religious authority (any who oppose the rabbi's rulings are usually subject to group censure). Of course as in any power structure one finds that rabbis have other rabbis who are their followers and they in turn have either flocks and students. When a rabbi teaches a student then that rabbi effectively holds the power of life or death in the community over his student (and sometimes literally (5)) and the rabbi will inculcate his ideas and doctrines into his student, which he represents as his own additions to his own masters doctrines (creating great family trees that form the rabbinical schools of thought). This is reinforced by the use of a rabbi's daughters as incentive for his students by holding out the prospective of good marriage to them as it became custom for jews in general, and rabbis in particular, to try and marry their sons and daughters to either great rabbinical or wealthy families (as that gives the best evolutionary advantage as well as a considerable amount of ego fulfillment).

It is also a fairly well known jewish custom, that is still practised today among secular and religious jews and mischlinge, to '*hothouse*' their children into being obsessed with success (and the factors that are considered to indicate success such as wealth [hence the jewish obsession with money]) for only that will grant both them and their jewish parents, generally-speaking, the egoistic fulfillment that they crave. In essence one could describe jewish culture generally and Judaism in particular as a massive conflict over who is the best at and/or who has X, Y and Z (i.e. an epidemic version of '*keeping up with the Jones*').

Understanding Judaism like this, i.e. through the lens of egocentrism, gave me a far better degree of insight and way of explaining jewish behaviour than ethnocentrism precisely because it allowed me to explain both the jewish attitude to and interaction with gentiles, the origins and evolution of jewish culture and religion and most importantly the jewish attitude towards other jews. It is worth mentioning that this is the major area that MacDonald misses out in his thesis and one which disproves his theory in so far as jewish organisations and individuals are not a harmonious bunch by any means and have a habit, and long history, of engaging in vicious and bitter internal struggles against each other. These can be understood in the manner of the conjectural question: '*what is good for jews?*', but then one finds both sides of any conflict are asking that same question and answering it differently. Therefore the conjectural question has to boil down to a '*what do I think is good for jews?*' and one is again forced down the road of looking at the emphasis in that which leads one to the basis of the jewish mind: '*what is good for me?*'

I am not going to go too deeply into my critique of Ethnocentrism and the detailed evidence for my Egocentric thesis as I will present those in time, but I wished to offer a short account of my basic evolution from an Ethnocentric to an Egocentric understanding of jews. I have been testing the Egocentric thesis for quite sometime now both in my studies of the jewish question and among friends who have also studied it. I will over the coming months present a series of essays on my Egocentric theory via working through specific areas of jewish studies and historical examples, while looking at the Ethnocentric interpretation and seeing whether it can really give a coherent answer to each covered area of jewish studies and the analysed historical examples.

## Notes

(1) Earlier expressions of an ethnocentric theory, although not elaborated in any great detail, can be found in the work of the late great Theodor Fritsch (in his works from the 1880s to the 1930s), Edouard Drumont (in his works from the 1880s to the 1900s), Professor John Allego (particularly his 1971 book on the Bar Kochba rebellion: *'The Chosen People'*, Hodder & Stoughton: London), Dr. Maximine Portaz (in her 1958, *'Paul de Tarse, ou Christianisme et juiverie'*, Self-Published: Calcutta) and in Professor Revilo Oliver's many writings on the jews (1966-1994).

(2) This would be akin to asserting that Karl Marx or Jean Jacques Rousseau were active participants in genocide, because their works formed the basis for two of the greatest evidenced genocides in history (the Red Terror of Lenin/The Purges of Stalin and the results of the French Revolution respectively). We may not like either of these two individuals or their theories, but no one can go so far as to assert that they were responsible for genocide (which would also make Christ responsible for all the deaths of say the Thirty Years War and all the Crusades [Western and Byzantine]).

(3) The 'convert' in question was Nicholas Donin. Who after being rejected and excommunicated by the Paris jewish community, splashed himself with holy water and became a Christian. Taking orders he began a campaign against his own former kin by presenting 35 charges against the jews on the basis of statements made in the Talmud Bavli. This resulted in the burning of all the copies that could be found of the Talmud Bavli in 1242 and the near extermination of all the overt, as opposed to covert i.e. 'converts' like Donin, jews in Anjou, Brittany and Poitiers.

(4) Gan Eden is simply the jewish version of heaven, but unlike the Christian version of heaven: admission is based on one's biological state as a jew and Gan Eden itself is transitional.

(5) *Hemdat yamim, Shabbat 81a*. This is a kabbalistic ethical tale, which demonstrates this trait in Judaism in so far as it tells of a student who laughed in the course of morning prayers at a synagogue and was considered to have disgraced himself by his teacher and the student died soon afterwards. The meaning of the tale being quite clear. An English translation of this tale can be found in Aryeh Wineman, 1988, *'Beyond Appearances: Stories from the Kabbalistic Ethical Writing'*, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, pp. 149-150.