

Chapter 3

The Drone in History

The Greeks

When looking at the drone in history it is perhaps best to first look at a relatively drone free society, so that a comparison can be drawn. One of the seminal works which informs this book is Benjamin Farrington's *Head and Hand in Ancient Greece*. In that series of essays Farrington looks at why ancient Greece was the foundation of the modern world and how it flourished to the extent it did. Farrington first identified what was unique in ancient Greek culture, relating⁴:

A distinguished French historian of culture, Felix Sartiaux, regards the metaphysics of the Greeks as not essentially different from the thought of other ancient peoples, and as not constituting, therefore, the chief claim of the Greeks to originality. There is, he suggests, a striking similarity between Hindu philosophy and Platonic idealism. But Greek science is unique. In Sartiaux's phrase, it constitutes a mutation in human thinking.

To identify this “mutation” Farrington then characterised previous civilisations, saying that in those cultures, change was prevented by the tyranny of the corporate orthodoxy, as follows⁵:

In the old bronze-age civilizations of the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates there was a high degree of technical development. But the ideas derived from the techniques could not be applied to the interpretation of the major phenomena of nature because the domain of nature was already occupied by an elaborate mythology handed down by priestly corporations. This mythology is incorrectly described as popular superstition. It was the official view of the nature of the universe which it would be impious to question because it was enforced by authority.

⁴ *Head and Hand in Ancient Greece* The Character of Early Greek Science 2

⁵ *Ibid.* The Character of Early Greek Science 2

Farrington discounted racial genius as the cause of the Greek “*mutation*”, as he says that the foundational developments occurred in the Greek Ionic settlements on the Anatolian coast, where there was the most intermingling of Greek and other peoples. The Greek colonies of Ionia were populated by those who Greek society did not have a place for. Untied to a traditional tribal culture, these Greeks freely mingled with all the peoples who moved through what was the great crossroads of the ancient civilisations. The treasure that the Greeks brought to the mix was the Polis, the democratic city state. From the mix the Ionic Greeks took the Phoenician alphabet, the simplicity of which democratised writing and better communicated the ideas being generated by the thinkers and the technological tinkerers.

Another important factor was that these new settlements could take advantage of the new found smelting of iron, which was more plentiful and more easily mined than copper and tin, and so less able to be monopolised by ruling hierarchies. All these factors combined in the ferment of the Greek academies of Ionia. Foremost were the thinkers of the polis of Milesia, who created a culture of practical enquiry as a basis for scientific and philosophical understanding. Farrington wrote⁶:

... technique has both a practical and an epistemological value. Successful practice is a revelation both of man's knowledge of nature and his power over it, which are but two aspects of the one thing. Such was the idea which gripped the minds of the Milesian thinkers. It appeared then, for the first time in history, because then for the first time political power was in the hands of free men who were also masters of productive techniques...

⁶ Ibid. The Character of Early Greek Science 26

From this practical beginning sprang scientific method, which ultimately broke the monopoly of knowledge held by the priestly corporations and their ancient drones. The struggle continued⁷:

... until the suggestions derived from technical processes could be boldly applied to the whole domain of nature, until the spell of the mythological mode of explanation was broken, and until the emerging mathematical disciplines ceased to be part of the administrative equipment of bureaucrats and became part of the culture of the free citizen.

Farrington says that a linguistic analysis reveals that Milesian philosophic terminology derives from the mechanical trades. Accordingly Farrington ascribes the incredible flourishing of Greek culture to the interaction and symbiosis of practical ability and intellectual understanding. Such many sidedness is referred to in Plato's *Republic* (600a), in which it is said that it "*befits a wise man*" to have "*many inventions and useful devices in the crafts or sciences*" attributed to him and it is also reflected in the Greek traditions of the academy and the gymnasium, in which both mind and body have their place. Thales, said to be the first true mathematician, is credited with inventing futures and/or options.

For Farrington this explosion of knowledge ends with the devaluation of practical ability. Whereas Hippocrates, in his oath, defers to the specialist surgeon, there is a "*decline of anatomy after Galen*" with the reassertion of "*the ancient prejudice against the cheirourgos, the surgeon or manual operator.*"⁸ Farrington considered that the elevation of the intellectual metaphysical over practical wisdom was exemplified in the work of the aristocrat Aristotle. Aristotle sought to validate his metaphysical speculations by claiming that his

⁷ Ibid. The Character of Early Greek 18

⁸ Ibid., A study in Greek Medicine 29

teaching derived from the Milesian philosophers, while at the same time distaining productivity as base and menial. Farrington contradicts this, saying:⁹
it was precisely because these arts were productive that they seemed to the first philosophers to constitute true knowledge of the nature of things.

It is accepted that few would count Aristotle mediocre. The drone effect at issue was Aristotle's function as an advocate of the aristocratic Greeks, whose privileged position was threatened by the revolutionary change the philosophers brought to the Greek world. Aristotle's fear of change also surfaces in his advice to Alexander the Great (Aristotle was Alexander's tutor). In regard to Alexander's Persian campaign, Aristotle told Alexander to treat the Persians "*like dogs*". Aristotle's concern was that if Alexander conquered Persia and so created a dominion which comprised of east and west, Persians of talent may flood Alexander's court and displace Greeks. Aristotle's racist stance was essentially a drone policy of preferment, as is racism generally. Racism elevates a mediocre member of the in group over the competent and even the gifted of the out-group. This racist response is exhibited elsewhere in the exclusionist policies of ancient Greece. Challenged by the polyglot ferment of Ionic Greece and the talented foreigners who flocked to Athens and other cities, the locals resorted to racial preferment. Adversely comparing Greek policy with the later Roman approach, Edward Gibbon in, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* comments¹⁰:

The narrow policy of preserving, without any foreign mixture, the pure blood of the ancient citizens, had checked the fortune, and hastened the ruin, of Athens and Sparta During the most flourishing era of the Athenian

⁹ Ibid. *The Character of Early Greek Science* 2

¹⁰ *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* Chap II Part 4 p55.

commonwealth, the number of citizens gradually decreased from about thirty to twenty-one thousand.

Alexander was ‘great’ precisely because he did the complete opposite to Aristotle’s advice. He staffed all the Persian provinces he conquered with Persian governors, although he was always careful to place rivals in adjacent provinces. Alexander learnt some Persian, took on Persian dress, took Persian concubines and treated the Persians with respect and dignity. This meant that, apart from the province from which the deposed King came, Alexander suffered no significant revolts. He could keep his garrisons small and was able to maintain the vast bulk of his fighting force on the front of his ever extending empire. A lesser man than Alexander would have taken Aristotle’s advice and foundered on unending rebellions. But Alexander was Alexander the Great because there were not many like him. The Greek Empire lasted another 200 years before being overtaken by the Romans, but after Aristotle the glory that was Greece was gone. This is because of the political dominance of drone aristocrats, whose bickering bleed Greece white in the Peloponnesian wars and whose policies put an end to the Greek mutation.

The Romans

The Roman Empire at one stage encompassed a large part of modern Europe, North Africa and a good chunk of the Middle East. It supported a population not much less than the same regions do now. Roman roads provided communication and unification. The saying that ‘all roads lead to Rome’ meant that Roman roads were the standard, and indeed it is a claim to the very definition of the word ‘road’. Aqueducts allowed cities to grow in size and created economies of scale. The tonnages of Roman grain ships were not equalled until the late middle ages. This vast empire, built under the Republic, only lasted some 400 years after its vainglorious legions overthrew civil government and ushered in tyranny. The

threat to the Republic was not from Julius Caesar at the head of the legions but the Hydra legions with Julius Caesar at the head. As the Republican Brutus and his allies found, cutting down Julius Caesar merely meant that the head of Augustus sprang up instead. As Gibbon relates¹¹:

The conqueror was at the head of forty-four veteran legions, conscious of their own strength, and of the weakness of the constitution, habituated, during twenty years' civil war, to every act of blood and violence, and passionately devoted to the house of Cæsar, from whence alone they had received, and expected the most lavish rewards.

The loyal legions of the Republic were defeated and “*the republicans of spirit and ability had perished in the field of battle, or in the proscription*”¹². Still the ancient traditions of the Republic were not yet entirely overthrown, but the absence of ability meant mediocrity came to the fore, and the psychopath Augustus knew his drones well. As Gibbon observed¹³:

Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation, that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom.

Augustus and the emperors thereafter took the form of the Republican offices of authority to cloak their monarchical powers, not merely to appease the republican spirit but more so to deceive the legions of their power. This was grim enough but the legions were not deceived for long. With their election of Claudius the stammerer, the Praetorian Guard established the principle that the legions chose the emperor. Once begun this principle devolved down through

¹¹ albid Chap III p59.

¹² Ibid. Chap III p59.

¹³ Ibid. Chap III p71.

those Emperors who gave the most generous donatives, to the winner of the raffle for the imperial crown, the ascension of the generals themselves, such as Septimius Severus, and then to Emperors from the ranks, in the gigantic form of Maximin. Psychopath followed psychopath, the drones in their train. Gibbon paints this picture of Augustus himself¹⁴:

A cool head, an unfeeling heart, and a cowardly disposition, prompted him at the age of nineteen to assume the mask of hypocrisy, which he never afterwards laid aside. With the same hand, and probably with the same temper, he signed the proscription of Cicero, and the pardon of Cinna. His virtues, and even his vices, were artificial.

The emperors after Augustus were a chaotic succession of ‘the good, the bad and the ugly’. Although the good allowed competency to rule, the bad and the ugly predominated and for them the great offices of the state were reserved for their favourites. This was the preferment of drones and every form of drone flourished, foremost the flatterer, the obsequious and the spy drone. The rise of the artificial meant ability was ousted and “*a cloud of critics, of compilers, of commentators, darkened the face of learning*”¹⁵. Emperors whom fortune had favoured, looked askance at talent, as “*important services implied a dangerous superiority of merit*”¹⁶. One palace coup followed another, sometimes in rapid succession. After Augustus, Constantine, coming some 300 years later, was the next Emperor to hold the throne for more than 30 years. Rather than merit determining status, success became happenstance. The cycle of bloodbaths, which so often accompanied Roman regime change, gradually culled out the competent as competence takes time to achieve its full potential. Competency

¹⁴ Ibid. Chapt III Part 2 p70.

¹⁵ Ibid. Chap I Part 4 p58.

¹⁶ Ibid Chap IV Part 1 p94.

matures, mediocrity sours. The decline and fall of the Roman Empire was characterised by a rapid succession of psychopaths and their drone accomplices.

The Drone Ages

What are commonly known as the dark ages are better described as the drone ages. The drone ages were a period of stasis brought about by the Roman Catholic Church's ideological dominance. To understand why the Roman Catholic Church was such a drone zone, one has to look at the foundations of the Christian Church under the Roman empire.

Besides the gentle message of Jesus, there were three core doctrines of the early Church, all of which encouraged the rise of drones:

- (a) the doctrine of the resurrection and the profession of miracles;
- (b) millennialism, that these were the end of days;
- (c) the placement of the pantheon of polytheism in the ranks of the demons.

I. The Doctrine of The Resurrection and the Profession of Miracles

After two thousand years of Christianity, it can be forgotten that the doctrine of the resurrection and the promise of a life everlasting was a promise which no religion had ever made before the Christian Church, and a promise which cannot even be found in the Old Testament. The novelty meant that the doctrine was met with some skepticism. Accordingly the doctrine of the resurrection was bolstered by the Church's claim to a profusion of Christian miracles and in particular the miraculous raising of the dead. The difficulty for the Church was that the proof seemed only to manifest to the believers. Gibbon relates¹⁷:

At such a period, when faith could boast of so many wonderful victories over death, it seems difficult to account for the scepticism of those

¹⁷ Ibid Chap XV Part 3 p459.

philosophers, who still rejected and derided the doctrine of the resurrection. A noble Grecian had rested on this important ground the whole controversy, and promised Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, that if he could be gratified with the sight of a single person who had been actually raised from the dead, he would immediately embrace the Christian religion. It is somewhat remarkable, that the prelate of the first eastern church, however anxious for the conversion of his friend, thought proper to decline this fair and reasonable challenge.

The doctrine of resurrection's central place in the Christian message suggests that it was responsible for a good percentage of converts. As victory over death was unsupported by direct evidence, the doctrine tended to select the credulous over the critical. This over-represented drones in the Church.

II. Millennialism

Central to the early Christian Church's teaching was the Gospel prophecy that some alive at the time of Jesus would see the end of days. This teaching gave rise to two drone effects. Firstly, as time went by and centuries passed, it became harder to convince that the omnipotent Lord of the universe had got held up with other business and was just running a little bit late. So again there was a selection towards the credulous drones. Secondly, those most receptive to the idea of the end of days were those who weren't having too good a day, i.e. those who were at the bottom of the heap. Although there were middle and even upper class Romans who became Christians, the early church was over represented by the poor and hence the uneducated. While education is not a mark of intelligence, the antagonism between the poor uneducated and the educated rich was manipulated by the drones into a fervent anti-intellectualism which placed faith above reason. For the drone, faith trumps reason because reason is not an option for them, they just don't have the equipment. Drones,

better than any can come to Jesus as little children because intellectually, they are little children. Under the proud wing of the drones and their trenchant philosophy that ‘more is better’, faith became the touchstone of Christianity, to the point that blind faith was the measure of belief. While this convinced the credulous, the problem for the drones was that having abdicated reason as a tool of moral suasion, they were left with belief as their only advocate. This meant that the Christian converts were only those who were easily swayed and that the church was bereft of tools to convince the more critical. This led the drones to the conclusion that if you can’t out-argue a skeptic, one of the responses is to kill them. For this the drone needed its old friend and ally, the psychopath.

III. The Placement of the Pantheon of Polytheism in the Ranks of the Demons

This brings into play the third central doctrine of the early Christian Church, the Christian placement of the pantheon of polytheism into the ranks of the demons. In the Judaic and Christian worldview there was simply no place for the pagan array of gods. Rather than simply deny the existence of these gods (possibly a dangerous precedent) the early Christian Church elected to place them all in the legions of the demons, despite the poor fit. This stance placed the Christians in direct conflict with the daily life of Roman society. Although the Greek playwrights and their audiences exhibited a playful familiarity with the deities, polytheistic religions suffused the ancient cultures on a day to day level. Different deities marked the special days and the auspicious moments in the lives of the populace and society at large. Pagan superstition, particularly the interaction of the gods as free agents and the role of fate, together with the totemism of the Legions, provided the foundational worldview of Roman culture.

From its Judaic origins the Christian Church inherited the notion not only of the one God but also that of a jealous God. This construct was unknown in the Roman world, where a heterodox polytheism happily jostled together. More than

this, the slightest contact with the pantheistic host, as Demons, was enough to jeopardise an immortal soul. This placed the devout Christian outside of civil society. As the Gods were the form of pagan culture, this anathema caught up the artists and intellectuals who used the stories of the gods as their raw materials. Here was a seed of the conflict between the educated part of society and the credulous Christians, which would eventually become a monstrous growth.

The challenge the Christian faith put to the Roman Empire was not so much a religious challenge, as a challenge to the authority of the empire. It was this challenge to authority that brought about the Empire's typically brutal response. The punishments inflicted on the Christians for civil disobedience, after a period of relative toleration, reached their highest point in the reign of Diocletian, the emperor preceding Constantine. Torments and executions of Christians created a climate of 'fear and loathing' within the Church towards its adversaries. These feelings could understandably give rise to antagonism towards the Imperial apparatus but significantly, hatred was equally directed towards the Christian Church's ideological opponents, the philosophers, poets and playwrights, as is apparent in the writings of the early churchman, Tertullian¹⁸:

How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs, so many fancied gods, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates, who persecuted the name of the Lord, liquefying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians; so many sage philosophers blushing in red-hot flames with their deluded scholars; so many celebrated poets trembling before the tribunal, not of Minos, but of Christ; so many tragedians, more tuneful in the expression of their own sufferings; ...

¹⁸ Ibid Chap XV Part 4 p457.

One of Diocletian's edicts ordered the burning of Bibles and Gibbon is of the opinion that this particular edict could well have originated from the pagan scholars, who knew how sacred the Bible was to Christians. While there was no danger that Diocletian's edict could eradicate a tract that by then was so widely disseminated, the Christian response, once in power, was to irretrievably destroy a good part of ancient knowledge. Arguably the major driver in Diocletian's purge of the Christians was the degree of adhesion the Christians had achieved, in comparison to the old religion. The problem for the old religion was that with so many gods, loyalty is thinly spread. The familiarity of Aristophanes, the wit of Cicero and the sarcasm of Lucien, undercut and questioned the superstition of the masses. While the knowing jibes of the playwrights and the mocking wit of the scholars was largely an upper-class affair this suffused down through the ranks of society and corroded the superstitions which provided the belief structure of the masses. This created something of an ontological vacuum, a destabilising and potentially dangerous situation should Christianity have taken a militant turn.

The pantheists, aside from a few eastern business models, were a ramshackle bunch of part-timers. It was not fanaticism, but a mark of rank and affluence that attached to the holders of sacred office in the pagan world of Rome. The organisation of religious life in the pagan Roman Empire was carried out much as charity work is now, by the more publicly spirited members of the upper class. In contrast, for the ambitious outsider Christians, contemptuous of wealth and terrified of the temptations of the flesh in all its forms, their only outlet was the building of the church. Although the Apostles had formed no religious organization, by the third century a hierarchy was emerging, first the Bishops gained power over the Church and then the Metropolitans and Primate of the major cities gained power over the Bishops. In the fierce power struggles

between the rival cities that ensued, the Church of Rome emerged triumphant at the head of an absolute hierarchy. As Gibbon says¹⁹:

they had acquired, and they employed within their own society, the two most efficacious instruments of government, rewards and punishments; the former derived from the pious liberality, the latter from the devout apprehensions, of the faithful.

The Christian Church had become a state within the state. Furious as Diocletian's purge was, the Christians withstood it and eventually the edicts were relaxed. Chaos ensued after Diocletian's abdication but the next real emperor, Constantine, a temperate and farsighted man, formed a strategic alliance with the Christian Church.

The pagan title of Pontiff was transferred to the head of the Christian Church and the Roman Catholic Church became the state religion. Constantine needed a 'one size fits all' solution. That is for the new Roman Catholic Church to provide a single coherent and compliant belief structure to underpin the state and to unite the many various peoples, with their many different religions, who had come into the Roman Empire. This is why the Christian church became the Catholic Church, as the meaning of catholic is universal. The Roman Catholic Church took Jesus' pragmatic "render unto Caesar what is Caesars" as its central tenet, but reduced it to the simpler "render unto Caesar". For Constantine:

*The passive and unresisting obedience which bows under the yoke of authority or even oppression, must have appeared in the eyes of an absolute monarch the most conspicuous and useful of the evangelical virtues.*²⁰

¹⁹ Ibid Chap XV Part 6 p477.

²⁰ Ibid. Chap XX Part 2 p224.

In this great compromise, in order to have appeal to the polyglot pagans of the empire, the Church paganised Christianity. The first step towards this was taken at the Council of Nicaea in 325 and the Nicene Creed was the first step away from monotheism towards a pagan panoply via trinitarianism. Pagan temples were converted to Christian churches. The old gods were taken down and replaced with a pantheon of Saints, who continued the old function of the house gods, as approachable intermediaries of fate, but now assiduously ranked in service to the supreme deity. Between the Catholic Church's establishment by Constantine in 313 AD and the sack of Rome in 410 AD, the Catholic Church's authority gradually increased.

The exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment; and the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered that the profession of Christianity might contribute to the present as well as the future²¹.

Pagans were successively disenfranchised by a series of penal laws, for example by not being able to be military officers. While the Roman Empire lasted, the Church's power did not fully extend to the patrician class and in particular to the patrician intelligentsia, the custodians of the Graeco-Roman heritage. This meant that post Constantine, Roman society comprised of two separate ideological orders. The patrician intelligentsia, being the established formation, was comprised of the more competent. The new kid on the block, the Catholic Church, had to make do with the mediocre, our old friend the drone.

When the Roman Empire fell in the west, and remembering there were successive invasions and that Rome's centuries-long decline accelerated into a chaotic jumble, military power fell into the hands of the invaders, the tribes of Germany. Though militarily triumphant the tribes were culturally challenged by Roman civilisation. This created an odd mixture of contempt and awe. After the

²¹ Ibid. Chap XX Part 2 p224.

first sack of Rome it was the Church that functioned as the go-between with the invaders. The Church leaders recognised that a new host was in the offing and astutely ingratiated themselves into the tribesmen's camp. After the second wave of invasions and the collapse of the Empire the Germanic tribes recognised that to make full use of the prize they had won by the strength of their arms, they needed bureaucratic brains and administrative skills to govern it. If the patrician intelligentsia were given this task there was always the threat of rebellion. Utilisation of the Church was much more advantageous to the Germanic tribes as the Church did not constitute a potential military rival.

There were also other advantages for the leaders of the Germanic tribes. The Germanic tribes are Rousseau's model for the social contract. Gibbon described the Germanic tribes as, "*a hardy race of barbarians, who despised life when it was separated from freedom.*"²² The very word 'Franks' means free. While in some bands constant warfare had elevated the warrior chief to the status of King, this was still an elective status which required the voluntary allegiance of tribal society. All free men had a right to bear arms, and the social order was founded on the antecedent nature of the Germanic people, which was comprised of a collection of fiercely independent family groups. The newly raised leaders of the Germanic tribes bridled at their kinsman's democratic fetter to their power and found an ally in the Roman Catholic Church.

In the Church's intestine and savage doctrinal schisms, the winners proclaimed themselves the holders of divine authority. For these new prelates the Church was divine power itself. Cyprian the bishop of Carthage, chiding the leniency of a colleague towards dissidents, wrote:

²² Ibid Chap I Part 1 p2.

...if such irregularities are suffered, there is an end of Episcopal Vigor; an end of the sublime and divine power of governing the Church, an end of Christianity itself²³ ...

As holders of this divine power the Catholic Church sanctified the Germanic leaders with the Catholic doctrine of the divine right of kings. The feudal order is the warrior chieftain's authority in battle, set in stone by the authority of the Catholic Church. The rank and file German pagans became 'Christianised' so easily because the Roman Catholic Church had already become pagan itself. This new world order paved the way for the Church to reorganise imperial power. This was done by the means of the Holy Roman Empire, the Roman Empire mark II. In the Holy Roman Empire the Church functioned as a Bolshevik bureaucracy as it managed the empire but its primary function was social control. In the Holy Roman Empire the drones of the Roman Catholic Church achieved a level of total surveillance and thought control that is the model for our present day drones. In this new marriage of church and state the Church had no established opposition to contend with, as the old patrician intelligentsia, partisans of a broken Empire, were now within the Church's power. They were the first victims the drones fed to their psychopaths. Then came the burning of the books. This evened up the drones, as now there was only one text that could be in issue.

This order held for nearly a thousand years but the Roman Catholic Church sat astride an enormous contradiction. Proclaiming the primacy of the life everlasting it was constantly embroiled in the hectic political struggles of the day. The Church preached that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than it was for a rich man to get into heaven, but controlled great wealth and exhibited all the trappings of pomp and glory. The bastion of morality, it was terminally infected with the vices of *Luxuria* and *Avaritia*. The

²³ Ibid Chap XV Part 4 p483.

Church leaders were not oblivious to this contradiction and the vitality and flexibility of their organisation was exhibited by its ability to co-opt and absorb critics of its earthly power, such as by its sponsorship of the mendicant orders, the Franciscans and the Dominicans. However by the early Middle Ages these pressure valves were inadequate to deal with growing societal tensions. The problem for the Roman Church was its own theology. All traditional Christianity is eschatological, involving the dissolution of the world order and the creation of the city of God. The Gospels state that ‘these are the last days and some of those who are alive now will live to see the Kingdom of Heaven’. For the early Christian theologians, millennialism was an integral facet of their world system. It is because millennialism is so fundamental to the very essence of Christianity, its apprehension and exaltation of the other, that it survived the transition of Christianity from a revolutionary transcendental movement to an orthodox repressive ideology. When the Roman Empire developed a need for a catholic religion to draw together its polyglot empire and the Christian church made its accommodations with temporal power, millennialist tendencies were repressed. Gibbon says²⁴:

The doctrine of Christ's reign upon earth was at first treated as a profound allegory, was considered by degrees as a doubtful and useless opinion, and was at length rejected as the absurd invention of heresy and fanaticism.

The Bible was purged of its apocryphal additions, the Book of Revelations only surviving because it was erroneously attributed to St John. Works such as those of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons at the end of the second century, were expurgated, his original millennial writings only being rediscovered during the Middle Ages in a copy which survived the censor's deletions. Despite the Roman Church's suppression, millennialism remained a fringe element of

²⁴ Ibid Chap XV p454.

Christianity, as millennial tendencies survived amongst those suffering from the “*loneliness of exile*”²⁵. Millennialism’s place in the Book of Revelations ensured its legitimacy and the tradition was kept alive by the visionaries and ascetics who dreamt of union with the Godhead. From these sources a steady trickle of commentaries and manuscripts seeped through the clerical intelligentsia.

In the early middle ages there arose a class of wandering priests who extolled renunciation and condemned worldly vice. These priests attracted a fervent following among the poor, who resented the opulence and hypocrisy of the clergy. Rejecting the earthy ways of the church drones, these wanderers preached the imminence of the second coming and a return to Christianity as it was before the growth of the Church. Although embraced by the poor they were not always rejected by the wealthy, who salved their consciences with atonements. Although these priests wore their poverty as a badge of honor, it was not always a voluntary state. Competition for office was intense. Nepotism and political corruption meant that many of ability could find no sinecure, as the drones had them all. Deprived of a place in this world, these outcasts became advocates of another. The homeless priests combined their message with people of talent amongst the poor. Again and again Norman Cohn in his *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, notes the magnetic personalities, the oratory and the commanding drive of the prophets of the apocalypse. They were truly “*religious virtuosos*”, to use Max Weber’s term. They were the talented who had no place in an empire of drones.

Europe of the early middle ages was beset with strife and upheaval as there were a variety of stresses and changes unfolding. Increasing population and nascent industrialism resulted in unprecedented aggregations of people, notably in the textile towns of Flanders and the Italian mercantile cities. These centres were

²⁵ Religion to Philosophy, p.180.

successively ravaged by plague and famine while on the periphery Tartars and Mongols threatened annihilation. The Moslem affront to the Catholic religion held not only the Holy Land but had Europe in a vice that stretched from the Pyrenees to Constantinople. The Holy Roman Empire was buckling under regional tensions and was later to be torn asunder by the Protestant schism. Improved communications stretched the web of feudal localism. These many dislocations produced a class of people who no longer had the material or spiritual support which had traditionally been the quid pro quo of the feudal order. Previously all had had a place in 'the great chain of being' but now this foundational conservative construct was being broken down by the increasing mobility of society. First amongst the dislocated and cut adrift were the urban and wandering poor. These dispossessed were no longer a recognised part of the traditional social structure, while at the same time it was they who most keenly felt the vicissitudes of the time. It was from this fertile soil, watered with the tracts that poured from the new printing presses, that the millennialists of the middle ages sprang. The vital spark in this mix was the torchbearers of the millennium, the wandering priests, the hermit ascetics, the brethren of the free spirit and the opportunists. Change was slowly stirring, disrupting the familiar torpor of the drone age. The activism of the millenarians provoked a shift from destiny to will.

Drones on the Run

The drones were pushed back in the Middle Ages by two main forces: the Reformation and technological change. The Reformation itself has two central components. One component was the religious desire to bypass the mediation of the drone infested Roman Catholic Church. The other component was economic; resistance to church taxes and desire for church property. Both these phenomena had one thing in common, they were new. Drones do not cope with the new, as the new requires change and stasis is the drone's natural state. Two things are required for change, freedom of thought and freedom of action. Both were

implacably opposed by the drone Church but the drones could not hold back human ability forever.

The Reformation arose from one of the great contradictions of the Christian Church. This was that the message of Christ, in its origins, was immediate and personal, but on top of this vibrant appeal, over time, the Roman Catholic Church built drone layer upon drone layer of intermediaries. As the Bible, written as it was in latin or Greek, was inaccessible to the vast majority, the Christian message was gradually altered by its interpreters. Ivan Illich graphically portrayed this change in the nature of Christianity in his analysis of the parable of the good Samaritan. Illich begins by relating what he takes to be the conventional meaning of the parable, which is that it presents a model of behavior that is to be adopted by the righteous. Illich says this interpretation is incorrect and importantly for this essay, he says the parable has been misinterpreted since about 300AD, the time of the dronification of the Christian Church. Illich then notes that ethics derive from ethos, that is to say that ethics set out the rules of behaviour within the ethnic group. It is for this reason that in the parable it is an outsider, a Samaritan (or Palestinian as Illich says) who acts, rather than a member of the injured Jew's own ethnic group. This illustrates the universalism of the Christian message, which transcends tribalism. Illich says that the reason Jesus gave for the Samaritan coming to the rescue was that the Samaritan felt moved in his very innards by the sight of the injured man who was lying beside the roadside. What Illich says is that the original meaning of the parable was that it encouraged one to act according to one's own feelings, such as an authentic person competent in their emotions might, but that later the Church re-interpreted the parable, to make out that it was an instruction, which provided a model of behaviour such as may be taught by and to drones.

The Reformation was a desire for a return to the primacy of a direct connection with conscience and the god within. In the heartland of the South,

the Church of the drones maintained absolute and brutal control. Change occurred on the periphery. It was no accident that the Protestants were strongest in the North, where the ancient Germanic freedoms clashed with the palace religion of the drones. Change also occurred in the North as it was the latifundia of the new order, and was bled by taxes to feed Rome. These onerous and preferential obligations overrode the local excise and impinged on the prerogatives of the Princes. The Catholic Church would have happily burnt Martin Luther, as it had Hus before him, but Luther was protected by his Prince and the Princes of Germany were tiring of their economy draining South.

The English transition from Catholic to Protestant demonstrates both the national interests and also the psychopathic hierarchical functions that were in play. Henry VIII, that "*mediocre intellect*" turned "*ego-centric monstrosity*" by a head injury, first enacted the Statute in Restraint of Appeals which outlawed Papal authority. The Supplication against the Ordinaries and the Submission of the Clergy, established royal supremacy over the church and the Ecclesiastical Appointments Act 1534 restricted bishops to those nominated by Henry. The Act of Supremacy declared that Henry was "the only Supreme Head in Earth of the Church of England" and the Treasons Act 1534 made it high treason, punishable by death, to refuse the Oath of Supremacy acknowledging the King as such. In this manner Henry made himself Pope of England, combining temporal and religious power. Henry then cashed up the Catholic Church's estates, redistributing a fifth of England's landed wealth to a loyal new Tory gentry, the Cavaliers.

Technological change is the manifestation of practical ability, the antithesis of drone-dom. During the drone age some slow innovation had occurred despite the dominance of the Church; as competency still lurked in hidden corners. The invention of the horse collar and the windmill mitigated the laboriousness of agriculture and provided food for thought. Further technological development,

such as the Flanders weaving industry, took place in the Northern Protestant states, which had overthrown the stasis of the drone church. Protestant progress was impeded by the genocidal assaults flung at them by the psychopaths and drones of the empire. Millions died and Europe was ravished by the Imperial armies. It was for this reason that Britain, with its ‘wooden walls of sailing ships’, together with the democratic nature of its society, became the pre-eminent technological power. The gradual transformation of work by innovation developed into exponential change. Free thought begat a free economy and a free economy fostered free thought. There was a return to the Grecian model where philosophers were also inventors and inventors were philosophers in turn. Francis Bacon, arguably the most intelligent man of his time, wrote²⁶:

Prejudice has stood in the way of research into nature through the avenue of the mechanical arts, but we must lay aside such pride. Among the arts we must prefer those which reveal the natural bodies and materials of things by changing and adapting them. Such arts are agriculture, cooking, chemistry, dyeing, glass-making, enamelling, sugar-making, powder-making, fire-works, paper-making and so on.

Ultimately the technological transformation of society swamped the drone states and handed imperial power to the most technologically advanced nations.

The Drones Strike Back

Drones hung on in pockets of the least democratic and technologically advanced nations, such as in Russia, which had been all but annihilated by the Mongols and then retarded by the autocratic means needed to oust them. Here the drones succeeded in creating a drone state. It is of course contradictory to maintain that the mediocre could attain such success but a study of Russian Bolshevism reveals the same mechanisms which accounted for the success of

²⁶ Head and Hand in Ancient Greece The Character of Early Greek Science 26

the Dronean Catholic Church. In the case of the Catholic Church, the drones were effectively installed as the State by the victorious Germanic tribes, who had conquered Rome but didn't know what to do with it. In the case of Russia it was the German army who installed the Bolsheviks in power by transporting them from their exile in Switzerland, across Germany so they could be inserted into Russia, with gold and mercenaries, in the form of the so called Latvian Rifles, who were actually crack German troops. The Germans have a lot to answer for.

That the Germans bought themselves the closure of the Eastern front is demonstrated by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk at which the Bolshevik plenipotentiary, Lev Davidovich Bronshtein repaid the Germans by giving them the Ukraine and the most productive parts of western Russia. This deal allowed the Germans to turn all their forces to the Western front and for the Bolsheviks to turn all their forces on their domestic opposition. The psychopathic leadership of the Bolsheviks could then set about exterminating all other ideologies, as had the Roman Catholic Church. They accomplished the same result as the Roman Catholic Church's burning of the books by enforcing total censorship. Similarly to the Holy Roman Empire the Bolsheviks created a society that was feudal. The Russian 'revolutionaries' were actually counter revolutionaries who overthrew democratization and replaced it with an order reminiscent of that of Ivan the Terrible. The more psychotic Bolsheviks, such as Vladimir Ulyanov, dreamt of total annihilation, saying that if only 10 people survived a world war, if they were communists, that would be victory. The more pragmatic majority knew that they owed their position to being the party of a new class of thieves, torturers, prison guards, informers and other apparatchiks. The majority also knew that they needed to deliver some sort of state organisation, which would provide a steady supply of victims.

The difficulty for the Bolsheviks was that, as Andrzej Łobaczewski author of *Political Ponerology*, and his co-workers estimated, psychopaths make up only .6% of any given population. In addition, being psychopaths, the Bolsheviks were as likely to kill each other as anybody else, as occurred in the gang warfare between Iosif Dzhugashvili and Bronshtein. The Bolsheviks' problem lay in the fact that by exterminating all other ideologies, they were exterminating the Russian intelligentsia, grinding them "to powder"²⁷ as one Vory commentator put it, when these were the very people they needed to run a state organisation. The drones were the psychopaths' salvation. Mediocre as they were, the drones managed the Soviet state bureaucracy. In a world where the competent were often murdered or dispatched to the Gulag, the drone reigned supreme. Without the competent to contend with, the drone set the new norm. Andrzej Łobaczewski's work focuses on psychopaths and in the passage below maintains that a pathocratic system gathers up the all psychopathic members of society regardless of intelligence, as the small percentage of psychopaths in society requires that all are utilised. To a similar degree pathocratic systems need drones regardless of their lack of competence, as for a pathocratic society obedience is more important than ability:

In a pathocracy, all leadership positions, (down to village headman and community cooperative managers, not to mention the directors of police units, and special services police personnel, and activists in the pathocratic party) must be filled by individuals with corresponding psychological deviations, which are inherited as a rule. However, such people constitute a very small percentage of the population and this makes them more valuable to the pathocrats. Their intellectual level or professional skills cannot be taken into account, since people representing superior abilities are even harder to find. After such a system has lasted several years, one hundred percent of all the

²⁷ Comrade Criminal p157.

*cases of essential psychopathy are involved in pathocratic activity; they are considered the most loyal, even though some of them were formerly involved on the other side in some way. (emphasis added)*²⁸

There is a symbiotic relationship between psychopaths and drones. This develops because there are no conflicts between psychopaths and drones in the same environment. The drone is by definition mediocre. When confronted by narcissistic psychopaths, who exude dominance, exaggerate their own abilities and project a façade of assurance and certainty, the drone capitulates. This creates a relationship somewhat like the sado-masochistic relationship, in which the drone becomes the willing tool of the psychopath, vicariously glorying in the psychopath's perceived superiority. Although the drone is not necessarily a psychopath itself, it is similar, as its false position of status above ability requires the drone to utilise psychopathic behaviours, particularly overestimation of their own worth relative to others, creating hysterical self-esteem and deceit. The psychopathic, as Andrzej Łobaczewski relates²⁹:

... learn to recognize each other in a crowd as early as childhood, and they develop an awareness of the existence of other individuals similar to them. (emphasis added)

Although the drone will always defer to the psychopath; where there is a clash of psychopathic leaders, as in the gang warfare between Dzhugashvili and Bronshtein, the drones may be the decisive force. In that contest the drones were more attracted to Dzhugashvili's stay at home model than to Bronshtein's messianic urge, as the former seemed like a lot less effort. While in the first instance the drones insured the survival of the psychopathic Bolsheviks, in the

²⁸ Political Ponerology p137.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p90.

long term they were a prime cause of the failure of the Soviet state. As developed below in the Drone Warfare chapter, drone infestation of the Russian military risked WWII being won by the Germans. As it was Russia lost over 26 million and possibly up to 40 million killed in the war and never really recovered. Khrushchev's dismantling of the Gulag Archipelago came too late, as by then drones were running society from top to bottom. The drone state meant that the competent could make little headway in a bureaucracy already riddled with drone clustering and infestations. Grandiose and imbecile drone schemes drained resources. The dead weight of the drones dragged down the Soviet economy. In the end there was not much more than an empty husk to kick over. Reeling from the psychotic depredations of the Bolsheviks and the jealous wrath of the drones, which together resulted in the devastation of the Russian economy and the murder of around 61 million Russians, this great country is only now staggering back to its feet.

The rise and fall of civilisations is a common feature in history. Beyond tyranny and mutation, the reasons why civilisations establish themselves, flourish and then decay are complex, but there are familiar patterns. Today the "*militarized plutocracy*"³⁰ requires another vast bureaucracy to maintain a hierarchy of wealth in the post-scarcity economies of the west. When we look at contemporary western civilisation, we can see a period of innovation and productivity slowly being strangled by ever-increasing red tape and bureaucratisation. The reason for this is that during periods of innovation and productivity drones are sidelined by the able, who pioneer the new technologies. The able who succeed prosper. These new rich spawn but in the raffle of life they beget drones, as all families do. As families love and advantage all their children the drones partake of the patrimony. As drones are risk averse their survival rate is better and they tend to inherit. The second, or more commonly

³⁰ Gore Vidal.

the third generation drones, bitterly aware that they do not have the talent of their forebears, devalue and even despise their predecessors' practical ability. The functionality of practical ability haunts the drone and the drone seeks to frustrate it at every turn. The drone turns to luxury and affectation as the measure and value of all things, as these are the opposite of work and productivity and also because luxury and affectation require no skill or effort. These drones are the troops of the playboy set and the vacuous members of Veblen's leisure class. This is the mechanism of decay and the basis of the concept that mankind is in a state of decline from the genius of the ancients.