

The Southern Israelite

Visit the primary platform at southernprotestant.com

Was Alexander the Great an Ethno-Nationalist?



See: <u>Comment</u> from discussion [<u>The Catholic Jesuit Question</u>] <u>The leadership of both American political parties is Jesuit Catholic, not Jewish.</u>

So the Alt-right boys, no doubt to buttress their revived Holy Roman Empire, maintain that Alexander the Great was an ethno-nationalist. These men try this nonsense, identifying their movement with the successes of the Greek and Roman Empires, so often with people I just wanted to catalog the documentation for our future intellectual massacres we will enact in future debates.

John Clark Ridpath informs us of the internationalist and cosmopolitan policy of Alexander the Great:

Universal History, Vol. 10. pgs. 654-656

"Among the captives found in this stronghold of the enemy was the daughter of Oxyartes, the beautiful Roxana, whom Alexander, against the half-suppressed protests of his Greeks, chose for his wife. It appears that the union was based on politics as well as affection; for it was now evident that the Macedonian contemplated the organic consolidation of the various nations subdued by his arms, and that he saw in intermarriage one of the chief means by which this result was to be accomplished. It was observed, more-over, that his army had of late been recruited from Asiatic sources, and notwithstanding the jealousy which this measure created among his Macedonian and Grecian subjects, Alexander persisted in the course which seemed to him most likely to conciliate the favor of the recently subjugated peoples."

John Clark Ridpath does admit that the Bactrian tribe from which Alexander's wife Roxana derived was of an Aryan stock:

Universal History, Vol. 10, pg. 384

"We must conclude that the Parthians, along with the Bactrians, Chorasmians, Hyrcanians, Medes, and Persians, belonged to the common family to which the name Aryan has been assigned."

However, this means very little when we realize that he never referred to the Aryans as one race but on too many occasions to cite here, refers to the plural Aryan Race<u>S</u>. (link)

This is why he will categorize the Burmese under "The Brown Races" yet tells us they were Aryans!

Universal History, Vol. 5, Table of Contents:

"Part Sixth

The Brown Races...

Chapter CXXXII — The Burmese. Place of Burmah and origin of Burmese race. —: Likeness of Burmese to Thibetans; race softened by climate. — Burmah forms the eastern limit of Aryan dispersion."

Universal History, Vol. 6, pg. 631,

"Burmah is, politically, an independent empire. It is a transmontane region lying beyond the mountain range which forms the natural limits of Bengal on the east. The country has a remarkable situation, ethnically considered; for it forms the easternmost boundary, the ultima Thule, of the Aryan excursion toward the rising sun. Here it is that British enterprise has carried the Indo-European race to the furthest mark of its adventure in Asia."

Plutarch, De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute (Plut. De Alex. 1.6),

"Thus, the definition of race used by the Alt-right, as definitive of Ethno-Nationalism is utter rubbish, complete anachronistic, ignorant horse-shit, designed to manipulate the minds of young and/or intellectually lazy white people who do not want to put the real work in necessary to build something of actual value. Here we see then that the Alt-right is definitive of Holy Roman-Pan-Euro Imperialism not Ethno-Nationalism.

Moreover, the much-admired Republic ¹ of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic sect, may be summed up in this one main principle: that all the inhabitants of this world of ours should not live differentiated by their respective rules of justice into separate cities and communities, but that we should consider all men to be of one community and one polity, and that we should have a common life and an order common to us all, even as a herd that feeds together and shares the pasturage of a common field. This Zeno wrote, giving shape to a dream or, as it were, shadowy picture of a well-

ordered and philosophic commonwealth; but it was Alexander who gave effect to the idea. For Alexander did not follow Aristotle's advice to treat the Greeks as if he were their leader, and other peoples as if he were their master; to have regard for the Greeks as for friends and kindred, but [p. 399] to conduct himself toward other peoples as though they were plants or animals; for to do so would have been to cumber his leadership with numerous battles and banishments and festering <u>seditions. But, as he believed that he came as a heaven-sent governor to all, and as</u> a mediator for the whole world, those whom he could not persuade to unite with him, he conquered by force of arms, and he brought together into one body all men everywhere, uniting and mixing in one great loving-cup, as it were, men's lives, their characters, their marriages, their very habits of life. He bade them all consider as their fatherland the whole inhabited earth, as their stronghold and protection his camp, as akin to them all good men, and as foreigners only the wicked; they should not distinguish between Grecian and foreigner by Grecian cloak and targe, or scimitar and jacket; but the distinguishing mark of the Grecian should be seen in virtue, and that of the foreigner in iniquity; clothing and food, marriage and manner of life they should regard as common to all, being blended into one by ties of blood and children."

Moreover, in centuries to come further definitive statements will be made regarding the internationalist and cosmopolitan nature of the Greco-Roman tradition:

Aelius Aristides, *The Roman Oration:*

"But the most marvelous and admirable achievement of all, and the one deserving our fullest gratitude, is this. . . . You alone of the imperial powers of history rule over men who are free. You have not assigned this or that region to this nabob or that mogul; [Both of these words denote brown races of Indian and Middle -Eastern stock (Link1) (Link2)- DS] no people has been turned over as a domestic and bound holding — to a man not himself free. But just as citizens in an individual city might designate magistrates, so you, whose city is the whole world, appoint governors to protect and provide for the governed, as if they were elective, not to lord it over their charges. As a result, so far from disputing the office as if it were

their own, governors make way for their successors readily when their term is up, and may not even await their coming. Appeals to a higher jurisdiction are as easy as appeals from parish to county. . . .

"But the most notable and praiseworthy feature of all, a thing unparalleled, is your magnanimous conception of citizenship. All of your subjects (and this implies the whole world) you have divided into two parts: the better endowed and more virile, wherever they may be, you have granted citizenship and even kinship; the rest you govern as obedient subjects. Neither the seas nor expanse of land bars citizenship; Asia and Europe are not differentiated. Careers are open to talent. . . . Rich and poor find contentment and profit in your system; there is no other way of life. Your polity is a single and all-embracing harmony. . . .

Create a free website or blog at WordPress.com.