The Stronghold and the Shrine Revisited

by David G. Pearson

This article will illustrate that the state is extraterrestrial in origin and that the city emanated from the state. The city is also, therefore, ET in origin. The abolition of slavery necessitates the eradication of the state and city (i.e. civilization).

In the 1960's Erich von Daniken asserted that ETs mated with apes via artificial insemination and gene-splicing, producing early hominids. The repetition of this process eventually produced Neanderthals and finally *Homo sapiens*, according to von Daniken. This theory is a special case of the general theory of "punctuated equilibrium," which was propounded by Niles Eldredge several years later. According to Eldredge's book, *Time Frames*: "Eldredge ... startled the world by challenging Darwin's cherished beliefs—proposing instead that once a species has evolved it rarely undergoes change, and that the evolution of new species occurs only periodically, in relatively rapid spurts."

Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Ed. defines the term "punctuated equilibrium" (1978) as: "evolution that is characterized by long periods of stability in the characteristics of an organism and short periods of rapid change during which new forms appear especially from small subpopulations of the ancestral form in restricted parts of its geographic range."

Von Daniken also asserted in his *Chariots of the Gods?* that the gods of antiquity were ETs. My claim is a variation of this theme: the state emanated from ET gods of antiquity and the city emanated from the state. To prove this, I must show that the gods of antiquity were extraterrestrials and that the state emanated from them. This will establish that the state is extraterrestrial in origin.

The next thing I must show is that the city emanated from the state. To do this we must assume, without proof—although a cogent argument does exist—that all modern states and cities diffused from the earliest states and cities of antiquity from Mesopotamia, Egypt, the Indus Valley in India, the Yellow River in China, sub-Saharan and central southern Africa and Mesoamerica.

This theory also assumes that the 'gods' of antiquity, if they are more than figments of humanity's imagination, are temporal, finite and mortal beings occupying the inside dimensions of space and time. In relation to the eternal, infinite and immortal transcendental God, creator of the Universe, the gods are no more than we are.

The theory of punctuated equilibrium and von Daniken's ET/ape-mating, gene-splicing theory are mutually supporting. Both theories explain "missing links" in the fossil record in a mutually supporting manner. If von Daniken's theory is correct, then the species *Homo sapiens* is some unknown 'x' percent ET in origin and the state is, therefore, at least 'x' percent ET in origin. My contention is that regardless of the validity of von Daniken's theory, the state emanated from ET gods of antiquity and the city emanated from the state. The state and the city are, therefore, ET in origin.

This article quotes Lewis Mumford extensively because of his accurate and comprehensive descriptions and analyses of the cultures of the Old and New Stone Ages and the earliest ancient cities.(see bibliography) Mumford neither believed nor explicitly asserted that the gods of antiquity were ETs, nor did he state that they actually existed outside the human imagination. However, Mumford believed that the state emanated from the gods (whatever their metaphysical reality) and that the city emanated from the state.

Paleolithic Campers and Neolithic Villagers

I believe the gods of antiquity were ETs and that they existed both *inside* and *outside* the minds (imaginations) of paleolithic campers and neolithic villagers, *simultaneously*. Also, it must be kept in mind that paleo-neolithics were steeped in animism and ancestor worship and it is likely, in my opinion, that they referred to certain manifestations of their ancestral spirits as gods. In other words, if ETs existed and made themselves audible or visible to paleo-neolithics, *the paleo-neolithics would identify, refer to and consult the ETs as materialized ancestors and, therefore, as god*s.

For the purpose of building cities, the ET gods would prop up paleolithic hunting chieftains and neolithic witch doctors as divine kings and high priests, respectively, in the same way that 18th and 19th century British colonialists did at a later time. If they existed, ETs would have been highly technical and, therefore, would have built a civilized environment for the express imperialistic purpose of spreading state and civilization as well as feeding, clothing, sheltering, and wining and dining themselves *via enslavement*. The earliest ancient cities were known as ancestral cities. Some primitives went along, devotedly, with the wishes of their 'ancestors'; others, no doubt, rebelled. But there exist no written records of these rebellions because writing hadn't been invented until one or two centuries after the earliest city (Eridu) was built, according to Mumford.

The earliest ancient cities, attested by Mumford, did not evolve out of neolithic villages for reasons of defensive or offensive warfare. Instead, neolithic villages tend to, in Mumford's words:

> … show a remarkable lack of anything that could be called weapons; and though this is a negative proof, it fits well into the picture of self-contained communities, too tiny, too lacking in surplus manpower, too far apart and too poor in easy means of movement until boats were invented, to have any need to crowd one another or encroach on each other's domain ... at this point, I submit, war is not yet in evidence ... The primal war of 'each against all' is a fairy tale: Hobbes' bellicose primitive man has even less historic reality than Rousseau's noble savage. As with the birds, 'territoriality' may have amicably settled boundary claims that only later, under more 'civilized' concern for property and privilege, led to savage conflicts.

Mumford continues:

> What the early castles and strongholds point to is not war and conflict between opposing communities, but the one-sided domination of a relatively large group by a small minority. Such compulsion and control as arms may have imposed were within the community, and not at first in struggles against other communities: it was by the wielding of arms that the 'nobles' at first achieved their age-old power over their own peasantry. Competition, conflict, violence and outright murder may all have existed in various degrees in every group, though they have probably been exaggerated by modern scholars who gratuitously read back into primitive times the aberrations and offenses peculiar on a magnified scale to 'higher' civilizations. But Bronislaw Malinowski's judgment on this subject seems to me sound: 'If we insist that war is a fight between two independent and politically organized groups, war does not occur at the primitive level.' (*The City in History* (TCIH), p. 24, 25).

As for warfare between hunters, Mumford states: "Now apart from a few dubious cave paintings of men with drawn bows facing each other, there is no early evidence to suggest that hunters preyed on other hunters." (TCIH, p. 22). Later on, according to Mumford, paleolithic hunters preyed on neolithic villagers in order to round them up and coerce them into building a city:

> What actually happened before the city came into existence can only be conjectured. Perhaps residual paleolithic hunting groups and the new neolithic settlers, each still too sparse to have the upper hand, began to occupy the same territory and stayed together long enough to absorb some of each other's ways and interchange some of their kits of tools... They were probably at first equal partners, but the relationship became increasingly one sided as the weapons and coercive habits of the aggressive minority were reinforced by the patient capacity for work that the stone-grinding neolithic peoples showed. As often happens, the rejected component of the earlier culture (hunting) became the new dominant in the agricultural community, but it was now made to do duty for the governance of a superior kind of settlement. Weapons served now not just to kill animals but to threaten and command men. (TCIH, p. 25).

Mumford continues: "In this emergence of the city, the dynamic element came, as we have seen, from outside the village. Here one must give the new rulers their due, for their hunting practices had accustomed them to a wider horizon than village culture habitually viewed." (TCIH, p. 31). This "paleolithic-neolithic union" or 'urban revolution' was accompanied by a transformation of deities. Quoting Mumford:

> • That urban transformation was accompanied, perhaps preceded, by similar outpourings from the collective unconscious. At some moment, it would seem, the local familiar gods, close to the hearth fire, were outpowered and partly replaced, certainly out-ranked, by the distant sky gods or earth gods, identified with the sun, the moon, the waters of life, the thunderstorm, the desert. The local chieftain [before the emergence of the city the local chieftain was a hunter who held a permanent *stronghold* which prior to that time was a temporary hunter's campsite] turned into the towering King, and became likewise the chief priestly guardian of the shrine, now endowed with divine or almost divine attributes. (TCIH, p. 30) (brackets added)

- The historic effort, as recorded on two famous Egyptian palettes, begins at the point where the paleolithic hunting chief, the first among equals, passes over into the powerful King, who takes to his own person all the powers and prerogatives of the community. (*The Myth of the Machine* (TMOTM), p. 169).

- ...The king became a mediator between heaven and earth,... The ancient King List of Sumer records that kingship 'was lowered down from heaven'. The five kings appointed by deity were given five cities...: Erion, Badtbria, Zarak, Sippar, Shuruppak. (TCIH, p. 38).

In summary, so far I have tried to show that: 1. the earliest ancient cities, according to Mumford, did not evolve out of neolithic villages and/or paleolithic caves and campsites for reasons of warfare; 2. late paleolithic hunters, after having been turned into kings by the gods, enslaved neolithic villagers for the purpose of building cities; 3. this enslavement was accompanied by a transformation of gods (deities); 4. the gods are ET in origin; 5. the state (i.e. kingship), having emanated from the gods, is ET in origin; and 6. the city, having emanated from the state, is ET in origin.

Assertions 4-6 can be shown more clearly by consolidating some of the preceding quotes of Mumford: "... local familiar gods, close to the hearth fire, were outpowered and partly replaced, certainly out-ranked, by the distant sky gods ... identified with the sun, the moon ..."; "It took extra, supernatural authority, derived from a god or group of gods, to make kingship prevail..."; "The five kings appointed by deity ..."; "...Kingship 'was lowered down from heaven.'"; "...the king became a mediator between heaven and earth,..."; "The five kings" (i.e. the state) were "appointed by deity" (i.e. the gods) and this appointment "was lowered down from heaven" (i.e. 'extraterra'). Hence, the gods are ET in origin.

It took the authority of god(s) "to make kingship (i.e. the state) prevail..." The state was "appointed" by the gods. The state "was lowered down from heaven." Hence, 5. the state emanated from ET gods, and the state is ET in origin. Assertion 6: The city, having emanated from the state, is ET in origin, follows from: "… one of the attributes of the ancient Egyptian god, Ptah, as revealed in a document derived from the 3rd millennium BC—*that he founded cities*—is the special and all but universal function of kings." (TCIH, p. 35)

Many scientific and scholarly readers have interpreted metaphorically and will continue to so interpret descriptions such as: "lowered down from heaven," "the five kings appointed by deity..." and "...authority, derived from a god or a group of gods." However, it is high time that language such as this be taken literally. We should learn to interpret religious language in a more literal and less figurative way; otherwise, the paleolithic hunter will be blamed for creating the state, slavery and civilization. Otherwise we will have to assume that the state, slavery and civilization evolved organically 'up out of the earth' in a natural and continuous Darwinian fashion. Are we to presume the seed of the earth's destruction emanated solely from the earth?

Inside the Citadel

Further evidence that supports the assertion that the earliest ancient states and cities were ET in origin can be attained by showing that the ancient states and cities did not 'evolve' gradually out

of neolithic villages and/or hunter-gatherer caves and campsites. Also, further supportive evidence can be attained, assuming that their 'evolution' was sudden and rapid via cultural "punctuated equilibrium," by showing that the primary causal agent of the transformation did not originate *inside* but *outside* the neolithic village and the hunter-gatherer cave and campsite.

The citadel is a fortification; a stronghold and city proper which rests inside the city-at-large. Inside the citadel is the palace which houses the god (first in command) and the king (second in command) and the temple which houses the high priest and subordinate priests. Mumford writes:

> In the citadel's bodyguard, we find the first army and the first police officers;... the first housing for such military functionaries, the barracks. Here, too, we find the first foreign office, the first bureaucracy, the first court of law (at the gate of the palace), likewise, from the temple quarter, the first astronomical observatory, the first library, the first school and college: not least, the first 'theater'. All these flourished in the citadel before there were any independent municipal equivalents with a larger domain to work in, or any question of democratic participation. . . . This royal monopoly held for many technical innovations, which made their appearance in the citadel long before they spread to the rest of the city. (TCIH p. 101).

Hence, the city-at-large emanated and diffused from the citadel which houses the god and the king who are the state. Hence, the city emanates from the state. As Mumford explains: "the citadel served as the original pilot project for the city;" (TCIH, p. 102) "No less important to the citadel than its enclosure was its centrality: both enclosure and centrality were attributes to the sanctuary, before they were passed on to the bigger urban community." (TCIH, p. 48) "The city as it took form around the royal citadel was a man-made replica of the universe." (TCIH, p. 49).

Inside the citadels of ancient Sumerian cities resided the ziggurats (temples) which "reached the height of true man-made mountains, comparable [in size] to the pyramids of Egypt..." (Janson, p. 68, brackets added).

I submit that the earliest ancient citadels could not have possibly evolved, gradually, out of neolithic villages and/or hunter-gatherer caves and campsites. Although, I concede that a sudden cultural transformation over a short period of time ("punctuated equilibrium") may have taken place, centering around the hunter chieftain's permanent stronghold which was formerly a temporary campsite. In other words, the citadel's *palace* and *temple* evolved rapidly from the hunter chieftain's *stronghold* and *shrine*. This is similar to Mumford's assertion, as follows:

> The proto-city had, as I pointed out, the beginnings of its institutional life in the fortified camp and the shrine, not necessarily occupying a common site. The mark of the city, let me repeat, is the coming together of these two institutions in a special precinct, set apart from the profane world. (TCIH, p. 64).

If this is true, how and why does a hunter chieftain, together with his hunting band, transform a campsite stronghold and a small rudimentary stone hut into a citadel, without the aid of some colossal external power and intelligence? It has already been established that the gods spearheaded this transformation; yet we are constantly being asked to believe that the gods were

simply and solely no more than a figment of the hunter/gatherer's imagination. In Mumford's words:

- Beginning as a concentration of manpower under a firm, unified, self-reliant leadership, the ancestral city was primarily an instrument for regimenting men and mastering nature, directing the community itself to the service of gods. (TCIH, p. 94). ...villages compelled under threat of starvation to labor like slaves." (TCIH, p. 89). "Every feature of the early city revealed the belief that man was created for no other purpose than to magnify and serve his gods. That was the city's ultimate reason for existence. (TCIH, p. 74, 75).

- The modest foundations of the village had been laid in the earth: but the city reversed the village's values, and turned the peasant's universe upside down, by placing the foundations in the heavens. All eyes now turned sky wards. (TCIH, p. 37).

- But the fact that the city has from the beginning been based on forced labor, and that forced labor was produced, not only by enslavement, but by monopoly of the food supply, seems to be indisputably incised on the walls of the ancient city. . . . It was not for nothing that this great storehouse [i.e. "monopoly of the food supply"] was within the heavy walls of the citadel, protected *against the inhabitants of the city*. (TCIH, p. 108, brackets added).

- Among the Aztecs, the need for sacrificial victims—as many as twenty thousand in a single year—was the main reason for the ferocious wars these people waged ... Invasions in force to round up captives for slavery, rather than sacrifice, may well have been an independent source of war. (TCIH, p. 41).

- Is it any wonder that early man looked back to the period before the city as the *golden age*? (TCIH, p. 52 emphasis added).

"According to Akkadian and Babylonian scriptures, the gods created men in order to free themselves from the hard necessity of work." (TMOTM, p. 206). I submit that the gods were far more than figments of the paleo-neolithic imagination. In the main room of the "White Temple" of the Sumerian city state of Uruk, "sacrifices were offered before the statue of the god." (Janson, p. 68). As well as being interstellar 'seeds' for the sprouting and spreading of state and civilization, the earliest newly built citadels were probably waystations for ET expeditionary flying helmsmen. The palace and its precinct provided leisure and comfort for the pilots, while the ziggurat temple and its precinct provided necessary provisions and luxury goods, also for them. According to Mumford, the ancient citadel or proto-city-state and its surrounding land was owned by a god who controlled a "totalitarian economy, centered in the temple." The god "exacted service from everyone":

. . . the temple precinct itself was not purely a religious area: it served also as a 'trading estate', where goods were manufactured, and as a 'shopping center', where they were stored and distributed. The store houses . . . contained 'an immense variety of articles: grain, sesame seed as the raw material for oil, vegetables, beer, dates, wine, fish (dried and salted), fat, wool, skins, huge quantities of reeds and rushes, mats, asphalt, stones.'

Wool-plucking, grain-milling, tanning, spinning, and weaving were all done within the temple precinct. Only with the growth of the urban population and the increasing complexity of economic operations *was a portion of this economy released to more purely secular enterprise, in other quarters of the town.* (TCIH pg. 72 emphasis added).

The City: Human Slave Megamachine

Why didn't the ET gods teach the slaves theoretical and applied sciences and introduce them to advancing industrial, agricultural and biological technologies so that the slaves could serve their gods with greater efficiency? Perhaps because had they done so, the status of the god(s) in the mind of the slave would have been significantly reduced, as it is today. Theoretically, in a relatively short period of time the slaves would have learnt how to build spacecraft (gliders for example), thus lowering the god to the status of a slave in the mind of the slave, or lifting the slave to the status of a god in the mind of the slave.

If the ET gods taught the slaves theoretical and applied sciences and advanced technologies, the slaves would have then been in a constant state of rebellion, and would have overthrown the god, the king and their boot-licking priests and set up their own proletarian state dictatorship. This would have meant that the villagers in the surrounding area would have been rounded up and pressed into urban slavery in order to fill the vocational vacancies left behind by the newly self-liberated slaves, who had in the meantime become citizens; that is, ruling class members. Otherwise, the newly self-liberated slaves would have returned to their former horticultural, rural village way of life and would have given up the city altogether for what it really was and always will be: a human slave "megamachine."

Historically, I gather, there have been ruling classes who have completely opposed technological advancement, or who at least kept a tight control over it lest it upset the religio-ruling class order. The emergence of the city in paleo-neolithic times and places was, in and of itself, a technological, antisocial revolution. The very 'molecules' of this new 'technology' was forced, complex, machine-like chain-of-command permeated social organization which is better known as slavery. This slavery was required in order to create an ongoing and advancing division of labor which was required in order to build and maintain the city. The force that was required to build and maintain the city was a state-centered chain of command that thoroughly permeated the whole society. Mumford refers to this social organization as the "megamachine."

Out of the megamachine, as a basis, the city and all advancing technology emerged. Thus slavery (i.e. forced, complex, machine-like chain-of-command permeated social organization), not technology or machines in the ordinary sense of the word, is the basis of civilization. The rumor that civilization progresses beyond slavery is a ruling class lie. Modern social organization is astronomically more complex than all of the metal and plastic high tech machinery combined. The city requires slavery. The city requires the state. (see *The Gods Will Have Blood*, Anatole France).

Viewed from the present, the "passage to civilization" is difficult to interpret. As Mumford has argued, no single technical factor marks the transition from the neolithic economy to a central economy. Apparently "power" was available in abundance before even metals and tools were invented: "power sufficient to build if not move mountains." Yet, Mumford explains,

"civilization from the beginning was focused on the machine"; this he calls "post neolithic technics." Mumford describes this post neolithic change in scale:

> Quantification and magnification are the marks of the new technology. Instead of the little neolithic shrine, there stands a towering temple, the 'Mountain House', and nearby a huge granary: instead of the cluster of frail, mud-walled village houses, for a score of families, a wall-engirdled city, with a thousand or more families, no longer merely a human home, but the home of a god: indeed a replica of Heaven.

This change in scale shows up everywhere, and it was brought about through the use of only Stone Age tools, such as wooden sledges, inclined planes, levers, chisels, saws, mallets and ropes. As Mumford notes, "changes that once would have needed scores of years to consummate now took place almost overnight, not because better tools and equipment [e.g. wheeled vehicles, plow, pulley, windlass, derrick and written language had not been invented prior to the emergence of cities and the "passage to civilization"] were at the disposal of the builders and fabricators, but because a highly efficient *type of social organization* [e.g. kingship chain of command, "mechanized men", "megamachine"], hitherto unknown, had taken command." (TMOTM, p. 165-168, 195, brackets added)

Hence, the earliest ancient towns (e.g. Jericho, 7000 BC; Catal Hüyük, 6000 BC) came into existence in the absence of an advancing campsite or village technics. And the earliest ancient cities (3500 BC) came into existence in the absence of an advancing campsite or village/town technics with the exception of a forced, complex, machine-like social organization, permeated and controlled by an ET state chain of command.

The Citadel: Keeping State Secrets

In contradistinction to the ruling classes who overtly suppress or tightly control an advancing technology, there exist the opposite types of ruling classes who energetically encourage an advancing technology. It seems that sometime after the emergence of an ancient city, the ET gods would abandon the city and its rulership and leave it to a god-king—maybe an ET-human hybrid—and his boot-licking priests. Dynastic periods probably begin around this time.

This new ruling class was probably, over time, more willing to allow technology to advance. Perhaps the hypnotic trance that the supernatural mystique of the ET god ruling class induced in the slave wore off after the ET gods abandoned the city. As this condition advanced, perhaps more and more slaves were allowed to share in the secret knowledge hidden away in the temple. Slaves would be set free and educated, but only when there was a large enough reserve of potential slaves in the free villages in the surrounding area to take their places.

Advancing technology, which emanates from the citadel, causes upward social mobility. Consequently, the ruling class grows larger, the slave class grows larger, and the city grows larger. This phenomenon has continued into modern times, where the advanced industrial working classes of the U.S., Canada, France, England, Russia, Japan and other nation states are ruling class members who are, via economic imperialism, living off, exploiting and uprooting the resources of the working classes and the indigenous villagers of the third world. The contemporary 'neolithic' indigenous populations of the world are still being used as a reserve

slave labor pool by the consumerist 'ruling class-working class' of the first world. Technological advancement is driving the indigenous off their land and into the world's urban centers.

Indeed, as Mumford explains, the secretive inner sanctum of the citadel was preeminently a *communications control center*; the chief reason for its existence was the keeping of technological secrets:

> As in the United States and Soviet Russia today, the great business of the citadel was to 'keep the official secrets.' These secrets created a gap between the rulers and the ruled that almost turned them into different biological species; and it was not until the achievements of civilization themselves were called into question, by popular revolt, that any part of these secrets was shared...

> So far I have dwelt on one phase of the monopoly of knowledge and power originally exercised by the rulers of the citadel. But as a matter of fact, this monopoly covered most of the functions which were later taken over and collectively distributed by the municipality only after many thousands of years. One might call this the law of cultural seepage ... This royal monopoly held for many *technical innovations*, which made their appearance in the citadel long before they *spread to the rest of the city*. (TCIH, p. 99, 100, 101).

Chances are, initially the ET gods prevented technology from advancing and prohibited any existing advanced knowledge from seeping out of the citadel's palace and temple and into the city-slave population-at-large. The ET gods did this, most likely, in order to obstruct any additional desire in the slaves to achieve any upward socio-economic mobility which is caused by an advancing technology under ruling class control.

Perhaps the most important reason that the ET gods would have hidden high-tech instruments and machinery (e.g. functioning spacecraft and ET-retrieved spacecraft wreckages) from the close-up view of the slaves, artisans, engineers and subordinate priests of the earliest ancient cities was to prevent the cities' inhabitants from building monuments depicting high-tech apparatuses or from engraving pictures of same on the walls of the ancient cities. These monuments and pictures would have provided the basis for the common belief among contemporary modern humans that the state and civilization (and their necessary attendant global ecocide) were created by the ETs—the same ETs who are allegedly abducting humans today and indoctrinating them into believing that they, the ETs, are our ecological saviors! Thus, ET gods allowing ancient urbanites a close-up view of high-tech instruments and conveyances would have led to a contradiction that would have completely compromised the ETs' alien/human hybrid/ecological project (A/HH/EP) which is being reported more and more frequently today to scientific researchers of the UFO abduction phenomenon by alleged abductees (see *Passport to the Cosmos*, John Mack). John Mack gives a report here of the A/HH/EP, and he suggests further that the state emerged from symbolist-crazed shaman abductees of UFOs from an "ecologically-minded spirit realm."

It should be kept in mind that the slaves of antiquity were anatomically modern humans, that is, they were *Homo sapien sapiens*, with the same emotional and intellectual capacity as our own. Probably, the ET gods ruled over 'protoliterate' Mesopotamia and predynastic Egypt until

approximately 3000 BC, when they relinquished their rulership to ET-human hybrid god-kings and pharaohs. Accompanying this ruling class transition was a change in policy with respect to advancing technology. The new ruling class, perhaps being less supernatural (in the minds of the slaves) than the full-blooded ET god ruling class, felt that they could afford to let technology advance at some controlled 'low' rate. And within the interval 3200 BC–2800 BC, according to Mumford:

> ... grain cultivation, the plow, the potter's wheel, the sailboat, the draw loom, copper metallurgy, abstract mathematics, exact astronomical observation, the calendar, writing and other modes of intelligible discourse in permanent form, all came into existence at roughly the same time, around 3000 BC give or take a few centuries. The most ancient urban remains now known, except Jericho [and probably Catal Hüyük 6000 BC], date from this period. This constituted a singular technological expansion of human power whose only parallel is the change that has taken place in our own time. (TCIH, p. 33, brackets added).

In summary, this article shows: 1. the gods are ET in origin; 2. the state, having emanated from the gods, is ET in origin; 3. the city, having emanated from the state, is ET in origin; and 4. ET gods (i.e. the state proper) applied force, coercion and deception to Old and New Stone Age societies, yielding complex machine-like social organization thoroughly permeated by a chain of command centrally directed by the ET gods. This chain of command social organization was necessary in order to put into place an ongoing and increasing economic division of labor which in turn was necessary in order to build and maintain the city.

Admittedly, the preceding argument has been a very linear and nondialectical, cause and effect description of the civilization process. But this is as it should be because the state, whose only reason for existence is the implementation of slavery (i.e. chain of command permeated social organization which is the structural basis of civilization) is inorganic, mechanistic, linear and non-dialectical. I would describe this cause and effect aspect of the civilization process in a consolidated schematic form as follows:

Extraterrestrial god (i.e. the state and ruling class proper) —> paleolithic hunter chieftain appointed king and boot-licking neolithic witch doctors appointed priests (i.e. the state and ruling class bureaucracy) —> chain-of-command permeated machine-like social organization (i.e. slavery) —> ongoing and increasing economic division of labor —> city (i.e. civilization) —> advancing technics.

What is to be done? We must effectuate the complete and permanent physical, social, moral and psychological destruction of the state and its written and philosophical jurisprudence. Furthermore, we must completely and permanently break each and every link in every chain of command of the social order so that every individual becomes a sovereign individual neither giving nor obeying orders.

Thus, with the sinews of the state and its by-product civilization completely and permanently dissolved, we will have then returned to that golden, chain-of-commandless, pre-urban cave and campsite, village and garden, anarchy of the Old and New Stone Ages, antedating large scale grain cultivation which is an urban form. We must return to the campsite and the garden; return

to anarchy, liberty and tranquility; return to those devolutionary junctures where and when the individual and the collective, humanity and humanity, humanity and nature, means and ends, subjective and objective, campsite and shrine, while in harmony for tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of years, suddenly devolved into "irreconcilable antagonists."

David Pearson is a freelance anarcho-ufology theoretician and a former 60s radical. He lives in Arlington, Massachusetts. The Stronghold and the Shrine Revisited was published in Paranoia, issue 30, Fall 2002.

Bibliography

Eldredge, Niles, *Time Frames: The Rethinking of Darwinian Evolution and the Theory of Punctuated Equilibria,* Simon & Schuster, NY, 1985.
Janson, H.W., *History of Art*, Prentice-Hall and Harry N. Abrams, Inc., NY, 2nd Ed. 1977.
Mumford, Lewis, *The City in History* (TCIH); Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., New York, 1961, 1st edition.
Mumford, *The Myth of the Machine* (TMOTM), 1966, 67.