

Varg Vikernes

On Civilization



This document is a collection of thematically associated articles copied from burzum.org:
About Civilization (2020); About Specialization (2020); The Class Struggle (2020).

The compiler of this document claims the right of the thule to disregard notions of copyright
for the sake of the preservation of knowledge.

About Civilization

High technology, superior art, great temples, great achievements and even great empires. It's all a result of civilization, and casting aside civilization would be a waste of potential. Right?

To answer that, the first question we need to ask is: where and why did civilization appear?

Where did they first appear? The oldest civilizations were located in the Middle East and North Africa, in the Fertile Crescent, the meeting point between Africa, Europe and Asia.

Why did they appear? When the humans of Africa, Europe and Asia met they also mixed. The peoples perfectly adapted for life in Africa mixed with the peoples perfectly adapted for life in Europe and Asia, and the result was a hybridized man not perfectly adapted for life anywhere. They had no natural habitat, because they were a cross between peoples from vastly different places.

They were hardly complete failures, surely they too could hunt and survive, but not as well as those perfectly adapted to their environment. So instead more and more of them resorted to agriculture. I may add that Europeans too resorted to agriculture some times, in the Stone Age, when they had no other choice, so this was not a new idea. This was how they had done it in the past, when things went wrong. However, they always cast aside agriculture again when they could, because they understood and felt that living as hunter-gatherers was better. The hybrids in the Middle East though kept it, and with time agriculture almost close to completely replaced hunting and gathering.

This however didn't repair their problem with not having any environment perfectly adapted for themselves. On the contrary, agriculture made it even worse. Their farmer diet made their jaws shrink (which is why people today no longer have room for their "wisdom teeth"), their skeletons became weaker, their brains shrunk and they even became more "slave-minded".

Let me elaborate on that a bit, before we continue: with agriculture came malnutrition (because their diet became less varied), slavery (because some people took control of the land and needed workers), war (because when famine struck one place, they tended to just go to another place and take their food instead, by force) and tyranny (because one guy always took control of it all). So in order to survive in these farmer areas of the Middle East/North Africa, most people had to be obedient, even submissive. You also didn't need very much intelligence: your local tyrant gave you what you needed to survive, in return for your slave-service in the fields.

Yes, this is how social classes appeared. They had no such division as hunter-gatherers, it was not needed at all, and would have been just a destructive nuisance. Free peoples don't have social classes. But in the farmer areas some people ruled, others slaved and some got their food by enforcing slavery.

I can add that the English term "Lord" actually means "Warden of the Bread", from Old English hleward ("bread-warden"). He was that tyrant who kept and distributed the bread to his warriors and slaves. The Lord. You don't do as he wishes? No bread for you...

These increasingly inadequate human beings built larger and larger communities, because although inferior to the hunter-gatherer diet, the farmer diet allowed them to feed many more. And voila! Civilization appeared, as a result of agriculture! They built entire towns to house the tyrant and his administration, surrounded by the farms of his slaves/workers. The hybrids constructed an artificial environment for themselves, because they didn't fit in perfectly in any natural environment.

You are right though: no hunter-gatherer ever invented combustion engines, satellite navigation systems, advanced computers or anything like that. You can argue that they didn't because they were "primitive" and because we are so much smarter than them, but you would be wrong to think so. Our hunter-gatherer forebears were not only stronger than us and had more powerful bones, but they also had bigger brains and were smarter than we are today.

Let me explain...

All this advanced technology that we surround ourselves with today, not only is it unsustainable, considering the amount of resources – often finite resources – we need to spend to make them, but it is basically like a wheelchair. Not just a simple wheelchair that needs to be pushed by someone. No! A high tech, fancy wheelchair with suspension, electric engines and inflatable tyres, sure.

Driving around in a modern wheelchair like that is probably fun, but you don't invent such a thing unless you need one. Yeah. If you can walk, you won't build yourself any type of walking aids to begin with. And this is the core of the problem: our forebears could walk, but because we become increasingly unable to walk on our own two feet, we keep inventing all these different types of walking aids. Not because we are smarter than them, but because we become more and more dependent on such aids.

The wheelchair is just an example, of course: this applies to everything we invent or invented, to help us survive. Even a script was such a "wheelchair". When asked by the Romans why the Gauls didn't have a script of their own, letters to write down things with, the Gauls replied that they didn't want to reduce their ability to remember. They argued that if you got used to writing down things, then you would no longer need to remember it, and therefore you would become more and more incapable of remembering – in the end anything. You would become more stupid.

Would you even want a book to write things down in, if you knew you could remember everything you wanted? What a waste! History, mythology, heraldic, herb lore, geography, etc. etc. all remembered by heart and taught to others orally. Yeah, they Gauls could "walk". They didn't need this "wheelchair". Not because they were inferior to the Romans, but actually because they were superior to the (more civilized...) Romans.

And yes, they were inferior to the Gauls because they were more civilized.

But in reality the inferior often beats the superior, as history has shown us over and over again, because quality is no match for treachery, lies, deceit and often also quantity. Alas! Civilization is a horrible and destructive force, but it spreads like fire in dry grass.

When we then enter the topic of "wasted potential" it starts to become more interesting, I think. Because what defines a "great achievement"? Walking on the Moon? Modern computers? Atomic bombs? Combustion engines? Sky scrapers? What?

You can justly argue that all such things are great achievements, but have you calculated in the costs of these achievements? Is it worth to degrade our species to such a degree as we have done by now, with civilization, to achieve that? Is it worth to risk our own destruction – through a slow suicide by degeneration and eventually starvation due to a devastated environment on Earth (caused by our civilization itself!) – for such things?

As part of this civilization we have something called auto-domestication, where we basically domesticate ourselves more and more, as time goes by. Yes, this is what causes the weakening of our skeleton and the reduction in brain size. We have seen it happen in all the animals we domesticated, and we see it happen in ourselves too. Compare one of those little rat-like dogs

women carry around in their purses today or a bulldog or something like that to a wolf, and you get an idea of how we have become compared to our forebears. Because of auto-domestication.

Had we instead created and kept a system where we would have seen a gradual improvement of our species over the ages... that would have been a great achievement. Sounds like an Utopian idea, right?

Except it isn't. That's what we had, when we were hunter-gatherers... we cultivated courage, kindness, honesty, intelligence, loyalty, strength, speed, skill and beauty/health.

Despair not! Many of us still do, but they fight an uphill struggle, because they still auto-domesticate themselves, by living in an agricultural civilization. Let me give you an example: we still have hunters who opt to use bow and arrow instead of a modern rifle. Why? Solely because it's more challenging. They pick the hard route to their goal. They elect to do it the hard way. This is still, thankfully, in our Native European spirit: to walk uphill even when we don't have to, simply because we want to challenge ourselves and improve. We are broken by civilization, but not that broken, and not completely broken. Yet.

So you might say that throwing away Moon journeys and fancy fast cars with air condition, and all else that technocrats love to think might come in the future, is a wasted potential, but look instead at yourself, and understand that you have potential too, as an individual and we as a species. Is it not a wasted potential to throw away your ability to walk only because high tech wheelchairs exist, and you really want to keep the one you have? Is it not a wasted potential to throw away your ability to remember the exact position of all the stars on the night sky, only because you can download some software telling you the same?

But now you must listen carefully to what I say: Is it not a wasted potential to throw away your ability to not be greedy, envious, petty, hateful, dishonest and coward?

The greatness of man does not lie in his ability to make fancy high tech wheelchairs, but in his ability to walk!

We can still walk. Yes, we have driven wheelchairs for thousands of years now, metaphorically speaking, but we have not yet lost our ability to walk. At least not all of us. This civilization was imposed on us, we didn't create it. We never needed it. Others did, yes, but we – Native Europeans – did not – and we still don't. Nor do the Native Africans or the Native Americans need it. Probably not the Native Asians either, although I am not sure if any of them are left, as such. They are all very mixed by now.

Only hybrids need civilization to survive, because they are not adapted to survival in any natural habitat. Civilization is their (artificial) habitat. Without it, they won't survive in the long run.

Civilization isn't going away though, anytime soon, and more and more people become hybridized. This is an inevitable consequence of having an artificial habitat where everyone can survive. In the end, everyone in this civilization will be hybrids. Everyone will depend on its survival. Everyone will need civilization in order to survive...

Yes, either civilization goes away, or we go away. That's your options, "Men of the West".

This brings us to the topic of survival. Because the only way mankind, as a species, can survive civilization is by letting civilization destroy itself and everyone in it. Only those who elect to

not participate, only those who elect to live not as a part of civilization, can stand any hope of survival – and they must survive not only the intrusions of civilization, but also its probably dramatic fall.

And a dramatic fall will come, in one way or the other. When many live cramped together, like humans do in cities, viruses will mutate a lot, and it is only a matter of time before one so deadly it will kill everyone will come from this – bred by our civilization itself. Like a self-destruct mechanism for a cancer on planet Earth. If that doesn't happen soon enough, civilization will collapse under the weight of all the problems it creates: idiocracy, desertification, crime and not least a lack of resources – especially finite resources. A massive solar storm would also send it into absolute chaos, or a nuclear war. Or something (by most people) unexpected, like a new Ice Age. Only death awaits for the civilized man and his cancerous civilization. Degeneration, decay, destruction and ultimately death.

What hope does mankind have then? We have hope in those who might survive the coming fall. Before the collapse they balance on a thin edge, over a vast sea of disaster, because they must not be noticed by the civilized man, lest the masses will drag them down; throw them in prison for "thought crimes", take their children from them, steal their food or even kill them. They must learn to endure hardship before hardship has come. They must become able to survive without civilization, whilst they at the same time LARP as NPCs, so that nobody notices what they are doing. They must become autonomous without anyone knowing they are. They must fake misery, when everyone else are suffering as it all comes crashing down on top of us all. Most importantly, they must stay unmixed, when everyone else mixes, or else they will not even be able to survive in the natural habitat that will replace the artificial habitat of civilization.

Yes, we have little hope, but a little is better than no hope, and Óðinn is to fight and never give up!

The gods help those who help themselves! So let us. Heill Óðinn!

Varg Vikernes
01.07.2020

About Specialization

Let us continue on the topic of civilization and in particular (auto-) domestication. What we do when we domesticate an animal is to further one special ability of an animal, such as tasty meat in one type of cows, the ability to produce much milk in another, obedience in dogs or their ability to pull snow sleds or hunt rats or pick up the scent of cancer cells or humans buried under masses of snow, and so forth. We don't need or want animals able to stand on their own two feet, so to speak. In fact our domestication of them to a very large degree, or even completely, ruins that ability. A milk cow let loose today, for example, would die real quick. It has been specialized in milk production so much that if she is not milked regularly this will kill her.

With humans we do the same, or we do the same to ourselves; because of civilization we automatically – unconsciously – domesticate ourselves. We have to be at least somewhat domesticated to function in this civilization to begin with, and by functioning in this civilization we become even more domesticated. We end up in a downward going spiral, until we – at one point – become completely dependent on civilization to survive and then finally unable to survive at all. And that will be the end of us, Idiocracy style.

Our hunter-gatherer forebears lived in small tribes, no larger than 144 people (called "a great dozen"). If they grew larger than that, they would split up and you would have two tribes instead. These tribes lived on their own for most of their time, away from others, but they did regularly meet at some few sacred places in Europe. I would guess that Stonehenge was such a place, but we also know of one such place in what is today the Czech Republic, and other such places surely existed too. They organized ring games (competitions), that eventually became known in historical times as the Olympic games, for example, and later as knight tournaments. They would go there to share news and other information, but also to find spouses from other tribes – to avoid inbreeding.

However, they only needed to tolerate the presence of other humans, and to socialize with distant relatives and strangers, for a short time. After these gatherings, they returned to living on their own, away from others. They remained wild and free, in natural tribes. Untamed. Everyone was family. They did not need to domesticate themselves to function in their type of society.

The (undesired) consequences of (auto-)domestication are many. We get a weaker skeleton, we get shorter faces (with teeth no longer having space to grow, like with "wisdom teeth"), we get weaker muscles, poorer joint definition, hair changes, fat accumulation, simplified patterns of behaviour, more pathology, physical defects, extended immaturity and not least, we get smaller brains. Yes, we become dumber.

But people today, completely hung up in the idea of "evolution", but too unintelligent to understand that theory, often believe that we are better today than we were before. "We have to be, because we have evolved so much since the Stone Age, right?" We live longer and we are capable of so much more – as proven by our high tech (the advanced wheelchair I talked about when I wrote about Civilization).

In reality we only live longer on average thanks to modern medicine (and other modern sciences), completely at odds with Nature and what is good for us – and we are so incapable that the only way we can get anything at all done is through specialization.

Now, this is a positively charged word, don't you agree? "Specialization". It means that each and every one of us becomes a specialist in something. Not necessarily something glamorous, it can be a specialist toilet cleaner, but still: a specialist. The term itself suggests, I think, that

we at least perform one single task well, and better than our pre-agricultural forebears, who were all jacks-of-all-trades. But...

Ah, yes. There is a "but" here. You see, when you look at historical sources, describing the performances of our forebears, and when you look at archaeological evidence, and not least the first books written, you realize that this is not the case at all. Yes, we specialize, we educate each and every one of us to become an efficient (hopefully?) cog in a great machinery, able to perform one single task well (dentist, driver, computer programmer, soldier, psychiatrist, teacher etc.), and some of us are indeed skilled in other tasks too, but even though we specialize, and pour all our energy into mastering that one single skill or lore, we fall short compared to our forebears.

Historical records tell us how the city of Athens, that had even been civilized for some time by then, could produce thousands of rowers able to row faster and for longer than our Olympic rowing champions are able to today. Fossilized footprints in the sand can tell how the average Stone Age man could run faster than our Olympic champion runners and world-record holders can. And they didn't even have running shoes on when they did, and ran along sandy beaches. Our average Stone Age forebear could throw a spear farther than our Olympic javelin champions can throw a javelin. And yes, the same average Stone Age forebear could do all these things that well, whilst we can only produce specialists able to compete with him in one single task. And it doesn't stop there. The average Stone Age man was also intellectually superior to our biggest geniuses.

Now, I don't claim to be one of our biggest geniuses, but if you take my own role-playing game, MYFAROG, as an example, you could say that I have specialized in making such a game, and therefore I am able to. I have written a comprehensive rule system that makes sense and covers all eventualities in the setting, and that can be used for role-playing. But I had to write it down. I don't remember everything in the rule-book by heart. A Stone Age forebear of mine would have been able to not only come up with such a system, but also he would not need to write it down. He would memorize it and everything in it. His players would not need character sheets, because they would easily remember all their stats and XP and whatnot, and changes to them as well. I might think highly of myself for making such a game, but I am but a shadow of my forebears.

They would memorize the position of the stars at different times of the year, learn all the properties of plants from their parents, without the need for any books, tell stories to each other that would make even Tolkien envious, and then those who listened to them would hear it once and be able to retell the same stories to others later on. And so forth. Our "great potential" was lost, because of agriculture and civilization. Or at least greatly diminished.

You think I exaggerate? Maybe I do, but I don't think so, and if you look at Europe, the average IQ has dropped here by 15 points the last 100 or so years already – and no, it's not all due to immigration from low-IQ populations in the third world. And the physical achievements of our forebears are well documented.

Peter Andreas MunchEven in the 19th century, we had for example a Norwegian author, Peter Andreas Munch, who went to the Vatican to read a book. He was not allowed to take notes or to take the book away from the Vatican library, but he simply went there and read the book, and then went outside and wrote what he had read down on paper. Yes, he could memorize what he had read, and then write it down afterwards. Even only a few generations ago, people were on average much smarter than people are today. The decline in intellectual abilities is dramatic! My father had to learn and were able to learn a lot more when he became an engineer, than my brother did, some 22-23 years later. Some time in the 90ies a class of engineers in Norway were given an exam from the late 70ies, because their professor had not had the time to make one himself, so he just used an old one that he was convinced they could not have seen before, and every single engineer student failed the exams, and filed complaints that it was too hard. Not one of them passed. Now, this can of course also be attributed to a

decline in the education in Norway, but this changes nothing, because why is education declining in Norway? The answer is the same: because people in general are becoming dumber. When the students today can't pass a single test and fail all their exams, then they... simply make the tests and exams easier. This applies to all subjects today in the educational system, even mathematics and biology.

And speaking off; even the scholars of the 19th century were not specialized like scholars are today. They would be experts in a wide field of subjects, whilst today's scholars are just poorly educated, according to their limited intellectual abilities, in one single subject.

So no, the specialization that came from civilization is not something positive. It had to come, because modern man has become so useless that the only way he can become useful is by focusing all his energy into learning to perform one task somewhat well, so that he can make a living and be somewhat useful for society. As you know painfully well, most of us aren't even able to perform that one task very well though. In fact, many so-called experts today are barely trained to look up questions in their field of expertise online. If the web went down, so would their knowledge and competence. A modern repairman no longer repairs anything. He just replaces broken parts with new parts.

It's because of Capitalism, yes, I agree, but this is a part of civilization, a consequence of it, and follows in the wake of its intellectual destruction – of our auto-domestication. In fact, it's a good example of how we domesticate ourselves and ensure that we become only increasingly dumber.

When mankind adopted agriculture and developed civilization he basically took a dive from a cliff. At first it went well – he was flying! But as he falls he picks up speed and we are currently heading at full speed towards the ground. It doesn't help to close your eyes. If you see what is coming or not is irrelevant. You will soon hit the ground regardless. And be smashed against the sharp rocks below.

The only parachute we have, that can save us? I will discuss that another day...

Thank you for reading
Varg Vikernes
02.07.2020

The Class Struggle

The nomadic hunter-gatherer had a very homogenous intelligence level. Everyone was pretty much of the same intelligence level, because the society was one where everyone had to know about the same and have the same abilities. It promoted the "Jack of All Trades" (and master of them all...), forcing everyone to perform well on all fields.

Poor craftsmen would fail, because they would make poor hunting gear and other equipment, and would fail when hunting and fishing, or when building clothes and shelter. Poor planners would fail too, because their prey would get away, they would not find the right place to fish, etc. Poor gatherers would fail too, because they would not find the right or enough herbs, nuts, sea shells, roots etc.

The above is true, but yes, it is simplified to make a point. In reality, the ones with poor skills and abilities would simply more often fail. The result was that the intelligence and ability level was forcibly maintained at a high level. Yes, maintained by the force of Mother Nature.

The nomadic hunter-gatherers were few and note that they had no different social classes. Everyone was the same, because everyone had the same skills and abilities. Those that differed from the rest in a negative way would die out. If not immediately, then over time. Because the families were all left alone, in the wilderness, and any and all incapable families would more rarely succeed out there.

Agriculture changed this for several reasons. First because it became easier to produce enough food for many. They didn't have to "leave the weak for the wolves" in the forest, in order to survive. They didn't as often experience death from cold or starvation or predators, because of lacking abilities. Secondly because the possession of land became important. Thirdly because different abilities became more important. That is: specialization became a factor.

Specialization is a positively charged word, but note that by specialization I mean that some became good at performing only certain tasks. Often tedious tasks, like harvesting or planting or grinding of grains. Tasks that required very little intelligence or skill, and those who performed those tasks were untrained in most other skills.

With food enough for many, and with the need for individuals able to perform tedious tasks, the less intelligent all of a sudden became a valuable resource. They could allow them to live, because they had food enough for them too, and they were just as useful in society as the others – because they were able to perform those tedious tasks. Yes, I say able, because a more intelligent person will much faster and more easily get bored performing tedious tasks. They are, in effect, not able to. If forced to, they will at best become sad – possibly chronically depressed.

When harvest failed or herd animals got sick or died, to avoid large scale famine the farmers would simply put solve this by taking the harvest or animals from others. By force. Other consequences was of course tyranny (one man controlled the land producing food, and the food itself), slavery (you could kidnap others and make them work on your fields or with your animals under threat of violence and death), and also the introduction of different social classes: the owners versus the workers. The farmer and his slaves. You saw the introduction of a warrior class; men hired by the owner to protect his land and to enslave others or ensure obedience in the ranks of the workers. Men hired to enslave and steal from others or indeed to protect the owner's lands and people from others doing that.

With different social classes we saw an active cultivation of different abilities in different groups of society. Owners needed to remain fairly smart, to organize society, to predict future

events accurately, to understand and prepare for different challenges, etc. The warriors needed to be obedient and capable. The workers needed to be obedient and "able to perform tedious tasks". Yes, the latter is a nice way of saying: "they needed the workers to be not too smart." Ergo: they needed the workers to be stupid.

Now, this didn't change man dramatically over night, but this process started some 7000 years ago here in Europe, and earlier elsewhere, and with time the differences became more and more noticeable. The owners remained fairly smart, although not as smart as the hunter-gatherers, because agriculture and later on civilization reduced their abilities too, as explained elsewhere. The warriors became more and more obedient (which can be a type of stupidity too, I may add...), and the workers dumber and dumber. So dumb that in our own age, the average worker is borderline retarded... and utterly slave-minded and incapable. Only able to obey and slave (work for others). Only able to perform simple tasks, and having close to zero personal initiative. They are content being entertained, when not slaving for their masters.

Yes, today we need people to be really stupid, because so many tasks are so utterly tedious, and we also need people to be extremely obedient, because otherwise they would not have performed them (like shoot rubber bullets on children only because your authorities tell you too, or throw gas grenades at pregnant women only because your authorities tell you too). "Don't ask any questions! Don't even wonder why you do that!" "Just obey!"

Then came Communism, or if you like; Marxism. I will use the Soviet Union as an example, because what happened there is so evident to those who look at it. First of all they removed (killed...) or enslaved (forced into GULags or working class jobs) the elite of the Russian society (the smarter owners). Secondly they removed the barriers that had previously prevented intermarriage between the social classes. In the USSR the "owner" would marry the "slave" as often as not. They were encouraged to, directly or indirectly. "There are no social classes! We are all the same!"

The result (after only some generations) of this mixing of classes was a man not smart enough to perform the tasks of the owner, but still a man too smart to perform the tasks of the worker. This of course is code for "a criminal"... one just smart enough to understand that he can break the rules and get away with it.

Now, not all ex-Soviet peoples are criminals, of course, but a disproportionately large amount of their populations are criminally corrupt. Russia is not "by chance" the most corrupt country in all of Europe, and competing for the title of the most corrupt in the entire world... Western Europe is not flooded by criminal East Europeans "by chance". This is the result of the Communism they have been under for 70 or so years.

Smart people still exist there, they are just fewer. Really stupid people (average workers) still exist there – and their numbers might actually have been increased. But the amount of "socially mixed" individuals have been dramatically increased by Communism, and the average intelligence has been lowered. Thanks to Marxism.

Here in "the West" we have had a similar reduction of overall quality of man, not just because of the general negative effects of agriculture and civilization, but also because of the equally bad Capitalism and its cultivation of greed at the expense of all qualities of man, but in a different way. Not in a better way, nor any less, but in a different way. I might discuss that another time, but today I just wished to point out that social classes are a result of agriculture and civilization, both utterly destructive to mankind, and the mixing of these social classes don't bring all up to the same or indeed a better level, but instead drag most down to the

lowest levels of mankind. That of a criminally corrupt individual or that or that of a seriously stupid worker.

If you are from the working class yourself, I can throw you a bone here, and remind you of the fact that if you are better than the average worker, you will rise up from that cesspool and no longer be working class.

Thank you for reading
Varg Vikernes
11.11.2020