

Alexander the Great as Iranian King of Kings, the fallacy of Hellenism, and the nonexistent Hellenistic Period

Pre-publication of chapter XI of my forthcoming book "Turkey is Iran and Iran is Turkey - 2500 Years of indivisible Turanian - Iranian Civilization distorted and estranged by Anglo-French Orientalists"; chapters XI, XII, and XIII constitute the Part Four (Fallacies about the so-called Hellenistic Period, Alexander the Great, and the Seleucid & the Parthian Arsacid Times) of the book, which is made of 12 parts and 33 chapters. Chapter XII 'Parthian Turan: an Anti-Persian dynasty' has already been uploaded as partly pre-publication of the book; it is currently available online here: https://www.academia.edu/52541355/Parthian_Turan_an_Anti_Persian_dynasty The book is written for the general readership with the intention to briefly highlight numerous distortions made by the racist, colonial academics of Western Europe and North America only with the help of absurd conceptualization and preposterous contextualization.

Seleucid (312-63 BCE), Ptolemaic (305-30 BCE) and Attalid (282-133 BCE) times have also been distorted enormously by the colonial Latinists, Hellenists, and Orientalists, over the past two centuries; they deliberately undertook a systematic Hellenization of the material record, being Eurocentric in their approach, discriminatory in their efforts of representation and interpretation of the historical past, and oblivious of every text and monument that would eventually refute their preconceived falsehood.

In this case, the fabrication and propagation of the term 'Hellenistic period' for this part of Late Antiquity represents only a minor dimension of the colonial academics' falsifications and a small part of the fallacious Western historiography about the topic. In fact, there was never any 'Hellenistic period' anytime anywhere.

The term 'Hellenism' was used indeed in Ancient 'Greek' texts about several nations that became familiar with the disorderly Ancient Pelasgian-Philistine-Peleset (which is wrongly called 'Greek'/'Hellenic' by colonial academics and intellectuals) lifestyle and culture during the early periods of Late Antiquity. However, this situation was sacrilegious if evaluated on the basis of Achaean and Danaan measures and moral standards that Homer had tried to reinstate, but failed. In fact, 'Hellenism' was an explicit form of Anti-Achaean odium that should consequently be defined as 'Pelasgicism'.

The familiarization phenomenon was basically attested in the case of the Lydians, the Carians, the Lycians, and the Phrygians; to lesser extent, it concerned the Thracians, the Macedonians, the Illyrians and the Romans. But all these populations, earlier known as Lukka, Kaeftiu, Sherden and Tarwisha/Tarwiya (Troy) in the Ancient Hittite or 'Sea Peoples' in the Ancient Egyptian texts, were ethnically, culturally and linguistically associated with the Anti-Achaean and Anti-Danaan Pelasgians-Peleset

of the 2nd millennium BCE South Balkans. It was therefore quite easy for them to assimilate with those who had been their allies in the destruction of both, the old Hittite-Achaean (wrongly called 'Mycenaean') alliance and the Homeric effort of an Achaean revival.

In fact, what is described as 'Ancient Greek (or Hellenic) civilization' by the racist historians of the West is an Anti-Achaean Pelasgian barbarism that constituted a blasphemy for all the ancient civilized nations of the Orient, including the Achaeans who are defined as the first 'Greeks' (Hellenes), although this sacrilegious name was abhorred by the Achaeans. During the 2nd millennium BCE, the continuous Achaean - Pelasgian clash had reflected the permanent Hittite-Lukka polarization in Western Anatolia, whereas the Hittite-Achaean alliance triggered the ominous Pelasgian-Trojan 'conspiracy' (to use the term employed by the Ancient Egyptian scribes of the Annals of Ramses III), since Troy was a member state of the Lukka confederacy. In short, the prevalence of Anti-Achaean Pelasgian ethos among the divergent ethnic groups of the region (Ionians, Aeolians, Danaans, Cadmeans and Dorian during the 1st millennium BCE) is what the Western historians call 'Ancient Greece' (Hellas).

One can easily understand Hellenism/Pelasgianism as an appalling corruption and sheer cultural degradation that was produced in Western Anatolia, the Anatolian Sea and the South Balkans, before being also diffused among the Phoenicians (notably in Cyprus, which is a Phoenician island bearing a Phoenician name) and the Jews (: the 'cosmopolitan' Sadducees' of Alexandria). But this was not true for the Aramaeans, the Iranians and the Turanians, the Egyptians, the Berbers of North Africa, the Meroitic Ethiopians of Ancient Sudan, the Yemenites, and many other civilized nations. They were not 'Hellenized' (or Pelasgianized).

Having followed Alexander the Great and the Macedonians, the Pelasgian soldiers (called 'Greeks'/'Hellenes') settled in small communities in various locations of Asia and Africa; however, they were mostly reviled by the local people for their absurd way of life.

It goes without saying that, during the Late Antiquity, the term 'Hellenism' was never used about these small communities or colonies of Ancient Greeks/Hellenes (: in reality 'Pelasgians') that were established in various parts of the dissolved Iranian Empire from Cyrenaica to Bactria, because their inhabitants were already 'Hellenes' (Greeks).

At this point, I must make clear that in Ancient Ionian (deliberately named 'Greek' by the racist scholars of the West), the nouns ending in -ismos originate from verbs that are formed with an ending in -izein (-ize in English); these forms helped describe the association with or the imitation of someone/something else. They were also used to express the meaning of becoming different from what one had originally been.

So, speaking at the grammatical level, 'Hellenizing' can be eventually said about anyone except for Hellenes/Greeks (in reality: Pelasgians), because other people imitating the Hellenes can truly be described as 'Hellenizing', but the Hellenes, being already who they are, cannot 'Hellenize'; it would sound nonsensical.

Similarly, other people imitating the Ancient Egyptians can indeed be described as 'Egyptianizing'; but the Egyptians, being already who they are, cannot 'Egyptianize'.

The same is valid for all possible terms: Babylonizing, Iranizing, etc. This is necessary to have in mind, because many ignorant people with evil political motives tend to misinterpret 'Hellenism' and pretend that the term denoted an ideology, a national theory or a feeling of national unity; that's totally wrong.

There was never an Ancient Greek word to describe any feeling of national unity among the Ionians, the Aeolians, the Achaeans, the Dorians, and the other anti-Pelasgian ethnic groups, because such feeling never existed, in spite of Homer's effort to re-Achaeanize them all. The absurd term 'Panhellenion' was coined very late; it was first used by the paranoid Roman Emperor Hadrian (117-138 CE), who suffered from an enormous psychological complex of inferiority opposite his great, magnificent and omnipotent father, namely Emperor Trajan (98-117 CE). Being the worthless son of an illustrious and most successful father and failing to inherit the slightest portion of his predecessor's military skills, the foolish Hadrian wanted to regroup together all the Greek-speaking slaves of the Roman Empire. That is why he fabricated the otherwise useless term; however, even the project failed. About:

https://www.persee.fr/doc/dha_0755-7256_1999_num_25_2_1540

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hadrian#Religious_activities

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panhellenion>

It is essential at this point to underscore two key issues; first, the term 'Hellenistic period' is not false only because it describes a secondary and rather marginal phenomenon that concerns only the few nations which imitated the Ancient Greek (Pelasgian) lifestyle after the end of the 4th c. BCE, but also due to the fact that, by focalizing on this event, one distorts the wider picture and definitely misrepresents the major historical developments that took place immediately after the military expedition Alexander the Great and the replacement of the Achaemenid dynasty by him on the throne of Iran.

Actually, it has to be pointed out that the brave Macedonian mystic and king did not undertake 'many' military campaigns and expeditions like Assurbanipal, Cyrus the Great, and Darius I the Great; simply, after defeating the 'Greeks', he only invaded the ailing and quasi-decomposed Iranian Empire and he tried to rule it as an Iranian king of kings.

The concept behind Alexander the Great's attempt to supplant the Achaemenid dynasty with his own reign in Iran testifies to a very conscious and truly magnificent effort to Orientalize the Macedonians and all the adjacent nations, 'Greeks' included. The real nature of Alexander's endeavor was apparently not to diffuse the barbarian ethos and the lowly culture of those, whom he had already crushed and submitted (i.e. the petty political leaders of Thebes, Corinth, Athens, Sparta and the rest of the South Balkan ordeal), but to civilize (i.e. Orientalize) the disorderly and uncivil populations of his empire's western confines.

Alexander put an end to the nonsensical politics of the choleric demagogues and sought to impose imperial rule on those who had failed to realize that there cannot be civilization without an empire and a clear-cut Caesaropapist model of power. The historical context of his time bears therefore witness to the fact that Alexander the Great attempted to do the exact opposite of what the racist academics of England, France and America have fallaciously and persistently tried to credit him with.

Alexander's exemplary substitution of Parsa (Persepolis) with Babylon as capital of Iran demonstrates that

- i. he viewed himself as an Iranian (or Oriental) king of kings (: emperor),
- ii. he considered Macedonia and Greece as apparently peripheral and not central parts of the Iranian Empire (thus spearheading an overwhelming, determinant and irreversible Orientalizing process),
- iii. he adopted the Oriental imperial order, discipline and world conceptualization, thus fully rejecting the inhuman paranoia of 'Greek politics' and the abomination of the disreputable Athenian state,
- iv. he adhered to Oriental spirituality, faith and mysticism, therefore rejecting the childish nonsense of the so-called Ancient Greek philosophers (Aristotle included), and
- v. he wanted to shift (and actually he did shift) the center of the vast Empire out of Fars (Persia), thus evidently posturing as an Anti-Persian Iranian.

Second, by focalizing on this development (namely the 'Hellenizing' attitude of few Oriental peoples), one distorts the wider picture and definitely misrepresents the major historical developments that took place in the period between Alexander the Great's death (323 BCE) and the Christianization of the Roman Empire (313–380 CE).

The rise of the Christian dogma as official (and later as the only official) religion of the Roman Empire constitutes only one late dimension of the phenomenal diffusion of Oriental cults, mysticisms, concepts of imperial rule and universalism, spiritual sciences, religions, faiths, imperial systems and practices of administration, cultures, and behavioral systems across Balkans ('Greece' included), Rome and Europe. This extraordinary development, which irrevocably shaped World History, took place during this period, thus making of the entire European continent a mere annex of the Oriental civilizations.

As a matter of fact, the Hellenizing attitude of few Oriental peoples was entirely overshadowed by the Orientalizing attitude of all the Western peoples (: 'Greeks', Romans, and all the other tribes and ethnic groups on European soil), because they all imitated -extensively, comprehensively and irrevocably- the Ancient Oriental lifestyle (: the true, historical Orientalism) and adopted Oriental concepts, principles, cults, faiths, trends and attitudes during that period (323 BCE - 380 CE).

Minor facts, such as the diffusion of Ionian language among Lydians and the spread of 'Ancient Greek art' among the Carians, were deliberately focused on and strongly underscored by the racist Western academics in order to cause confusion among the average public, distort the educational system of the Western countries, and conceal the historical reality. As an academic endeavor, it was futile and puerile at the same time; actually, the so-called Ancient Greek art was not authentic, as it consisted in an interminable series of adaptations of Hittite, Assyrian and Egyptian patterns, styles, models, and concepts. Indicatively:

<https://arkeonews.net/from-hittite-bit-hilani-to-ancient-greek-temple-pillars/>
<https://blogs.brown.edu/arch-0760-s01-2019-spring/2019/04/14/the-bit-hilani/>

We can therefore conclusively state that the principal trait of Late Antiquity (i.e. the period stretched from the conquest of Babylonia by Cyrus the Great to the death of Prophet Muhammad (539 BCE-632 CE) is the fact that all the Ancient 'Greeks', the Romans and the Europeans adopted a great number of Oriental religions, theological

doctrines, spiritual exercises, world views, esoteric mysteries, cosmogonies, cosmologies, eschatologies, cults, behavioral systems, and lifestyles.

Ancient Greeks adored Mithras, Horus, Isis, Cybele, Atargatis ('the Syrian goddess') and other Oriental deities, but in striking contrast, Ancient Iranians disregarded the sacrilegious Pelasgian ('Ancient Greek') narratives about Dionysus/Bacchus, Athena, and Pan. Ancient Greeks stopped having any interest for the lawless, immoral and absurd theories of the paranoid 'philosopher' Epicurus and for the shallow, pointless and confusing treatises of the spiritually underdeveloped but opinionated author Aristotle, and they started being concerned with the Chaldean Oracles, seeking magical recipes by Ostanes, and flocking to the mysteries of Ptah.

Ancient Romans adored Osiris, Thot (as Hermes Trismegistus), Zervan (as Saturn), and other Oriental concepts of divinity, but in striking contrast, Ancient Egyptians did not bother at all about the insignificant myths of Juno, Venus, Mercury and Vesta. Ancient Romans stopped expressing interest for the childish sermons of their orators and for the republican nonsense of their recent past; quite contrarily and with utmost nostalgia, they were inclined to evoke their remote Antiquity in Anatolia (Aeneid).

All the other European nations of the Roman Empire acted similarly, and to this fact testify the many hundreds of Mithraea (temples of Mithra), Iseia (temples of Isis), and temples of other Oriental divinities that have been unearthed across Europe, within the Roman Empire and beyond its borders, from the Iberian Peninsula to Hungary and from England to Ukraine.

The extreme disgust for the disgraceful political system of Ancient Athens and the total disrespect for the worthless talks of the Ancient Greek and Roman philosophers fully characterize this period of Oriental impact on Ancient Greeks, Romans and Europeans. Such was the impact that these underdeveloped nations disappeared, because the followers of Mithra in Rome, Macedonia, Athens and Ephesus had more in common among themselves than one of them with one of his 'compatriots' who happened to be an adept of Isis or a devotee of Atargatis, the 'Syrian goddess'.

This situation became then decisively important: affiliation with a mystical order eclipsed ethnic membership and clannish affiliation, at a time no patriotism could subsist anymore but no imperial doctrine and theory had yet been incepted. It is true that the formation of the Roman Empire was very different from the inception of the Oriental empires.

People realized then that politics, theater and philosophy were good for nothing, as they disoriented every human being and member of a society, and distracted all humans from the basics of human life, as these had been spelled out by all major Oriental civilizations. In terms of Eschatology and Soteriology, Ancient Greek philosophy and politics were worthless notions and apathetic practices. As such, they were duly and irreversibly rejected once for all.

The terms 'Neo-Platonism' and 'Neo-Pythagoreanism' are entirely fake; in fact, they function as a smokescreen for the Oriental spiritual schools, faiths, mysticisms, theologies and religious doctrines that the various so-called 'Neo-Platonic' and 'Neo-Pythagorean' philosophers stood for and attempted to widely popularize among

their various students. The correct terms in replacement of these appellations are 'Egyptian Heliopolitan' and 'Egyptian Memphitic' respectively; this is so because both thinkers (Plato and Pythagoras) were formed after several years of studies in Egypt and they produced their theoretical systems as subsequent reflections of these two Ancient Egyptian systems of spirituality, world conceptualization, faith and theology.

However, one must never confuse between the low level of a Neo-Platonic pupil in Athens, who was limited in theorizing, and the spiritual potency of an initiate in the mysteries of Isis at the Philae Island temple.

Quite notably, if the racist academics of Western Europe and North America wanted to conceal this paramount reality, this was basically due to the crucial fact that the spiritually inexperienced Neo-Platonic pupil was indeed an Athenian (i.e. a White Guy) whereas the Isis initiate was a Blemmyan or a Nubian Black African. That's why Hellenism is abhorrent racism.

How could one therefore describe correctly this period, efficiently replacing the fallacious term 'Hellenistic period'?

The response is very simple: it was an 'Orientalistic period'.