

Who We Are: A Series of Articles on the History of the White Race (Part 1 – Introduction)



DISSIDENT MILLENNIAL (EDITOR) • 25 JUNE, 2017

24



by Dr. William L. Pierce

*Unity & Diversity in Nature, but Never Equality
Miscegenation Stifles Evolutionary Progress
Changing Climate Sped Eurasian Evolution*

NO PEOPLE is morally and spiritually healthy unless it is imbued with a strong sense of its own identity. Essential to that sense of identity are an awareness and an understanding of all the qualities which the members of the people share in common.

It is doubly imperative that every man and woman who claims the privilege of membership in a community based on the bonds of common race and common culture knows and takes pride in his racial and cultural history, for in this history are all the elements which give his community its unique character and differentiate its members from all those who are not members.

When such knowledge and pride are lacking, a community is subject to a host of ills and cannot long endure. Solidarity and a sense of responsibility to the community give place to special-interest factionalism and alienation. A lack of a sense of identity blurs the distinction between compatriot and stranger, between friend and foe, and leaves the community prey to the greed or malice of aliens as well as of its own pathological members, who will grow mightily in numbers as loss of identity proceeds.

The National Alliance is still very small compared to the larger national-racial community of which it is a part, yet if it is to grow someday into a truly effective community of blood and spirit which can serve as a nucleus for the regeneration of the larger community, it must begin now the process of education which will later serve as a model for the re-education of our whole people. NATIONAL VANGUARD serves this purpose, and it is hoped that the series of articles entitled "Who We Are" which will appear in successive issues will contribute to its overall effectiveness in that direction.

Let us begin acquiring our understanding of who we are by going far, far back beyond our earliest historical records ... back beyond man himself ... back to ... the Beginning.

In the Beginning was the Cosmos — and is and ever shall be. The Cosmos is the Whole, the All-encompassing. It comprises all things, material and spiritual. The blazing suns of the firmament; the formless gas between the stars; the silent, frozen mountain peaks of the moon; the rustling trees of earthly forests; the teeming creatures of the dark ocean depths; and man are parts of the Cosmos.

The Cosmos is ever-changing, ever-evolving, moving toward ever higher states of existence. Here on earth man partakes in this evolution, just as before man other living creatures partook in it, with each succeeding eon leading to higher and higher levels of order, of life, of self-awareness.

If we trace this evolution backward in time, following as best we can the scientific clues down through the eons; looking back toward more and more primitive forms of life — and even earlier, before the first biological life existed, before the earth itself had condensed, to a time when the only animate entity was the Whole itself, the only consciousness in the Cosmos its own immanent animus — we find ourselves approaching a singular set of conditions, in which temperature and density were everywhere much higher than now. In this early era neither stars nor planets had yet taken shape; matter did not yet exist in the forms with which we are

familiar. The conditions which we can see when we look far enough backward in time were too extreme even for the existence of the neutrons, protons, and electrons which make up the material universe today; even time itself was ill-defined at the Beginning.

The Primordial Atom

We can look back some 15 billion years altogether, to a singular state of the Cosmos, when it existed as a primordial “atom” of infinite temperature and density. Beyond that singular state we cannot see, nor do we feel that it is even meaningful to ask what existed “before,” because, as already mentioned, time itself loses its familiar meaning as we probe deeper and deeper into that earliest era of evolution of the Cosmos.

That is a limiting situation which is not likely to change in the future, even as science enables us to make more and more refined and sophisticated observations, from which can be implied a more and more detailed and precise picture of the state of the Cosmos in the era just after the Beginning. But even today we can, with considerable confidence, draw a series of pictures of the early states of the Cosmos stretching back roughly 15 billion years, so long as we do not press too close to the Beginning.

Within the first million years of that 15 billion years — less than one ten-thousandth of the total interval — the Cosmos evolved very rapidly and changed a great deal, indeed. The primordial “atom” — the Cosmic fireball — had expanded and cooled to such an extent that all the types of particles with which we are familiar today could exist, and from the hot gases which these particles combined to form, the first stars were condensing.

The First Life

The evolution of the Cosmos has proceeded much more slowly since then, but a great deal has happened, nevertheless. Many of the earliest stars have evolved through their entire life cycles and returned their constituent matter to interstellar space, from which new generations of stars have been born and have, in their turn, died. This process of stellar evolution has gradually changed the makeup of the interstellar gas, enriching it more and more with heavy species of atoms.

From this enriched interstellar gas our own sun was born some five billion years ago, and the earth condensed from the same material at about the same time; the latest estimate of the earth’s age is around 4.6 billion years. Within a billion years of the earth’s formation, the first biological life appeared on its surface.

This earliest biological life — as distinguished from the more generalized “life” of the Cosmos — consisted merely of self-replicating molecules: complex aggregates of atoms which had, in the course of the inorganic evolution which preceded the first

life, acquired the ability to organize the atoms and simpler molecules of their environment into replicas of themselves — i.e., the ability to “reproduce.”

As the process of organic evolution continued, new forms appeared — more complex, more highly organized forms than those preceding them. The process led from single, “living” molecules to the first creatures with a cellular structure, then from single-celled life to multi-celled forms. It led from the earliest forms of life in the primal seas to the amphibians to the reptiles to the birds and mammals — from trilobite to tyrannosaur to proto-tarsier — and, eventually, to man, who first appeared anywhere from one to three million years ago, depending upon where one arbitrarily draws the line between “man” and “ape-man.”

Homo erectus

The “men” of that distant era differed quite a bit from the members of any living race; they were merely the first creatures in a particular ape-to-man evolutionary line who exhibited certain characteristics which qualified them as members of genus *Homo* (man), rather than *Pithecus* (ape) or *Pithecanthropus* (ape-man). Among these characteristics were a more-or-less erect posture, the regular manufacture and use of tools, and cranial and dental features which were more manlike than those of the apes or the ape-men.

The oldest identifiable members of genus *Homo* are known to us today only through a few fragments of bone. By about 900,000 years ago, however, there lived on earth a species, *Homo erectus*, which left more plentiful remains and whose members are generally recognized as the immediate pre-human ancestors of today’s living races of man.

Until a few years ago the youngest fossil remains of *H. erectus* known were about 100,000 years old. It is now believed that *H. erectus* survived until as late as 10,000 years ago in isolated tropical areas. Long before that species became extinct, however, it had diversified into several different pre-human races, each of which evolved separately across the threshold between *H. erectus* and *H. sapiens*, the species to which all living human subspecies, or races, have been assigned by the taxonomists. And each of these major racial branches of *H. sapiens* has itself thrown out branchlets: the Nordic, Alpine, and Mediterranean subraces of the White (Caucasian, European) race, for example.

The Tree of Life

Later, we shall examine in detail the development of the White race over the last half-million years or so, paying particular attention to its branching away from the parent *H. erectus* stock and then its subsequent diversification. Before we concentrate our attention on our particular branch, however, we want to note several general characteristics of the Tree of Life.

The first thing to note is that it is branched. Man's immediate progenitors were ape-like — as were, of course, the immediate progenitors of today's apes. That means that the relationship between living apes and man is not a father-son relationship, but one between cousins — an obvious distinction, but one which has, nevertheless, been overlooked by a great many people since the notion gained popular currency that Charles Darwin had postulated that "man is descended from the monkeys."

The Tree of Life branches and rebranches, with each branching marking the birth of a new species. This occurs whenever a portion of the population of an existing species becomes isolated from the rest of the population long enough for the genetic constitutions of the two groups to drift apart.

Hybridization

After a branching occurs there are several possibilities: one — or both — branches may terminate in extinction; a branch that does not terminate may continue to grow indefinitely without sending out any new shoots, although considerable evolutionary change may take place as the branch grows; or it may give birth to any number of other branches.

Also, divergent branches may occasionally recombine, in a rather untree-like manner. This last possibility may occur when two species, formerly isolated, are brought into contact, perhaps by a glacial or tectonic change which establishes a land bridge across a water barrier. If the species have not become too genetically disparate, hybridization may sometimes occur, although among nearly all animals there are strong built-in tendencies against this. (Contrary to popular misconception, the mere fact that two organisms belong to different species does not necessarily preclude their being able to mate and produce fertile offspring; although this seldom happens under natural conditions, there is a large number of pairs of species for which it can happen and has happened. The other side of the coin is that the mere fact of interfertility is, in itself, not a sufficient reason for classifying two types of organism — or two races — in the same species.)

The Unity of Life

The second outstanding characteristic of the Tree of Life to be noted is its unity. From a single trunk have grown all the myriad species, living and extinct, of the plant and animal kingdoms of this planet. No species exists apart from the others; none can claim an Immaculate Conception; all evolved from more primitive species. And a connection can be traced through the branches of the Tree between any two creatures, no matter how different, no matter how lowly the one and exalted the other.

Again, this is an obvious characteristic, but it is often ignored by those who would prefer to believe that man and the rest of the Cosmos are separate — in particular, by those who would wrench man's own branch from the Tree of Life and make it a

separate tree unto itself, governed by laws entirely different from those governing all other living things.

This vain attempt to create a special status for mankind finds among its staunchest boosters the racial egalitarians. These befuddled neo-humanists seem to believe that, by putting every featherless biped which can be squeezed into the *Homo sapiens* category on a high plateau above the rest of the animal kingdom, and by anointing those thereon with “human dignity” — a quality which sets them utterly apart from all creatures not so anointed — they are promoting the cause of “human brotherhood.”

The Evolutionary Continuum

Others who shun the fact of Nature’s unity do so for reasons of piety. Unless they can imagine a great gulf between man and non-man, they run into insurmountable difficulties in deciding which creatures are entitled to immortal souls and which are not.

Closely related to the unity of the Tree of Life is its continuity. Nature does not jump suddenly from one species to another. Although the rate of evolutionary change varies greatly from branch to branch and from time to time, it is always evolutionary, never revolutionary. Between any two life forms in the Tree, there are always intermediate forms (although, at a particular time, some of the intermediate forms may be extinct rather than living).

Thus, every living creature, including man, can trace his antecedents back through a 15-billion-year continuum of evolutionary states, in skin color, in intelligence, in facial features, in skull shape, or in any other characteristic distinguishing two races, as if the existence of mongrels in some way implies that everyone is a mongrel.

But they are less enthusiastic about the continuity between man and his non-human ancestors, as well as about the gradations which can be seen in many anatomical features between man and his living non-human cousins, because these cast a new light on human racial differences — a light which reveals the fact that Nature’s hierarchical principle, the progression from primitive to advanced forms, operates within *H. sapiens* as well as without. Some races of man are then seen all too clearly as intermediate forms between higher human types and non-human types.

Meaning of “Species”

One further digression is worthwhile, before we look in detail at our ancestors. Let us, in view of the preceding observations on the general characteristics of the Tree of Life, consider just what the designations “species” and “race” (subspecies) actually mean.

Historically both terms — especially race — have had many different meanings. Today a species is usually defined, very roughly, by zoologists as an interbreeding group of animals; and a race, or subspecies, as a morphologically distinct subdivision of a species.

An attempt at a more precise definition of species has been made by Theodosius Dobzhansky. According to Professor Dobzhansky (who is an unabashed propagandist for the cause of racial equality), two groups of sexually reproducing animals constitute two separate species when the groups “are reproductively isolated to the extent that the exchange of genes between them is absent or so slow that the genetic differences are not diminished or swamped.”

What does Dobzhansky’s definition really mean? Certainly, where the exchange of genes between two groups of animals is physically impossible, because no offspring or only infertile offspring can result from a mating, the groups are specifically distinct. Thus, for example, donkeys (*Equus asinus*) and horses (*Equus caballus*) belong to separate species, because their mongrel offspring, mules, are always sterile.

Nature Abhors a Mongrel

But, as already noted, there are a great many instances of pairs of groups which can interbreed with each other but, under natural conditions, either do not or do so relatively seldom, so that their genetic differences are not “swamped.” Such groups are customarily regarded as specifically distinct, in accord with Dobzhansky’s criterion.

One example of such a pair is provided by two very similar species of gazelles, Grant’s gazelle and Thomson’s gazelle. The two intermingle with each other in the wild, and they are interfertile, but they do not mate with each other. Although the morphological difference between the two species is slight — much less than the difference between a Nordic and a Mediterranean, not to mention the difference between a White and a Negro — the gazelles are able to recognize this difference (probably with their sense of smell), and mating is psychologically blocked.

Many other examples — not only among mammals, but also among birds, fish, reptiles, amphibians, and even invertebrates — could be given of pairs of species, potentially interfertile, whose separateness is maintained only by an instinctive, psychological barrier against miscegenation. This general revulsion in Nature against miscegenation has long been recognized by zoologists, and more than a century ago the distinguished French surgeon and naturalist Paul Broca wrote: “Animals that live in complete liberty and only obey their natural instincts seek ordinarily for their amours other animals that are altogether similar to their own kind, and mate almost always with their own species.”

Psychological Isolation

Were this not almost universally the case, the evolutionary process would be vastly less efficient than it is at producing new species. It would depend entirely upon geographical isolation. In fact, however, psychological isolation has played at least as important a role in preventing the recombination of incipiently divergent branches of the Tree of Life.

It should be noted, however, that psychological isolation often breaks down when animals are not in their natural state. In captivity or under domestication many of an animal's built-in behavior patterns become inoperative or distorted, and this is especially true where mating is concerned. When confined, bulls may mount mares, roosters will sometimes attempt to copulate with ducks, and baboons have been known to lust after women.

The domestic dog, *Canis familiaris*, provides the classic example of the breakdown of the psychological inhibition against miscegenation, where races as divergent as the St. Bernard and the Chihuahua are not only interfertile but are willing to mate. Dogs have been domesticated and bred by men for at least the last 10,000 years, and constant interbreeding has prevented their separation into distinct species, despite the enormous range of somatic and psychic traits they display — a range approached by no other mammal except man.

Domesticated Man

Man, of course, is the most domesticated of all animals, and it is not surprising that his natural inhibition against miscegenation has become confused — even without the perverse efforts of the egalitarians to promote racial mixing. We should instead wonder at the degree to which this healthiest and most essential of our natural sexual predispositions has survived centuries of a most unnatural lifestyle.

There is a great deal of evidence, historical and otherwise, indicating that in the past the White race, at least, felt a much stronger inhibition against miscegenation than it does today. As urbanization has spread, so has racial mixing. The evidence also indicates a marked variation from race to race in the strength of the inhibition against miscegenation — a variation which, to be sure, may only reflect the effect of different racial lifestyles.

Aryans, Dorians, Goths

The ancient Nordic tribes of Europe universally abhorred racial mixing. The Aryans who conquered India more than 35 centuries ago imposed a strict ban on any sexual contact with the non-White indigenous population, a ban which survives in vestigial form to this day as the Indian caste system. The Dorians who conquered the Peloponnessus at about the same time — and were later known by the name of their chief city, Sparta — likewise forbade miscegenation with the non-Nordic Pelasgian natives. And the Goths who conquered Italy 2,000 years later refrained from mating with the mixed, partly Mediterranean population they encountered there.

In every case the inhibition eventually broke down, as the hardy conquerors settled into a new and softer lifestyle and departed more and more from their ancestral ways. As warriors, hunters, farmers, and craftsmen living in close communion with Nature in their northern fields and forests, their sexual instincts remained sound. But when they became city dwellers and merchants and clerks and administrators, their instincts became blunted, and this fact was reflected in gradually changing sexual mores.

Latin Miscegenation

In other races and subraces the pattern has been different. The Mediterranean peoples of southern Europe have generally shown less disinclination to mate with other races than have Nordics. One can see the effect of this difference most strikingly in the different colonial histories of North America and South America. The early colonists who settled the former were predominantly Nordic, and racial mixing with the indigenous Indians was minimal. But the latter continent was settled by Portuguese and Spaniards, both of whom had a heavy Mediterranean admixture. They interbred widely with the indigenous population, as well as with the Black slaves they imported from Africa.

The same difference can be noticed in the European colonization of Africa. The Portuguese interbred with the Blacks in their colonies of Angola and Mozambique, while the Dutch and English in South Africa and Rhodesia kept their blood largely untainted. Such mongrels as the Nordic settlers did produce were not absorbed into the White population, whereas those produced by the Portuguese were.

It is possible that this Nordic-Mediterranean difference can be partly accounted for in the two different religions the two races of colonizers brought with them to their colonies. The present pattern in America does not support such an accounting, however. Irish, Italian, Polish and other predominantly Catholic ethnic groups are displaying better instincts, on the whole, than the Protestant majority.

It must be remembered, of course, that both Catholicism and Protestantism have undergone significant changes in the last few decades, and that, with the exception of some Italian elements (primarily from southern Italy) and a few other elements from the Mediterranean area, most (White) Catholic ethnic groups in the United States today are very similar racially to the Protestant majority. Certainly, they are far less Mediterranean in their makeup than the Spanish and Portuguese colonizers of South America and Africa were.

Anything that Moves

In the case of the Negroes, their notorious lack of sexual discrimination clearly cannot be blamed on their religion. It is true that a civilized environment is even more unnatural for them than it is for Whites, but even in controlled situations, such as prisons, there remains a strong racial difference in behavior between Blacks and Whites. As anyone unfortunate enough to have spent any time in close

confinement with them can testify, Blacks will attempt to copulate with anything that moves.

We can now see that the lumping together of Negroes, Whites, Mongolians, Australian aborigines, and others in a single species, *H. sapiens*, can be justified only because, under the unnatural conditions in which they live, they often interbreed with one another. Under natural conditions, where psychological barriers against miscegenation become more fully operative and the various races no longer form a single, interbreeding group, they must be classified as separate species.

Furthermore, if any one race achieves a sense of identity sufficient to make feasible the full reactivation of its natural loathing of racial mixing, whether by means of education or some other form of psychological conditioning capable of overcoming the instinct-blunting effects of an unnatural lifestyle, it thereby achieves for itself the status of a separate species.

Thus, the basis on which the concept of a single human species rests is quite tenuous. It is not a physical basis — the morphological differences among the races are more than sufficient to qualify them as separate species — but a psychological basis, and a basis in abnormal psychology, at that.

Brother to the Wolf

It is important to understand this, because with understanding comes freedom from the superstition of “human brotherhood.” We are one with the Cosmos and are, in a sense, brothers to every living thing: to the ameba, to the wolf, to the chimpanzee, and to the Negro. But this sense of brotherhood does not paralyze our will when we are faced with the necessity of taking certain actions — whether game control or pest control or disease control — relative to other species in order to insure the continued progress of our own. And so it must be with the Negro.

The enlightened attitude for which we should strive is one which places more emphasis than has been customary in the past on the unity of life, and which consequently values non-human life — whether redwood trees or whales — more than it does a minor human convenience or a temporary economic advantage, but which at the same time maintains a proper perspective toward all forms of life, whether closely related to us or not. No neo-humanistic superstition must allow any species — or sub-species, if one accepts the all-inclusive definition of *H. sapiens* now in vogue — to stand between us and our race’s evolutionary destiny.

Tracing Our Roots

Tracing modern man’s roots back to his pre-human ancestors is a fascinating task, but also a very difficult task, and a thankless one in terms of material reward; government and institutional support for paleontological research has always been

scanty. Nevertheless, a number of exceptional men have devoted their lives to it, and the last century has seen an enormous increase in our knowledge of our roots. That knowledge, however, remains far from complete; in some areas it is sketchy, indeed.

Briefly, what we know is this: the first, primitive primates (the order of animals to which all monkeys, apes, and men belong) branched off from the rest of the mammals (warm-blooded, fur-bearing animals which bear their young alive and suckle them) in the neighborhood of 70 to 80 million years ago. These early primates (most nearly represented among living species of primates by the prosimians: tarsiers, lemurs, lorises, and tree shrews) differed from other mammals primarily in having somewhat larger brains (relative to their overall size), prehensile (grasping) hands and feet with nails rather than claws, and stereoscopic vision.

The primates continued to evolve and branch over the next few tens of millions of years. Some of the branches evolved quite slowly and others much more rapidly. About 25 million years ago one of the faster-evolving branches split in two. From one of those branches grew the family of apes, whose modern descendants are the gibbon, the orangutan, the gorilla, and the chimpanzee.

The Family of Man

From the other branch grew the family of man. This branch itself rebranched a number of times, but its only living descendants are those creatures today classified as *Homo sapiens*; the other branchings died out. Thus, man's line of evolution separated from that of all the other animals alive today some 25 million years ago.

The ancestral apes of that day are exemplified by the species *Dryopithecus africanus*, otherwise known as Proconsul, an animal about the size of a modern chimpanzee. For a number of years in the latter half of the 19th century and the early part of this century, there was a search for Proconsul's contemporary on man's side of the fork — a contemporary which came to be popularly called "the missing link."

In 1891 the Dutch naturalist Eugene Dubois discovered a fossil skull in Java he believed to be that of the missing link. He named the species represented by his skull *Pithecanthropus erectus* (erect ape-man). It was later decided that the skull belonged to a Javanese variation of *Homo erectus*, which came to be popularly known as Java Man.

From the ages of the geological strata where Dubois's skull and similar ones were discovered, Java Man was found to have lived from 700,000 to 900,000 years ago.

More Links

Other fossil discoveries supplied other missing links in the chain stretching from *H. erectus* back nearly 25 million years to the time of *Proconsul*. One of the oldest of these links is the genus *Ramapithecus*, covering the span from 12 million years ago to about 15 million years ago. Another link is the genus *Australopithecus*, whose fossils range from something over four million to about 600,000 years old.

But as more and more fossils were found and dated, it became increasingly clear that reality was somewhat more complex than the searchers for various missing links had assumed. Links were being found not in a single evolutionary chain, but in several parallel chains.

Since 1960 the evidence has become overwhelming that for roughly the last three million years — the geologic epoch known as the Pleistocene — man's family tree has looked rather like a hedge, with a confusing array of branches and twigs. This evolutionary proliferation has its origin in the unique environmental conditions which existed during the Pleistocene.

Ice Ages

For a great many millions of years — in particular, during 70 million years or so of primate evolution — the earth's climate was warm and stable. Then, about three million years ago, a period of climatic instability set in. Global temperatures began oscillating, and these oscillations caused drastic changes in living conditions for animals in many parts of the world.

Associated with these temperature changes were the advance and retreat of huge ice sheets in the northern and southern temperate zones. After an initial two million years or so of relatively minor glacial periods, the Pleistocene temperature oscillations became more extreme, producing four major ice ages, beginning about 1.5 million years ago.

These four ice ages have been designated in chronological order by geologists as Guenz, Mindel, Riss, and Wurm. The Wurm glaciation began to recede about 15,000 years ago, in a general warming trend. At that time thick ice sheets covered much of North America, Europe, and Asia.

Actually, each major glacial period encompassed several global temperature oscillations, with the ice advancing and receding accordingly. During the recessions, which lasted from several thousand years to several tens of thousands of years, many areas which had been covered with ice became much warmer — some of them even warmer than today.

Change and Adaptation

The important thing, from the evolutionary standpoint, about the Pleistocene is not so much that it brought ice and cold weather to large areas of the earth, but that it brought change: a continuing series of drastic climatic changes from hot to cold,

from wet to dry, and back again. Each change forced the animal and plant life exposed to it to adapt or to become extinct. The continuing pressure for rapid adaptation provided an enormous stimulus to the process of evolution.

Now we can see the difficulty of the paleontologists' task. They would dig up a series of fossils covering a time span during which they could see evolutionary changes in a species of ape-man. Then they would find another fossil contemporary with one in their series, but substantially more advanced. The new fossil wrecked their nice picture of a simple progression of evolutionary stages and forced them to the realization that at some point in time the species whose progress they were following had begun diverging, part of it evolving much more rapidly than the remainder. This was something which happened repeatedly throughout the Pleistocene.

In particular, it happened to the Australopithecines. The older Australopithecines, four to five million years old, were clearly ancestral to man. But the later Australopithecines, only a million years old, were not, because a branching had taken place. The slower-evolving branch of the Australopithecine line eventually died out, but the faster-evolving branch gave rise to *Homo erectus*.

And this was even more so the story of *Homo erectus*, our direct ancestor. His fossils date from about 900,000 years ago (the end of the Guenz glaciation) to about 100,000 years ago (the beginning of the Wuerm glaciation), but not all the members of *H. erectus* who lived during that 800,000-year period are ancestral to all living men. As we shall see in the next installment in this series, *H. erectus* gave rise to several branches at different times. Some of these branches became extinct, and others gave rise to the various living races of man.