

NEANDERTHAL EXTERMINATION



César Tort (Editor)

Cover:

Human-Neanderthal skull comparison;
German peaked visor cap with SS skull
emblem (Totenkopf) & Maxfield
Parrish's *The Lute Players* (1924).

Daybreak Press

First PDF edition: August 2025
(The previous editions, from 2020 to 2023,
were published under the title *On Exterminationism*
and lacked the initial text of this edition
which gave the book its title.)

The following books
have been written
by the Editor:

Day of Wrath
Daybreak

In Spanish:

Hojas susurrantes
¿Me Ayudarás?
Lágrimas

cesartort@yahoo.com
<http://www.westsdarkesthour.com>

One can say, with more and more certainty as the 'Dark Age' goes on, that the god-like men of action are defeated, at least for the time being, *not* for having been too ruthless, *but for not having been ruthless enough*—for not having killed off their fleeing enemies, to the last man, in the brief hour of triumph; for not having silenced both the squeamish millions of hypocrites and their masters, the clever producers of atrocity-tales, by more substantial violences, more complete exterminations.

—Savitri Devi

Foreword

From the mid-1970s onwards, my teenage life was destroyed not only by my parents' abuse, but also by a psychiatrist they hired to finish me off.

Discovering an area of research that significantly improves my view of the world has only happened to me occasionally. In 1983, for example, I discovered an interview with Theodore Lidz in a bookshop that made me realise that not all psychiatrists were depraved individuals who sided with abusive parents in conflict with their children. When talking about possessive mothers who came to his office and co-dependent fathers who fell into a state of *folie à deux* with them, Lidz seemed to portray the dynamics of my family as if he had lived with us! And unlike the vast majority of his colleagues, Lidz and other professionals knew that such parents can drive their children mad. My discovery of that book marked the beginning of my familiarisation with the trauma model in the decades that followed. Unlike the pseudo-scientific model of orthodox psychiatrists, I eventually came to understand my parents' behaviour.

But the damage to my mind due to abuse at home was already done, and I was unable to pursue a career, instead becoming alienated in cults and pseudosciences of the paranormal. The next milestone in my intellectual life came in 1990, when I began reading the sceptics of parapsychology, thanks to the group led by Paul Kurtz whom I had met at the end of the previous year at some lectures they gave in Mexico City. Thanks to their work I realised that parapsychology was also a pseudoscience.

In 2002, I discovered the books of Swiss psychologist Alice Miller: the first writer to take the side of the abused child one hundred per cent, thanks to whom I was able to heal my still wounded heart. But it was not until late 2008 that I discovered, thanks to the internet, that millions of Muslims were migrating to Europe, replacing the native population. I became so obsessed with

the subject—which, unlike the others, could only be discussed on the internet—that the following year I came across articles in *The Occidental Quarterly Online* that revolutionised my worldview. It was only thanks to this latest discovery that I began a career as a blogger with my *The West's Darkest Hour*, to which I eventually gave an anti-Christian slant: insofar as ideas about racial egalitarianism and humane universalism have a Christian aetiology, regardless of Jewish subversion in the media.

It was precisely because of this neo-Nietzscheanism that, at Christmas 2018, my next intellectual milestone was to realise that the historicity of Jesus had been seriously questioned. In my spiritual odyssey I owe this new discovery to Richard Carrier's work on the New Testament. For someone who sixty years earlier had been baptised by the famous Jesuit Joaquín Sáenz y Arriaga, a friend of my very Catholic parents, Carrier's discovery was a real milestone as the Christian doctrine of eternal damnation had virtually driven me mad in my teens and twenties.

Thus, at the ripe old age of sixty-seven, I never imagined that another author could further improve my worldview. But the miracle happened in August 2025, the month in which I am writing this prologue. I am referring to Danny Vendramini's *Them and Us*.

But why was a book that attempts to revolutionise our view of the interaction between Neanderthals and our distant ancestors also a milestone? To answer that, I would have to go back once again to the fateful 1970s. It was in the same decade that my parents murdered my soul that I coined the phrase 'the extermination of the Neanderthals'. But to understand it, I would have to go back even further, to the 1960s.

As I recount in a passage from my autobiographical trilogy, when I was a small child, going with my family to downtown Mexico City, I was horrified by the people I saw there. Compared to the beautiful Colonia Del Valle where we lived, the city centre was a horrible place, and the people I saw there seemed horrible to my eyes. So much so that years later, when I was eleven, I once told my younger siblings (I am the eldest) that I wanted to machine-gun 'em all.

It was those exterminationist desires that, in the following decade, when my parents began to mistreat me, spawned the tremendous call to *exterminate Neanderthals*. I cannot pinpoint the exact year when I came up with that phrase, but if we fast forward

fifty years later I discovered an eloquent book that talks about how Neanderthals were, in fact, exterminated! Although a few years earlier I had heard, albeit only in passing, that Cro-Magnons had eliminated the Neanderthals, Vendramini's book paints a picture of Cro-Magnons in such a way that their psychology seemed like a super-accurate X-ray of my old exterminationist passion.

The point is that in the 1970s I had never heard that Cro-Magnons had exterminated Neanderthals, nor in the 1980s, 1990s or the first decade of the new century. If Vendramini and others are right, how could I have sensed it? Yes: it could have been a mere coincidence. Another possibility is that Carl Jung is right. In *Man and His Symbols*, he said:

The archetype in dream symbolism

By "history" I do not mean the fact that the mind builds itself up by conscious reference to the past through language and other cultural traditions. I am referring to the biological, prehistoric, and unconscious development of the mind in archaic man, whose psyche was still close to that of the animal... My views about the "archaic remnants," which I call "archetypes" or "primordial images," have been constantly criticized by people who lack a sufficient knowledge of the psychology of dreams and of mythology.

The Swiss psychologist illustrated this with a case that impressed me:

A very important case came to me from a man who was himself a psychiatrist. One day he brought me a handwritten booklet he had received as a Christmas present from his 10-year-old daughter. It contained a whole series of dreams she had had when she was eight. They made up the weirdest series of dreams that I have ever seen, and I could well understand why the father was more than just puzzled by them. Though childlike, they were uncanny, and they contained images whose origin was wholly incomprehensible to the father. Here are the relevant motifs from the dreams.

I'll just mention a couple of them, and Jung's brief interpretation that describes what we call the collective unconscious:

A drop of water is seen, as it appears when looked at through a microscope. The girl sees that the drop is full of tree branches. This portrays the origin of the world.

A small mouse is penetrated by worms, snakes, fishes, and human beings. Thus the mouse becomes human. This portrays the four stages of the origin of mankind...


Precisely a mouse-like creature that survived the asteroid that killed the dinosaurs was our remote ancestor. Unfortunately, something happened to the little girl:

The father was convinced that the dreams were authentic, and I have no reason to doubt it. I knew the little girl myself, but this was before she gave her dreams to her father, so that I had no chance to ask her about them. She lived abroad and died of an infectious disease about a year after that Christmas.

If the Cro-Magnons wiped out the Neanderthals—in addition to Vendramini, this is a common opinion among many other scholars—the study of archaic remnants could shed light on my desire to ‘exterminate the Neanderthals’; and why it took hold of my psyche, from my adolescence, until it became a true personal religion. Although in his book Vendramini mentions Jung’s collective unconscious in passing, he attempted to give it a scientific basis with the theory of *teems*: that archaic remnants or primordial images could be hidden in our ancestral DNA. The big question is, could the genocidal passion that sprang from the depths of my being have been unleashed when I found myself in an extreme situation?

As for why Vendramini’s work has not been addressed in academia, it has to do with the fact that the Establishment is composed of those I call hyper-Christian atheists, in the sense that they have taken not only racial egalitarianism and catholic universalism as dogma, but also love for all wingless bipeds as the new faith of secular man. This axiological phenomenon, which is nothing more than *folie en masse*, began with the fateful defeat of Adolf Hitler’s Germany in 1945. The post-1945 System simply ignores any data that might inspire whites to ethnically cleanse the West of non-white invaders. For example, the neochristians who have uploaded videos purporting to refute Vendramini have resorted to gross distortions, straw men and even lies. As I said at the end of my article ‘Youtubers’: ‘Only when academia returns to the hands of scholars who don’t hate the white man—and that

would only happen after a revolution—can Vendramini’s work be valued on its own merits’.¹



This book is composed of three sections. The first section quotes key passages from Vendramini’s book.

The second section collects entries from my blog, including repeated quotes from William Pierce’s *The Turner Diaries*, culminating in my brief exterminationist manifesto.

The third section complements the embryonic precepts of my new religion with more edited entries from *The West’s Darkest Hour*, and the appendix demonstrates that the ancient Indo-Aryans would share this exterminationist passion when the dark age arrived.

César Tort
27 August 2025

¹ <https://westsdarkesthour.com/2025/08/26/youtubers/>

Contents

Foreword 7

First Part

Neanderthal extermination 16

Second Part

The blood flowed ankle-deep – *Editor* quotes *Pierce* 79

Email to Mark – *Editor* 83

Terre et Peuple, Blut und Boden – *Commenter* 85

Who We Are excerpts – *William Pierce* 86

Linder on the *Diaries* – *Editor* 90

Turner Diaries excerpts – *William Pierce* 91

The word ‘racism’ – *Commenter* & *Ed.* 95

The depth of evil – *Andrew Hamilton* 97

Ostriches – *Editor* 100

Follow my yellow brick road – *Editor* 102

Kemp’s book – *Editor* 104

Animal hell and white sin – *Editor* 106

On my moral inferiors – *Editor* 109

Turner Diaries climax – *William Pierce* 112

Why I am not a neonazi – *Editor* 121

On exterminationism – *Editor* 125

Third Part

Lebensraum – *Editor* 129

Subtitle – *Editor* 141

Kalki the Avenger – *Savitri Devi* 143

Panentheism – *Editor* 144

On solving the problem of evil – *Gaedhal* 146

Am I a psychopath? – *Editor* 149

Appendix

The fate of the world – *Eduardo Velasco* 155

First part

Neanderthal extermination



Darwinian scholar
Danny Vendramini.

Preliminary by César Tort

Not since I read Desmond Morris's *The Naked Ape* decades ago have I been so fascinated by facts about our prehistory that I knew nothing about, in part because academia has been under the grip of an anti-white mentality that considers these topics taboo, including Aryan beauty. For example, the mania of seeing 'noble savages' in infanticidal and even cannibalistic cultures has been extended to prehistory throughout universities.² Only a futuristic Aryan ethnostate—Adolf Hitler's dream—whose academic fields are linked to archaeology, palaeontology and prehistorical geology, will evaluate Vendramini's Neanderthal Predation theory and clarify the matter.

The NP theory is based on the three Darwinian mechanisms of evolution: natural selection, sexual selection, and artificial selection. The thesis that, through sexual and artificial selection, our ancestors eliminated all ape-like traits to produce the physiognomy of modern humans is supported by scholars other

² See e.g., my book *Day of Wrath*, available as PDF in my website.

than Vendramini (see Appendix I: ‘How did whites get their appearance?’). If the conclusions of Vendramini and others are valid (that *prehistoric* Neanderthals were exterminated by our ancestors), this process could potentially be repeated with *historic* ‘Neanderthals’, although this would imply a complete reversal of Christian mindset to the mindset of our distant ancestors.

In this section I quote some annotated excerpts from Danny Vendramini’s *Them and Us: How Neanderthal Predation Created Modern Humans* (first edition, 2009), and his video “Neanderthal: Profile of a super predator”, where Vendramini draws on scientific evidence to show that Neanderthals had an ape-like appearance.

Bold emphasis is mine.

Video transcript



This is the current accepted view of what Neanderthals look like: a bit hairier than us and with a larger nose and thicker brow ridges. But apart from that they're unquestionably human. In fact, it has been said that, if you gave a Neandertal a shave, a haircut and dressed him up in a nice suit he could easily attend Harvard.

There's a couple of things wrong with this picture. First, it's not based on any sound archeological evidence. That's because soft tissue features like skin, hair color and eyeballs are not preserved in the fossil record. The other reason is that after studying the Neanderthals for ten years, I'm convinced they look nothing like this at all.

There's a reason why all these forensic reconstructions end up looking like humans and it has got nothing to do with science. I think it's about anthropomorphism. That's our tendency to attribute human characteristics to other animals. It seems to be part of human nature. We assume that because we've got smooth skin, protruding noses, clear eye whites and full lips then the Neanderthals did too. And just because we lost our body hair we assume they did as well.

You can see examples of this anthropomorphic bias in television documentaries and in museum reconstructions around the world. The Neanderthal men are sometimes shown as quite handsome and often they are even clean shaven. The children are nearly always quite cute and some of them, amazingly, even wear

diapers. The females occasionally sport trendy tattoos and they always have breasts—even though not one other the species of primate has permanently protruding breasts. So you're just left with the impression that we're seriously projecting our own tastes and values onto the Neanderthals.

Quite apart from the anthropomorphic problem there's also a fundamental flaw in the technique used to reconstruct Neanderthals faces from their skulls. This forensic process works fine on humans, but that's because we know the shape and position of our noses, ears and lips. We know the thickness and texture of our skin, and we know the shape and size of our eyeballs. These soft tissue features are unique to humans. You would never use them to reconstruct the face of a chimpanzee or a gorilla, and yet scientists always use human facial characteristics and dimensions to reconstruct Neanderthals' faces. So it's inevitable that you end up with something that looks like a human. It's spurious science.

Television documentaries often use actors to portray Neanderthals. This involves hours and hours of meticulous makeup which the producers assure us is a hundred percent anatomically accurate. But it's not, and one reason is that Neanderthals eyes were in a different position in their skulls compared to humans. They were higher up, about where our foreheads are. And judging by the size of their orbits or eye sockets, their eyes were also considerably larger as well.



Vendramini shows that Neanderthal eyes were not only higher on the skull than ours, but were also much larger.

When you actually look at the hard evidence, you soon see that Neanderthal skulls and human skulls were fundamentally different. This [*see pic above—Ed.*] is a Neanderthal skull. It's got a

protruding face, large eye sockets and very prominent brow ridges compared to a human skull—quite different.

There's another reason why Neanderthals don't look like humans and that has to do with the environment. Basically, we know from Darwin that it's the environment that largely determines what an animal behaves like and looks like. In the case of Neanderthals and humans, they evolved on completely separate continents.

Humans evolved in the temperate warm fertile savanas of Africa. Neanderthals evolved in the frozen glacial wastelands of Ice Age Europe.

In fact the two species, when they met again, had been apart for over half a million years. It's inconceivable from a Darwinian perspective that Neanderthals and humans would still resemble each other after half a million years.

All this suggests to me that Neanderthals did not look like humans, which raises an interesting question.


What did they look like?

Actually once you get rid of all the anthropomorphic bias and inherent flaws in the reconstruction technology, answering this question is not particularly difficult. And that's because ultimately Neanderthals were members of the order of primates. They were primates. And as such you would expect them to maintain the appearance of primates.

The fact that humans no longer look like their primate ancestors is, I believe, due to completely unique ecological and environmental circumstances which I describe in my book. These circumstances certainly didn't apply to Neanderthals, so in light of that you would expect them to maintain the appearance of a tall bipedal primate. Once you acknowledge that Neanderthals were primates, you start to see similarities between them and other primates. For example, when I compared the profile of a Neanderthal with a chimpanzee, they seem to fit amazingly well.

For my book *Them and Us* I commissioned one of the world's best digital sculptors to create a completely new forensic reconstruction based on my theories. We began by scanning the skull of a French Neanderthal. Then over several months and

hundreds of emails and phone calls between Spain and Australia, a creature gradually emerged.



Forensic reconstruction of the La Ferrassie Neanderthal began with a computer scan of its skull. Digital sculptor Arturo Balseiro then used NP theory to reconstruct detailed features of its anatomy.

Now, saying that Neanderthals look like modern primates is an interesting clue, but it only goes so far. That's because modern primates come in all shapes and sizes. And there's a good reason for that: they've simply adapted to very specific, regional, ecological and environmental circumstances—and we would expect the same of Neanderthals. So to create a more nuanced picture of Neanderthal

physiology we need to understand the specifics of their environment. And we know a great deal about that: it was Ice Age Europe, a frozen glacial Wasteland described as the most inhospitable environment ever occupied by hominids. This was the environment that shaped every aspect of their physiology and behavior.

Take the issue of body hair for example. Were the Neanderthals hairless like us? Or did they have body hair like all the other primates? Well, if you look at the animals that lived in Ice Age Europe at the same time as the Neanderthals, you see that they all had thick, dense coats of body hair: the mammoth, the woolly rhino, the Eurasian cave lion, the cave bear—all had thick fur coats. And that makes sense as an ecological adaptation to the climate. So it makes sense that Neanderthals did too.



In Africa, where humans evolved, there was a wide range of prey species that could be hunted. There was also an endless variety of edible plants, fruits, berries, nuts, fungi and even shellfish. By comparison, in Ice Age Europe where Neanderthals evolved there are only about five or six edible plants, and those that did grow there were of such low nutritional value they weren't worth the time and effort to harvest. This, I believe, forced the Neanderthals to abandon their ancestral omnivore diet that they acquired from Africa, and adopt an exclusive carnivorous diet. In other words, they stopped being hunter gatherers and became exclusive hunters.

But this is where it gets interesting: the prey they were forced to hunt included some of the fiercest, largest and certainly most dangerous animals on Earth. These animals raised the bar and forced the Neanderthals to become adept hunters. My contention is that this transformed them over half a million years into the apex predator of Europe. My theory that Neanderthals were flesh-eating

predators is supported by new molecular analysis of their teeth. This reveals that the Neanderthals diet consisted of 99 percent meat. In fact, that's all they ate; and there's only one way to get that much fresh meat, and that's by hunting.

It also seems that they didn't care where the meat came from. That's because we now know that Neanderthals were cannibals. The first evidence of this actually surfaced in 1906. Since then, literally hundreds of bones have been discovered right across Europe bearing the unmistakable cut marks of cannibalism.

My predator theory also explains why Neanderthals were so much stronger than humans. Their muscles were so large they had to have extra thick bones to take the strain. It has been estimated that the Neanderthals were six times stronger than humans. Even a Neanderthal child could toss a human adult around like a doll. It also explains their extraordinary intelligence. The Neanderthals were unquestionably the smartest animal in Europe at the time. They mastered fire making. They constructed wind brakes. They made tools and weapons including razor-sharp thrusting spears, and like other social predators they hunted in packs and used sophisticated ambush tactics to maximize rates.

But there's one last adaptation that helped transform the Neanderthals into such a formidable killing machine: the dark. The vast majority of land-based predators hunt at night because it's easier to catch prey when they're resting or asleep. This theory predicts that Neanderthals acquired larger night vision eyes, and pupils to see in the dark. These kinds of eyes reflect light extremely efficiently. It would explain why Neanderthals had such enormous eye sockets.

Ancestral humans

If you think my Neanderthal reconstruction pictures are a bit scary, or the idea of camping alone at night out here in the forest [*at this point in the video, Vendramini is in a nocturnal wooded area—Ed.*] is a bit disconcerting, there's a good reason for that and it goes to the heart of my Neanderthal predation theory.

That's because about 100,000 years ago a group of European Neanderthals migrated into the Middle East, into an area currently occupied by Israel, Syria Jordan and Lebanon.

Now, living there at the time was a group of ancestral humans. These were timid Stone Age hominids who moved up from Africa, and the evidence suggest that the Neanderthals began hunting them, but not just the food. I believe that Neanderthals males also began hunting human females for sex. Now, this horrific period of sexual and cannibalistic predation went on for in excess of 50,000 years. It's this and only this scenario that explains why the 2010 draft sequence of the Neanderthal genome found categorically that Neanderthals had interbred with humans.

For our ancestors being hunted by the most ferocious killing machine on Earth was so traumatic, so transformative that even today we still harbor the genetic legacy of that horrific period of predation.



Reconstruction of an ancestral human.

Since the beginning of humanity these creatures have haunted the human imagination. They are the stuff of nightmares, they are the monsters, vampires and werewolves of myths movies and folklore. My research indicates that the only humans to survive were those born with modern human adaptations: things like high intelligence, creativity, language and aggression. This allowed them to turn the tables on the Neanderthals. For the next 20,000 years they hunted them to extinction. So the basic premise of my book is that everything we are today, everything that defines us as humans is the result of that extraordinary 70,000-year conflict between **them, and us.**

It's what made us humans.

Them and Us
Vendramini's Preface
(book excerpts)

When I applied Teem theory³ to what had transformed humans from stone-age African hominids into fully modern humans, why we look and act the way we do, and even why we're obsessed with sex and violence and good and evil, it proposed a single simple explanation that was both extraordinary and unexpected.

The result is a unified theory of human origins called Neanderthal Predation theory (or NP theory) which is based on a fundamental reassessment of Neanderthal behavioural ecology. Exciting new evidence reveals Neanderthals weren't docile omnivores, but savage, cannibalistic carnivores—top flight predators who hunted, killed and cannibalised our archaic ancestors in the Middle East for 50,000 years. What's more, Neanderthals were also sexual predators, who raided human camps to rape, and abduct young females, leaving a trail of half-cast 'inbreds'.

This multi-faceted predation eventually drove our ancestors to the brink of extinction. Genetic evidence reveals that at one stage our entire ancestral population was reduced to as few as 50 people.

³ See Vendramini's *The Second Evolution: The secret role of emotion in evolution*.

Teems are inheritable packages of emotion, and provide only an emotional memory of a traumatic incident. Teems derived from Neanderthals and Cro-Magnons present only half the picture—and no details. They describe what the others felt like but not what they specifically looked like. To flesh out the details, Mesolithic and Neolithic humans had to use their imagination, or draw on their storytellers and mythographers (all aspects of culture) to give form to the demons, monsters and satanic creatures they believed lurked in the darkness beyond their walls. In other words, culture gives form to teems. Even today, when modern humans attempt to identify the source of residual anxieties, they too must draw on their imagination, just as their ancestors did, or project their feelings onto one of the monsters from mythology, literature or the movies.

The only humans to survive the predation were those born with mutations for ‘survivalist adaptations’—modern human traits like language capacity, Machiavellian intelligence, coalition building, creativity, risk-taking and aggression. These traits effectively transformed them from a prey species to a virulent new hunter species—*Homo sapiens*.

Armed with these new attributes, the first modern humans systematically exterminated their former predators, firstly in the Middle East and then in a blitzkrieg invasion of Europe. They then spread out to colonise the world. **Guided by an innate sense of them and us, hyper-aggressive men killed anyone who looked or behaved even remotely like a Neanderthal, including hybrids and other humans.** It was this lethal process of artificial selection that gradually unified human physiology and behaviour.

It’s a fairly radical theory, but its strength lies in its predictions and ability to explain aspects of human evolution, physiology and behaviour that have frustrated philosophers, biologists and anthropologists for centuries.

The book has been written for a general readership which has an interest in how we got here. I’ve included ‘boxes’ to explain peripheral subjects and there’s a glossary of ancillary terms at the end. But to help academics evaluate the theory, I’ve also included my references—all 800 of them.

Because the evolutionary events I am investigating happened so long ago, some aspects of the scenario I propose are speculative. For instance, I speculate on the psychological impact that Neanderthal predation had on our ancestors, how the menfolk felt seeing their women abducted and raped. I do this because the psychology of ancestral humans had a direct bearing on our evolution and needs to be considered as part of a holistic theory.

For some scholars, though, the use of speculation and the imagination are anathema—but historically there has always been a legitimate place for the imagination in science. A scientific model can be subjected to rational debate and analysis only once it exists in a tangible form. The day before Einstein conceived his theory of relativity, there was nothing to think about. It existed in a netherworld beyond deductive reasoning, and required an act of imagination to bring it into existence.

Einstein is famously quoted as saying, “Imagination is more important than knowledge” and he explains, “For while knowledge

defines all we currently know and understand, imagination points to all we might yet discover and create.”

For radical, big-idea science, imagination isn’t just ancillary to the scientific process, it is an indispensable ingredient.

With human evolution, it could be argued that the reluctance of academics to imagine alternative evolutionary scenarios, or to encourage lateral thinking beyond the narrow pathways of orthodoxy, has hampered progress in this field.

While imagination played a role in the formulation of the NP theory, the resulting evolutionary scenario has, of course, been subjective to an exhaustive six-year process of scientific scrutiny and verification which involved sifting through 3000 scientific papers and other pieces of evidence. Ultimately, the theory’s credibility rests on the rigour of this process.

That’s more like it

Twenty-eight thousand years after the last Neanderthal roamed the earth, forensic science is able to reconstruct a far more accurate representation of a Eurasian Neanderthal. Their thick coat of fur, hunched back, bow legs and distinctive gait added to their unique appearance [*see previous pages—Ed.*].

A creature that looks like an athletic gorilla but uses complex weapons to hunt its prey is so foreign and counterintuitive it has hampered our understanding of Neanderthals for one hundred years. Anthropologist John Shea’s description of Neanderthals as “wolves with knives” comes close to describing their paradoxical nature.

Among the higher mammals—and this is particularly true of primates—it is usually the female that is proactive in selecting a mate. While males will mate with any female in oestrus, females are more discriminating. This would suggest that Skhul-Qafzeh females [*our ancient hominid ancestors—Ed.*] used sexual selection as an evolutionary tool more than the males did. But, as we are about to see, the final mechanism of selecting anti-Neanderthal traits was wielded almost exclusively by males.

When Darwin coined the term natural selection, he meant that nature was doing ‘the selecting’—that the natural environment the organism lived in was a major determinant of which members lived and which died. In addition, Darwin described artificial

selection: the way farmers and breeders intentionally select certain traits in domestic animals, which is a relatively benign form of artificial selection. However, the term also applies to the lethal form of selection—almost always applied by human males—as to who lives and who dies.

So the third way that anti-Neanderthal adaptations spread was by artificial selection—where coercion, ostracism, banishment and lethal violence by Skhul-Qafzehs gradually removed from the gene pool any individual who (for whatever reason) they considered too Neanderthaloid. NP theory holds that, throughout the Late Pleistocene, coalitionary groups of human males increasingly resorted to infanticide and homicide to eradicate Neanderthal-human hybrids, excessively hairy individuals, deviant neonates, or anyone who looked like a Neanderthal.

One of the most salient features of artificial selection is its speed. Unlike natural selection, which tends to create gradual change over thousands of generations, even benign forms of artificial selection can occur very quickly. A good example is the selective breeding experiments carried out in the 50s by the Russian geneticist Dmitri Belyaev to produce tame foxes. By selecting only the tamest foxes to breed, Belyaev and his team turned a colony of wild silver foxes into domestic pets within ten generations. The new animals were not only unafraid of humans, they often wagged their tails and licked their human caretakers in shows of affection. Even their physiology changed—the tame foxes had floppy ears, curled tails and spotted coats.



[Author's footnote to the previous illustration:] (In eastern Spain, scrawled on a cave wall in red ochre, is one of the earliest known depictions of intergroup violence.)

However, this rapid transformation of Belyaev's foxes pales into insignificance compared to lethal and pernicious forms of human artificial selection—including **genocide, ethnic cleansing, racial vilification**, religious persecution and pogroms—that can exert a significant evolutionary impact almost overnight. The long history of such affronts and their ubiquitous application by disparate cultures separated by thousands of years supports the hypothesis that aggressive Skhul-Qafzeh males would have no compunction in eradicating anyone they felt was more them than us.


Historically, lethal violence and genocide have not been the business of women. Throughout human history, they have mostly been the preserve of males, and there is no reason to believe it was any different in the Late Pleistocene. Males claimed lethal violence as their own instrument of artificial selection. Groups of men decided what constituted a Neanderthaloid trait, and who felt like a Neanderthal. Men became the ultimate arbiters of who and what was acceptable. It was they who decided who lived and who died.

Given this, the use of artificial (or lethal) selection to remove anti-Neanderthaloid traits would be more prevalent on females, children and infants than on adult males. Sociological and anthropological evidence appears to support this more nuanced view.

Evolutionary biologist Ronald Fisher observes that when a trait conferring a survival advantage also becomes subject to sexual selection, it creates a positive feedback loop that leads to very rapid uptake of the trait. But we can now see that in the Levant it was not only natural selection and sexual selection that were working together to rid the population of hybridised individuals and Neanderthaloid characteristics. The process was also being logarithmically boosted by artificial selection—as coalitions of aggressive males banished or murdered their way towards the same common objective—towards a new kind of human that looked, sounded, smelt and behaved less like a Neanderthal. This blind, inexorable process would have made a substantial contribution to human evolution by identifying and quickly culling vestigial Neanderthal genes from the nascent human genome. Nobody would want a mate who looked like a Neanderthal, so the new 'human look' became increasingly subject to sexual selection. As the 'new look' became de rigueur, the old look became subject to

artificial selection. Not having ‘the look’ was not only seriously ‘uncool’—it was likely to get you killed.

The characteristics which came under the most intense meta-selectional pressure were physical features that could be seen from a distance, because early identification of a predator is at the core of survival. This would mean that, for humans, body hair (length, density and colour) gait, posture, body silhouette and facial features were the most obvious foci of predator identification and differentiation.



[*Author’s footnote to the previous illustration:*] (When the original Levantine population of Skhul-Qafzeh early humans was decimated by Neanderthal predation, the survivors became the nucleus of a new founding population of modern humans.)

A hairy problem

Although it is interesting to speculate on what colour skin the Skhul-Qafzeh people had, it was not a factor at the time because it is almost certain that the Skhul-Qafzeh people were covered in dense body hair.

While readers may find the prospect of recent human ancestors sporting so much body hair unpalatable, this is precisely what NeoDarwinian theory predicts. Coming from Africa where they occupied an open savannah environment, it is highly likely that the Skhul-Qafzeh people acquired a coat of protective hair to insulate them from the hot African sun and its equally cold nights. The same reasoning suggests that—like lions, monkeys and other mammals occupying the same grassland environments—lightbrown fur would probably have been most adaptive because it facilitated concealment from predators. So, what happened to the hair? Can NP theory shed any new light on this age-old question?

The loss of body hair in humans—but in no other primate—has generated a vigorous debate among anthropologists for decades. It's particularly puzzling in light of the fact that hairlessness is maladaptive in terms of climate extremes, heat stress, sunburn, skin cancers, hypothermia and low ambient temperature environments. [*Author's box in brown letters about human hairlessness:*] (Actually, modern humans are not hairless. But discarding our thick, long and highly pigmented hair, called terminal hair, in favour of fine, short and unpigmented vellus hair has created the impression of hairlessness. For the purposes of this book, terms like hairlessness and denudation are used even though they're not strictly correct.)

In *Before the Dawn*, Nicholas Wade outlines the paradox:

Hairiness is the default state of all mammals, and the handful of species that have lost their hair have done so for a variety of compelling reasons, such as living in water, as do hippopotamuses, whales and walruses, or residing in hot underground tunnels, as does the naked mole rat.

Innumerable theorists have attempted to explain why only humans turned into a 'naked ape', including Charles Darwin who argues:

No one supposes that the nakedness of the skin is any direct advantage to man; his body therefore cannot have been divested of hair through natural selection. [...] In all parts of the world women are less hairy than men. Therefore we may reasonably suspect that this character has been gained through sexual selection.

A variation of Darwin's sexual selection theory has been proposed by American psychologist Judith Rich Harris. She believes that hairlessness and pale skin are the result of sexual selection for beauty, which operates through a form of infanticide she calls parental selection. Harris argues that historically, parents frequently killed infants they didn't consider beautiful enough, and one of the criteria for beauty she nominates is hairlessness. [...] Negative attitudes to hirsutism and a preference for hairlessness (personally and in prospective mates) are universal across human cultures throughout recorded time. Because artificial selection was practised almost exclusively by males, the selection pressure for female denudation would have been even more acute, resulting in women

becoming even less hairy than men. This indicates that the pressure on women and girls to be hairless is anchored in the threat of lethal force wielded exclusively by men since the Late Pleistocene.

While hairy aggressive men were quite prepared to kill hairy women, they were less enthusiastic about topping themselves. This reasoning is supported by considerable sociological research which shows modern women and girls traditionally come under greater pressure to be less hairy than men. For example, a study of 678 UK women in 2005 found that 99.71 percent of participants reported removing body hair. Citing examples of depilation in ancient cultures (Egypt, Greece and Rome) and in a variety of modern societies (Uganda, South American and Turkey), cultural anthropologist Wendy Cooper contends that the need for women to remove body hair is deeply embedded in human nature.



[Author's footnote to the previous illustration:] (Philosophers and scientists have pondered the aesthetics of human beauty for thousands of years but are still no closer to explaining them, or why our faces look so different from those of every other primate. Finally, we have a simple answer—the human face evolved to be visually different from Neanderthals—allowing us to tell friend from fiend. Today, Neanderthal facial characteristics, as depicted in the forensic reconstruction, provide an innate standard by which humans judge ugliness and beauty. The less like this Neanderthal you look, the more ‘beautiful’ you are.)

Excerpts from Chapter 14: No sex please, we're human

The sexual revolution

Neanderthal sexual predation not only reduced the Skhul-Qafzeh population, but also contributed to the hybridisation of the Levant population so, unless humans could find a way of preventing—or at least minimising—the worst excesses of Neanderthal sexual predation, their future as a separate species looked bleak. This generated selection pressure for adaptations to counter, or at least reduce, the impact of Neanderthal sexual predation.

Ostensibly, the goal of Skhul-Qafzeh males was to out-compete Neanderthal males and retain access to fertile females. But, from a Darwinian perspective, the stakes were much higher. Sexual compatibility exposed humans to overwhelming aggressive competition from Neanderthals, a competition so powerful and destabilising it rendered the existing Skhul-Qafzeh sex system obsolete and maladaptive. If the Levantine humans could not reclaim sexual exclusivity, their viability as a species was in jeopardy.

Given the enormous selection pressure this situation generated, we can use Darwin's model to predict what happened next. In the struggle for survival, random mutations that increased the Levantine humans' chances of sexually out-competing Neanderthals were selected and fixed.

What I propose is that the process of natural selection gradually came up with an entirely new human sexuality.

This hypothesis claims that sexual adaptations against Neanderthal predation that accrued via natural selection formed the basis of a uniquely human mating system. The new system was unique in the animal kingdom and achieved the almost impossible—it excluded Neanderthals and brought Neanderthal sexual predation to a complete halt. By abandoning most of the primate-Neanderthal sexual protocols—the pheromonal scents, swollen genitalia, colouration, vaginal sniffing and violent status

contests—the new human mating system became ‘Neanderthal proof’.

To be adaptive and effective, the new sexual protocols had to achieve fixation (or close to it) in the Skhul-Qafzeh population. Normally, this would take thousands of generations. But, because the Levantine human population was so small (ironically due to the Neanderthals themselves), the new system spread rapidly to fixation via genetic drift.

The break from sexual tradition and the emergence of a new human mating system did something else equally important. It indelibly stamped the Skhul-Qafzeh humans as a sexually isolated new breeding population. As human sexuality developed along new isolationist lines, the demarcation between the species increased. From then on, there would be no more sexual compatibility, no more interspecies sex, and no more hybrids.

In this radical new theory of human sexuality, the devil is in the detail. Analysis of the new mating system reveals how each of its constituent components served an adaptive function vis-à-vis reducing Neanderthal sexual predation. **Let’s begin with patriarchy.**

The battle of the sexes

Winning, and then defending fertile females from other males is a core element of primate reproductive strategy. **So keeping human females from falling into the arms of Neanderthal males would become the responsibility of every male** Levantine adolescent and adult. Any systemic failure of this imperative could contribute to the extinction of the Levantine population. It is to be expected then that, during the attenuated 50,000-year period of Neanderthal predation, the Levantine males’ fear of losing their mates to Neanderthals became innately associated with hyper-vigilance, anxiety, suspicion, guilt, control, resentment, depression, paranoia, grief and loss of self-esteem.

Levantine males would have been terrified of Neanderthals, and this would have discouraged direct retributive aggression against them. It would have been far easier (and safer) to sublimate those hostile feelings and redirect them towards their females. By virtue of their greater strength and aggression, men would

unilaterally have asserted physical control over their females and their sexuality.

While primate males regularly use dominance to control access to fertile females, the Levantine humans took this to a whole new level. **For the first time in human evolutionary history, males imposed mandatory (sexist) restrictions on female behaviour** that included an insistence on monogamy, obedience, fidelity and sexual modesty, plus a ban on public flirtation and copulation, overt sexual displays **and especially any form of fraternisation with Neanderthals—or any strangers.** The hypothesis also asserts that groups of dominant young males would have enforced these draconian protocols with threats, banishment, physical coercion and lethal violence. In this way, early human Levantine society was abruptly reconfigured from a promiscuous sexual society to a male-dominated, sexually restricted hierarchical society.

Is this when a proprietary sense of ‘ownership’ was first insinuated in gender relations? I believe so. After millions of years of casual female promiscuity, men began to claim females they had sex with as their own. Females were no longer free to copulate with multiple partners or to migrate to outside groups. **Promiscuity was out. Women lost control of their bodies and their sexuality.** The sexes were no longer equal. **Sexism had arrived.**

Another name for the control of females and their sexuality by males is patriarchy. Although many primate species (including chimps) display some patriarchal elements, others (like bonobos) display very few. But no other primate species imposes such draconian restrictions on its females as humans. And in no other primate species do males kill females to maintain sexual control, although male primates have been known to kill their infants if they have been sired by another male.

Because patriarchy is such a ubiquitous feature of human society (no genuine matriarchic society has ever been documented), we tend to take it for granted and assume it is simply another facet of human nature. Or assume, as some do, that it is a cultural artefact that sprang from preclassical western civilisations. But NP theory makes the case that patriarchy emerged in its present form and became entrenched in the male psyche only because Neanderthals drove a wedge into human sexual relations. Patriarchy makes sense in evolutionary terms only as part of a suite of male

mate-guarding adaptations that emerged to provide some relief against Neanderthal sexual predation.

One indication of the important adaptive function patriarchy provided during the Late Pleistocene is that today it remains the prevailing social structure of virtually every human society. Modern women are still subject to far greater sexual control than men. Social anthropologists say this mechanism of control is expressed through marital customs, rape laws, sexual harassment, wife beating, abortion laws, femicide, birth control restrictions, eating disorders, sexual jealousy, and cosmetic surgery. Enforced monogamy is as ubiquitous as female modesty. Adultery by women in many human societies is still punished by severe penalties, while adultery by men is often condoned or ignored.

Perhaps nowhere is patriarchy more keenly expressed than through male sexual jealousy. But let's make a distinction. We are not talking about the kind of jealousy a young male chimp displays when his amorous advances towards a female are gazumped by an alpha male. Among primates, that kind of sexual jealousy serves an adaptive function. It's part of mate-guarding protocols that ensure certainty in paternity and prevents expending time and effort on another male's offspring.

By comparison, if human sexual jealousy was forged, as I contend, in the furnace of Neanderthal sexual predation this would explain why humans acquired a far more virulent and potentially lethal variant. Human sexual jealousy has been fuelled and maintained by hatred built up over thousands of years and encompasses, not just anger and frustration, but murderous rage, hyper-vigilance, severe beatings, mental cruelty, femicide and even suicide—behaviours virtually unknown in other primate species.

For example, no other primate demonstrates morbid jealousy, psychotic jealousy, conjugal paranoia or the so-called Othello Syndrome—a lethal form of sexual jealousy, characterised by irrational thoughts and emotions, violence and an unfounded belief in a partner's sexual infidelity. Morbidly jealous individuals are much more prone to domestic violence, including homicide and suicide. Because lethal jealousy is unknown in the primate order, and appears so maladaptive, it is likely that the Othello Syndrome evolved in humans as an adaptation against Neanderthal sexual predation.

Honey, I killed the kids

Despite the Levantine males' best efforts to protect their females from Neanderthals, some women inevitably fell pregnant to Eurasian Neanderthals and, because they were sister species, these conceptions occasionally produced fertile offspring. What happened to those hybrid offspring is one of the most important aspects of the Neanderthal predation paradigm.

If Levantine males saw these children as mutants—abominations—then it's likely that they were summarily killed. A similar fate may also have been dealt out to the mothers, notwithstanding that they had little choice in getting pregnant. In other words, throughout the Late Pleistocene, infanticide and femicide may have been widely implemented as crude adaptive strategies to thwart the Neanderthalisation of the Levantine population. [...]

Excerpts from Chapter 18: Strategic evolution

The ultimate makeover

Despite defensive adaptations like xenophobia, changes in sexuality, raising wolves as guard dogs, becoming more athletic, developing a trauma-proof CNS [Central Nervous System], keeping to their own territory (and away from forests), plus a plethora of defensive teams, the fossil record reveals the Levantine population continued to decline. It seems that the Skhul-Qafzeh humans were slowly losing the battle for survival—and heading inexorably towards extinction. But at this pointy end of the predation cycle, things started to change, radically.

To understand what happened next, we need only examine the situation through the prism of Darwinian theory. This predicts the extraordinary and dramatic events that unfolded as the human population plunged towards extinction. For a start, it tells us that all the weak, slow-moving, dim-witted, gullible humans went the way of the dodo—their genes eradicated from the gene pool.

Then, as all but the most diehard survivors perished, it generated intense selection pressure for a new kind of adaptation. Why? Because the old defensive adaptations were no longer

adaptive. Neanderthal predation was continuing to decimate the Skhul-Qafzeh population and make their lives a misery. What was needed was a radical new adaptation, one that didn't just help humans evade or escape Neanderthals. To survive as a species and to be truly free of Neanderthals, humans needed to go on the offensive. This required a revolutionary new approach to the problem. And this is precisely what I theorise happened. The enormous selection pressure generated by Neanderthal predation gave birth to a completely new group of adaptations, which I call strategic adaptations.

Strategic adaptations are not defensive, they are offensive and, in the Levant, their blind objective was to empower the Skhul-Qafzeh humans to engage Neanderthals in combat and defeat them. **Strategic adaptations were blindly aimed at the complete annihilation of the Eurasian Neanderthal.** The emergence of strategic adaptations makes sound evolutionary sense. Defensive adaptations were useful, up to a point. **But ultimately, the only way the Levantines could achieve continuity and security and be predation-free was to permanently remove Neanderthals as ecological competitors.** Skhul-Qafzeh humans had to depose Neanderthals from the top of the food chain and take over the mantle of apex predator.

The enormity of the task was mind-blowing. For a timid prey species to turn the tables on the top predator on the planet would require the reversal of an ancient and well-established predator-prey interaction and would almost certainly have been **unprecedented in the animal kingdom.** Humans had to evolve into a militaristic species, the likes of which had never been seen before. They would have to become more intelligent, ruthless, cunning, aggressive, cruel and determined than their lethal adversary—**become a new super-warrior species with one specialist skill: to kill Neanderthals.**

A superior killing machine

Skhul-Qafzeh humans born with offensive physical characteristics and aggressive teems—any kind of inheritable trait that allowed them to outcompete, kill, wound or chase off Neanderthals—lived to pass on their offensive genes along with their newly acquired Neanderthal battle teems. **Strategic**

adaptations included any physical or behavioural adaptation that directly or indirectly contributed to Neanderthal extinction.

NP theory argues that, for the first time, a few humans didn't run and hide when they saw Neanderthals approaching. Instead, they courageously stood their ground and engaged Neanderthals in combat. Bolstered by their newly-acquired strategic adaptations, the humans began to win a few victories. Initially, they would have lost a lot of men, but this only concentrated the strategic adaptations into a smaller group.

Because the human survivor population was so small at the time and the strategic adaptations were so adaptive, the genes that encoded the most aggressive adaptations spread to fixation very quickly. Soon, a **new transitional human emerged. Natural selection was gradually evolving the ultimate killing machine—the most virulent hominid species by far—modern humans.** Once acquired, what humans did with these strategic adaptations is not in doubt. Charles Darwin, in *The Descent of Man*, provides a salutary reminder of what lay ahead for the Neanderthals:

We can see, that in the rudest state of society, the individuals who were the most sagacious, who invented and used the best weapons or traps, and who were best able to defend themselves, would rear the greatest number of offspring. The tribes, which included the largest number of men thus endowed, would increase in number and supplant other tribes.

The strategic adaptations which I propose played a pivotal role in humans gaining the upper hand over their historical enemy are a disparate lot. They include high intelligence, cruelty, male bonding and aggression, language capacity, the facility to interpret intention from behaviour, organisation, courage, guile, conjectural reasoning, **a genocidal mindset, improved semantic memory, consciousness, competitiveness and the ability to form strategic coalitions, or proto-armies.** These adaptations included a raft of new aggressive them and us teems that unified the Levantine humans into a cohesive combative force **(the first proto-army) that encouraged them not only to stand their ground but to attack Neanderthals and exterminate them without guilt or remorse.**

A major plank of the hypothesis is that strategic adaptations emerged only towards the end of the period of Neanderthal

predation (during the population bottleneck) sometime between 70,000 to 50,000 years ago. **To prove the strategic adaptations hypothesis, it must be demonstrated that they all emerged because they helped humans kill Neanderthals, and that they all appeared between 70,000 and 50,000 years ago.** Because there are so many strategic adaptations it is not possible to make a detailed examination of them all in this book. Instead, my analysis is limited to a sample of the most important strategic adaptations:

- Male aggression
- Courage
- Self-sacrifice
- Tough-mindedness
- Machiavellian intelligence
- Language
- Creativity
- Organisation—the origins of human society
- **Gender differences**
- Division of labour.

Bloodlust teens

Courage, bravado and proactive aggression are normally anathema (or a last resort) to prey species. From a survivalist perspective, it makes more sense to be timorous and cautious. But, because killing Neanderthals would require hand-to-hand combat, getting into close contact required courage, audacity and even self-sacrifice. **Gradually, timid defensive individuals lost out to a new breed of aggressive, courageous, tough-minded individuals.**

It is not difficult to see how a ‘bloodlust teen’ could be encoded. If a group of Skhul-Qafzeh men came across a wounded or infirm Neanderthal, they might easily work themselves up into a highly agitated state and beat him to death before pounding his corpse to a pulp. This kind of frenzied excitement (observed so frequently among wild chimpanzees) could generate enough excitement in one individual to precipitate a directed (or teemic) mutation in an intron (the nonprotein-coding region of his DNA). If the affected intron happened to be on his Y (male sex) chromosome, the bloodlust emotions he experienced during the melee would be permanently encrypted into his ncDNA and subject to patrilineal descent. Once inherited by male descendents, the

archived bloodlust emotions would remain unexpressed until triggered by the sight or sound of a Neanderthal. When expressed, the bloodlust emotions could precipitate the same kind of reckless and frenzied aggression.



[Author's footnote to the above illustration:] (The current anthropological model does not adequately explain the historic and cultural preoccupation with the hero's struggle against the forces of evil. However, in the context of an adversarial struggle between two sibling species, it makes sound evolutionary sense.)

Only in this specific and atypical ecological context were reckless daring, proactive aggression and self-sacrifice adaptive behaviours. When it came to fighting Neanderthals, risk-taking become both a laudable human attribute and a functional adaptation. In this context, foolhardy machismo and reckless bravado became laudable heroism. American anthropologist Joseph Campbell once said, **"A hero is someone who has given his or her life to something bigger than oneself."** And, while the great cause was genocide, for those Skhul-Qafzeh humans it would have been a noble cause. Heroic males would not only be praised and appreciated as altruistic and self-sacrificing by the folk they defended, but would also be highly sought after as sexual partners by admiring females. Even today, research shows that when

choosing a mate, women place significantly greater importance on altruistic traits than anything else.

Thus, the nascent genes for courage, altruism, self-sacrifice—indeed for heroism itself—dispersed through the community, transforming the Levantines from a timorous prey species into a proto-militaristic tribe. **It follows that the Skhul-Qafzeh attitude to killing also had to change. Early humans obviously killed other animals, but only for food. Now for the first time, they had to kill something they didn't intend to eat, and another hominid to boot. And kill them without compunction, hesitation or guilt. This required a library of virulent new aggression teams.**

These new teams were adaptable because, if early humans could not bring themselves to administer the coup de grâce to a wounded Neanderthal, then these soft-minded individuals risked retaliation, revenge and possibly their own lives. **Selection favoured the cruel and the merciless. This was, after all, war before there was a notion of it—before civilisation, before even barbarism.** There were no treaties, protocols, exchange of prisoners or rules of engagement. No field hospitals, no Red Cross and **no POWs. In this context of quintessential savagery, mercy was not only maladaptive, it was not a practical option.**

To dispatch Neanderthals efficiently and without pity, humans had to perceive them psychologically and emotionally in a new way. And this is where teams proved so functional. Teams can encode extreme antipathetic feelings into genetic sequences. Once encoded into ncDNA and inherited, Neanderthal hostility teams provided the emotions used to instinctively loath and dehumanise Neanderthals. They allowed the Levantines to perceive Neanderthals as sub-human, not even in the same category as animals. After all, the animals they regularly killed for food were not despised but were more likely revered for their speed, grace and life-force, and because they gave their lives so that humans could survive. This respect for prey (at times elevated to a spiritual relationship) is evident in every modern hunter-gatherer culture.

Neanderthals though, were a special case.

They were, in all probability, considered by humans as 'worse than animals', categorised metaphorically as pests, along with cockroaches, spiders and rats.

This would have served an important adaptive function. Seeing Neanderthals as subhuman allowed humans to slaughter them without guilt or remorse. Administering the coup de grâce to a wounded Neanderthal would be as easy as squashing a cockroach or crushing a rat with a rock. **The selection extended to favour men who were willing to give up their lives fighting Neanderthals. Under normal circumstances, male self-sacrifice would almost certainly be maladaptive, but in lethal combat with Neanderthals, this level of commitment and courage was obviously a strategic advantage that could turn the tide of a battle. Also, male bonding, pack mentality and obedience to the leadership would be eminently adaptive because discipline, organisation and hierarchy are essential elements of military success.**

Within the context of the life and death struggle in the Levant between two adversarial sibling species, aggression, risk-taking, self-sacrifice, and the ability to exercise lethal violence without hesitancy (all derived from Neanderthal teens) were advantageous and essential to human survival.

Collectively, this disparate assortment of aggression traits in modern humans has been aptly described by psychologist Erich Fromm as ‘malignant aggression’, which he says is biologically nonadaptive. Considering that during the last century alone, 203 million people were slaughtered by other human beings, he’s got a point. [...] The challenge to existing theories of human evolution is to explain how and why ‘malignant’ [*my quotation marks—Ed.*] aggression and its correlates—warfare, racism, and genocide—were initially selected, and what adaptive function they conferred. It is hard to imagine any situation, apart from Neanderthal predation, where such extreme levels of male aggression (levels that are still evident today) would be adaptive.

Excerpts from Chapter 19:
Natural born killers

“I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds”

When all the strategic adaptations described in the last chapter are added to the defensive adaptations humans acquired earlier, the result is something that looks very much like a fully modern human. This is not a coincidence. As disagreeable as it may be, this combination of aggressive, murderous, devious, cruel, sexually repressive, devilishly clever and patriarchal characteristics is a substantial part of what define us as a species. These characteristics distinguish modern humans from their stone-age ancestors and from every other primate. **Thousands of timid archaic humans went into the population bottleneck, and only a handful of ferocious, militaristic modern humans came out.**

Transforming into the most virulent species on earth is what it took for humans to throw off 50,000 years of persecution. Only a superior predator could have reversed the predator-prey dynamic. And only by transforming into something more lethal and dangerous than Neanderthals themselves, could those early humans stake their claim to the top rung of the food chain. From an evolutionary point of view, the struggle to reverse the predator-prey dynamic (despite being **fuelled by genocidal rage**) wasn't personal. It was simply a rudimentary and spontaneous expression of 'survival of the fittest'.

The Levantine reversal set the tumultuous course of human evolution for the next 50,000 years, honing the strategic adaptations that transformed the Skhul-Qafzeh humans from timid to triumphant, from fearful to fearless. **It was here that the die was cast**, from which all future humans would be forged. The Levantine humans had become something without precedent in the animal kingdom. For the Eurasian Neanderthals, this new breed of humans must have seemed like Frankenstein monsters, so different were they from their timorous predecessors. To comprehend the sinister nature of the human transformation, I am reminded of something

the father of the atomic bomb J. Robert Oppenheimer said when he witnessed the first nuclear denotation. He quoted a line from the Hindu scripture the *Bhagavad-Gita*: “Now I am become Death, the destroyer of worlds”.

Phoenix rising

With its red and gold tail plumage, the phoenix is a beautiful bird from Phoenician mythology that was said to live for 500 years. When it is about to die, it builds a nest of cinnamon twigs, nestles in, and sets fire to itself. When the firebird is completely consumed, a new phoenix rises magically from the ashes. This mythic tale of resurrection and regeneration provides a fitting analogy for what happened to the Skhul-Qafzeh humans. The catharsis of Neanderthal predation decimated their numbers, devastated their lives, and drove them to the precipice of extinction. But just as they were about to disappear forever, enough strategic adaptations took hold to fan the embers and allow a few resolute souls to emerge—belligerent, deadly and looking for revenge.

This scenario of resurrection and retribution encapsulates two major tenets of the strategic adaptation hypothesis and, coincidentally, provides two predictions that can be used to test the theory. The first is that strategic adaptations fixed during the population bottleneck transformed Skhul-Qafzeh humans into recognisably modern humans with a new Upper Palaeolithic culture. Secondly, this allowed the post-bottleneck humans to reverse the ancestral predator-prey relationship and go on a genocidal rampage of retribution against their ancestral foe.

If the first prediction is correct, the fossil record of the Levant should show that Upper Palaeolithic culture suddenly appeared there between 50,000 to 46,000 years ago. And it does. The Upper Palaeolithic transition first shows up in the fossil record about 47,000 years ago, which is when NP theory proposes that modern humans were emerging from the population bottleneck. Secondly, a plethora of solid archaeological evidence confirms the Levant is the site of the earliest systemic transition from Middle Palaeolithic to Initial Upper Palaeolithic anywhere in the world.

Most of the recognised indicators of modern behaviour are there—including prismatic blade technology, the transport of raw materials over long distances, complex multi-component tools

(including, for the first time, bone and ivory tools), personal ornaments, specialised subsistence strategies, language capacity, symbolic notation systems, and so on. The hypothesis argues that the gradual accumulation of new strategic adaptations created a tipping point that resulted in a new species.


One of the methods that biologists use to determine if two populations are the same species is to check whether they interbreed. Even if they look very similar, if they don't interbreed it's a sure sign they're different species. For example, Cope's Gray Treefrog (*Hyla chrysoscelis*) and the Gray Treefrog (*Hyla versicolor*) are visually indistinguishable. The only distinctive thing that separates them is their singing voices, but this is enough to prevent them interbreeding and so they're classified as separate species. So because the Levantine humans that emerged from the bottleneck were no longer subject to sexual predation and interbreeding with Eurasian Neanderthals, they were now a sexually isolated breeding population. If Neanderthal males came around looking for females, they would now be given short shift. The days of predation were over.

More to the point, though, the post-bottleneck Levantines were physically and behaviourally so different from their pre-bottleneck ancestors as to be virtually unrecognisable. This indicates that a speciation event took place. They were no longer Skhul-Qafzeh. Indeed they would probably look down on Skhul-Qafzeh folk as dumb, timid brutes with whom the prospect of interbreeding would be repulsive. In every respect, the post-bottleneck people were now effectively a new species. But what species?

The black sheep of the family

Although they possessed many characteristics of fully modern humans of today, when it came to outward appearances the post-bottleneck modern humans were most likely quite different from both their pre-bottle-neck ancestors and fully modern humans. For a start, they had slightly larger brains (1600cc compared to 1400cc for today's humans) and as a predator species, acquired a more robust skeletal-muscular physiology, so they looked bigger and beefier than fully modern humans. And, according to anthropologist Vincenzo Formicola's analysis of the data, the males

were considerably taller (at 176.2 cm) than their predecessors. In other words, this was a transitional morphology—not quite Skhul-Qafzeh, but not quite fully modern human. Were a crowd of these post-bottleneck humans to appear on the high street today, we might be surprised by how visually different they were from us. Overall these post-bottleneck humans would convey a disconcerting impression. We would probably consider them brutish, ill-formed, hairy and uncouth. And, because their faces appear unbalanced (asymmetrical), we would probably judge them unattractive (even ugly) by modern standards. They are after all, still stone-age cavemen and women.



[*Author's footnote to the above illustration:*] (This figure from the Natural History Museum in New York is described as a reconstruction of *Homo ergaster*, a hominid species that lived in Africa between 1.9 and 1.4 million years ago. However, NP theory asserts that this is what humans looked like 50,000 years ago.)

But it would be their behaviour more than anything else that would make them conspicuous. Over thousands of years of continual interspecies warfare, natural selection had retained the toughest, most aggressive, resilient, merciless individuals. Clearly the selection for aggression and risk-taking was directed primarily at adolescent and young adult males who were the ones doing most of the fighting. One simple mechanism of selection focused on males with abnormally high levels of hormones such as testosterone, which has been shown to increase verbal and physical aggression in young males.

By a simple application of Darwinian theory, an hypothesis emerges which proposes that the continual selection for aggression

in young males (because it was so adaptive) would gradually produce a cohort that was so innately aggressive and predisposed to violence that a new word was needed to describe them. Modern terms like hooligans, ruffians and even barbarians won't do. **Modern descriptions of male group violence are inadequate for these post-bottleneck people, who existed before rules, civilisation, or even humanity as we know it. Their exceptional level of aggression was selected for because it was adaptive. It wouldn't be today. Only in the context of a war of unimaginable barbarity against a ferocious enemy would this level of aggression be necessary or warranted.**

To distinguish this unprecedented level of male aggression, I use the term **hyper-aggressive**. It describes a repertoire of extreme behavioural responses that emerged in response to the aberrant environmental circumstances prevailing at the time. Male hyper-aggression includes a suite of teemic traits that, in addition to negligible impulse control and aggression, also includes paranoia, callousness, ruthlessness, sadism and absence of empathy, remorse and love.

In 1941, Hervey Cleckley, a psychiatrist with the Medical College of Georgia, described a similar list of personality traits and behaviours in modern humans and called it 'psychopathology'. There can be little doubt that your average post-bottleneck male would be classified as a psychopath according to diagnostic criteria developed by Robert Hare from the University of British Columbia, the current world authority on the subject. However, it's important to put the psychopathology of these early modern humans into context. They lived in a time before morals and ethics existed, so of course it follows that they were immoral and unethical. Romantic love was still in its infancy. **Empathy for anyone beyond the family or the tribal group was practically anathema.** And having a conscience, feeling guilty or empathising with one's victim was not only useless, it was almost certainly maladaptive. [...]

This NP theory view of a malignantly aggressive 'psychopathic' transitional species is at odds with most palaeontologists who argue these people were fully modern—indistinguishable from you and me. Anthropology does not currently recognise the need for an interim species between Upper Palaeolithic stone-age people and ourselves. But NP theory argues that, although the new hyper-aggressive humans had come a long

way, their journey was far from over. Natural selection still had a great deal of fine tuning to do (including exorcising the genes for hyper-aggression) before one of these post-bottleneck humans could attend the theatre without causing a riot.

To distinguish the transitional clade of hyper-aggressive early modern humans that sprang from the Levantine bottleneck—cantankerous and spoiling for a fight—I have revived the term Cro-Magnon. [*Author's box in brown letters:*] (Cro-Magnon was the name given to the earliest modern humans to enter Europe by the French palaeontologist Louis Lartet. Lartet discovered the first five skeletons in the Cro-Magnon rock shelter at Les Eyzies, in south-western France in 1868. Cro-Magnons are the quintessential 'cavemen' of popular literature. Although today the term has mostly been supplanted by anatomically modern or early modern humans, I find the term useful to describe a transitional population between Initial Upper Palaeolithic—or modern—humans and fully modern humans.)

It's payback time

In drama, good characters drive the plot. So, with the dramatic entrance of a compelling new protagonist onto centre stage, our Shakespearian drama of human origins is set for an exciting plot twist, one which will drive the drama to its cathartic climax. From what we now know about Cro-Magnons, we can predict what happened next. Unconstrained by laws, religion, morals, treaties or codes of civility, **hyper-aggressive Cro-Magnons would have embarked on a protracted campaign of retributive violence against the Eurasian Neanderthals.**

The object of this 'proto-war' was not dietary predation or territorial encroachment, but something quite unique among the anthropoids—killing members of a sibling species out of **extreme antipathy**. This in turn is based on an innate sense that it was them or us—an instinctive awareness that the two species were mutually exclusive—that there is room for only one of them. **Armed with their innovative projectile weapons, newly acquired military tactics, courage, cunning and aggression, Cro-Magnons took every opportunity to exterminate every Neanderthal they came across. This, I believe, was the first time humans killed other than for the purposes of food, the first time they hunted for sport.** From the perspective of a virile young Cro-

Magnon male, it is hard to imagine there would be any consideration of the social, political and evolutionary consequences of their murderous campaign. It was intuitive and instinctive—because it was already innate.

Just as lion cubs and other juvenile predators use play to practise the hunting and killing techniques they will use as adults, Cro-Magnon boys would have incorporated their new aggressive proclivities into their development. From an early age, they would have played with toy spears and clubs—the new tools of the trade—and practised hunting and killing Neanderthals. By the time they reached their teenage years, Cro-Magnon boys would be physically, hormonally and socially prepared to take on their fathers' lethal quest.


Today, boys around the world do not pretend to hunt antelope or mammoths to practise future skills. They play variations of 'Cowboys and Indians'—seminal them and us battles between humans. These games are the vestigial remnants of ancestral imperatives—innate proclivities that had served to hone the violent duties of adulthood. [*As far as cowboys and Indians are concerned, see Appendix II —Ed.*]

There is reason to believe that hyper-aggression included a sexual component. I proposed earlier that one method of achieving hyper-aggression in young Cro-Magnons males was by selecting for extremely elevated levels of serum testosterone. Testosterone also happens to be the primary male sex hormone, elevated levels of which predisposes increased sexual arousal and activity. This means that, not only were Cro-Magnon men hyper-aggressive compared to modern humans, they were almost certainly hyper-sexual as well.

If Cro-Magnon social groups resembled modern hunter-gatherer groups, they would ostensibly congregate in tribes close to fresh water and good hunting grounds. From there, the young men would launch hunting and gathering expeditions, sometimes lasting weeks, or even months. These bands of heavily-armed hyper-aggressive, hyper-sexual young men—genetically charged with a bevy of powerful hormones—posed a threat not only to Neanderthals but to other human populations.

As a hunting and fighting group, the Cro-Magnon men depended on each other for their survival. They hunted, fought, suffered and died together. And doubtlessly they celebrated their victories together. These emotionally shared experiences would

create an indelible bond between the men, far more intense than today's male bonding of football teams and fishing buddies. **For Cro-Magnons, male bonding was not just social, it was a life and death issue.** As such, it was a functional adaptation that directly contributed to their survival and reproductive success. **Also deeply ingrained in the Cro-Magnon psyche was the concept of them and us.** For them, it represented more than a species divide. It was a life and death distinction, adaptive because it was plain and simple enough for them to understand at a visceral, intuitive level. It had almost nothing to do with rational thought and objective reasoning and everything to do with gut instinct—innate prejudices, sex and violence and deeply entrenched them and us mindsets.



[Author's footnote to the above illustration:] (After the population bottleneck, the human population expanded and the Eurasian Neanderthal population plummeted towards extinction.)

There was no precise intellectual concept of them. The description applied to almost anyone and anything outside the group. Any mix of sex and violence could be meted out without the slightest remorse to anyone branded 'them'. The Cro-Magnons were probably the most psychopathic humans who ever lived—but they were creatures of their time. With a job to do. And if they had not done their job, none of us would be here.

The first genocide

From a broader sociological perspective, it is immediately apparent what these nomadic bands of hyper-aggressive, hyper-sexed Cro-Magnons were doing. **They were practising genocide. It was undirected, haphazard and certainly inefficient by today's**

standards, but it was highly motivated. And over a few thousand years, the Cro-Magnons drove the Eurasian Neanderthals to extinction. The genocide hypothesis fits with sociological studies of lethal aggression by male coalitions (modern armies) and with a long history of human warfare, xenophobia and genocide. In *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin has this to say on the propensity of humans to kill off those they considered inferior:

All that we know about savages, or may infer from their traditions and from old monuments, the history of which is quite forgotten by the present inhabitants, shew that from the remotest times successful tribes have supplanted other tribes.

More importantly, the theory that humans annihilated the Eurasian Neanderthals is consistent with the fossil record of the Levant that shows the Neanderthals disappeared just after the first appearance of the first Upper Palaeolithic humans in the Levant. John Shea says:

Throughout Western Eurasia, the end of the Middle Palaeolithic period marks the last appearance of Neanderthals in the fossil record. Between 30–47 Kya, Upper Palaeolithic humans expanded their geographic range to include all the territory formerly occupied by the Neanderthals and other anatomically archaic humans. The Middle Palaeolithic period in the Levant was the last period in which modern humans had serious evolutionary rivals for global supremacy.

NP theory goes even further, predicting that a genocidal war took place, that it was successful, and that it was relatively quick. Why? Because the Cro-Magnons were not only militarily much more advanced than the Eurasian Neanderthals, they were socially bonded into a single massive military group that can only be described as an army—or at the very least a proto-army. This was the strategic application of the new socialisation process—a process that effectively united the disparate tribes of Syria, Israel, Palestine, Jordan and other areas of the Levant into a single combative force that swept all before it. **As the raggle-taggle proto-army grew, a tipping point was reached, and the tide began to turn. The Cro-Magnon campaign accelerated its onslaught into a blitzkrieg. Over time, this search and destroy operation became genetically encoded in testosterone-charged adolescent and young adult males and continued unabated—generation after generation—**

until not a single Neanderthal was left alive from northern Turkey to Egypt.

This view is supported by the archaeology. John Shea concludes in *Modern Human Origins and Neanderthal Extinctions in the Levant*, “that around 45,000–35,000 BP, Neanderthal fossils cease to occur in the Levant at exactly the point when Upper Palaeolithic industries first appear in Israeli and Lebanese cave sites.” At the Amud Neanderthal cave, northwest of the Sea of Galilee in Israel, for instance, materials dated from the lowest levels of the cave reveals that Neanderthals first occupied the site 110,000 years ago ($\pm 8,000$ years). The youngest date measured at the site comes from a single tooth from Level B1/6 which tells us the occupation ended 43,000 years ago (± 5000 years).

Until recently, it was generally assumed that the disappearance of Eurasian Neanderthals from the Levant was caused by a deterioration in the climate. But in April 2008, at a meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, Miriam Belmaker from Harvard University deftly demonstrated that the climate in the Levant at the time of their extinction was stable, ruling out climate change as a factor in their disappearance.


Power plays and mind games

If NP theory is correct and Cro-Magnons were a hyper-aggressive new transitional species, purpose-built by natural selection to kill Neanderthals, then it follows that even after the disappearance of the last Neanderthal, Levantine males would simply disperse further afield in search of more victims. They had spent several thousand years relentlessly hunting their ancestral foe—this is what young Cro-Magnon males did—and they were not going to stop now. But NP theory and an understanding of human nature also predicts something else happened: the proto-army of the Levant began to fall apart, and ultimately turned against itself.

The alpha males who, by force of strength and aggression, had maintained cohesion within the group became besieged by eager and ambitious young males determined to assume their mantle. Here, I suggest, is the origin of that unique and ubiquitous pattern of human group dynamics, distinguished by male intergroup competition, power plays, political divisions, leadership challenges, Machiavellian intrigues, betrayals, ‘civil war’ and chaos. The

techniques that had been so effective in conquering Neanderthals had found a fertile new outlet within Cro-Magnon society.

As the proto-army grew too large to be effectively managed, fed, organised and controlled, secondary leaders (beta males) saw an opportunity. Taking advantage of the increasing frustration, they agitated, conspired and aspired to be alpha males with access to all the fertile females. Leadership challenges became a constant fixture of the times. Retributions for unsuccessful coup attempts were swift and violent, and deposed leaders would be banished or killed. Dissent spread, disorder became the status quo and eventually some beta males broke away or were expelled, taking their warriors and their families with them. These smaller armies then spread out from the Levant to conquer and colonise their own territories.



[Author's footnote to the previous illustration:] (The global expansion of modern humans began in the Levant and dispersed to Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia and the Americas, via a coastal, island-hopping route.)

While this scenario is, at best, informed conjecture, it is supported by the genetic and archaeological evidence, which reveals the Levant human population did split into at least three large groups that eventually dispersed out of the Levant at precisely that time.

One group migrated east, around the coast of India into eastern Asia, and eventually across the Bering Plain (Beringia) to people the Americas. A second group dispersed from the Levant to Europe, while a third migrated back to Africa. These migrations all date to between 45,000 to 40,000 years ago.

Suggesting that the third group of Levantine humans migrated south into Africa—their ancestral homeland—is at odds with the long-held assumption that the world-wide dispersal of modern humans began in Africa. Corroborative evidence for the

back migration theory only emerged in December 2006, via a landmark study of mitochondrial DNA from ancient human fossils by an international team of 15 geneticists lead by Antonio Torroni from the University of Pavia in Italy. The study, published in *Science*, reports that between 40,000 to 45,000 years ago, a group of modern humans living in the Levant split into genetically separate groups. Torroni traces one group as it moved north into Europe, and another that moved back to Africa.

By measuring the amount of genetic diversity in the mtDNA and on the Y (male) chromosome, Torroni's group concludes, "the first Upper Palaeolithic cultures in North Africa (Dabban) and Europe (Aurignacian) had a common source in the Levant", spreading by migration from a core area in the Levant. The Upper Palaeolithic Levantine people that Torroni refers to (that first appeared 46,000 to 45,000 years ago) dispersed to south-eastern Europe via Turkey around 43,000 years ago.

The date of the dispersal from the Levant (45,000 to 40,000 years ago) agrees with the near-extinction hypothesis of NP theory and the emergence of a new human species as a consequence of Neanderthal predation.

The pace of this dispersal fits with my more nuanced view that Cro-Magnons, unlike their Middle Palaeolithic predecessors, were not averse to risk-taking, exploration or territorial expansion. It also supports NP theory's proposal that **the incursion into Europe was not a nonchalant nomadic migration in search of hunting and gathering opportunities, but a militaristic blitzkrieg by hyper-aggressive males inherently confident of their colonising and military capabilities. This indication of a new 'conquistadorial' component of human nature** creates the impression that Cro-Magnons believed their technological and psychological superiority made them invincible—that nothing and no one could stand in their way. This was the first example of military expansionism, and it set the stage for the first real world war.

Excerpts from Chapter 20: The invasion of Europe

In Europe, the Cro-Magnons encountered the European species of *Homo neanderthalensis* for the first time. The narrative history of the two species proposed by NP theory predicts an inevitable outcome of this interaction: that from around 44,000 years ago, when they first entered Europe from the east, hyper-aggressive Cro-Magnon males threw themselves into a protracted campaign against a well-entrenched (and much larger) population of European Neanderthals. **This first successful incursion into traditional Neanderthal territory had all the hallmarks of an invasion. Its intention was nothing less than the complete eradication of Neanderthals from their ancestral homeland.**

The archaeology shows that the euphemistically named ‘replacement’ began in the east and progressed in a westerly direction across continental Europe. The first Neanderthals to be replaced by Cro-Magnons were living in Eastern Europe, followed by those in France, Greece, Italy and finally Spain.

What the fossil record and carbon dating agree on is that in every individual case of replacement, the Neanderthals disappear from the fossil record only after modern humans have moved into their territory. Even though Neanderthals had survived in Europe for over 300,000 years—often in the most extreme climatic conditions—it was only once Cro-Magnons occupied their territory that they disappeared. In other words, Cro-Magnons swept across Europe in an east-west direction and Neanderthals became extinct in the same east-west direction at exactly the same time.

This is not to say that the European Neanderthals were a pushover. They were a well-entrenched, formidable adversary, with exceptional hunting and tracking skills, knowledge of the terrain, superior physical strength and indomitable courage. And they were now fighting for their lives. The fact that the replacement began around 44,000 years ago and took 20,000 years to complete suggests the European Neanderthals put up one hell of a fight.



[*Author's footnote to the above illustration:*] (Although isolated, regional populations of European Neanderthals survived in mountainous regions of Croatia and the Caucasus until about 29,000 years ago, the last remaining Neanderthals appear to have been pushed down the Iberian peninsula to Gibraltar on the southern tip of Spain.)

Another factor that almost certainly contributed to the protracted nature of the conflict was the size of the Neanderthals' territory. When Cro-Magnons from the Levant invaded Europe, they could have had no idea that the enemy occupied an area of 10 million square kilometres. And in the Late Pleistocene, a few hundred thousand Neanderthals could easily disappear for long stretches, particularly in the forests and mountains, avoiding contact with the intruders.

The last Neanderthal bites the dust

Despite the sporadic late flowering of Neanderthal culture, the last Châtelperron assemblages (at Arcy-sur-Cure and Quinçay, in France) vanish about 34,000 years ago. Among the last surviving populations of European Neanderthals are those from Gibraltar, dated to 28,000 years ago, but with some bone samples reliably dated as recently as 24,000 years ago. With them disappeared forever one of the toughest and most durable hominid species of all time.

The reason why the European Neanderthal population became extinct when the Levantine human population recovered after its own near-extinction event was, I think, because the persecution of European Neanderthals by Cro-Magnons was not based on dietary predation. When predation is simply about killing for food, prey species usually recover in number when they are no longer worth the time and effort to hunt. But if the objective of Cro-Magnon aggression was not dietary, then the cyclical pattern that normally allows the prey species to recover its numbers would

not occur. Because NP theory nominates genocide as the objective of the European territorial incursion, it predicts that successive generations of humans kept relentlessly hunting Neanderthals throughout their entire European habitat until they were eliminated.

While the genocide model may seem somewhat melodramatic to those who take an anthropocentric view of humanity, it is a lynchpin of NP theory. Ironically, it is also one of the few elements of NP theory that accords with conventional anthropological thinking. The idea that Cro-Magnons killed off the European Neanderthals is a view held by a sizable proportion of academics. In anthropological terms, it is known somewhat euphemistically as the competitive replacement model, and it was first proposed by French palaeontologist Marcellin Boule (the first person to publish an analysis of a Neanderthal) in 1912.


Claudio Cioffi-Revilla, a computational social scientist from George Mason University in Virginia, calls the replacement a “large-scale violent eviction accompanied by purposive massacre” and defines it as history’s first genocide.

Another supporter of competitive replacement is Jared Diamond, who points out in his book *The Third Chimpanzee* that the genocidal replacement of Neanderthals by modern humans is similar to modern human patterns of behaviour that occur whenever people with advanced technology invade the territory of less advanced people.

The competitive replacement model is not, however, universally accepted and one of the reasons for this is that it does not explain why Cro-Magnons eradicated the Neanderthals. NP theory’s contribution to the competitive replacement model is to provide the all-important motive—the hatred of a former prey species of its erstwhile predator.

Another criticism of the competitive replacement model is a familiar one—that there are no mass graves or other unequivocal evidence of a genocide in either the Levant or Europe. We learn from watching shows like CSI that violent crimes usually leave some forensic evidence, so we half expect to unearth mass graves or other unequivocal forensic evidence. Realistically though, it cannot be expected that archaeologists will dig up a pile of 40,000-year-old Neanderthal bones from some long-forgotten massacre site,

complete with Cro-Magnon arrowheads embedded in their ribs. Usually, the only time we find fossilised hominid bones is when they've been purposely buried or thrown into a bog. Unlike modern massacres like Srebrenica, where an estimated 8000 men and boys were shot and buried during the Bosnian War, Cro-Magnons would not be concerned about burying their victims. It is more likely that Neanderthals would be left to rot at the kill site, or butchered and consumed for their meat. [...]



[Author's footnote to the above illustration:] (Gorham's Cave, centre, Gibraltar. Although the water now laps at its entrance, when Neanderthals lived there the sea level was much lower. According to Clive Finlayson, this is where some of the last European Neanderthals held out, hunting seal, dolphin and fish.)

Ultimately, the only certainty is that by 24,000 years ago, the Neanderthals had disappeared forever. [...] The world had changed. After more than 75,000 years, the great struggle was over. For the first time—humans were alone. They were now the undisputed 'masters of the universe'.

César Tort's interpolated note:

"We have to fight to secure the existence and expansion of our race and of our people; to enable them to nourish their children and to preserve the purity of their blood; to secure the freedom of our Fatherland".

—Hitler


The drama didn't end with the extinction of the prehistoric Neanderthals. The rest of the hairy hominids that didn't undergo

the genetic changes that led to ‘the naked ape’ were exterminated too. However, after the passages cited above Vendramini’s book loses its primitive force. It reminds me that Tom Holland’s *Dominion* helped me understand how Christianity transmuted into neochristianity. But like Holland, Vendramini also subscribes to Christian ethics. That is why in the final chapters, despite his professed atheism, Vendramini insists that contemporary humanity is a single species. In fact, Danny Vendramini had probably the most iconic last line in this book by saying “there is no them and us. It’s all an illusion. There is only us.”

To combat this claim, it is useful to familiarise oneself with Jared Taylor’s books on racial realism, and better still, with the first chapter of William Pierce’s *Who We Are*. It is this first chapter, in which Pierce discusses prehistory, that serves us well in building a bridge between what we have seen so far in *Them & Us* and history.

Although Vendramini’s book has been truly wonderful up to this point, the rest of his chapters must be taken with a grain of salt. The *there is no them and us* Leitmotif permeates them. Even so, some subsequent passages in Vendramini’s book are relevant to understanding that the work of ethnic cleansing only began with Cro-Magnon man. And had it not been for the greatest historical blunder committed by Westerners, Himmler and the SS would have continued the work of eugenics in territories that shouldn’t belong to the Slavs but to the Germans who would have fulfilled their Master Plan East.

Vendramini wrote:



This hypothesis proposes that top of the hit list for eradication on six continents were deviants and those perceived to be the others. Theoretically, this could mean anyone who triggered a Neanderthal teem. Pragmatically though, it could include anyone who looked different. If your nose was too flat, your eyeballs not white enough, your pupils not circular enough or your lips too thin, you were at risk of being subconsciously perceived as a Neanderthal—and treated as such. In a world where first impressions were often a matter of life and death, coming across as dumb, crass, humourless or gruff was likely to get you killed. And because nothing creates a first impression better

than posture, having a stooped (monkey-like) gait, hunched shoulders or a head that jutted forward on your shoulders was a recipe for a short life.

Because artificial selection was almost exclusively exercised by men, females would be more prone to scrutiny than males. If girls were considered too flat-chested, straight-waisted, wrinkled, thin-lipped, or if the labia protruded beyond the vulva, they would be less likely to pass on their genes.

It was as if these spontaneously self-forming death squads had all been issued with the same orders. And the same hit list. From Spain to eastern Mongolia, and from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego the same motley collection of ill-formed deviants became the target of this sustained campaign of lethal selection. Although it is sometimes argued that ‘death squads’ only emerged in the 1970s and 1980s in South America, they have existed under different guises since prehistoric times. The all too familiar lament of ‘the day men came with guns’ to rape, murder and pillage has its antecedents in the Mesolithic, when men came with flint-tipped spears—to line up the innocents and make their lethal selection. But had a CSI unit of forensic pathologists examined the bodies, they would have seen a pattern to the victims. The selection was anything but random. By this simple expedient, a unique homogeneous human physiology and behavioural repertoire began to emerge simultaneously around the world. This blunt, brutal but chillingly effective scenario is, along with mate selection derived from Neanderthal teens, the only evolutionary scenario that can explain how and why modern humans are today one species.

Learning to dance


As a result of this lethal form of artificial selection, behaviours that had previously provided little or no contribution to fitness (like the ability to dance, hold a tune or laugh at a joke) now assumed an adaptive function. When a Cro-Magnon raiding party descended on a community, the villagers’ ability to speak fluently, decorate their bodies or even crack a joke could mean the difference between living and dying. This brings new meaning to conformity—and to being ‘human’. If Neanderthals were thought of as an artless, humourless, crass bunch, then art, tattoos, music,

dancing, laughter and singing would become reliable indicators of us.

This generated pressure for everyone to acquire these external identifying signifiers. Men and women began wearing jewellery, tattooing their bodies and painting them with red ochre because they found these cultural accruements to be like passports—facilitating free and safe movement.

Cro-Magnons invented musical instruments and played them as a stamp of their humanity. They told stories, brewed alcoholic drinks and sang songs around the campfire. And they painted pictures on cave walls and fashioned ivory into figurines. Back in the Mesolithic, ‘artistic’ was not an affectation or indulgence—it was a much admired survivalist skill that could very well save your life. Styling their locks, embellishing clothes, tools and weapons—in effect, ‘making a fashion statement’—became ingrained in the human psyche as an adaptive behaviour. In a very real sense, the Cro-Magnons were the first slaves to fashion.

There is every reason to believe that the relentless selection process included newborns. Neonates displaying atypical characteristics were ‘soft targets’ and infanticide was unquestionably the simplest, most cost effective application of artificial selection.



[Author's footnote to the above illustration:] (Intergroup violence is so pervasive in human history, we tend to take it for granted. From top: a prehistoric drawing of archers and victim from a cave in Castellón, Spain; the biblical massacre of the innocents; the

shooting of Kiev Jews by Nazis; the My-Lai massacre by American troops in Vietnam; and skulls of the victims of the Rwandan genocide.)

Eliminating the competition

The theory that blind senseless violence—that most loathsome of human proclivities—has played a pivotal role in the emergence of modern humans by eradicating vestigial Neanderthaloid remnants from the Cro-Magnon genome, may be disagreeable. However, the model now goes even further. It predicts that as Cro-Magnons colonised Africa and Asia, they inevitably encountered ancestral hominid populations such as *Homo floresiensis* and *Homo erectus*. The model proposes that the perceived deviancy of these indigenous people would also trigger them and us teemic responses, that would predispose Cro-Magnons to treat them as if they were Neanderthals, even though they had never seen a real Neanderthal. In other words, the hotchpotch campaign of sexual selection and artificial selection that they applied to one another would now be applied to other species of *Homo* they came across.

Once labelled generically as them, indigenous hominid species would be subject to the full force of Cro-Magnon aggression. With inevitable consequences.

Could this explain what happened to all those pre-existing populations of hominids and early modern humans spread across Asia, Africa and the Americas? The archaeological evidence certainly confirms that, while there were numerous hominid species living from Africa to Asia before the arrival of Cro-Magnons, once the Cro-Magnons arrived, they all disappeared. The first to vanish were two species of *Homo erectus*—one in China, the other in Indonesia.

Until then, *erectus* had been probably the most successful hominid species of all, a tenacious hunter-gatherer who had survived for 1.75 million years and colonised half the globe. For ages, it was believed that *Homo erectus*—thought to be the first hominid species to leave Africa—became extinct long before modern humans arrived in their areas. But we now know this is not the case. Recent dating of fossilised bones and artefacts reveals one population of *erectus* held out on the isolated island of Java until as

recently as 25,000 years ago. This coincides with the time humans reached Java. After that, *Homo erectus* disappears from the fossil record.

Their new cognitive capacity enabled Cro-Magnons to build seaworthy vessels and cross the Timor Sea to Australia. The earliest widely-accepted date for their arrival in Australia is around 38,000 years ago, but a recent review of the data suggests occupation as early as 42,000–45,000 years ago. When Cro-Magnons arrived, there appears to have been at least one other hominid species already living in Australia—in the south of the continent. Known as the Kow Swamp people, they had relatively large and robust bodies and thick skulls indicating they were related to *Homo erectus*. It's thought the Kow Swamp people arrived when there was still a land bridge between Australia and Asia. The Kow Swamp people appear in the fossil record about 20,000 years ago, and then abruptly disappear. Given that Cro-Magnons entered Australia from the north and the isolated Kow Swamp lived in the south, it is conceivable that the two groups did not make contact for thousands of years. NP theory suggests that when they finally did, the humans promptly wiped them out.



Whether humans were also responsible for the extinction of the diminutive *Homo floresiensis* [pictured above—Ed.] on the remote island of Flores in Indonesia about 13,000 years ago, is also impossible to confirm. But again, anthropologists Peter Brown, Michael Morwood and their Indonesian colleagues, who discovered and named *floresiensis*, argue that they were contemporaneous with modern humans on Flores. This makes them the longest-lasting

hominid (apart from humans), outlasting the Neanderthals by about 12,000 years. It also highlights Peter Brown's claim that these resilient species of the genus *Homo* may have been direct descendants of *australopithecus* (like 'Lucy'), one of the earliest African hominids. If so, then these resilient little fellows—the 'Hobbits'—managed to survive in an unbroken line for a whopping five million years. Until, that is, modern humans arrived on their island. Once humans arrived, *floresiensis* abruptly disappeared.

This represents only circumstantial evidence of genocide and requires more proof, but some points are unequivocal. Firstly, by 13,000 years ago, of the at least seven—and possibly dozens, or even hundreds—of different subspecies of hominids which had inhabited the world, there remained only one. Secondly, their disappearance occurred only after the arrival of modern humans. Thirdly, because all other species became extinct, everyone living today can trace their ancestry to the original population of Cro-Magnons in the Levant. **In effect, this 'purification' of the gene line was evolution by genocide. As an instrument of artificial selection, it was systematic, methodical and extremely efficient.** Modern humans owe their present homogeneity to the thoroughness of the genocidal eradication of anyone considered too deviant to fit into the Cro-Magnon culture. [...]

The journal, *Evolution and Human Behavior* recently published a study by Canadian anthropologist Peter Frost, which claimed the genetic mutation in the hair colour gene that resulted in blonde hair occurred about 11,000 years ago and quickly spread through sexual selection. Researchers at Copenhagen University have identified the single point mutation in the OCA2 gene that is responsible for all the blue-eyed people alive today. They calculated the mutation happened between 6,000 and 10,000 years ago in Europe.

This genetic data supports NP theory's argument that by 10,000 years ago, artificial selection and sexual selection of the nascent human phenotype was in full swing. [...]

For example, so thoroughly had the genes for hairiness been expunged, rendered inoperative (turned into what are called pseudogenes) or silenced (which means they are no longer expressed) that today, anyone born with full body hair is considered a medical curiosity. Since records began in the Middle Ages, only about 34 cases of the condition, called congenital generalised hypertrichosis, have been described in the medical literature.

Because of its importance in differentiating the warring species, the Cro-Magnon human face received the full makeover. Faces became more symmetrical. Skin became wrinkle-free, clear and unblemished. The eye whites really were white, the lips fuller and the nose (petite by primate standards) protruded conspicuously from the face. Gone were the two forward-projecting gaping nostrils of the primate nose. Gone was the leathery skin. And gone too was the coating of protective body hair, even in hot tropical regions. Beauty became the prevailing guide to mate selection, and meant the opposite of what Neanderthals looked like.

Further accentuating the divide were mutational alleles for novel hair and eye colours. Amongst some Northern European groups the new lighter colours became highly-prized. From a distance nothing stamped a person one of us better than blue eyes and a coiffure of blonde, brunette or red hair, especially if it was well-groomed and decorated—something the others never did.


The 35,000-year-long process of genetic pruning was so comprehensive that it rendered Cro-Magnons almost unrecognisable from their former selves. They were now much smarter, more artistic, more creative... more human. Behaviourally though, it was a different story. There was still one step to go—one final transition before you'd let one of these Neolithic men date your daughter or sit down with you to discuss the economic meltdown over a decaf cappuccino. The last challenge was to curb—or at least control—hyper-aggression in young males.

Let 's be logical about this

Hyper-aggression is derived from the emotional centres of the 'reptilian brain'. This means that Cro-Magnon fixed action patterns would have been inflexible, emotional responses. The non-cognitive nature of these behavioural responses is reflected today in psychological attitudes like racism, colourism, xenophobia, ethnocentrism, chauvinism, pack rape mentality, vigilantism, hooliganism and vandalism. For the most part, these are not specific behaviours. They are emotional states and psychological mindsets that, under certain circumstances, may predispose violent behaviour such as lynching, gang rapes and ethnic cleansing. Once they are triggered, these behaviours are normally resistant to cognitive constraint. [...]

But despite the glacially slow progress, by 1790 the Declaration of the Rights of Man of the French Revolution was empowered in a genuine attempt to curb the devastation of barbarism, anarchy and mob rule.

The theory argues that all the great empires of antiquity—Phoenician, Persian, Greek, Roman, Mongol, Egyptian, Byzantine, Mogul and Aztec—engaged in expansionist re-enactments of the first great conquistadorial campaign by Cro-Magnons against the Neanderthals. Their strategies and techniques have uncannily mimicked Cro-Magnon tactics—classifying the alien enemy as inferior and sub-human; killing the men and raping the women; subjugating, pillaging and enslaving; occupying enemy lands; and showing no mercy. **The same innate Neanderthal responses that find expression in ethnic cleansings and internecine conflicts have also been intuitively applied by dictators and unscrupulous politicians.**



[Author's footnote to the above illustration:] (Motley collection of yetis, abominable snowmen and sasquatch from popular culture and mythology, all bear a striking similarity to Neanderthal physical characteristics.)

Appendix I

How Did Whites Get Their Appearance?

Abridged from an interview published
in *American Renaissance*, March 13, 2020



Peter Frost is a Canadian anthropologist. His main research interest has been the role of sexual selection in highly visible human traits, notably diverse hair and eye colors. Other interests include vitamin D metabolism in northern hunting peoples and gene-culture coevolution, such as genetic pacification due to the state monopoly on violence (reduction of propensity for personal violence).

Grégoire Canlorbe: You are best known for your claim that the most plausible origin for the light coloration of skin in Europeans is sexual selection rather than natural selection. Could you remind us of your argument?

Peter Frost: It's not just light skin. It's also the extraordinary variety of hair and eye colors. I prefer to begin with them because they are much less explainable by anything other than sexual selection.

Take hair color. Most humans have black hair and one allele for hair color. Europeans have over two hundred for colors ranging from black to blond. The conventional explanation is straightforward: As humans entered higher latitudes, with less solar radiation, there was less selection for dark skin and, consequently, an accumulation of defective alleles for pigmentation. So the number of hair colors grew as a side effect.

That scenario has two problems. First, the genetic linkage between skin color and hair color is weak. If we took all humans with black hair, we would have a group with the full range of skin colors. Second, millions of years are needed to accumulate that many alleles through relaxation of selection. Yet modern humans have been in Europe for scarcely 45,000 years.

Did Europeans get their hair colors from the Neanderthals? According to a study of five alleles for red hair, one of them seems to be an archaic introgression, but the others are of modern human origin. Even if we assume that all of the alleles for hair color had slowly accumulated during the long existence of the Neanderthals, the timeline is still too short—at most three quarters of a million years. Furthermore, even if they all had a Neanderthal origin, we would still need to explain how they reached their current prevalence. Europeans today are only 1 to 4 percent Neanderthal.

That's not all. Eye color, too, diversified during the same 45,000 years. So two polymorphisms—for hair and eye color—have developed in parallel with different genetic causes and within the same limits of time and space. There must have been a process of selection. Something helped preserve those new colors and pass them on to subsequent generations.

That something, in my opinion, was sexual selection. It begins when too many of one sex have to compete for too few of the other. The latter are in a buyer's market and can pick and choose among prospective mates. Conversely, the "sellers" are in a worse position and must market themselves as best they can. They succeed by attracting attention and holding it as long as possible, typically by means of bright colors.

Sexual selection is consistent with the evolution of European hair and eye color in four ways:

First, the European color pattern has become more developed in one sex. Specifically, hair and eye colors are more varied among women than among men, with infrequent colors

more common among women and frequent ones less common. A UK Biobank study found that red hair is especially prevalent among women, followed by blond hair and light brown hair. Conversely, the same study found that black hair is three to five times less common among women than among men. The different eye colors are likewise distributed more uniformly among women. These sex differences seem to be due to the action of estrogen during fetal development. A Czech study found that face shape was more feminine in blue-eyed men than in brown-eyed men, as if a single factor had feminized both face shape and eye color.

Second, dark colors have given way to brighter colors, even though new dark colors could have been created. Hair is carrot red, not beet red. Eyes are light blue, not navy blue. Brightness increases visual impact, causing the observer to watch the image longer and keep it in memory longer.

Third, broad-spectrum colors have given way to narrow-spectrum, “pure” ones. A pure color has relatively few wavelengths and is restricted to a narrow slice of the visible spectrum. Such colors don’t happen by accident. They are unusual in the natural world and almost always serve to attract attention, either as a warning coloration or as a means to attract a mate.

Fourth, a single color has given way to a variety. A color grabs attention not only by being bright within a narrow slice of the spectrum but also by being novel. If a particular color becomes too common, it will be less novel and less attractive, and the pressure of sexual selection will shift to more unusual ones. A variety of colors will thus coexist and grow in number as more appear through mutation.

But why would sexual selection be stronger in Europe than elsewhere? Keep in mind that most Europeans did not look European until late in time, almost at the dawn of history. As late as the Mesolithic, pale skin and diverse hair and eye colors were confined to Scandinavia, the Baltic countries, and areas farther east. **The oldest dating of blond hair goes back 18,000 years in central Siberia. We know all this from DNA in human remains. Inferential methods place the emergence of pale skin within the same time frame:** 19,000 to 11,000 years ago according to one research team, and 19,200 to 7,600 years ago according to another. That’s more or less the last ice age, and long after modern humans had come to Europe. As a *Science* correspondent wrote:

“The implication is that our European ancestors were brown-skinned for tens of thousands of years.”

We still need more data, but it seems that the current European phenotype arose during the last ice age, some 10 to 20 thousand years ago, among hunting people who inhabited the plains stretching from the Baltic to Siberia. Their women were subjected to strong sexual selection for two reasons. First, men were fewer in number. In a hunting society, male mortality increases as hunters cover longer distances, and average hunting distance is longest in open northern environments. Second, polygyny was less frequent. Since men provided almost all the food, the effort of providing for a second wife and her children was impossible for all but the best hunters. With few polygynous men, and fewer men altogether, women were in a tough market—too many competing for too few. Even slight improvements in attractiveness could make a big difference.

Why didn't the new phenotype survive in Siberia? First, the colder and drier climate kept human numbers smaller than in Europe, the Gulf Stream being too distant to exert its warming and moistening influence. So the effects of sexual selection could not survive and accumulate as much, especially when the population contracted at the height of the ice age. Other humans then moved in as the climate turned warmer. Nonetheless, as shown by ancient DNA, the new phenotype did persist in south-central Siberia as late as the fourth century. Its population base had probably become too small to ensure its long-term survival.

Final question: Why are Europeans diverse for hair and eye color but not for skin color? The reason may be a pre-existing sex difference that oriented sexual selection in one direction. In all human populations, girls become lighter-skinned during adolescence, with the result that young women are noticeably fairer than young men. A fair complexion was traditionally valued in women, who would make themselves even fairer by avoiding the sun, by wearing protective clothing, and by using face powders. This gender norm has existed across all cultures with one exception, albeit a big one: the tanning craze of Western women since the early 20th century. Thus, at least in premodern times, fairer women were preferred, and such a preference, under intense sexual selection, would eventually drain the gene pool of alleles for dark skin. This may explain the strange albino-like skin of Europeans.

This episode of intense sexual selection probably did much more than change hair, eye, and skin color. Those effects are the most obvious, and the hardest to explain otherwise.

Other effects might include changes in hair form. Hair form was originally thick and straight across northern Eurasia. It then diversified in Europe during the same narrow timeframe that saw hair and eye colors diversify. From being thick and straight it became thin with diverse textures. About 45 percent of Europeans now have straight hair, 40 percent wavy hair, and 15 percent curly hair.

Appendix II



Historic 'Neanderthals'
and hyper-aggressive Aryans

(César Tort quotes Thomas Goodrich)

These are the epigraphs to my webpage article 'The Wall':

Christian ethics was like a time bomb ticking away in Europe, a Trojan horse waiting for its season. —William Pierce

1945 was the year of the total inversion of Aryan values into Christian values. —Joseph Walsh

Before Christian ethics metastasized to levels of Aryan suicide after the Second World War, even in the Christian Era white people were capable of fighting against the historical Neanderthals, as I call the coloureds. For example, at the beginning of *Scalp Dance: Indian Warfare on the High Plains, 1865-1879*, Thomas Goodrich quotes accounts of 19th-century whites in their war with the Indians. He wrote:

Revealed a Denver man who, with two friends, stumbled upon the aftermath of one Indian raid:

About 100 yards from the desolated ranch [we] discovered the body of the murdered woman and her two dead children, one of which was a little girl of four years and the other an infant. The woman had been stabbed in several places and scalped, and the body bore evidences of having been violated. The two children had their throats cut, their heads being nearly severed from their bodies. [...]

“Remember the murdered women and children!” cried [John] Chivington as he and his nine hundred screaming horsemen charged toward the village. Sure of their safety, the sleeping Indians were caught completely by surprise. According to one witness:

When I looked toward the chief’s lodge, I saw that Black Kettle had a large American flag up on a long lodgepole as a signal to the troops that the camp was friendly. Part of the people were rushing about the camp in great fear. All the time Black Kettle kept calling out not to be frightened; that the camp was under protection and there was no danger. Then suddenly the troops opened fire on this mass of men, women, and children, and all began to scatter and run.

Though most of the 600 Indians, including Black Kettle, miraculously escaped, many were not so fortunate. Besieged for three years with their backs to the wall, harassed and humiliated by a wily, elusive foe that simply defied pursuit, when the Coloradans finally gained control of the camp all their hate and fury exploded in a fiery flash. Running through the village the troops mowed down men, women, and children in heaps. Vengeful and murderous as many were, some soon discovered they had no stomach for what then ensued. “They were scalped, their brains knocked out,” said one horrified soldier. “The men used their knives, ripped open women, clubbed little children, knocked them in the head with their guns, beat their brains out, [and] mutilated their bodies in every sense of the word.” Recalled another trooper:

There was one little child, probably three years old, just big enough to walk through the sand. The Indians had gone ahead, and this little child was behind following after them. The little fellow was perfectly naked. . . . I saw one man get off his horse, at a distance of about seventy five yards, and

draw up his rifle and fire—he missed the child. Another man came up and said, “Let me try the son of a bitch; I can hit him.” He got down off his horse, kneeled down and fired at the little child, but he missed him. A third man came up and made a similar remark, and fired, and the little fellow dropped.

When the carnage had ended, one officer noted:

In going over the battleground. I did not see a body of a man, woman, or child but what was scalped, and in many instances, their bodies were mutilated in a most horrible manner—men, women, and children’s privates cut out. I heard one man say that he had cut a woman’s private parts out, and had them for exhibition on a stick. I also heard of numerous instances in which men had cut the private parts of females, and stretched them over their saddlebows, and some of them over their hats.


While many were stunned and sickened by the slaughter, most felt justified after it was done.

I saw some of the men opening bundles or bales. I saw them take therefrom a number of white persons’ scalps—men’s, women’s, and children’s. I saw one scalp of a white woman in particular. It had been taken entirely off the head; the head had been skinned, taking all the hair; the scalp had been tanned to preserve it; the hair was auburn and hung in ringlets; it was very long hair. There were two holes in the scalp in front, for the purpose of tying it on their heads when they appeared in the scalp dance.

When John Chivington and his victorious column returned to Denver a short time later, the city erupted in a “glorification.”

“They have won for themselves,” rang a local editor, “the eternal gratitude of dwellers on these plains.”

Even as one great war was winding down, the seeds for another were being deeply sown by both sides. Unlike the one just ending, however, this next war would last much longer. And unlike the war now ending, this new fight would be waged with a hatred and fury that would soon make the world shudder.



César Tort's gospel:

Regarding *Appendix I*: The modern man's body beautification did not end with the Cro-Magnon. It is a task that continued throughout later prehistory, and must continue today.

Regarding *Appendix II*: The trauma of Neanderthal predation and Cro-Magnon hyper-aggression shaped our psyche. This is such a huge revelation that I will need to incorporate this knowledge into my worldview. For the priest of sacred words⁴ the good news is that, under the right circumstances, the desire for extermination can be reactivated; for example, when energy devolution (cf. studies on peak oil) is in full swing.

⁴ 'Let us eliminate all unnecessary suffering' (again, cf. my trilogy) ☺
'We must secure the existence of our people and a future for white children, because the beauty of the White Aryan woman must not perish from the Earth'.

Second part

The blood flowed ankle-deep

Editor quotes Pierce



Along with the justice meted out to white women who had sex with blacks in ‘The Day of the Rope’, in the final pages of William Pierce’s *The Turner Diaries*, originally published almost half a century ago, I enjoyed the fate of feminised Western men in the final stages of the race wars in North America and Europe:

For the first time I understand the deepest meaning of what we are doing. I understand now why we cannot fail, no matter what we must do to win and no matter how many of us must perish in doing it. Everything that has been and everything that is yet to be depend on us. We are truly the instruments of God in the fulfilment of his grand design. These may seem like strange words to be coming from me, who has never been religious.

Although I am not a religious person either, the images that once graced my blog’s sidebar, Maxfield Parrish’s *Florentine Fete* murals, on display at the National Museum of American Illustration (pictured above), reflect better than a thousand words what we have

in mind: the potential divinity of the fair race, something that could only be achieved with the continued elimination of Neanderthaloid traits, though in this instance I'm referring to the historical Neanderthals we still see on the streets. To avoid anachronisms, I have lightly edited the final pages of Pierce's 1978 novel. No ellipses have been added between the paragraphs I haven't quoted:

Food became critically scarce everywhere during the winter. The Blacks lapsed into cannibalism, just as they had in California, while hundreds of thousands of starving Whites, who earlier had ignored the Organisation's call for a rising against the System, began appearing at the borders of the various liberated zones begging for food. The Organisation was only able to feed the White populations already under its control by imposing the severest rationing, and it was necessary to turn many of the latecomers away.

Those who were admitted—and that meant only children, women of childbearing age, and able-bodied men willing to fight in the Organisation's ranks—were subjected to much more severe racial screening than had been used to separate Whites from non-Whites in California. It was no longer sufficient to be merely White; in order to eat one had to be judged the bearer of especially valuable genes. In Detroit the practice was first established (and it was later adopted elsewhere) of providing any able-bodied White male who sought admittance to the Organisation's enclave with a hot meal and a bayonet or other edged weapon. His forehead was then marked with an indelible dye, and he was turned out and could be readmitted permanently only by bringing back the head of a freshly killed Black or other non-White. This practice assured that precious food would not be wasted on those who would not or could not add to the Organisation's fighting strength, but it took a terrible toll of the weaker and more decadent White elements. Tens of millions perished during the first half of that year, and the total White population of the country reached a low point of approximately fifty million.

Outside these zones of order and security, the anarchy and savagery grew steadily worse, with the only real authority wielded by marauding bands which preyed on each other and on the unorganised and defenceless masses. Many of these bands were composed of Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and half-White mongrels. In growing numbers, however, Whites

also formed bands along racial lines, even without Organisation guidance. As the war of extermination wore on, millions of soft, city-bred, brainwashed Whites gradually began regaining their manhood. The rest died.

The only time, after that November, that the Organisation was forced to detonate a nuclear weapon on the North American continent was a year later, in Toronto. Hundreds of thousands of Jews had fled the United States to that Canadian city, making almost a second New York of it and using it as their command centre for the war raging to the south. So far as both the Jews and the Organisation were concerned, the US-Canadian border had no real significance during the later stages of the Great Revolution, and conditions were only slightly less chaotic north of the border than south of it. Throughout the Dark Years neither the Organisation nor the System could hope for a completely decisive advantage over the other, so long as they both retained the capability for nuclear warfare. Then, of course, came the mopping-up period, when the last of the non-White bands were hunted down and exterminated.

With the principal centres of world Jewish power annihilated, and the nuclear threat neutralised, the most important obstacles to the Organisation's worldwide victory were out of the way.


There is a major flaw in Pierce's worldview. Jews didn't take over the American financial system and media by force of arms. It was idiotic white Christians who admitted them in the late 19th century, under the influence of liberal ideas since the founding of the United States. This critical paragraph about Pierce does not appear in the entry I published on my website nine years ago. I've matured in recent years (and something similar could be said about the Nazis). That said, Pierce is right about the need for ethnic cleansing:

From as early as that year the Organisation had had active cells in Western Europe. The disastrous economic collapse in Europe in the spring, following the demise of the System in North America, greatly helped in preparing the European masses morally for the Organisation's final takeover. That takeover came in a great, Europe-wide rush in the summer and fall, as a cleansing hurricane of change swept over the continent, clearing away in a few months the refuse of a

millennium or more of alien ideology and a century or more of profound moral and material decadence. The blood flowed ankle-deep in the streets of many of Europe's great cities momentarily, as the race traitors, the offspring of generations of dysgenic breeding, and hordes of *Gastarbeiter* met a common fate. Then the great dawn of the New Era broke over the Western world.

As everyone is aware, the bands of mutants which roam the Waste remain a real threat, and it may be another century before the last of them has been eliminated and White colonisation has once again established a human presence throughout this vast area. But it was in that year, according to the chronology of the Old Era—just 110 years after the birth of the Great One—that the dream of a White world finally became a certainty.

Pierce was referring to Hitler.



11 December 2011, edited in 2025: as the remaining articles will be edited for this edition.

Email to Mark

by Editor

In his most recent article, 'The New Right versus the Old Right', Greg Johnson, editor of *Counter-Currents*, a white nationalist webzine, wrote:

The North American New Right is founded on the rejection of Fascist and National Socialist party politics, totalitarianism, terrorism, imperialism, and genocide... For instance, latter-day National Socialist William Pierce routinely pooh-pooed the Holocaust. But he was willing to countenance real terrorism, imperialism, and genocide on a scale that would dwarf anything in the 20th century. That spirit is what we reject.

Although I feel closer to David Irving and Mark Weber on the alleged Holocaust than Pierce and most people in the movement, I am tempted to write a brief rebuttal to Johnson's article because:

1. Fascist and National Socialist politics will be very useful after the fall of fiat currencies.

2. Totalitarianism might be useful in completely eradicating the Enemy and his worldview after the founding of the ethnostate.

3. Terrorism is indispensable: without our petty revenge ('Day of the Rope') no hard lesson shall be learnt by rootless whites.

4. Imperialism will be indispensable. After the colossal mistake of exporting Western technology to non-Western nations, some of which already possess nuclear weapons, the only way to guarantee the survival of Aryans in the face of such aggressive competition is to conquer entire continents for white children, starting, for example, with Africa and Latin America.

5. A comparatively humane genocide will be inevitable if these continents are conquered (as was inevitable when Anglo-Americans conquered their precious lands).

I said I was itching to write a rebuttal, but lately, when I want to read Gibbon, I don't have time for a formal rebuttal to Johnson's article. However, I'm so fed up with the incredibly positive reviews his article received in the comments section that I have to say something anyway. Would you be willing to write an in-depth article, or should I post this email on *The West's Darkest Hour*?

We need someone of Pierce's stature to write a proper rebuttal. Where the hell are Pierce's intellectual followers, Mark? I've only been involved with the movement for a couple of years, and it seems to me that the new generation of white nationalists are typical feminised bourgeois men, incapable of facing the hard work that lies ahead (see what Breivik recently said about the monetary crisis of the future).

Is this a fair assessment of 21st-century white nationalism?

12 May 2012

Terre et Peuple, Blut und Boden

by a commenter

The notion that every people needs their own land is absolutely essential. The white race must acquire a Homeland of its own, some place on earth where white children can be born and raised in physical and spiritual safety, and where the numbers of European-descended peoples may be restored and the threat of racial extinction overcome.

Land and people, blood and soil.

5 June 2012

Who We Are excerpts

by William Pierce

Mixing and retrogression

From the far north they came, the *xanthoi*, the golden-haired ones: tall, blue-eyed and grey-eyed giants, on horseback and on foot, carrying their battleaxes and their spears, bringing their women and their wagons and their cattle. Warrior-farmers, craftsmen and traders, they worshipped the shining Sky Father and spoke an Indo-European language. They were the Greeks.

The Greeks—or Hellenes, as they later called themselves—crashed down upon the Mediterranean world in a long sequence of waves. The first wave, a relatively weak one—and more properly described merely as Indo-European rather than as specifically Greek—hit about 5,100 years ago, and it apparently took a roundabout course, passing first from the north into western Asia Minor, and thence, by way of the Cyclades and other islands of the southern Aegean, westward into Crete and Greece...

The Minoan civilisation was in its essence, however, much more a Mediterranean than a Nordic civilisation. The Greeks did not bring civilisation to Crete; they brought only the tendency toward civilisation and the capacity for building it inherent in the higher human type which they represented.

But inevitably racial mixing occurred, sometimes soon and sometimes later. The Nordics would disappear into the mass, and the civilisation they had created would lose its vital spark, stagnating and eventually retrogressing, although it might coast for centuries on its momentum after the disappearance of the Nordic element before retrogression set in. Race-mixing and retrogression were avoided only when the Nordics exterminated the non-Nordic natives of an area instead of merely conquering them. But then there was left no large serf-class for the maintenance of a culturally innovative aristocracy...

Because the Mediterraneans were only conquered and not exterminated; because they formed the bulk of the economic base on which Greek society rested; because the lifestyle of Hellenes themselves changed, becoming more dependent on agriculture than before; and because race mixture inevitably followed conquest, it is not surprising that the religion of the conquerors underwent a change and assimilated many elements from the religion of the conquered natives.

Extermination or expulsion

And what a contrast between the Hellenes and their achievements, on the one hand, and what existed before—and has existed since—in Greece! That is not to say that every Greek of today is unimaginative or insensitive or ugly, but it is clear that something essential has been lost between the time of Aristotle and the time of his late namesake, Mr. Onassis. And the loss was at least as great between the time of Achilles and Aristotle, although the culture-lag phenomenon tends to mask this earlier decline in racial quality.

The Hellenic genes are still there, the genes of the race which gloried in single combat between equals facing one another on the field of battle and pitting skill, courage, and strength in a contest to the death, but they are now submerged in the genes of a race which always preferred to sling its stones from afar, to lie in stealthy ambush, to give a surprise knife-thrust from the rear. The race-soul which first envisioned the symmetry of the Doric temple and pondered the mysteries of existence as none before it has become inextricably mingled with one concerned, first and last, with personal advantage and disadvantage, profit and loss.

This catastrophic mixing of bloods has occurred over and over again in the history and prehistory of our race, and each time it has been lethal. The knowledge of this has been with us a long time, but it has always failed us in the end. The Hellenes of Sparta and Athens both strove to keep their blood pure, but both ultimately perished. The only way they could have survived would have been to eliminate the entire indigenous population, either through expulsion or extermination, from the areas of the Mediterranean world in which they settled.

The Hellenes always possessed a certain feeling of racial unity, distinguishing themselves sharply from all those not of their blood, but this racial feeling was, unfortunately, usually overshadowed by intraracial conflicts. The rivalries between Hellenic city-states were so fierce and so pervasive, that the Mediterranean natives were more often looked upon as a resource to be used against other Hellenes than as a biological menace to be eliminated.

Lost opportunity

The attractions of the vast and rich Orient for one Nordic conqueror after another are obvious. What is unfortunate is that none made racial considerations the basis of his program of conquest—and it could have been done.


Alexander, for example, could have laid the foundations for a Nordic empire which could have stood against the rest of the world—including Rome—forever. The Macedonians and the Greeks shared common blood and had similar languages (ancient Macedonian was an altogether different language from modern Macedonian, which has its roots in the sixth century c.e. conquest of Macedonia by Slavic tribes). If, before invading Asia and defeating the Asian armies, Alexander had devoted his energies to forging just these two peoples into a unified population base, casting out all the alien elements which had accumulated in Greece by the latter part of the fourth century b.c.e.; and if, while conquering Asia, he had carried out a policy of total extermination—then he could have colonised Asia with Nordic settlements from the Indus to the Nile, and they could have multiplied freely and expanded into the empty lands without danger of racial mixing.

But Alexander did not cleanse Greece of its Semitic merchants and moneylenders and its accumulated rabble of half-breeds, and he chose to base his Asiatic empire on the indigenous populations instead of on colonists. And so the Greco-Macedonian world, despite its uninterrupted prosperity and its maintenance of the appearance of might after Alexander's death, continued its imperceptible downward slide toward oblivion.

Economics over race

The ultimate downfall of the Nordic conquerors in Asia, just as in the Mediterranean world, can be traced to an economic consideration and to an error in human judgment. The economic consideration was that a conquered population, just like the land itself or the gold and other booty seized by the conquerors, had real value. Whether the people were enslaved or merely taxed as subjects, they were an economic resource which could be exploited by the conquerors. To drive them off the land or wipe them out completely would, from a strictly economic viewpoint, be akin to dumping captured gold into the ocean.

Such an action could be justified to a conquering tribe of Indo-Europeans only if they were willing to subordinate all economic considerations to the goal of maintaining their racial integrity into the indefinite future—and if they also had a sufficiently deep understanding of history to foresee the inevitability of racial mixing wherever two races are in close proximity. Unfortunately, even where the will for racial survival was very strong, the foresight was insufficient. Measures which were quite adequate to prevent race-mixing for a few generations, or even for a few centuries, broke down over the course of a thousand years or more.



Copied and pasted from William
Pierce's book, 19 July 2012)

Linder on the *Diaries*

by Editor

I don't think anyone could like [*The*] *Turner Diaries*. It is a disturbing book, frightening even—even if you agree with him, as I obviously do. But it is undeniably heavy. In a way that Covington's novels, so beloved of [Greg] Johnson, are not. They are almost fruity in how bubbly the characters are, given the situation, although they are certainly enjoyable escapism.

Pierce's work has a gravitas befitting a genocidal struggle, and no other WN [white nationalist] novel has come even close to it except Raspail's *Camp of the Saints*. Raspail is a better artist than Pierce, by a long stretch, but both books are about equally heavy, in that they impress and linger.

Alex Linder is considered the toughest racist among those who attempt to educate other white people through the written and spoken word. I didn't criticise him at the time, but it's clear we live in parallel worlds. Not only did I love Pierce's novel when I listened to it on audio, but I saw myself so fully in it that, even though Pierce had passed away in 2002, I felt I had finally found a kindred spirit, at least when it comes to extermination.

Linder wants to wipe out the Jews, but as a typical white nationalist, he doesn't understand that it's not only they who must be exterminated. Either Linder hasn't read *Who We Are*, or a residue of Christian moral standards in the anti-Christian Linder prevents him from seeing that only extermination can prevent the Nordics from intermingling again, as we'll see in the following quote from *The Turner Diaries* (which contextualises the previous quote).

15 August 2012
(edited 2025)

Turner Diaries excerpts
by William Pierce



Since then he has been issuing idiotic proclamations about ‘restoring the Constitution’, and holding new elections to ‘re-establish the republican form of government intended by the Founding Fathers’, whatever that means. And he has denounced our radical measures in the south as ‘communism’. He is appalled that we didn’t hold some sort of public referendum before expelling the non-Whites and that we didn’t give individual trials to the Jews and race-criminals we dealt with summarily.

Doesn’t the old fool understand that the American people voted themselves into the mess they’re in now? Doesn’t he

understand that the Jews have taken over the country fair and square, according to the Constitution? Doesn't he understand that the common people have already had their fling at self-government, and they blew it? Where does he think new elections can possibly lead now, with this generation of TV-conditioned voters, except right back into the same Jewish pigsty? And how does he think we could have solved our problems down here, except by the radical measures we used?

卐 卐 卐

'Finally, we warn you that, in any event, we intend to liberate, first, the entire United States and then the remainder of this planet. When we have done so we will liquidate all the enemies of our people, including in particular all White persons who have consciously aided those enemies'.

Then we formed the people into labour brigades to carry out a number of necessary functions, one of which was the sanitary disposal of the hundreds of corpses of refugees. The majority of these poor creatures were White, and I overheard one of our members refer to what happened to them as 'a slaughter of the innocents'. I am not sure that is a correct description of the recent holocaust. I am sorry, of course, for the millions of White people, both here and in Russia, who died—and who have yet to die before we have finished—in this war to rid ourselves of the Jewish yoke. But innocents? I think not. Certainly, that term should not be applied to the majority of the adults.

After all, is not man essentially responsible for his condition—at least, in a collective sense? If the White nations of the world had not allowed themselves to become subject to the Jew, to Jewish ideas, to the Jewish spirit, this war would not be necessary. We can hardly consider ourselves blameless. We can hardly say we had no choice, no chance to avoid the Jew's snare. We can hardly say we were not warned.

Eventually the System began regrouping its forces elsewhere, to meet new challenges in other parts of the country. And then, just as the Jews had feared, the flow of Organisation activists turned exactly 180 degrees from what it had been in the weeks and months. From scores of training camps in the liberated zone, first hundreds, then thousands of highly motivated guerrilla


fighters began slipping through the System's diminishing ring of troops and moving eastward. With these guerrilla forces the Organisation followed the example of its Baltimore members and rapidly established dozens of new enclaves, primarily in the nuclear-devastated areas, where System authority was weakest. The Detroit enclave was initially the most important of these. Bloody anarchy had reigned among the survivors in the Detroit area for several weeks after the nuclear blasts of September 8. Eventually, a semblance of order had been restored, with System troops loosely sharing power with the leaders of a number of Black gangs in the area. Although there were a few isolated White strongholds which kept the roving mobs of Black plunders and rapists at bay, most of the disorganised and demoralised White survivors in and around Detroit offered no effective resistance to the Blacks, and, just as in other heavily Black areas of the country, they suffered terribly.

Then, in mid-December, the Organisation seized the initiative. A number of synchronised lightning raids on the System's military strong points in the Detroit area resulted in an easy victory. The Organisation then established certain patterns in Detroit which were soon followed elsewhere. All captured White troops, as soon as they had laid down their weapons, were offered a chance to fight with the Organisation against the System. Those who immediately volunteered were taken aside for preliminary screening and then sent to camps for indoctrination and special training. The others were machine-gunned on the spot, without further ado.

The same degree of ruthlessness was used in dealing with the White civilian population. When the Organisation's cadres moved into the White strongholds in the Detroit suburbs, the first thing they found it necessary to do was to liquidate most of the local White leaders, in order to establish the unquestioned authority of the Organisation. There was no time or patience for trying to reason with short-sighted Whites who insisted that they weren't 'racists' or 'revolutionaries' and didn't need the help of any 'outside agitators' in dealing with their problems, or who had some other conservative or parochial fixation. The Whites of Detroit and the other new enclaves were organised more along the lines described by Earl Turner for Baltimore than for California, but even more rapidly and roughly. In most areas of the country there was no opportunity for an orderly, large-scale separation of non-Whites, as in California, and consequently a bloody race war raged for months,

taking a terrible toll of those Whites who were not in one of the Organisation's tightly controlled, all-White enclaves.

Food became critically scarce everywhere during the winter. The Blacks lapsed into cannibalism, just as they had in California, while hundreds of thousands of starving Whites, who earlier had ignored the Organisation's call for a rising against the System, began appearing at the borders of the various liberated zones begging for food. The Organisation was only able to feed the White populations already under its control by imposing the severest rationing, and it was necessary to turn many of the latecomers away. Those who were admitted—and that meant only children, women of childbearing age, and able-bodied men willing to fight in the Organisation's ranks—were subjected to much more severe racial screening than had been used to separate Whites from non-Whites in California. It was no longer sufficient to be merely White; in order to eat one had to be judged the bearer of especially valuable genes.



Copied and pasted from William
Pierce's novel, 9 November 2012.

The word ‘racism’

by Ed. & Commenter

‘Racist is a control word for whites’.

—Anonymous

The fact that the word *racism* was coined relatively recently in French (*raciste* and *racisme*) in 1897 (its first use in English was in 1902),⁵ explains why my Spanish-speaking grandmothers, born in 1888 and 1914, never used it when I lived with them. They were educated in the late 19th and early 20th centuries respectively, when no one used a word now used to control white people.

Language criticism is the most radical of all. If we don’t eradicate the Newspeak of anti-white societies from our vocabulary—remember that when all the great European civilisations were at their height, the word ‘racism’ didn’t exist—we can’t even begin to debate the issues.

Some linguists have argued that language is rhetorical and that humans make a fatal mistake in believing that if a group of people uses a word in complete seriousness, it means there’s something real behind it. According to Orwell, the goal of Newspeak is social control. While Orwell focused on a hard totalitarian dystopia, today the word ‘racist’ is used pejoratively in soft totalitarian societies.

If we translate the term into the old language—just as ‘pagan’ simply meant the habitual follower of classical culture—we see that racism is a code word for ‘pro-white’. Detecting psychological operations or psyops is an elementary step in the de-brainwashing process. In addition to the more obvious words, such

⁵ See ‘On the origin of the word racist’ by Hadding Scott, originally published in his blogsite on October 29, 2012.

as 'Islamophobe' or 'xenophobe', here is a brief sampling of Newspeak terms translated into the old language:

Affirmative action: Black people steal our jobs.

Antisemitism: The belief among Gentiles that Jews can be criticised like any other group.

Civil rights: People of colour have more rights than Aryan men in the New World Order.

Diversified workforce: Far fewer white men will be hired or promoted.

Disadvantaged: Unskilled and don't speak English, German, or French, so they have to be given money.

Equal treatment and opportunity: Fewer opportunities for white people.

Feminism: Psychotic disintegration of an entire society: *folie en masse*, more recently called 'mass formation.'

Hate: Anything in favour of white people.

Historical grievances: White people ended slavery, human sacrifice in the Americas and cannibalism in tribal societies.

Homophobia/gay-bashing: Lot's healthy revulsion at sodomite or Gomorrite behaviour.

Human Rights Commissions: Inquisitions that deny freedom of speech. Thought police that enforce liberal political doctrine.

Immigration: Racial replacement. Genocidal levels of immigration.

Interracial relationships: Spoiled white women sinning against the Holy Ghost. Also called racial engineering or soft genocide of white people.

Misogynist: Anyone who disagrees with the racially suicidal empowerment of women.

Multicultural enhancement: Destroying all European cultures.

Politically correct: Fines and/or jail time for anyone who isn't liberal and follows the New World Order.

Respect and tolerance: Surrender. Tolerance for millions of immigrants means demographic genocide for whites.

Women's choice: Abortion and genocide of millions of white babies (always remember that the prehistoric men who exterminated the Neanderthals vigorously imposed patriarchy).

The depth of evil

by Andrew Hamilton

The mass media and state-controlled education have displaced the family in the formation and transmission of attitudes, beliefs, behaviour, and culture. In addition, the mass media winnows candidates for public office at every level, thereby exerting effective control over the (formerly) democratic political process. There are many unexplored reasons why TV, movies, video games, pop music, and other forms of media exercise such tremendous influence over our ideas and behaviour. A 'simple' one, I believe, is the (literal) hypnotic effect they have on us.

The Jews, as William Pierce recognised, control the mass media of news and entertainment (which he invariably denominated the 'controlled media'). There is perhaps no other truism of modern life that he emphasised so repeatedly. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that he never developed, or at least never publicly articulated, a theory of media control, or analysed the nexus between media messages and human psychology and behaviour. Instead, he stated his case axiomatically:

By permitting the Jews to control our news and entertainment media we are doing more than merely giving them a decisive influence on our political system and virtual control of our government; we also are giving them control of the minds and souls of our children, whose attitudes and ideas are shaped more by Jewish television and Jewish films than by parents, schools, or any other influence... To permit the Jews, with their 3000-year history of nation-wrecking, from ancient Egypt to Russia, to hold such power over us is tantamount to race suicide.

William Pierce also taught that the vast majority of whites are neither good nor evil; they will think and behave in whatever manner the powers that be direct them to. Most people that is, will conform and obey, no matter what (Pierce called them 'lemmings').

Only a tiny handful, he said, are truly good or evil—he estimated 1 to 3 percent in either direction. For some reason he believed the number of ‘good’ people, though exceedingly small, was roughly double the number of intrinsically bad people.

My own inclination is perhaps closer to the Christian belief that humans are afflicted with original sin, and can only be saved (become good) through a process of change and redemption. What I failed to realise for many years was the depth of the evil and the resistance to individual redemption. Obviously, if people are evil when evil people rule, and good only when good people rule, they are not really good.

Nevertheless, people’s beliefs and behaviours can change radically. Change (for the worse) during my lifetime has been massive. Of course, it is easier to destroy than to build.

Unfortunately, if Pierce’s assumptions are correct—and, apart from his optimistic overestimation of the number of good to evil people, they appear to be—then it is comparatively easy with modern technology and dedicated ruthlessness for a small, domineering elite to continuously identify and destroy the tiny handful of good people on the margin, as they did under Communism and have continued to do in the post-WWII era. As a result, whites opposed to genocide or totalitarianism have failed to gain any traction.



Editor’s comment

Hamilton is a Christian or a Christian sympathiser, and believes that Jews are the primary cause of the decline of the white population. I believe the primary cause is white people themselves, who have allowed to be infected by the egalitarianism and universalism of Christian ethics.

But Hamilton said something that really impressed me: ‘What I failed to realise for many years was the depth of the evil and the resistance to individual redemption. Obviously, if people are evil when evil people rule [*e.g., today’s Western governments*], and good only when good people rule [*e.g., when the Nazis ruled*], they are not really good’. The point is that, as moral values are inverted in the West,

the philosophical implications of the depth of evil *among whites themselves* is something no white advocate I know has been willing to confront.

In other words, people, including the vast majority of white people, are not good. And if they aren't, what's wrong with the genocidal fantasy of my 'Dies Irae', published on *Day of Wrath*, featuring a vengeful Starchild calling 500 million Caucasians (and, of course, all non-whites, including Jews) home to ensure that Dave Lane's words are fulfilled among the remaining Aryans?

December 22, 2012
(edited 2025)

Ostriches

by Editor

In Sebastian Ronin's recent response to some of Matt Parrott's comments in *The West's Darkest Hour*, this paragraph caught my eye:

Nothing is 'free', not even 'virtually free', especially not energy. No one, absolutely no one, gets to dodge the bullet of Post-Peak Oil energy devolution. A global civilisation, to which Murka is the metaphorical Rome, collapses; it comes to an end... In historically relative terms, the current century will make the Black Death seem like a nose bleed.

Why most Murkan White Nationalists cannot see, will not see, or refuse to see how this most devastating of historical events will impact racial politics is simply mind-boggling. Wait! No, it's not all that mind-boggling at all, but that is another matter, another day.

The reason most white nationalists are unwilling to analyse the evidence for both the imminent collapse of fiat currencies and the apocalyptic energy devolution is easily explained by considering several posts on my website where I have claimed that, unlike William Pierce, current nationalists still prefer the American way of life. See, for example, my response to Andrew Hamilton in the provocative post 'The Depth of Evil'.

Although edited for the formality of this book, I would like to republish below a substantial portion of what I said in an old post, 'On Ostriches and Real Men'. I take issue with Greg Johnson's statement: 'We believe it [*the ethnostate*] can be achieved through peaceful territorial divisions and population transfers'. Aside from the fact that many Jews were probably holocausted in World War II—something that many racialsists, ignorant of what their Cro-Magnon ancestors did, deny—the following is what, like ostriches, most nationalists don't want to see:

1. In all likelihood, the collapse will be followed by the ‘chimp out’ of the niggers (the ‘Neanderthals’ of our time); high unemployment, riots, and looting in major Western cities;

2. Unlike what the niggers did in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, the bullet won’t be dodged this time. Racial tensions in ethnically ‘enriched’ cities will intensify throughout the West.

3. Later, these socio-political crises will converge with the energy devolution that Ronin predicts and by the end of the century, it will eliminate the global population surplus created as a result of both capitalism and Christian ethics (as Søren Renner said: ‘Billions will die, we will win’).

The reactionary, non-revolutionary side of white nationalism buries its head in the sand. In the coming tribulation, few will worry about ‘totalitarianism, imperialism or genocide’, as Johnson does. During the convergence of catastrophes racists will be ruthless survivors in the vein of *The Turner’s Diaries*—or Cro-Magnon!

In other words, the future belongs to the bloodthirsty, not to the so-called New Right. Johnson’s manifesto could be read by those conservatives torn between guilt and pro-white sentiments. Against them, and with the help of Mother Nature, I claim that only a scorched-earth policy has any chance of success (what the Cro-Magnons did in Europe). Even those nationalists who strongly disagree with me on moral grounds will open their hearts after the collapse finally arrives. Pull your heads out of the sand! The convergence of catastrophes will mark ‘the metamorphic rebirth of Europe or its demise and transformation into a cosmopolitan and sterile Luna Park’, as Guillaume Faye puts it.

June 2013
(edited 2025)

Follow my yellow brick road

by Editor

Today is my birthday, so I'm going to indulge my typical ethnocidal fantasies.

I recently watched the 1939 film *The Wizard of Oz*, after decades without having seen it as a child, based on Frank Baum's 1900 novel: a film that presented the yellow brick road for Dorothy, as opposed to a very different red brick road.

Every day I distance myself more from those who follow the latter. I feel closer to the historical Himmler; not the fictional Himmler of the effeminate WN literature that denies that a couple of million Jews were massacred (while the enemy committed a Holocaust of Germans). In my previous post today, I quoted Helmut Stellrecht's *Faith and Action* (1938) for the Hitler Youth, and a single sentence stood out to me: 'Love the animals that are tortured and tormented in other countries'. A *Kladderadatsch* cartoon from September 1933 showed laboratory animals, including white rabbits, giving the Nazi salute to Hermann Göring for his order banning vivisection. Göring, banned this monstrosity and said that those who 'still believe they can continue treating animals as inanimate property' would be sent to concentration camps. Alas, the West raged against Germany just after the release of *The Wizard of Oz*, and animal torture continued in other countries.

As you know, I live in Mexico. Every time I hear about how these slightly mixed Amerindians torture cows in slaughterhouses and continue to perform vivisections, I can't help but recall the words of Frank Baum. His solution is the only way to end the torture of the creatures I love:

With his fall [Sitting Bull] the nobility of the Redskin is extinguished... The Whites, by law of conquest, by justice of civilisation, are masters of the American continent, and the

best safety of the frontier settlements will be secured by the total annihilation of the few remaining Indians. Why not annihilation? We cannot honestly regret their extermination...

Yes: these are the wise reflections of the famous author of *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, published in the *Saturday Pioneer* of December 20, 1890. Just compare Baum's words with the effeminate, politically correct pronouncements of today's white nationalists, so willing to use epithets like 'sociopath' and 'psychopath' for any Aryan who dares to think like old Uncle Frank.

Neochristian WN must die. The spirit of the Skhul-Qafzehs pre-humans and the Cro-Magnons must live in its place! That is why I publish and will continue to publish posts on Nietzsche. As long as, unlike Uncle Frank and Uncle Friedrich, the current generation of nationalists clings to the old moral canons, white Americans will continue to walk the red road to extinction. My birthday advice: Start following my yellow brick road if you don't want to see America turned into that grotesque African-American remake of *The Wizard of Oz*!

12 August 2013
(edited 2025)

Kemp's book

by Editor

The following sentences from chapter 30 of *March of the Titans: The Complete History of the White Race* by Arthur Kemp caught my attention:

The lands making up western and southern Russia, Asia Minor (Turkey), and the southeastern Balkans were to be the scene of some of the most dramatic racial conflicts between various tribes of Europeans on the one hand, and various Asiatic, Mongol, and mixed race Muslim armies on the other.

These wars started around 550 c.e., a century after the crushing of the Mongolian Hunnish invasion of Europe. They only finally stopped with the defeat of new Asian invaders some 400 years later, with the defeat of an Asiatic alliance known as the Magyars, in Bavaria in 954 c.e. This massive struggle against Asian and Mongolian hordes can rightly be grouped into one heading, even though different players acted in the drama. If these combined Asian invaders had not been turned back, then it would most certainly have given the non-White Moorish invasion in Spain, which took place in the same time span, a far better chance of success. The White race might have been exterminated between the Asians and the Moors—but it was not.

All of these race wars chronicled in that chapter and the following ones, including 'The Fifth Great Race War: Genghis Khan' and 'The Ottoman Holocaust', make for fascinating reading. I won't quote more than these paragraphs to encourage readers to obtain a hard copy of *March of the Titans*. The fact is that, unlike other races, white people, as a people, have been on the brink of extinction more than once; and this is of utmost importance for understanding our times.

I find it incomprehensible that so few white nationalists are interested in the history of their race. Proof of this is that books like this are not bestsellers in the community. In a more sane Western civilization, a West that follows in the footsteps of the Skhul-Qafzeh hominids and the Cro-Magnon humans, the mere facts of the greatest genocide ever committed against the white race should have moved us to target Mongols and Muslims for complete extermination long ago: something that did not happen when whites developed weapons of mass destruction because they were under the influence of Christian standards of morality (cf. our anthology *The Fair Race's Darkest Hour*).

2 October 2013
(edited 2025)

Animal hell and white sin

by Editor

I'm shocked. Last night I went to the grocery store and saw a couple of typical Mexican children, one of them holding a rabbit. After talking about rabbits, the youngest boy, about eight years old, told me a horror story.

At school, his group was taken to a farm in Mexico to see all the animals. Unexpectedly, at one spot, he saw live little rabbits hanging from a wire by their ears. They were in excruciating pain and desperately trying to escape by waving their tiny limbs in the air. The older boy, still holding his pet rabbit, told me that his brother returned traumatised by what he saw. The store owner, an older woman, commented that animal cruelty was very common and that the farm owners probably didn't expect the children to pass by that particular place.

Exterminatable monsters like the perpetrators of such animal torture, white people are even worse. They, like the children I interviewed today, possess precisely the compassion necessary to stop crime. But they do nothing because of the Christian mandate to love one's neighbour. With their weapons of mass destruction, they could conquer Latin America, Africa, and Asia to save animals from hell. White people are so sinfully blind that they wilfully ignore that if their race becomes extinct, it would mean hell—thousands and thousands of years of hell—for the farm animals that people of colour treat so badly.

In my autobiography I describe evil as 'militant ignorance'. White people like to militantly ignore that the radical Other is not like us. I would say that while some persons are aware of self-deception, at least to some degree, evil white people actively and militantly refuse to see the radical Other or non-white cultures. If anyone doubts my final dream in 'Dies Irae', that billions of humans must die so the world would be less hellish, please imagine what

these poor creatures are going through right now here in Mexico and other non-Nazi countries.

White people have been so incredibly idiotic, so evil; they so desperately want to believe that Amerinds, gooks and sandniggers are like them, that they believe non-whites simply treat our animal cousins the same way they do. If I were a lord, I would punish those with talents, like in the ‘parable of the talents’: whites. Instead of putting their talents to good use—for example, by conquering non-white lands just as the Cro-Magnons conquered Europe—, whites simply went and hid their talents in the ground. Such cruelty toward adorable creatures should arouse, among the most emerging specimens of *Homo sapiens*, the same level of hatred that the Skhul-Qafzehs felt.

Let us put my philosophy this way: non-Nazis are evil.

They have allowed the historic Neanderthals to exist, reproduce, and even conquer large parts of the world. If so many whites hadn’t become accomplices to the greatest crime in history, what I call the Hellstorm Holocaust, the Third Reich would have become a vast empire from the Atlantic to the Urals, whose culture and philosophy embraced the most basic animal rights. As I’ve already said, the Nazis outlawed vivisection and declared that those who treated animals as objects would be sent to concentration camps. If the evil Anglo-Americans hadn’t intervened, after the Soviet Union, China might also have been conquered by the Germans. Today, China is the most notorious nation where our animal cousins are systematically tortured on an industrial scale. The footnote is taken from People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). I didn’t include it in the main text because I don’t want to reread it during proofreading! Sadly, this article⁶ merely reflects PETA’s neochristian moral standards.

⁶ When undercover investigators made their way onto Chinese fur farms, they found that many animals are still alive and struggling desperately when workers flip them onto their backs or hang them up by their legs or tails to skin them. When workers on these farms begin to cut the skin and fur from an animal’s leg, the free limbs kick and writhe. Workers stomp on the necks and heads of animals who struggle too hard to allow a clean cut.

When the fur is finally peeled off over the animals’ heads, their naked, bloody bodies are thrown onto a pile of those who have gone *before* them. Some are still alive, breathing in ragged gasps and blinking slowly. Some of the animals’ hearts are still beating five to ten minutes after they are skinned. One investigator

The *only* way to prevent such cruelty is to simply exterminate the historic Neanderthals who perpetrate these crimes. There is no other way to solve the problem of evil.

24 October 2013
(edited 2025)

recorded a skinned raccoon dog on the heap of carcasses who had enough strength to lift his bloodied head and stare into the camera. Before they are skinned alive, animals are pulled from their cages and thrown to the ground; workers bludgeon them with metal rods or slam them on hard surfaces, causing broken bones and convulsions but not always immediate death. Animals watch helplessly as workers make their way down the row.

Undercover investigators from Swiss Animal Protection / EAST International toured fur farms in China's Hebei Province, and it *quickly* became clear why outsiders are banned from visiting. There are no penalties for abusing animals on fur farms in China—farmers can house and slaughter animals however they see fit. The investigators found horrors beyond their worst imaginings and concluded, 'Conditions on Chinese fur farms make a mockery of the most elementary animal welfare standards. In their lives and their unspeakable deaths, these animals have been denied even the simplest acts of kindness'.

On these farms, foxes, minks, rabbits, and other animals pace and shiver in outdoor wire cages, exposed to driving rain, freezing nights, and, at other times, scorching sun. Mother animals, who are *driven* crazy from rough handling and intense confinement and have nowhere to hide while giving birth, often kill their babies after delivering litters. The globalisation of the fur trade has made it impossible to know where fur products come from. China supplies more than half of the finished fur garments imported for sale in the United States. Even if a fur garment's label says it was made in a European country, the animals were likely raised and slaughtered elsewhere—possibly on an unregulated Chinese fur farm. The only way to prevent such unimaginable cruelty is never to wear any fur.

On my moral inferiors

by Editor

The whole issue of white survival depends on regaining a self-image that places them morally above other races, including empathy for children and our cousins, the animals. Recently, a regular visitor let me know by email that he was dismayed by my desire to exterminate those who trade in skinning poor animals alive. He just wanted to shut down the Chinese factories that supply more than half of the fur garments sold in the unhinged West. This is my response: I am not the monster. Those who don't harbour exterminationist fantasies are the moral Neanderthals compared to me.

Take my recent posts on pre-Hispanic Amerindians, for example. In the last one, the author of a scholarly article raised a disturbing possibility: Several Maya skulls show marks of sharp, unhealed cuts, particularly around the eye sockets, suggesting that some of these individuals may have been flayed before sacrifice. The presence of women and children among these skulls means that even they, and not just the mature men, could have suffered a horrible death, like what still happens today in Chinese fur factories.

I don't often get comments on my posts about the pre-Columbian era, perhaps because the data sheds light on so dark history that it is hard to digest. But if we dare to see the same thing happening today with some animals, the psychogenically emerging individual who approaches these issues can only see those who avoid it as intellectual cowards.

After my blog entry on Maya sacrifice, I read another scholarly article in the book *El Sacrificio Humano* of 28 authors, this one by Vera Tiesler and Andrea Cucina, a chapter with nine pages of bibliographical references to specialized literature.⁷

⁷ 'Sacrificio, Tratamiento y Ofrenda del Cuerpo Humano entre los Mayas Peninsulares', in López Luján, Leonardo & Guilhem Olivier (2010): *El*

Tiesler and Cucina let us know that modern Mayanists are using, in addition to Spanish chronicles and iconographic evidence from pre-Columbian art, the science of taphonomy (skeletal analysis) as tangible evidence of human sacrifice in Mayan civilization. On pages 199-200 the authors mention the techniques the Maya used in their practices, now corroborated by taphonomy: the victim could have been shot with arrows or stoned, his throat or neck could have been cut or broken, his heart could have been extracted through the diaphragm or thorax; he could have suffered multiple and fatal lacerations, or have been cremated, disembowelled, flayed or dismembered. The bodily remains may have been ingested, used as trophies or in the manufacture of percussion instruments. The authors deduce this from direct, physical evidence from the skeletons studied (or other remains) and also mention a form of sacrifice I had not heard of: the offering of human faces in the context of the influence on the Maya of the Xipe-Totec deity, 'Our Lord the Flayed', who was widely worshiped in northern, central Mexico.



Amerind flaunting
an inverted head.

Tiesler and Cucina also point to another type of physical evidence in Maya civilization (which I have already mentioned in *Day of Wrath*): many skeletons with sacrificial marks have been

Sacrificio Humano en la Tradición Religiosa Mesoamericana. Mexico City, published by INAH and UNAM.

found at the bottom of sacrificial cenotes. On page 206 they include an illustration of Mayan dignitaries wearing inverted heads on their 'uniforms' like the one above. A skeleton of an individual has also been found with a human mask hanging from his belt on his thorax.

On page 209 the authors let us know that the Maya even sacrificed animals, and include an illustration of a jaguar surrounded by flames. They don't say whether the animal was alive when it was sacrificed; and on page 211 they speak of 'a high percentage of child, adolescent and female victims whose corpses were also often the object of ritual manipulation'. On the same page is a Mayan representation of a decapitated woman, and on page 215 a photo of a perforated thorax is reproduced, suggesting that the bodily remains may have been used as mannequins 'to make a terrifying display of institutional power'. They also suggest that sacrifices may have continued to be performed long after the Spanish conquest, albeit 'clandestinely and with increasing recourse to animal substitutes'.

This proves my point beautifully. If a barbaric practice is banned in a primitive race, violence will be *displaced*, not eradicated. The sacrificial victims are now the animals. Remember my post where I mentioned the case of the recent torture of farm animals in Mexico? The reason I speak with haughty contempt of the non-exterminationists—'my moral inferiors'—is that they are afraid to take their survivalist premises to their logical conclusion. It is not enough to close down Chinese skinning factories or Mexican slaughterhouses. To put an absolute end to these practices without further *displacement*, you got to wipe out the entire psychoclass behind such cruelties (see the final book of my trilogy).

8 December 2013
(edited 2025)

Turner Diaries climax

by William Pierce

I drove to the one place I was reasonably sure was still manned by Organisation personnel: the old gift shop in Georgetown. It was just outside the new Pentagon security perimeter. I arrived there as dusk was falling and pulled the pickup truck around to the rear service entrance. I had just climbed out of the truck and stepped into the shadows at the rear of the building when the world around me suddenly lit up as bright as noon for a moment. First there was an intensely bright flash of light, then a weaker glow which cast moving shadows and changed from white to yellow to red in the course of a few seconds.

I ran to the alley, so that I could have a more nearly unobstructed view of the sky. What I saw chilled my blood and caused the hairs on the back of my neck to rise. An enormous, bulbous, glowing thing, a splotchy ruby-red in colour for the most part but shot through with dark streaks and also dappled with a shifting pattern of brighter orange and yellow areas, was rising into the northern sky and casting its ominous, blood-red light over the land below. It was truly a vision from hell.

As I watched, the gigantic fireball continued to expand and rise, and a dark column, like the stem of an immense toadstool, became visible beneath it. Bright, electric-blue tongues of fire could be seen flickering and dancing over the surface of the column. They were huge lightning bolts, but at their distance no thunder could be heard from them. When the noise finally came, it was a dull, muffled sound, yet still overwhelming: the sort of sound one might expect to hear if an inconceivably powerful earthquake rocked a huge city and caused a thousand 100-story skyscrapers to crumble into ruins simultaneously. I realised that I was witnessing the annihilation of the city of Baltimore, 35 miles away, but I could not understand the enormous magnitude of the blast. Could one of our

60-kiloton bombs have done that? It seemed more like what one would expect from a megaton bomb.

The government news reports that night and the next day claimed that the warhead which destroyed Baltimore, killing more than a million people, as well as the blasts which destroyed some two-dozen other major American cities the same day, had been set off by us. They also claimed that the government had counterattacked and destroyed the 'nest of racist vipers' in California. As it turned out, both claims were false, but it was two days before I learned the full story of what had actually happened.

Meanwhile, it was with a feeling of deepest despair that I and half-a-dozen others who were gathered around the television set in the darkened basement of the gift shop late that night heard a newscaster gloatingly announce the destruction of our liberated zone in California. He was a Jew, and he really let his emotions carry him away; I have never before heard or seen anything like it. After a solemn rundown of most of the cities which had been hit that day, with preliminary estimates of the death tolls (sample: 'and in Detroit, which the racist fiends struck with two of their missiles, they murdered over 1.4 million innocent American men, women, and children of all races...'), he came to New York. At that point tears actually appeared in his eyes and his voice broke...

Gradually, during the next 48 hours, we learned the true story of that dreadful Thursday, both from later and more nearly accurate government newscasts and from our own sources. The first and most important news we received came early Friday morning, in a coded message from Revolutionary Command to all the Organisation's units around the country: California had not been destroyed! Vandenberg had been annihilated, and two large missiles had struck the city of Los Angeles, causing widespread death and destruction, but at least 90 per cent of the people in the liberated zone had survived, partly because they had been given a few minutes advance warning and had been able to take shelter.

Unfortunately for the people in other parts of the country, there was no advance warning, and the total death toll—including those who have died of burns, other wounds, and radiation in the last ten days—is approximately sixty million. The missiles which caused these deaths, however, were not ours—except in the case of New York City, which received a barrage first from Vandenberg and then from [Russia]. Baltimore, Detroit, and the other American

cities which were hit—even Los Angeles—were all the victims of Soviet missiles. Vandenberg AFB was the only domestic target hit by the U.S. government.

The cataclysmic chain of events began with an extraordinarily painful decision by Revolutionary Command. Reports being received by RC in the first week of this month indicated a gradual but steady shift of the balance of power from the military faction in the government, which wanted to avoid a nuclear showdown with us, to the Jewish faction, which demanded the immediate annihilation of California. The Jews feared that otherwise the existing stalemate between the liberated zone and the rest of the country might become permanent, which would mean an almost certain victory for us eventually. To prevent this they went to work behind the scenes in their customary manner, arguing, threatening, bribing, bringing pressure to bear on one of their opponents at a time. They had already succeeded in arranging the replacement of several top generals by their own creatures, and RC saw the last chance disappearing of avoiding a full-scale exchange of nuclear missiles with government forces.

So we decided to pre-empt. We struck first, but not at the government's forces. We fired all our missiles from Vandenberg (except for half-a-dozen targeted on New York) at two targets: Israel and [Russia]. As soon as our missiles had been launched, RC announced the news to the Pentagon via a direct telephone link. The Pentagon, of course, had immediate confirmation from its own radar screens, and it had no choice but to follow up our salvo with an immediate and full-scale nuclear attack of its own against [Russia], in an attempt to knock out as much of the Soviet retaliatory potential as possible. The Soviet response was horrendous, but spotty. They fired everything they had left at us, but it simply wasn't enough. Several of the largest American cities, including Washington and Chicago, were spared.

What the Organisation accomplished by precipitating this fateful chain of events is fourfold: First, by hitting New York and Israel, we have completely knocked out two of world Jewry's principal nerve centres, and it should take them a while to establish a new chain of command and get their act back together. Second, by forcing them to take a decisive action, we pushed the balance of power in the U.S. government solidly back toward the military leaders. For all practical purposes, the country is now under a

military government. Third, by provoking a Soviet counterattack, we did far more to disrupt the System in this country and break up the orderly pattern of life of the masses than we could have done by using our own weapons against domestic targets—and we still have most of our 60-kiloton warheads left! That will be of enormous advantage to us in the days ahead...

We took an enormous chance, of course: first, that California would be devastated in the Soviet counterattack—and second, that the U.S. military would lose its cool and use its nuclear weaponry on California even though, except for Vandenberg, there was no nuclear threat there to be knocked out. In both cases the fortunes of war have been at least moderately kind to us—although the threat from the U.S. military is by no means over. What we lost, however, is substantial: about an eighth of the Organisation's members, and nearly a fifth of the White population of the country... Fortunately, the heaviest death toll in this country has been in the largest cities, which are substantially non-White.

All in all, the strategic situation of the Organisation relative to the System is enormously improved, and that is what really counts. We are willing to take as many casualties as necessary—just so the System takes proportionately more. All that matters, in the long run, is that when the smoke has finally cleared the last battalion in the field is ours...

October 28. Just back from more than a month in Baltimore—what's left of it. I and four others from here hauled a batch of portable radioactivity-metering equipment up to Silver Spring, where we linked up with a Maryland unit and continued north to the vicinity of Baltimore. Since the main roads were totally impassable, we had to walk across country more than halfway, commandeering a truck for only the last dozen miles.

Although more than two weeks had passed since the bombing, the state of affairs around Baltimore was almost indescribably chaotic when we arrived. We didn't even try to go into the burned out core of the city, but even in the suburbs and countryside ten miles west of ground zero, half the buildings had burned. Even the secondary roads in and around the suburbs were littered with the burned hulks of vehicles, and nearly everyone we encountered was on foot. Groups of scavengers were everywhere, poking through ruined stores, foraging in the fields with backpacks, carrying bundles of looted or salvaged goods—mostly food, but

also clothing, building materials, and everything else imaginable—to and fro like an army of ants. And the corpses! They were another good reason for staying away from the roads as much as possible. Even in the areas where relatively few people were killed by the initial blast or by subsequent radiation sickness, the corpses were strewn along the roads by the thousands. They were nearly all refugees from the blast area.


Close to the city one saw the bodies of those who had been badly burned by the fireball; most of them had not been able to walk more than a mile or so before they collapsed. Further out were those who had been less seriously burned. And far out into the countryside were the corpses of those who had succumbed to radiation days or weeks later. All had been left to rot where they fell, except in those few areas where the military had restored a semblance of order.

We had at that time only about 40 Organisation members among the survivors in the Baltimore area. They had been engaged in sabotage, sniping, and other guerrilla efforts against the police and military personnel there during the first week after the blast. Then they gradually discovered that the rules of the game had changed. They found out that it was no longer necessary to operate as furtively as they had before. The System's troops returned their fire when attacked, but did not pursue them. Outside a few areas, the police no longer attempted to undertake systematic searches of persons and vehicles, and there were no house raids. The attitude almost seemed to be, 'Don't bother us, and we won't bother you'.

The civilian survivors also tended to take a much more nearly neutral attitude than before. There was fear of the Organisation, but very little overt expression of hostility. The people did not know whether we were the ones who had fired the missile which destroyed their city, as the System broadcasts claimed, but they seemed about as disposed to blame the System for letting it happen as us for doing it. The holocaust through which the people up there had passed had clearly convinced them quite thoroughly of one thing: the System could no longer guarantee their security. They no longer had even a trace of confidence in the old order; they merely wanted to survive now, and they would turn to anyone who could help them stay alive a while longer. Sensing this changed attitude, our members had begun recruiting and organising among

the survivors around Baltimore in semi-public fashion and meeting with sufficient success that Revolutionary Command authorized the attempt to establish a small liberated zone west of the city.

The eleven of us who had come up from the Washington suburbs to help pitched in with enthusiasm, and within a few days we had established a reasonably defensible perimeter enclosing about 2,000 houses and other buildings with a total of nearly 12,000 occupants. My principal function was to carry out a radiological survey of the soil, the buildings, the local vegetation, and the water sources in the area, so that we could be sure of freedom from dangerous levels of nuclear radiation resulting from fallout. We organised about 300 of the locals into a fairly effective militia and provided them with arms. It would be risky at this stage to try to arm a bigger militia than that, because we haven't had an opportunity to ideologically condition the local population to the extent we'd like, and they still require close observation and tight supervision. But we picked the best prospects among the able-bodied males in the enclave, and we do have quite a bit of experience in picking people. I'll not be surprised if half our new militiamen eventually graduate to membership in the Organisation, and some will probably even be admitted to the Order.



Then we formed the people into labour brigades to carry out a number of necessary functions, one of which was the sanitary disposal of the hundreds of corpses of refugees. The majority of these poor creatures were White, and I overheard one of our members refer to what happened to them as 'a slaughter of the innocents'. I am not sure that is a correct description of the recent holocaust. I am sorry, of course, for the millions of White people, both here and in Russia, who died—and who have yet to die before we have finished—in this war to rid ourselves of the Jewish yoke. But innocents? I think not. Certainly, that term should not be applied to the majority of the adults. After all, is not man essentially responsible for his condition—at least, in a collective sense? If the White nations of the world had not allowed themselves to become subject to the Jew, to Jewish ideas, to the Jewish spirit, this war would not be necessary. We can hardly consider ourselves

blameless. We can hardly say we had no choice, no chance to avoid the Jew's snare. We can hardly say we were not warned.

Men of wisdom, integrity, and courage have warned us over and over again of the consequences of our folly. And even after we were well down the Jewish primrose path, we had chance after chance to save ourselves—most recently when the Germans and [their enemies] were locked in struggle for the mastery of central and eastern Europe.

We ended up on the Jewish side in that struggle, primarily because we had chosen corrupt men as our leaders. And we had chosen corrupt leaders because we valued the wrong things in life. We had chosen leaders who promised us something for nothing; who pandered to our weaknesses and vices; who had nice stage personalities and pleasant smiles, but who were without character or scruple. We ignored the really important issues in our national life and gave free rein to a criminal System to conduct the affairs of our nation as it saw fit, so long as it kept us moderately well-supplied with bread and circuses.

And are not folly, wilful ignorance, laziness, greed, irresponsibility, and moral timidity as blameworthy as the most deliberate malice? Are not all our sins of omission to be counted against us as heavily as the Jew's sins of commission against him? In the Creator's account book, that is the way things are reckoned. Nature does not accept 'good' excuses in lieu of performance. **No race which neglects to insure its own survival, when the means for that survival are at hand, can be judged 'innocent', nor can the penalty exacted against it be considered unjust, no matter how severe.**

Immediately after our success in California this summer, in my dealings with the civilian population there I had it thoroughly impressed on me why the American people do not deserve to be considered 'innocents'. Their reaction to the civil strife there was based almost solely on the way it affected their own private circumstances. For the first day or two—before it dawned on most people that we might actually win—the White civilians, even racially conscious ones, were generally hostile; we were messing up their life-style and making their customary pursuit of pleasure terribly inconvenient. Then, after they learned to fear us, they were all too eager to please us. But they weren't really interested in the rights and wrongs of the struggle; they couldn't be bothered with soul-

searching and long-range considerations. Their attitude was: 'Just tell us what we're supposed to believe, and we'll believe it'. They just wanted to be safe and comfortable again as soon as possible. And they weren't being cynical; they weren't jaded sophisticates, but ordinary people.

The fact is that the ordinary people are not really much less culpable than the not-so-ordinary people, than the pillars of the System. Take the political police, as an example. Most of them—the White ones—are not especially evil men. They serve evil masters, but they rationalise what they do; they justify it to themselves, some in patriotic terms ('protecting our free and democratic way of life') and some in religious or ideological terms ('upholding Christian ideals of equality and justice'). One can call them hypocrites—one can point out that they deliberately avoid thinking about anything which might call into question the validity of the shallow catch-phrases with which they justify themselves—but is not everyone who has tolerated the System also a hypocrite, whether he actively supported it or not? Is not everyone who mindlessly parrots the same catch-phrases, refusing to examine their implications and contradictions, whether he uses them as justifications for his deeds or not, also to be blamed?

I cannot think of any segment of White society, from the Maryland red-necks and their families whose radioactive bodies we bulldozed into a huge pit a few days ago to the university professors we strung up in Los Angeles last July, which can truly claim that it did not deserve what happened to it. It was not so many months ago that nearly all those who are wandering homeless and bemoaning their fate today were talking from the other side of their mouths. Not a few of our people have been badly roughed up in the past—and two that I know of were killed—when they fell into the hands of red-necks: 'good ol' boys' who, although not liberals or shabbos goyim in any way, had no use for 'radicals' who wanted to 'overthrow the gummint'. In their case it was sheer ignorance. But ignorance of that sort is no more excusable than the bleating, sheep-like liberalism of the pseudo-intellectuals who have smugly promoted Jewish ideology for so many years; or than the selfishness and cowardice of the great American middle class who went along for the ride, complaining only when their pocketbooks suffered.

No, talk of ‘innocents’ has no meaning. We must look at our situation collectively, in a race-wide sense. We must understand that our race is like a cancer patient undergoing drastic surgery in order to save his life. There is no sense in asking whether the tissue being cut out now is ‘innocent’ or not. That is no more reasonable than trying to distinguish the ‘good’ Jews from the bad ones—or, as some of our thicker-skulled ‘good ol’ boys’ still insist on trying, separating the ‘good niggers’ from the rest of their race.

The fact is that we are all responsible, as individuals, for the morals and the behaviour of our race as a whole.

*(Cited as a blog post on January 1, 2014
Bold emphasis added by Editor.)*

Why I am not a neonazi

by Editor

Almost all white men have been brainwashed about what happened in the Second World War. What's more, they have been feminised. They are the antipodes of the Spartans, the Vikings or Himmler's SS men.

Even white nationalists are reluctant to repudiate feminism—that is, not only to deny women their so-called right to vote, but also to not allow them to inherit wealth or property or choose the number of children they have (cf. not only how the Skhul-Qafzehs established patriarchy, but what we say in our anthology *On Beth's Cute Tits*).

I consider myself a priest of the sacred words; that is, a spiritual heir to the National Socialist legacy. But I reject neonazism because neonazis are simply white nationalists with Nazi paraphernalia. Unlike the Germans, quite a few of them love degenerate music, Judaised Hollywood and non-reproductive sex. Many are also anti-Nordicists who dismiss the injunction cited in Stellrecht's first lesson in *Faith and Action*: 'But if your blood has traits that will make your children unhappy and a burden to the State, then you have the heroic duty to be last'.


Even pure Aryans hate Nordicism. What I love about Himmler is that, precisely because he wasn't handsome, he admired the Hyper-Nordics of a Norwegian village visited by the SS and harboured the idea that their people could become a biological template for the Reich. Here are a commenter's words in my website about white nationalists:

Not only does it [Nordicism in general and National Socialism in particular] retrigger all the anti-racist conditioning they thought they'd gotten rid of, but it makes them ask 'where does it end?' 'At what point can we finally stop paying attention to each others genetic (and non-genetic) flaws?'

The answer is that it doesn't end: that all life is struggle and hierarchy and that the Aryan race will never be perfected nor entirely freed from threats. But that's not what they want to hear. Pierce made eugenics the core of his religious outlook as a means of protecting the eugenically-selecting society. But I see little concern for the subject among modern white nationalists. Can you imagine a racial state with a comprehensive eugenic policy that *didn't* consider the reversal of mongrelisation to be a major objective? That it *wouldn't* make its population look more like Swedes and less like Sicilians, as time goes on? It's hard to do so, which is why I believe 'anti-Nordicism' in white nationalism has, among other things, shut down much of the discussion on the subject.

In September 2013, on Harold Covington's blog several commenters adhered to political correctness in attacking Covington so as not to offend the feelings of contemporary Greeks. A more sensible commenter opined: 'Those of us who can't look at a picture of half-Turks and say they're not white would never accomplish anything in the name of the white race'. The other part of Covington's purported revolutionary commenters ignored that DNA testing has even revealed Negro genes in quite a few Portuguese people. This cowardly inability to acknowledge the foundations of Indo-European studies isn't the only thing that bothers me about the internet movement known as white nationalism. I'm also bothered by neonazis demanding that I dismiss Holocaust stories as hoaxes.

As someone who has spent many years studying controversial topics (pseudoscience in both parapsychology and biological psychiatry), I know full well that it takes at least a decade of one's life to digest the literature on both sides of an intellectual debate. I'm now in my fifties and have neither the time nor the motivation to research claims and counterclaims about the Holocaust. Suffice it to point out that two former Holocaust revisionists, Mark Weber, director of the Institute for Historical Review, and David Irving, our best historian of the Third Reich, have changed their minds over the years and both now accept that a couple of million Jews probably died as a result of harsh Nazi treatment.



David Irving in 2012

But I'd like to go beyond Irving's scruples. A Swede commented on my website:

What is certain is that the Holocaust would not have produced any debilitating psychological effect on non-Christian whites. (By Christianity I mean 'Christian morality'. Most atheists in the West are still Christian, even if they don't believe in God or Jesus.) Being emotionally affected by the Holocaust presupposes that you think: (1) Victims and losers have intrinsically more moral value than conquerors and winners, (2) Killing is the most horrendous thing a human can do, (3) Killing children and women is even more horrendous and (4) Every human life has the same value.

None of these statements ring true to a man who has rejected Christian morality. Even if the Holocaust happened, I would not pity the victims or sympathise with them. If you told the Vikings that they needed to accept Jews on their lands or give them gold coins because six million of them were exterminated in an obscure war, they would have laughed at you.

Thank you, Nietzschean of the North! Himmler also believed that the German moral compass was misled by the Catholic and Protestant churches. And let us never forget Hitler's own words in one of his after-dinner talks: 'The heaviest blow that humanity has received was the coming of Christianity'.

If neonazis were true National Socialists, they would try to prove that Himmler's 1943 Posen Speech is authentic, not a hoax as some claim, and would even find genocidal inspiration in it (paraphrasing a passage from Peter Helmkamp in *Controlled Burn*, Joseph Walsh stated on my blog: 'The truth is that the glad stirrings

of genocide lurk in the heart of every man, yet only the Nazis had the courage to acknowledge the truth’).

I’ve read *The Turner Diaries* twice. When I first read it, or rather, when I listened to the audio version with Pierce’s voice, I was still struggling with the last vestiges of my Christian programming. I didn’t like the cruelties, like the executions of a bunch of pro-white warriors for not addressing the Jewish problem in Toronto. And in *The Day of the Rope*, I was disturbed by the depiction of how many innocent whites also die. Then I read Covington’s quartet and sensed a moral difference. Covington’s revolutionary characters don’t embrace exterminationism. I could imagine myself doing what we read in Covington’s novels, but in the past, some passages in the *Diaries* made me hesitate...

Now I’ve left Christian ethics behind and finally see that Pierce was right. As priests of the sacred words, in the coming race wars we must be imbued with the Roman ethos, *gravitas* and *severitas*. The big difference between Covington’s saga and the *Diaries* is that in Pierce’s universe not only is an ethnostate born: the final pages describe how only the Aryan race will inherit the Earth. In Covington’s universe, such a scenario is ruled out because it would involve extermination on a scale that only Cro-Magnon men could carry out!

18 March 2014
(edited 2025)

On exterminationism

§ 1

No one, to my knowledge, has written a comprehensive analysis about his abusive parents. But what I said in my trilogy about the murder of children's souls only lays the groundwork for a deeper elaboration of psychohistory, which ultimately shows us that the human species is a failed species.

§ 2

From a careful reading of my books, one cannot but deduce that most of the human species should be exterminated, in addition to what is written there, because, as Schopenhauer said, if the world is hell, human beings are the demons of animals. And if we want to save animals from human demons, we have no choice but to dispatch the latter.

§ 3

That only a few of the most beautiful specimens of Nordic whites deserve to continue living, so beautiful in body and soul as to have left human devilry behind—‘Neanderthalism’ I call it in my soliloquies—, has become as evident to me as that a cow is a mammal.



*23 September 2014
(edited 2025)*

Third part

Lebensraum

by Editor



Anyone who has read Arthur Kemp's *March of the Titans* knows that, for centuries, the ancient Russians were invaded by Mongols who substantially dyed Slavic blood with non-Aryan genes. Therefore, to understand the Master Plan East we must always keep in mind both Kemp's book and Pierce's proposed solution to the mudblood problem.

The following is an edited article about the Third Reich's Master Plan East. I am quoting and rephrasing two sources: one in English and one in Spanish without the anti-German spin of both.

The *Generalplan Ost* (translated as Master Plan East) was a secret National Socialist plan for the colonisation of Central and Eastern Europe. Its implementation would have required large-scale ethnic cleansing in these European territories, occupied by Germany during World War II. The plan, prepared in the years 1939-1942, was part of the *Lebensraum* policy of Adolf Hitler, the National Socialist movement and the fulfilment of the *Drang nach Osten* (Drive to the East) ideology of German eastward expansion, both part of the broader plan to establish a New Order.

The body responsible for drafting this plan was the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA in German), the SS security organ responsible for fighting the enemies of National Socialism. It was a strictly confidential document, and its contents were known only to

the highest echelons of the National Socialist hierarchy. According to the testimony of SS-Standartenführer Dr Hans Ehlich, the final version was drafted in 1940. As a senior RSHA official, Ehlich was responsible for the drafting of the Master Plan East together with Dr Konrad Meyer, Head of the Planning Office of Himmler's Reich Commissar for the Consolidation of the German People. It had been preceded by the *Ostforschung*, a series of studies and research projects carried out over several years by various academic centres to provide the necessary facts and figures. The draft versions were discussed by SS Chief Heinrich Himmler and his most trusted colleagues even before the outbreak of war.

Almost all the wartime documentation of the Master Plan East was deliberately destroyed shortly before Germany's defeat in May 1945. Thus, after the war, no copies were found among the documents in the German archives. Apart from Ehlich's testimony, several documents refer to this plan or are supplements to it. Although no copies of the actual document have been preserved, most of the essential elements have been reconstructed from memoranda, summaries and other related ancillary documents.

One of the main documents that have made it possible to recreate the content of the Master Plan East is a memorandum of 27 April 1942 entitled *Stellungnahme und Gedanken zum Generalplan Ost des Reichsführers SS* (Opinion and Ideas on the Reichsführer-SS General Plan East), written by Dr Erich Wetzel (*Leiter der Hauptstelle Beratungsstelle des Rassenpolitischen Amtes der NSDAP*). This memorandum is an elaboration of the Master Plan East.

Phases of the plan and its implementation

The final version of the *Generalplan Ost*, essentially a grand plan for ethnic cleansing, was divided into two parts: the *Kleine Planung* (Small Plan), which covered actions to be carried out during the war, and the *Grosse Planung* (Great Plan), which covered actions to be carried out after the war was won, to be implemented gradually throughout twenty-five to thirty years. The Master Plan East envisaged varying percentages of the various conquered nations being subjected to

I Germanisation. For example, 50 per cent of the Czechs, 35 per cent of the Ukrainians and 25 per cent of the Belarusians,

II Extermination,

III Expulsion and other fates such as

IV Slave labour.

The net effect was to ensure the full Aryanization of the conquered territories. Within ten years, the plan effectively envisaged the Germanisation, expulsion, extermination and/or enslavement of most or all of the East and West Slavs living behind the front lines in Europe.

The 'Small Plan' was to be implemented as the Germans conquered the areas east of their pre-war borders. Thus, the plan for Poland was drawn up at the end of November 1939 and is probably responsible for much of Germany's expulsion of Poles (first to the colonial district of the General Government and, from 1942 onwards, also to *Polenlager*).

After the war, under the 'Great Plan', the Master Plan East envisaged the expulsion of forty-five million of un-Germanisable people from Central and Eastern Europe, of whom thirty-two million were 'racially undesirable': Jews (100 per cent), Belarusians (75 per cent) and Ukrainians (65 per cent) were to be deported to Western Siberia, and some fourteen million of them were to remain. On the other hand, up to 8-10 million Germans were to be settled in an enlarged 'living space' or *Lebensraum*. Since the number of Germans seemed insufficient to populate the vast territories of Central and Eastern Europe, peoples considered racially situated between Germans and Russians (*Mittelschicht*), i.e. Latvians and even Czechs, were also to be resettled there.

Attempts at Germanisation were to be carried out only in the case of those foreigners from Central and Eastern Europe who could be considered a desirable element for the future Reich from the point of view of their genes. The Plan stipulated that there should be different methods of dealing with certain nations and even certain groups within them. There was even an attempt to establish the basic criteria for determining whether a given group lent itself to Germanisation. These criteria were to be applied more liberally in the case of nations whose racial material (*rassische Substanz*) made them more suitable than others for Germanisation. The Plan considered that there were a large number of such elements among the Baltic nations. Dr Wetzel considered that a possible Germanisation of the entire Estonian nation and a considerable part of the Latvians should be envisaged. On the other

hand, the Lithuanians seemed less desirable, as they contained too great an admixture of non-Germanic blood.

In any case, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were to be deprived of their statehood, while their territories were to be included in the eastern zone of German settlement. This meant that Latvia and especially Lithuania would be covered by the deportation plans, albeit somewhat more gently than the Slavic or 'voluntary' emigration to Western Siberia. Although the Baltic nations, like the Estonians, would be spared, in the long run National Socialist planners didn't envisage their existence as independent entities. Initial plans were for Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia to be Germanised in twenty-five years, but Himmler revised them to twenty years. In 1941 it was decided to redesign the Polish nation and many Polish children were abducted for Germanisation, as we shall see.

Lebensborn

Heinrich Himmler was happy. 7 October 1939 was a very special day for him. Not only was he turning thirty-nine, but Hitler had appointed him Reich Commissar for the Consolidation of the German People, which, among other things made him responsible for the inhabitants of Poland: a country Germany had occupied a month earlier.

Himmler wasted no time. He immediately ordered a report and, a month later, had a forty-page text on his desk. The document contained a detailed plan for the efficient use of manpower in the conquered areas in the east. Most of the population was to be displaced or used for work so that the Germans could settle and enjoy the living space called *Lebensraum*. Those who remained were to be bred in Germany and become part of the master race. The report recommended that selection should be mainly among the youngest: 'We must exclude racially valuable children from deportations, so that they grow up in Reich schools run by German families', and ended with another recommendation: 'They should be no older than eight or ten years old because up to that age their national identity can be completely changed and their final Germanisation achieved'. After reading the report, Himmler decided that the solution for the children of Poland and other countries had to begin as soon as possible, even if it meant handing

these children over to parents in a foreign country. The acquisition of new Aryan citizens for the Third Reich had a top priority.

Below, Herr Himmler examines a non-German child looking at his racial potential.



Four years earlier, in December 1935, the entity in charge of the project, *Lebensborn* (Source of Life, not to be confused with *Lebensraum*)—a social welfare organisation whose main purpose was to offer different kinds of facilities to single mothers and their babies—, had been created. The German population had been declining for decades and the country was suffering from a serious demographic crisis. The birth rate, which had been healthy at the turn of the century, had fallen to unhealthy levels by the year Hitler came to power. Reversing this trend was essential to the Führer's ambition to populate the eastern regions with purer Aryans.

Himmler calculated that 120 million people were needed. Family life and childbearing were promoted in various ways, most notably with special marriage loans and birth grants to encourage Germans to bring more children into the world. At the same time, all information on contraception was suppressed and contraceptives were banned. Abortion was also banned, which was described as 'sabotage against the future of Germany'. The idea of increasing the population with a large number of children of the superior race was

firmly rooted in the party's mentality. Hitler had stated with conviction at a party meeting in 1929: 'If Germany had a million children a year and eliminated 700,000 to 800,000 of the weaker ones'—referring to the mentally retarded—, 'the result would probably be an increase in her strength'. At this thorny point, it is worth interpolating a couple of vignettes from my own life.

Non-blood relatives (since my grandmother married again after my grandfather died) had a son who was born in the same year as me. But this boy is mentally retarded, so terribly retarded that he once bit off his sister's finger. Another case: the only friend I used to talk disparagingly about race had a sister with Down's syndrome whose retardation was so great that, if left within a few feet of her flat, she wouldn't know how to get home: an IQ lower than a dog's. These real-life cases show that you have to be brainwashed by Christian ethics to avoid what the ancient Greeks and Romans did with their defective children. Christian ethics has damaged the morals of these people I know, and millions of others like them.

Among my relatives, only Uncle Beto admired Hitler. He once said, perhaps about one of my disabled cousins, 'I would kill a daughter like that and then I would go to hell!' He meant that he would kill her if she were his daughter. Although I didn't witness this anecdote I suppose his sisters—my great-aunts—were shocked by such pronouncements.

Back to the Third Reich. 'If we could establish the Nordic race and, from this seedbed, produce a race of 200 million, the world would be ours' Himmler said eloquently. A few months after its founding *Lebensborn* opened *Heim Hochland*, the first home for pregnant women. For this purpose, the National Socialists took over the building of a Catholic orphanage in the city of Munich. Initially, the institution could accommodate up to thirty mothers and fifty-five children, and the applicants were carefully selected. Only women who met the characteristics of the dominant race were admitted. Candidates had their skulls measured, and only those with the coveted elongated skull, typical of the Nordid type, could be admitted. They also had to meet other requirements, such as blond hair, blue or green eyes and good health: the next eugenic step from what our hominid ancestors initiated!

Those who passed the test were rewarded with the best care in exquisite surroundings. The living quarters were usually in stately homes which, as in the case of *Heim Hochland*, had often been taken

from Hitler's enemies, and other mansions, from Jews. The organisation's headquarters in Munich, for example, was in a house that had been owned by the writer Thomas Mann, who had six children with his Jewish wife. All the houses were equipped with modern medical equipment and staffed by medical personnel. These luxurious conditions took their toll. In 1939 Gregor Ebner, *Lebensborn's* medical director, informed Himmler that a total of 1,300 women had applied. Of these, 635 had been deemed suitable because of their racial characteristics and state of health. Births went very well. While in Germany the mortality rate of newborns was six per cent, in the *Lebensborn* organisation's homes this figure was halved. 'Deliveries are easy, without major complications, which is attributable to racial selection and the quality of the women we take in', Ebner wrote proudly. Of course, all this came at a high cost: 400 Deutschmarks per mother. 'It isn't a great sacrifice if we can save a million children with good blood', Ebner concluded.

Mothers of healthy children were usually allowed to stay with them, but they had to follow certain rules, and in return for looking after their physical well-being *Lebensborn* controlled them ideologically. While there, the women had to attend indoctrination courses three times a week in which they were shown propaganda films; they read episodes of *Mein Kampf*, listened to talks on the radio and sang war songs. The staff was instructed to keep a close eye on the women and report on their behaviour in daily life, their bravery (or lack thereof) during childbirth, and the opinions they expressed about Hitler and National Socialism. To this end, each woman was given a book with the inscription RF—corresponding to the Reichsführer—which, after her stay there, was sent to Himmler and used to decide whether a *Lebensborn* home would be used again.

Himmler ran the homes in a very personal way, with all sorts of guidelines. One of his favourite subjects was diet, on which he had very strong opinions. The Reichsführer regularly visited the homes to follow the progress of the mothers and children. He was so interested that children born on his birthday, 7 October, automatically became his godchildren. Each received a mug engraved with his name and that of the Reich leader. The households would then send him reports on the child's development. In one of them, Himmler was able to read that

Ingemar Kurt, born on 7 October 1937, 'is developing well and is a strong and healthy boy'. Gerlinde, born on the same day two years later, had contracted severe pneumonia but was now recovered. 'Gerlinde has overcome her serious illness and is a happy girl', the message read.



Before leaving home, the children went through the rite of pagan baptism, which served as an oath of allegiance to Hitler and the SS. At a table draped with a swastika flag and a bust or picture of Hitler, the mothers promised to raise their children to be good citizens of the Reich. The baby was then handed over to an SS officer, who gave him a kind of blessing. The words changed from home to home, but the content was the same: 'We believe in the God of all things. And in the mission of our German blood, which rejuvenates on German soil. We believe in the blood-bearing race. And in the Führer, chosen for us by God'. Then the officer held a dagger over the boy and read the words initiating him into the SS: 'We will welcome you into our community as a member of our corps. You will grow up under our protection and must give honour to your name, pride to your brotherhood and glory to your inexhaustible race'.

And today's racial right?

Just compare this National Socialist creed with the ancient Nicene-Constantinian creed and with the way American white nationalists baptise their children before a Semitic idol...

In order to found Rome, we have mentioned elsewhere the abduction of the beautiful Sabine women, who belonged to a people ethnically related to the Spartans. We have also talked about how the Spartan state nationalised young children for safekeeping. But neither Sparta nor Republican Rome had yet experienced the miscegenation that would befall Europe centuries later. Since extensive miscegenation with the mongrels was already well advanced in the last century, the Germans were forced to kidnap the most Nordid-like children from the conquered countries to educate them properly. If the white race is to be saved such measures must be resumed, and white nationalists who reject Nordicism must be repudiated.



Despite the successes, Himmler admitted that the *Lebensborn* households couldn't produce enough children to fulfil his dream. Even counting German speakers in the new regions, such as the Sudetenland, the population of the Third Reich was no more than seventy-nine million, far short of the 120 million he had aimed for. To increase the population, Himmler ordered soldiers in the occupied countries to abduct Nordid-looking children. This strategy was carefully implemented in some areas of the East, especially Poland. Children were divided into two groups: those with Slavic features were deported to the East or became labourers; those with Aryan features were allowed to become Germans with all their privileges. The result was a veritable hunt for blond-haired, blue-eyed children. After this examination, they were classified into three

different categories: desirable, acceptable or undesirable. Having Gypsy features automatically made a child undesirable, which in practice meant a death sentence. Many of them were sent to the camps. As for the desirable ones, the chosen children's past was thoroughly erased. They were usually told that their parents were dead and, after giving them a new name with Germanic resonances, they were sent to Germany. (At this point it is necessary to recall the quote from *Who We Are* in which Pierce criticises the grotesque American custom of giving Hebrew names to children.) There they entered a home where they were strictly forbidden to speak Polish. Those who could not learn German or didn't adapt to their new nationality were sent back to Catholic Poland.

This same fate befell the children of many other parents, including Czechoslovakia, Slovenia and parts of the Soviet Union. One of them was Alexander Litau, originally from Crimea, who was only twenty months old when, in 1942, Germany invaded the peninsula. With his blue eyes and blond hair, the little boy was exactly what the Germans were looking for. One day, SS officers saw him playing in front of his house and took him away. Alexander was first sent to Poland, where German doctors made sure he was healthy and met all the requirements. The examination was thorough, and the boy was found to have no Jewish traits. He was then placed in a *Lebensborn* home, *Sonnenwiese* (Sunny Meadow) in Kohren-Sahlis, Saxony. There, now with the name *Folker*—again, compare this with what the Judaised American have been doing with their children—, he was offered for adoption along with others. 'My first memory is of being in a room with thirty other children. People would come in there and line us up like we were puppies looking for a new home. Those people were going to be my parents. They left and came back the next day. My "mother" wanted a girl, but my "father" preferred a boy... I put my head on his knee and that was enough: I would be his son', recalls Folker.

Latter-day Sabines

Abduction and aid to unwed mothers weren't the only methods used by the Germans to increase the population. In an unofficial document sent to all members of the SS on 28 October 1939, Himmler ordered his men to do their patriotic duty by becoming fathers. It didn't matter whether they were married or

not. 'Beyond conventional bourgeois laws, which may be necessary for other circumstances, it may be a noble endeavour for German women and girls to become, even out of wedlock—and not lightly, but with deep moral seriousness—, mothers of children who will become soldiers and go to war; of whom only fate knows whether they will return or die for Germany', Himmler wrote. At the same time, the Reichsfürer assured the soldiers that both mothers and children would be cared for as long as the war lasted, or if the men fell on the battlefield. 'SS soldiers and mothers of these children: Let's show that you are willing, out of faith in the Führer and for the sake of our blood and our people, to regenerate life for Germany with the same courage with which you know how to fight and die for Germany'.

Stories of sex in Hitler's Youth, which were already circulating, were revived. Rumours also spread that the *Lebensborn* organisation favoured sexual encounters between honourable women and members of the SS, causing a scandal among people who didn't yet fully understand the laws of sexual selection and positive eugenics that the Skhul-Qafzehs and the Cro-Magnons understood so well! Himmler tried to soften things up, but only made the situation worse: 'We only recommend as conception assistants men who have no race problems'. He then had to clarify that the order didn't apply to the wives of soldiers and policemen. He also expressed his great faith in German women and claimed that he could decide for himself whether a potential mother was racially and ideologically appropriate. Unfortunately, none of this had much effect on a public that still needed decades of education in elemental eugenics.

When the storm subsided, the Führer extended the *Lebensborn* programme to the occupied countries. Here soldiers were invited to have relations with the most racially pure women: a modern re-enactment of the Sabines tale albeit in a more formal, orderly and less brutal manner. If a pregnancy occurred, the mother-to-be was invited to a *Lebensborn* house, where the child would be born in a safe place. Such houses were opened in France, Norway, Denmark, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Poland. In Norway, the programme was carried out with great zeal, as Norwegian women were very sympathetic to the National Socialist ideal. The German regime believed that the genetics of Norwegian women were superb and wanted them to have many

children with German soldiers. They loved Nordic women, with their blonde hair and blue eyes, and therefore considered Norway to be a suitable country for *Lebensborn*. During the occupation, some 12,000 children were born to Norwegian mothers and German fathers.



Alas, due to the ultimate treachery of the Anglo-Americans, with time it became clear that Hitler and Himmler's Schutzstaffel couldn't achieve the dreams of increasing the Aryan race. Far more lives were lost in that unjust war than the *Lebensborn* programme could ever produce.

But infinitely worse was their military defeat.

On 1 May 1945 the troops of the vilest country the West has ever produced, the United States of America, arrived at the orphanage in Steinhöring, a community in the district of Ebersberg in Upper Bavaria, and found three hundred blond children between the ages of six months and six years. I don't want to recount what happened afterwards with the *Lebensborn* project: it pains me deeply. Suffice it to say that the dream of the *Lebensraum* that would last a thousand years was aborted by the Allied forces as soon as it was born.

8 December 2020
(edited 2025)

Subtitle

by Editor

For a brief time the subtitle of this blog read *America delenda est*. I removed it when I remembered that Europeans want to beat America at its own ethnosuicidal game. One of those anecdotes concerns the vile way the Norwegians treated their *Lebensborn* children after 1945: toddlers who before the greatest betrayal in history had been destined to rule the expanded Reich...!

The hatred I promote for the Allies must extend to every contemporary white who has embraced ethnosuicide as his new religion after the Second World War. If whites were good people who didn't deserve my hatred, they would wake up dreaming every morning that the island of La Palma, close to another Canary Island where I lived, had collapsed in 1945 causing a kilometre-high tsunami that would have bounced the entire US fleet that was to invade the Normandy coast back to the American mainland; and they would also dream that the Tunguska event that hit the sparsely populated eastern Siberian Taiga had occurred in Moscow under Stalin.

But American racialsists dream no such dreams. After 1945 the white man's moral compass underwent a complete reversal, or inversion of values, that began with our prehistoric ancestors and culminated with Nazi Germany. If whites were sane and good people, in this age that craves their extermination they would also dream about demolishing all anti-white institutions, and imagine committing genocides such as humanity has never seen.

The priests of the fourteen words see white nationalism as a club of little women unable to see that a nation is only made by blood and iron. It is a pity that even the online encyclopaedia that claims to protect the white race is a platform for neochristian values. If one takes a look at the article on *Lebensraum* in Metapedia

it not only shows no enthusiasm for the Master Plan East: it questions its very existence! This only demoralises the Blond Beast.

To illustrate my point a little further, let us take the most radical case of a white nationalist in the United States. As we saw earlier in this book Alex Linder didn't feel the same way as I did when he read *The Turner Diaries* because, like all other whites, he is still subjected to a neochristian programming tail. On the other hand, Hitler and the SS leadership saw the world with a moral compass analogous to those who exterminated the Neanderthals. But after the Hellstorm Holocaust there are no exterminationist intellectuals, except for a couple of visitors to *The West's Darkest Hour*.

What I am getting at is something much deeper than simply telling Linder that we agree to disagree about the Master Plan East. Recall that Andrew Hamilton, one of Pierce's most serious readers, when he read the *Diaries* thought Pierce was shooting himself in the foot. Only later did he learn, to his surprise, that others had liked the novel. Even hard-core white nationalists have been programmed with the old axiology, which prevents them from seeing what was more than obvious to the National Socialist leadership: only with an exterminationist ideology was it possible to carry out the Master Plan East.

It is this mental virus implanted in our psyches since our ancestors accepted Christ that keeps all the people of the racist right axiologically stuck. Only if white nationalism dies—really dies!—and the spirit of the Germans who wanted to conquer the world for the children of the *Lebensborn* flourishes again, will our world be saved.

9 December 2020
(edited 2025)

Kalki the Avenger

by Savitri Devi



As I said before,⁸ His *companions* at arms will be the last National Socialists; the men of iron who will have victoriously stood the test of persecution and, what is more, the test of complete isolation in the midst of a dreary, indifferent world, in which they have no place; who are facing that world and defying it through every gesture, every hint—every silence—of theirs and, more and more (in the case of the younger ones) without even the personal memory of Adolf Hitler’s great days to sustain them; those I have called ‘gods on earth’ and parents of such ones. They are the ones who will, one day, make good for all that which men ‘against Time’ have suffered in the course of history, like they themselves, for the sake of eternal truth: the avenging Comrades whom the Five

⁸ *Editor’s note:* Savitri Devi was talking about the degenerate westerner of today. These are paragraphs from the final pages of ‘Kalki the Avenger’: the last chapter of Savitri’s magnum opus, *The Lightning and the Sun*. In previous chapters, Savitri had explained the difference between the men of their time, and the man against his time. To put it in plain English, the men of their time are those who always ‘support the current thing’. By contrast, a man against his time is someone like us.

Thousand of Verden called in vain within their hearts at the minute of death, upon the bank of the Aller River, red with blood; those whom the millions of 1945—the dying; the tortured; and the desperate survivors—called in vain; those whom all the vanquished fighters ‘against Time’ called in vain, in every phase of the great cosmic Struggle without beginning, against the Forces of disintegration, co-eternal with the Forces of Life.

They are the bridge to supermanhood, of which Nietzsche has spoken; the ‘last Battalion’ in which Adolf Hitler has put his confidence. Kalki will lead them, through the flames of the great End, into the sunshine of the new Golden Age...

(Written in 1956)

Panentheism

by Editor

Savitri Devi’s literary style, with sentences so long I sometimes lose track of her thoughts, is the opposite of mine. But discovering her was like finding a soul mate, even though I never met her (she passed away in 1982, long before my racial awakening). In the comments section of my website regarding an article by Savitri, Krist Krusher commented:

One problem that I have with pantheism is, that if the universe itself is god, then would that mean insects, faeces and non-whites are also part of god? I find such an idea preposterous: such a realization undermines the entirety of the idea of God. It reduces it to simply mean anything and everything. Such is not worth worshipping or venerating to me. I was personally a little disillusioned when I read *Who We Are* and found that Pierce, using his Comostheistic logic, deduced that even Negroes were in a way brothers to Whites!

Krusher is referring to this particular paragraph: ‘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 amoeba, the wolf, the chimpanzee and 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 to ensure the continued progress of our own. And so it must be with the Negro’. Krusher continues:

The problem with this is that it ultimately creates another kind of Brotherhood, one which if coupled with the kind of thinking that slave morality produces, would result in something as asinine as Jainism: where all life has worth regardless if it is paramecium, slime mould or cockroach! It would be such an easy thing to bend to erroneous beliefs. Some will argue that the end of [Pierce’s] paragraph would guarantee that this would never be perverted, but I know many who would warp it to think non-whites can be ‘Aryan’ too.

Here’s my response: Did Hitler embrace the philosophy of pantheists, or that of those *panentheists* who postulate an impersonal God who could intervene in history, though not through miracles, since it is not a theistic god? In my humble opinion, panentheism, rather than simple pantheism, might better correspond to the way Uncle Adolf described Providence favoring the Aryan people. One thing is certain: evolutionists affirm that all creatures are connected by a common ancestor. If so, even arthropods and the crown of evolution itself have a common ancestor. Divinity is perceived in some aspects of nature, such as trees, the colour of the sky against the backdrop of mountains, and some cute mammals, including the lutenists we see on the cover of this very book.

And considering that white man still lives in a psychotic age due to Christian ethics, only the expansion of the Master Plan East to the entire planet could guarantee that the phenotype of these divine creatures would be perpetuated as long as the sun lives... But yes: there are real monsters in nature like spiders, etc. And regarding the monsters of the natural world, my solution is extermination. Nature is the greatest exterminator in the universe: it has been exterminating ninety-nine percent of its species for hundreds of millions of years. If I’m a sort of apprentice to Kalki the Exterminator, I must say that getting rid of obsolete species is

fundamental to this Hindu archetype—a theme on which Savitri got it wrong. While she rightly criticized present-day primitive man, she idealized *all* animal species. We, on the other hand, want to exterminate most of them (imagine our little utopia with the city of Lys in Arthur Clarke’s futuristic novella, *Against the Fall of Night*).

If the Cro-Magnons exterminated the Neanderthals, then all the more reason we should exterminate the primitive versions of *Homo sapiens*. This doesn’t contradict panentheism. On the contrary: it is an essential part of the phenomenology of the spirit.



Blog post of 10 August 2021, edited in 2025. I wrote the Cro-Magnon phrase years before I discovered Danny Vendramini’s book, *Them and Us*.

On solving the problem of evil

by Gaedhal

I get the ‘Hell Planet’ idea from Dr Robert Morgan who is an explicit atheist and an explicit determinist and an explicit ‘eliminative materialist’. I on the other hand am a bit more of a Sheldrakean on these points. Morgan has read Sheldrake and rejects him, which is his right so to do. He has also read the antinatalist pessimist atheists Benatar and Schopenhauer more in-depthly than I have.

Pine Creek Doug once was asked if an asteroid were inbound that would destroy the Earth, and if he could press a button to restart abiogenesis and evolution on another planet he would do so. He initially said: ‘yes’ but then said ‘no’. I would say ‘yes’... However, in so doing, I will be fully cognizant of my calling into being all manner of evils: plagues, famines, paedophilia etc.

However, I would hope, that at the end of it all, intelligent sentient beings might find a way to solve the problem of evil. Instead of antinatalism, solving the problem of evil is a better use of our time because, for all we know, the Cosmos might call forth the

phenomenon of life somewhere else. Antinatalism doesn't actually solve the problem of evil. It just turns this small corner of the Cosmos into a sterile place devoid of life. Benatar wants eventually for mankind to nuke itself out of existence. I hope that I am not misrepresenting his position. Type in 'Alex O'Connor' and 'antinatalism' on YouTube for a discussion between Benatar and O'Connor. I would link to it but I don't want to. Antinatalism terrifies me. I want to give it a wide berth.

I am not a classically theistic God, which is why it is okay for me to press the abiogenesis button on Earth 2 somewhere in the Cosmos. However, as Dr Robert Morgan correctly points out: a classically theistic God who would use evolution to bring about life would be a sadist. Robert Morgan links people to videos of animals being eaten alive. This truly is a Hell Planet, and if a classically theistic God created it then he is evil by our reckoning; he is a sadist and a voyeur by our reckoning. With the misotheists, we should hate such a God.

Editor commented:

Nice theological reflections from Gaedhal. As for what he says—that, instead of anti-natalism, solving the problem of evil is a better use of our time—I can't help remembering how my religion of the four words,⁹ which fits perfectly with Hitler's panentheism, is the solution to the problem of evil.

These days I have been revising my Daybreak Press books for publication as PDFs. But I will make an exception for what I have written in my mother tongue (my trilogy). To edit them, it will be necessary to obtain the printed volumes (fortunately they haven't been censored, and I plan to translate them into English). That religion is the only way to understand how, in the end, we plan to solve the problem of evil, at least on Earth. To what Gaedhal said above I would add that if there is one word that defines my religion it is exterminationism, but obviously we don't mean *all* creatures on Earth. Hence I prefer the term panentheism to the term pantheism used by Richard Weikart in his books on Hitler.

⁹ *"Eliminad todo sufrimiento innecesario"* ('Let us eliminate all unnecessary suffering').

Gaedhal responded:

Exterminationism is a huge part of my plan to solve the problem of evil, as well. Life unfit for life, as the Nazis put it, is a huge part of the suffering on this planet. Life unfit for life tortures itself and others, and particularly the poor defenceless animals.

It is Christian axiology that makes us see in Life unfit for life the image of God. If the botched of this planet are images of God then why would you worship such a god?

30 July 2022

Am I a psychopath?

by Editor

On my website Autisticus Spasticus asked me:

César, there's something I've wanted to ask you for quite some time. Do you, personally, have it in you to kill non-white women and children in cold blood? Imagine they were lined up before you, black and Arab women and children, sobbing, pleading desperately for their lives as you level a machine gun at them. Could you bring yourself to do it? I'm genuinely curious. Have you ever given it much consideration?

The best way to answer him and others who ask me similar questions is through an experiment of the imagination, already mentioned in my trilogy, but now translated into English:

It is enough to see the photographs of mammals in laboratory experiments that are carried out throughout North America and Europe to perceive that *the human being is truly a wicked species*. I will not incur the rudeness of adding those photographs in this text: a task I leave to my readers.

My exterminating fantasies would not seem unhealthy if we do another thought experiment. In *Dies Irae* I quoted a non-fiction book by Arthur Clarke where he talked about the 'judgment from the Stars' that earthlings could experience. If we imagine that in real life someone similar to a Karellen visited our planet, what is the first thing he would see from his distant silver ships, far above the human tingling? Urban spots. Industries that destroy the environment and, bringing his cameras closer, abject human misery and inconceivable suffering of the other species that share the planet with us. If, as in Clarke's novel, the visitor also possessed machines to open a visual window to the past to study the species, he would perceive that, besides the hell that the naked apes

subject their cousins, through history and prehistory they had behaved in an absolutely horrendous way with their own children. It does not hurt to summarize the revelations of the previous pages.

With his machines to literally *see* the human past this hypothetical extra-terrestrial would be taken aghast by the magnitude of infanticide: nine percent of all human births. He would see thousands of young children slaughtered ritually, offered to the goddess of Babylon. He would see the infant sacrifices of the Pelasgians, the Syrians, the sacrifices in Gezer and in Egypt of the centuries that the earthlings call 10th to 8th before Christ. And let's not talk about what the visitor would see with his machines when focusing on the ancient Semites of Carthage, where the burning of living children ordered by their own parents reached levels that surpassed the exclamation of Sahagún. Something similar could be seen by our visitor about other Phoenicians, Canaanites, Moabites, Sepharvaim, and ancient Hebrews: who in their origins offered their firstborn as a sacrifice to their gods. With his magic to see our past, the alien visitor would learn that both the exposure and the abandonment of infants continued in Europe until a council took action against the custom of leaving the children to die in the open.

With technology based on unimaginable principles the visitor would also see much worse behaviour in the lands of coloured people: thousands of babies, mostly girls, abandoned in the streets of ancient China, and how those babies that were not abandoned were put in cold water until they died. He would see how in feudal Japan the baby was suffocated with wet paper covering her nose and mouth; how infanticide was systematic in the feudal Rajputs in India, sometimes throwing the living children to the crocodiles; and how in pre-Islamic Arabia they buried alive not a few new-borns. The visitor would also see that the sub-Saharan inhabitants of Africa killed their children much more frequently than other races did. He would even see that the sacrifice of children in Zimbabwe was practiced as recently as the beginning of the century that the earthlings call the 20th century. The window to the past would also make visible the incredibly massive slaughter of infants among the natives of the countless islands of Oceania, New Guinea and even more so among the extremely primitive

aborigines of Australia, Tasmania and Polynesia. He would realise that in the American tribes, including the redskins, infanticide continued at a time when the practice had been abandoned in Europe. The same happened not only in Central American and South American tribes, but also in the civilizations prior to the Spanish conquest: where the ritual sacrifice of women and children suggests that they did it out of pure sadism. Finally, the visitor would see how, after the Conquest, the sacrificial institution of the Mesoamerican and Inca Indians was forbidden only to be transferred to the animals in the so-called *santería* in times when our visitor no longer has to use his devices to open the Complete Book of History and Prehistory of the species he studies.

It's clear where I want to go... If it is legitimate for this hypothetical extra-terrestrial to remove from the face of the Earth a newly-arrived species whose haughtiness blinds them from seeing their evil ways, how can it be pathological for an earthling to arrive at identical conclusions? Just because, unlike the ET visitor, he lacks technological power? The sad truth is that the infanticidal passion and cruelty of primitive humans have not been atoned, only transferred to our cousins.

When approaching questions like those of Autisticus Spasticus, it is crucial not to fall into stereotypes like those films that Jews make about Nazis. In the real world, the scenario I imagine would liberate various areas by issuing calls to white men who want to fight in the Racial Holy Wars (RAHOWA), and to white women who want to procreate: Flee to the liberated areas, away from the archipelago of cities and towns that are about to be punished. Once those want to survive take their families to the liberated areas, electricity is cut off, and they are denied access to oil. Those who remain in Neanderthal lands will begin to die like flies. In the Jewish holy book, it is Yahweh who punishes with floods or fires, in RAHOWA it will be an Aryan Man redivivus who imitates the Neanderthal exterminators of our distant past.

None of this resembles the Hollywood stereotype, especially if all this is done in the name of the Four Words, like the alien in our *Gedanken experiment*. On the contrary: it is something that could be done with the utmost serenity and, preferably, without eye contact with those about to be exterminated, or with as little

contact as possible.

I call what the historical Neandertals would suffer *necessary* suffering (remember that the four words say something else: eliminate all unnecessary suffering): exactly what the prehistoric Neanderthals felt before the Cro-Magnons. It is the same as starting to exterminate the gangs of orcas that torture a whale calf for hours by slowly drowning it. By shooting them with Apache helicopters, the goal would not be to make the gang of orcas suffer, but to eliminate the unnecessary suffering of the calf. That an orca suffers after the massacre—let's imagine one of the gang dodges the rockets and ends up traumatised without a family—is what I call necessary suffering.

With the historic Neanderthal we would proceed the same. The distinction between necessary and unnecessary suffering is fundamental to understanding the point of view of the priest of the sacred words.

8 August 2022
(edited 2025)

Appendix

The following are excerpts from an English translation of one of the articles that originally appeared in the *Europa Soberana* webzine, authored by the Spaniard Eduardo Velasco.

The fate of the world according to the Indo-Aryans

All things on earth are attained by destruction,
for without destruction there can be no generation.

—Hermes Trismegistus

The cycles of the yuga

The twilight of the Kali Yuga would therefore have begun in the year 1939 of our era, in May.¹⁰ The final catastrophe will take place during this twilight. The last vestiges of present-day humanity will have disappeared by 2442.

Finally comes the fourth age or ‘age of conflict’, the Kali Yuga. It lasts 6,048 years. It will result in the almost total destruction of present-day humanity.

The predictions: the precursor signs

The period preceding the cataclysm that is to destroy the present species of humans is marked by the disorders that are heralding signs of its end. As happened in the case of the *asuras* (the demons in Hinduism), Shiva can only destroy those societies that have strayed from their role, and that have transgressed Natural Law. According to the theory of the cycles that regulate the evolution of the world, we are today approaching the end of the Kali Yuga, the age of conflicts, wars, genocides, embezzlements, aberrant philosophical and social systems and the evil development of knowledge falling into irresponsible hands. Races and castes are mixing. Everything tends to be levelled out in all areas: the prelude

¹⁰ Some important historical events in May 1939 are the appointment of Molotov as foreign minister of the USSR, the withdrawal of German and Italian troops from Spain, the ‘New Palestine Plan’ approved by the British and the German-Italian military alliance.

of death. At the end of the Kali Yuga this process is accelerated. The phenomenon of acceleration is one of the signs of the approaching catastrophe. The *Puranas* describe the signs that characterise the last period.

According to the *Linga Purana*:

It is the baser instincts that stimulate the men of the Kali Yuga. They prefer to choose false ideas.

In the age of Kali false doctrines and misleading writings spread.

Most of the new chiefs will be of *Sudra* origin. They will persecute the Brahmins [*high caste, light-skinned*] and those with wisdom.

Foetuses in their mother's womb will be killed and heroes murdered.

Sudras will pretend to behave like Brahmins, and Brahmins like Sudras.

Thieves will become kings, kings will become thieves.

Many will be the women who will have relations with several men.

Men who do not possess the virtues of warriors will become kings.

There will be many displaced people, wandering from country to country.

Good men will give up their active roles.

Young girls will trade their virginity.

Everyone will use harsh and rude words.

Rape will be frequent. Many individuals will be perfidious, lubricious, vile and reckless. They will wear their hair in disarray.

People will become inactive, lethargic and aimless.

Heretics will oppose the principle of the four castes.

—*Linga Purana*, Chapter 40.

According to the *Vishnu Purana* (Book VI, Chapter 1):

The people of the Kali Yuga will pretend to ignore caste differences and the sacredness of marriage which ensures the continuity of a race, the relationship of teacher to pupil and the importance of rites. During the Kali Yuga people of any origin will marry girls of any race.

Women will become independent and look for beautiful men. They will adorn themselves with extravagant hairstyles and leave a poor husband for a rich man. They will be slim, greedy and attached to pleasure. They will produce too many children but will be little respected. They will be interested only in themselves, they will be selfish and their words will be perfidious and deceitful. Highborn women will indulge in the desires of the vilest men and perform obscene acts.

Men will want nothing more than to make money, the richest will be the ones in power.

The heads of state will no longer protect the people but, through taxation, will appropriate all the wealth.

People will believe in illusory theories. There will be no more morals and the length of life will be shortened.

People will accept as articles of faith the theories promulgated by anyone. False gods will be worshipped in false temples.

The Sudras will claim equality with the brahmins. The cows will not be saved because they will give milk.

Many will commit suicide. Suffering from hunger and misery, sad and desperate, many will emigrate to the countries where wheat and rye grow.

—*Vishnu Purana*, VI. 1.

According to the *Linga Purana* (Chapter 40):

During the twilight period when the Yuga ends, the Justiciar will come and slay the wicked.¹¹ He will be born in the Moon dynasty. His name is *Samiti* ('War'). He will roam the earth with a vast army. He will destroy the *mléçhā* ('barbarians', 'foreigners') by the thousands. He will destroy the low-caste people who have seized royal power and will exterminate false philosophers, criminals and people of mixed blood. He will begin his campaign in

¹¹ Interesting mention of what might be considered as the 'Messiah' or saviour of spirituality and destroyer of decadence, which fits in quite well with the various traditions, existing in so many peoples, about a great chief or king, who would have died under unclear conditions and who would supposedly be 'hibernating' to awaken in a future moment of maximum danger to save his people from destruction. [Editor's Note: This Justiciar is Kalki, the last incarnation of Shiva in Hindu eschatology.]

his thirty-second year and continue for twenty more. He will kill billions of people. The earth will be razed to the ground.

They will be hungry, they will be sick and they will know despair. It is then that some will begin to reflect.

—*Linga Purana*, Chapter 40.

The predictions about the end of the world

A mass of fire will rotate with a great roar. Enveloped in these circles of fire all moving and immobile beings will be destroyed.

—*Vishnu Purana*, I, Chapter 8, 18-31.

These gigantic clouds, making a terrible noise, will darken the sky and flood the earth with a rain of dust that will extinguish the terrible fire. Then, through endless flood, they will inundate the whole world.

—*Vishnu Purana* I, Chapter 7, 24-40.

When reading the descriptions in the *Puranas*, it is difficult not to think of nuclear weapons.

The end of the Kali Yuga is a particularly favourable period for investigation and search for true wisdom.

**Ragnarok: the fate of the world
according to the Germanic peoples**

In the mentality of our ancestors the first ages were times of justice, harmony, beauty and wisdom, which gradually became corrupted into times of betrayal, conflict, violence, dishonour, forgetfulness of the gods and rites, evil, materialism, miscegenation and being trapped by the dark powers that oppose the gods.

For the Germanic people the Age of the Wolf, the last of all ages, would be a time of wars and catastrophes, ending in Ragnarok ('fate of the gods', also 'twilight of the gods'). A few gods and men will survive this struggle, and with the ruins of the Iron Age they will build a new golden age.

Let us look at the symbolic language elaborated by the subconscious instinct of the primitive Germanic people to be able to express themselves and thus engrave themselves in the collective Germanic memory. It must be made clear once again that it is symbolic, that each element has a meaning and that it is not to be taken literally, as if it were a simple story. (In the same way, no one interprets a dream literally, but tries to dive into the symbols.) It is telling that the Germanic people, an Indo-European branch at the opposite geographical extreme to the Indo-Aryans, had a concept of the end of the cycle very similar to that of their Eastern cousins.

This would mean the end of man and life, and the destruction of the nine worlds; but one human couple, *Lif* ('Life') and *Lifþrasir* ('he who wills life', or 'desire to live'), will survive by climbing the Ygdrasil tree, the axis of the world.

The Germans, then, were pessimistic in their conception of the progressive degeneration of mankind that, when it hits rock bottom, will trigger the awakening of the gods and a world war that will end the present world as we know it.

How were these ideas forged?

In short, where did those Hindus and Germans get all these ideas from? Because we are talking about very specific predictions and, to top it all, much of it is coming true.

Symbols were an effective way of skipping tedious data and long explanations, and of directly reaching people who were in a position to understand them. It is well-known that a word to the wise is enough. The problem is that generally, today, the conditions in which we live are so far removed from those in which our ancestors were immersed that we are unable to process the symbolic range they handled, since it was designed for people with a psychological horizon dominated by the earth, living creatures and the beyond, intense physical activity, clan cohesion, courage, fog, cold, snow, folk legends, forests, the importance of the solar cycle, mystery and fascination with a world that is perceived to be entirely alive and full of energy and movement... Whereas we are accustomed to the masses of concrete and glass: the four walls of a room, discotheque, school, high school or university; to harmful substances that attack human biology, television series, ideas hostile to our mind and aberrant lifestyles.

Christianity persecuted this wisdom. Still, certain traditions have survived and in Iceland, a medieval republic formed by Norwegians and the world's oldest democracy, the idea of 'Ragnarok' was written down.

Many people don't believe in all this. It is not my intention to convince them that there is clairvoyance, the 'beyond' and all these matters, but even the most sceptical and materialistic will have to recognise, in any case, that any natural society possessed instinctive wisdom which has been lost with the advent of the technological revolution, and that traditional societies are 'more spiritual' than modern ones.