

FROM SLAVE TO EMPEROR - FAMOUS HISTORIANS ON THE RACIAL CHANGE LEADING TO THE FALL OF THE CLASSICAL ROMAN CIVILIZATION

All civilizations fall only if the people who made those civilizations vanish. This is a truth, which applies to all races, nations, and people: as long as the people who created a particular civilization survive, and are present in significant numbers, the civilization that they created, will continue.

Once those people vanish, then their civilization vanishes with them. There is no escaping this iron law of nature.

Classical Rome, one of the mightiest nations of the ancient world, was no exception to this rule. Although historians tend to focus on economic, moral, or military reasons for the fall of Rome, the real reason why this mighty civilization fell was because the very people who established the Roman civilization, ceased making up the majority population in and around Rome.

Although many historians have either ignored the racial factor in the cause of the fall of the Roman Empire - and some have never even thought about it - there have been many who have recognized race as the critical element. Amongst the more famous of these were professor Tenney Frank, from the Johns Hopkins University. Professor Frank, a recognized authority on the history of ancient Rome, is most famous for his work "An Economic History of Rome" (New York, Cooper Square Publishers, 1927, reprinted 1962) but his other works included the important "Race mixture in the Roman Empire" published in the American Historical Review, volume 21 pages 689-708.

(Available on the Internet at:

<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jstor/ahr/ahr-21-4-toc.html>)

Along with Frank, many other well known and respected historians dealt with the issue of how the Roman population changed. Amongst these were professor A.M. Duff; Charles Merivale; George La Piana; Theodor Mommsen; and the multiple authors of both the Cambridge Ancient History and the Encyclopedia Britannica's Historians History of the World.

Below follows a selection of quotations from all these sources, discussing the change in the racial makeup of classical Roman society.

FRANK'S FIRST CLUE: NAME CHANGES IN ROMAN SOCIETY

In his piece, "Race mixture in the Roman Empire", Frank outlined how he first realized that race mixture was the cause of the change in Roman society. By studying the names of graves on the Appian Way in Rome, he found that huge numbers of late Roman Republic inhabitants had names which originated in the Levant, or Middle East, in strong contrast to the early inhabitants of Rome, who had Latin names.

Frank describes it so:

"There is one surprise that the historian usually experiences upon his first visit to Rome. It may be the Galleria Lapidaria of the Vatican or at the Lateran Museum, but, if not elsewhere, it can hardly escape him upon his first walk up the Appian Way. As he stops to decipher the names upon the old tombs that line the road, hoping to chance upon one familiar to him from his Cicero or Livy, he finds praenomen and nomen promising enough,

but the cognomina all seem awry. L. Lucretius Pamphilus, A. Aemilius Alexa, M. Clodius Philostogas do not smack of freshman Latin. And he will not readily find in the Roman writers now extant an answer to the questions that these inscriptions invariably raise. Do these names imply that the Roman stock was completely changed after Cicero's day, and was the satirist (Juvenal) recording a fact when he wailed that the Tiber had captured the waters of the Syrian Orontes? If so, are these foreigners ordinary immigrants, or did Rome become a nation of ex-slaves and their offspring?"

(Frank, Tenney, 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21,
<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jstor/ahr/ahr-21-4-toc.html>)

"Unfortunately, most of the sociological and political data of the empire are provided by satirists. When Tacitus informs us that in Nero's day a great many of Rome's senators and knights were descendants of slaves and that the native stock had dwindled to surprisingly small proportions, we are not sure whether we are not to take it as an exaggerated thrust by an indignant Roman of the old stock."

(Frank, Tenney, 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21,
<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jstor/ahr/ahr-21-4-toc.html>)

"To discover some new light upon these fundamental questions of Roman history, I have tried to gather such fragmentary data as the corpus of inscriptions might afford. This evidence is never decisive in its purport, and it is always, by the very nature of the material, partial in its scope, but at any rate it may help us to interpret our literary sources to some extent. It has at least convinced me that Juvenal and Tacitus were not exaggerating. It is probable that when these men wrote a very small percentage of the free plebians on the streets of Rome could prove unmixed Italian descent. By far the larger part - perhaps ninety percent - had Oriental blood in their veins."

(Frank, Tenney, 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21,
<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jstor/ahr/ahr-21-4-toc.html>)

PATTERN REPEATED ELSEWHERE

Frank then went on to make a determined study of the tombs and monuments in Rome and surrounds, drawing up a database of over 13,900 different names. His analysis of those names drew the conclusion that about 75 percent of those names were not Latin in origin.

Frank wrote:

"For reasons which will presently appear I have accepted the Greek cognomen as a true indication of recent foreign extraction, and, since citizens of native stock did not as a rule unite in marriage with liberti, a Greek cognomen in a child or one parent is sufficient of status (i.e., was foreign)."

(Frank, Tenney, 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21p. 691).

"On the other hand, the question has been raised whether a man with a Greek cognomen must invariably be of foreign stock. Could it not be that Greek names became so popular that, like Biblical and classical names

today, they were accepted by the Romans of native stock? In the last days of the empire this may have been the case; but the inscriptions prove that the Greek cognomen was not in good repute. I have tested this matter by classifying all the instances in the 13,900 inscriptions where the names of both father and son appear. From this it appears that fathers with Greek names are very prone to give Latin names to their children, whereas the reverse is not true."

(Frank, Tenney, 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21pp. 692, 693).

"Clearly the Greek name was considered as a sign of dubious origin among the Roman plebians, and the freedman family that rose to any social ambitions made short shift of it. For these reasons, therefore, I consider that the presence of a Greek name in the immediate family is good evidence that the subject of the inscription is of servile or foreign stock. The conclusion of our pro's and con's must be that nearly ninety per cent of the Roman-born folk represented in the above mentioned sepulchral inscriptions are of foreign extraction."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21, p. 693)

NOT GREEKS, BUT MIDDLE EASTERNERS

These "Greek" names were for the greatest part not Greeks at all, and were Middle Easterners who had adopted Greek names, particularly after the conquest of their region by Alexander the Great.

The writer Juvenal, speaking of the Roman population, actually points out the Levantine origin of many of these people in his writings, referring to the Syrian River, the Orontes:

"These dregs call themselves Greeks but how small a portion is from Greece; the River Orontes has long flowed into the Tiber"
(Juvenal, III, 62).

Frank himself went on to describe where these people with Greek names had come from:

"Therefore, when the urban inscriptions show that seventy per cent of the city slaves and freedmen bear Greek names and that a larger portion of the children who have Latin names have parents of Greek names, this at once implies that the East was the source of most of them, and with that inference Bang's conclusions (Dr. Bang of Germany) entirely agree. In his list of slaves that specify their origin as being outside Italy (during the empire), by far the larger portion came from the Orient, especially from Syria and the provinces of Asia Minor, with some from Egypt and Africa (which for racial classification may be taken with the Orient). Some are from Spain and Gaul, but a considerable portion of these came originally from the East."

"Very few slaves are recorded from the Alpine and Danube provinces, while Germans rarely appear, except among the imperial bodyguard. Bang remarks that Europeans were of greater service to the empire as soldiers than servants. This is largely true, but, as Strach has commented, the more robust European war-captives were apt to be chosen for the grueling work in the mines and in industry, and largely they have vanished from the

records. Such slaves were probably also the least productive of the class; and this, in turn, helps to explain the strikingly Oriental aspect of the new population."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21, pp. 700,701).

FRANK DETAILS RACIAL CHANGE IN ROME

Frank went on to explain the push and pull effect that led to the racial makeup change in Rome: of how native Romans were drawn away from Rome by colonization and military service, and of how their places were taken up by slaves, in serfdom and as freedmen, in Rome itself:

"There are other questions that enter into the problem of change of race at Rome, for the solution of which it is even more difficult to obtain statistics. For instance, one asks, without hope of a sufficient answer, why the native stock did not better hold its own. Yet there are at hand not a few reasons. We know for instance that when Italy had been devastated by Hannibal and a large part of its population put to the sword, immense bodies of slaves were brought up in the East to fill the void; and that during the second century B.C., when the plantation system with its slave service was coming into vogue, the natives were pushed out of the small farms and many disappeared to the provinces of the ever-expanding empire."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21 p. 703).

"Thus, during the thirty years before Tiberius Gracchus, the census statistics show no increase. During the first century B. C., the importation of captives and slaves continued, while the free-born citizens were being wasted in the social, Sullan, and civil wars. Augustus affirms that he had had half a million citizens under arms, one eighth of Rome's citizens, and that the most vigorous part."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21 p. 703).

"During the early empire, twenty to thirty legions, drawn of course from the best free stock, spent their twenty years of vigor in garrison duty while the slaves, exempt from such services, lived at home and increased in numbers. In other words, the native stock was supported by less than a normal birthrate, whereas the stock of foreign extraction had not only a fairly normal birthrate but a liberal quota of manumissions to its advantage."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21 p. 703).

HOW MANY SLAVES IN ROME?

It is estimated that the slave population of Rome and its immediate surrounding area at the time of Augustus (circa 30 BC) was some 300,000-350,000 out of a population of about 900,000-950,000.

(Hopkins, K. Conquerors and Slaves. Sociological Studies in Roman History, Volume 1. Cambridge,1978)

For all of Italy, the figure is approximately the same. A figure of around two

million slaves out of a population of about six million at the time of Augustus is accurate - this means that at this early stage one in every three persons in Rome and Italy was a slave.

(John Madden, *Slavery in the Roman Empire - Numbers and Origins*, University College, Galway, *Classics Ireland*, 1996 Volume 3, University College, Dublin, Ireland <http://www.ucd.ie/~classics/96/Madden96.html>)

NATIVE ROMAN DEPOPULATION SPEEDED UP BY COLONIZATION

The historian George La Piana has the following to add about how native Romans were drawn away from Rome by colonization and of how 'new races' took their place in Rome:

"To this increase in the population the native stock seems not to have contributed much. Decimated by long wars, fought by citizen crimes, which secured to Rome a Mediterranean empire, its ranks were thinned still further by the withdrawal of colonies of citizens to the provinces beyond the sea and by a heavy decline in the birthrate even among the poorer classes. The native Roman and Italian population steadily dwindled and the gaps were filled by new races."

(George La Piana, *Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire*, *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. XX, pp. 188, 189).

LAWS TO ENCOURAGE NATIVE ROMAN BIRTHRATE FAIL

Far thinking Roman leaders saw the decline in native Roman numbers and the threat it posed: Professor A.M Duff remarks:

"One of the most serious evils with which the imperial government was called upon to contend was the decline in population. Not only had the Italian stock almost disappeared from the towns, but the descendants of freedmen had not been born in sufficient numbers to take its place. Accordingly, while the Lex Papia Poppaea offered privileges to freeborn citizens for the possession of three children, it used the whole question of inheritances of freedmen and freedwomen for the encouragement of procreation."

(A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, Oxford Univ. Press 1928, p. 191).

Charles Merivale, another renowned expert on Roman history, continues the story:

"The centre of the empire had been more exhausted by the civil wars than any of the provinces. The rapid disappearance of the free population had been remarked with astonishment and dismay, at least from the time of the Gracchi. If the numbers actually maintained on the soil of the Peninsula had not diminished, it was abundantly certain that the independent native races had given way almost throughout its extent to a constant importation of slaves."

(Charles Merivale, *The Romans Under the Empire*, vol. 2. pp. 395, 396. 397).

"The remedies to which Caesar resorted would appear as frivolous as they were arbitrary He prohibited all citizens between the age of twenty and forty from remaining abroad more than three years together, while, as a matter of state policy, he placed more special restrictions

upon the movements of the youths of senatorial families."
(Charles Merivale, *The Romans Under the Empire*, vol. 2. pp. 395, 396.
397).

CAESAR TRIES TO RESTRICT SLAVE INFLUX INTO ROME

Merivale also points out how Julius Caesar himself saw the danger of slave labor flooding Rome, and actually passed a law forbidding certain types of labor-intensive work from using only slaves:

"He (Caesar) required also that the owners of herds and flocks, to the maintenance of which large tracts of Italy were exclusively devoted, should employ free labour to the extent of at least one-third of the whole. Such laws could only be executed constantly under the vigilant superintendance of a sovereign ruler. They fell in fact into immediate disuse, or rather were never acted upon at all. They served no other purpose at the time but to evince Caesar's perception of one of the fatal tendencies of the age (i.e. race deterioration in Italy), to which the eyes of most statesmen of the day were already open."

(Charles Merivale, *The Romans Under the Empire*, vol. 2. pp. 395, 396.
397).

ROMAN FATE SEALED

Duff pointed out that even by the time of Octavian Augustus, there were significant numbers of 'Orientals' in Rome:

"Even in Augustus' day the process of Orientalization had gone too far. The great emperor saw the clouds, but he did not know they had actually burst. His legislation would have been a prudent and not a whit excessive a century earlier; but in his time Rome was a cosmopolitan city, and the doom of the Empire was already sealed"

(A.M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, pp. 207, 208).

'THE RACE WENT UNDER'

Frank's study of the Roman family lines revealed exactly how native Romans vanished. He writes:

"The race went under. The legislation of Augustus and his successors, while aiming at preserving the native stock, was of the myopic kind so usual in social lawmaking, and failing to reckon with the real nature of the problem involved, it utterly missed the mark. By combining epigraphical and literary references, a fairly full history of the noble families can be procured, and this reveals a startling inability of such families to perpetuate themselves."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': *American Historical Review*, Volume 21: pp. 704, 705).

"We know, for instance, in Caesar's day of forty-five patricians, only one of whom is represented by posterity when Hadrian came to power. The Aemilii, Fabii, Claudii, Manlii, Valerii, and all the rest, with the exception of Comelii, have disappeared. Augustus and Claudius raised twenty-five families to the patriciate, and all but six disappear before

Nerva's reign. Of the families of nearly four hundred senators recorded in 65 A.D. under Nero, all trace of a half is lost by Nerva's day, a generation later. And the records are so full that these statistics may be assumed to represent with a fair degree of accuracy the disappearance of the male stock of the families in question."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21: pp. 704, 705).

"Of course members of the aristocracy were the chief sufferers from the tyranny of the first century, but this havoc was not all wrought by delatores and assassins. The voluntary choice of childlessness accounts largely for the unparalleled condition. This is as far as the records help in this problem, which, despite the silences is probably the most important phase of the whole question of the change of race. Be the causes what they may, the rapid decrease of the old aristocracy and the native stock was clearly concomitant with a twofold increase from below; by a more normal birth-rate of the poor, and the constant manumission of slaves."

(Frank, Tenney 1916 'Race mixture in the Roman Empire': American Historical Review, Volume 21: pp. 704, 705).

ROMAN SOCIETY BECAME "ORIENTALIZED"

Duffy goes on to describe the social change process at work in Roman society:

"It may be asked in this connexion what became of the Latin and Italian stock. Reasons may be given for the coming of the foreigners, but at the same time some explanation may be demanded for the disappearance of the native. In the first place there was a marked decline in the birthrate among the aristocratic families. . . . As society grew more pleasureloving, as convention raised artificially the standard of living, the voluntary choice of celibacy and childlessness became a common feature among the upper classes."

(Duff, A.M., Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire, Cambridge, Engl: W Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1958 (1928), p. 200).

"But what of the lower-class Romans of the old stock? They were practically untouched by revolution and tyranny, and the growth of luxury cannot have affected them to the same extent as it did the nobility. Yet even here the native stock declined. The decay of agriculture. . . drove numbers of farmers into the towns, where, unwilling to engage in trade, they sank into unemployment and poverty, and where, in their endeavours to maintain a high standard of living, they were not able to support the cost of rearing children. Many of these free-born Latins were so poor that they often complained that the foreign slaves were much better off than they - and so they were."

(Duff, A.M., Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire, Cambridge, Engl: W Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1958 (1928), pp. 200, 201).

"At the same time many were tempted to emigrate to the colonies across the sea which Julius Caesar and Augustus founded. Many went away to Romanize the provinces, while society was becoming Orientalized at home. Because slave labour had taken over almost all jobs, the free born could not compete with them. They had to sell their small farms or businesses and move to the cities. Here they were placed on the doles because of unemployment. They were, at first, encouraged to emigrate to the more

prosperous areas of the empire – to Gaul, North Africa and Spain. Hundreds of thousands left Italy and settled in the newly-acquired lands.”
(Duff, A.M., *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Engl: W Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1958 (1928), pp. 200, 201).

“Such a vast number left Italy – leaving it to the Orientals – that finally restrictions had to be passed to prevent the complete depopulation of the Latin stock, but as we have seen, the laws were never effectively put into force. The migrations increased and Italy was being left to another race. The free-born Italian, anxious for land to till and live upon, displayed the keenest colonization activity.”
(Duff, A.M., *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, Cambridge, Engl: W Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1958 (1928), pp. 200, 201).

The desire of Romans to emigrate to other areas of the empire, is mentioned by the Roman writer Seneca, who stated that Romans looked for every opportunity to leave their native country:

“This people (the Romans), how many colonies has it sent to every province! Wherever the Roman conquers, there he dwells. With a view to this change of country, volunteers would gladly ascribe their name, and even the old man, leaving his home would follow the colonists overseas.”
(Seneca, *Helvia on Consolation*, VII, 7).

Mommsen and Duff continue:

“The Latin stock of Italy underwent an alarming diminution, and its fair provinces were overspread partly by parasitic immigrants, partly by sheer desolation. A considerable portion of the population of Italy flocked to foreign lands. Already the aggregate amount of talent and of working power, which the supply of Italian magistrates and Italian garrisons for the whole domain of the Mediterranean demanded, transcended the resources of the peninsula, especially as the elements thus sent abroad were in great part lost for ever to the nation.”
(Theodor Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, vol. V., p. 393).
“The Roman thus gave away to the Easterner in Italy, while he made a place for himself in the provinces.”
(Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, p. 202).

“THE SCANTY NUMBER OF FREE BORN” ROMANS – TACITUS

The Cambridge Ancient History adds:

“With thoughtful citizens, partly owing to the Stoic doctrine of the fraternity of man, humaner views gradually spread and made for amelioration in the lot of servitude, and for so much readiness in masters to liberate slaves that Augustus, recognizing the serious infiltration of alien blood into the body politic, introduced restrictions on manumission.”
(Cambridge Ancient History, vol. VI, pp. 755, 756).

“Yet this proved but a slight check, and Tacitus records a significant remark that ‘if freedmen were marked off as a separate grade, then the scanty number of free-born would be evident.’ This shows how very few native free-born were left in Italy by our era. This freemen were now

freedmen – ex-slaves or their descendants. They were taking over the complete population. The rise of successful freedmen to riches made a social change of the utmost moment, and the wealth amassed by a Narcissus or a Pallas gives point to Martial's use of 'wealthy freedmen' as something proverbial.

(Cambridge Ancient History, vol. VI, pp. 755, 756).

"SLAVES FROM THE EASTERN PROVINCES NUMERICALLY PREPONDERANT IN ROME"

Freed slaves, mostly of Syrian or Eastern extraction, soon became numerically strong in Rome itself. The Emperor Philip was in fact born in Syria, and became known as "Philip the Arabian" as a result.

"It seems unquestionable that the slaves from the eastern provinces were numerically preponderant in Rome, and – what is still more important – that they played a more important part in Roman life. . . . The large population of slaves gave rise to a numerous class of foreign origin, the *liberti* or freedmen, which came to play an important part in the life of the city. Rome's policy of manumitting slaves was very liberal and the grant of freedom and citizenship made it possible for them to become merged in the citizen body of Rome. Former slaves and sons of slaves spread into trades and crafts that required civil standing, and in Cicero's day it was these people who already constituted the larger element of the plebian classes."

(La Piana, Foreign Groups in Rome, pp. 190, 191).

"One thing which must, most of all, have shocked the aristocracy, even though of recent date, was the large number of Orientals, especially freedmen, who – had been given some of the highest posts in the empire."
(Cambridge Ancient History, vol. X, p. 727).

Tacitus complains that in Nero's day most of the senators and members of the aristocracy were now men of ex-slave status – and most of these were of Eastern origin.

"The reign of Nero saw no abatement in the power of the imperial freedmen (ex-slaves). When Agrippina was accused of treason, freedmen were present to hear her defense. One of Nero's freedmen, Polyclitus, was actually employed as an arbitrator between a senator and a knight; for when Suetonius Paullinus, the legate of Britain, had disputes with his procurator, Polycritus was sent to settle their differences. He proceeded to the island (of Britain) with the gorgeous train of an Oriental potentate, but the barbarians failed to comprehend why their conqueror should bow the knee to a slave. When Nero went on his theatrical tour to Greece he left the freedman, Helius, in charge of Rome. Twelve years before this menial had been employed by Nero to murder Silanus; and was now absolute master of the imperial city."

(Duff, pp. 178, 179).

By the Third Century AD, many of the emperors were actually descendants of the slaves of earlier centuries. La Piana states it this way:

"The denationalized capital of the great empire, came to be ruled by the

offspring of races which originally had come to the city only to serve."
(La Piana, Foreign Groups in Rome, p. 223).

'90 PERCENT' OF ROME'S POPULATION OF 'SERVILE EXTRACTION'

Based on his research, Frank goes on to estimate that as much as 90 percent of the population of the city of Rome was of "servile extraction." While this 90 percent would not all have been of foreign race, the majority most certainly were. Frank states:

"But however numerous the offspring of the servile classes, unless the Romans had been liberal in the practice of manumission, these people would not have merged with the civil population. Now, literary and legal records present abundant evidence of an unusual liberality in this practice at Rome, and the facts need not be repeated after the full discussion of Wallon, Buckland, Freulander, Dill, Lemonnier, and Cicotti. If there were any doubt that the laws passed in the early empire for the partial restriction of manumission did not seriously check the practice, the statistics given at the beginning of the paper should allay it. When from eighty to ninety per cent of the urban population proves to have been of servile extraction, we can only conclude that manumissions were not seriously restricted."
(Frank, *ibid.*, pp. 698, 699).

"By far the larger part - perhaps ninety per cent - had Oriental blood in their veins"
(Frank, *ibid.*, p. 690).

CHANGE OF RACE EXPLAINS CHANGE IN CIVILIZATION - FRANK

"This Orientalization of Rome's populace has a more important bearing than is usually accorded it upon the larger question of why the spirit and acts of imperial Rome are totally different from those of the republic. There was a complete change in the temperament!" wrote Frank.
(Frank, *ibid.*, p. 705).

"There is today a healthy activity in the study of the economic factors that contributed to Rome's decline. But what lay behind and constantly reacted upon all such causes of Rome's disintegration was, after all, to a considerable extent, the fact that the people who had built Rome had given way to a different race."
(Frank, *ibid.*, p. 705).

"The lack of energy and enterprise, the failure of foresight and common sense, the weakening of moral and political stamina, all were concomitant with the gradual diminution of the stock which, during the earlier days, had displayed these qualities."
(Frank, *ibid.*, p. 705).

The Cambridge Ancient History put it this way:

"What of the enormous change in intellectual outlook and spiritual atmosphere between Augustus and Constantine? Is not the result something more Oriental than Greek or Roman in type and temper?"

(Cambridge Ancient History, vol. XII, p. 448).

Frank adds:

"The cumulative effect of these Oriental religions helped to break the old Roman character. Another more powerful solvent was also inherited from slavery and manumissions. The profuse intermixture of race, containing without interruption from 200 B.C. far into the history of the Empire, produced a type utterly different from that which characterized the heroes of the early republic. Instead of the hardy and patriotic Roman with his proud indifference to pecuniary gain, we find too often under the Empire an idle pleasure-loving cosmopolitan whose patriotism goes no further than applying for the dole and swelling the crowds in the amphitheatre."
(Frank, *ibid.*, pp. 205, 206).

SLAVERY THE KEY

The Historians History of the World, edited by HS Williams, and published by the Encyclopedia Britannica underlines the importance of slavery in this change in Roman society:

"Slavery was the most determined enemy of that spirit of conservatism and tradition which had been the strength of the Roman race. The slaves did not spring from the soil of Rome, their recollections and affections were elsewhere, and when they became citizens they did not hesitate to welcome foreign customs and to introduce them into the city. Whilst the statesmen and leading men wore themselves out in trying to preserve what remained of the ancient spirit and old customs, down below, amongst those classes of the populace which were constantly being recruited from slavery, there was a continual working to destroy it. It was thus that, thanks to this secret and powerful influence, new religions easily spread throughout the empire."

(The Historians' History of the World, A Comprehensive Narrative of the Rise and Development of Nations from the Earliest Times as recorded by over Two Thousand of the Great Writers of All Ages. Edited with the Assistance of a Distinguished Board of Advisers and Contributors by Henry Smith Williams, LL.D. In Twenty-Seven Volumes. Volume XXI—Scotland and Ireland; England Since 1792. London & New York: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1904 [5th ed., 1926]. vol. 6, p. 365)

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF NATIVE BORN ROMAN EMPERORS

The replacement of the original Roman people by immigrants was marked first at the lowest levels of society, but then gradually made its way up through all levels.

Septimus Severus was the first Roman Emperor who was not of Roman extraction, born as he was a Phoenician from North Africa. His wife was Julia Domna, a Syrian. Severus was succeeded by his two sons, who reigned for awhile together then successively. The throne later came to two grandsons. In all, the Syro-Phoenicians dominated the Roman Empire from 193 A.D. to 235 A.D.

THE SYRIAN EMPERORS

The Historian's History describes this period so;

"The Syrian emperors, as far as political traditions are concerned, inasmuch as they were not Romans and had none of the Roman prejudices, often give proof of an openness of mind which would have been impossible to the great emperors of the second century, all of whom were intensely conservative. They flung the doors of the empire wide open."

(The Historians' History of the World, A Comprehensive Narrative of the Rise and Development of Nations from the Earliest Times as recorded by over Two Thousand of the Great Writers of All Ages. Edited with the Assistance of a Distinguished Board of Advisers and Contributors by Henry Smith Williams, LL.D. In Twenty-Seven Volumes. Volume XXI—Scotland and Ireland; England Since 1792. London & New York: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1904 [5th ed., 1926]. vol. 6, p. 404).

CONCLUSION: A SUPPRESSED VIEW OF HISTORY

It is therefore clear that many famous historians who studied the classical Roman era in depth, saw clearly the change in race which took place as being the primary cause of the fall of that civilization.

In summary:

1. The original Roman people were dissipated by war, foreign service in the military and emigration to their colonies;
2. Their place in Rome and surrounds was taken by the wholesale importation of slaves, the majority of whom had come from the mixed race southeastern reaches of the empire;
3. Eventually not even the emperors themselves were of Roman extraction; and
4. As a result, the remaining Roman population became increasingly of mixed racial origin as time progressed.

The importance of this racial change was not lost on many famous historians, but the modern era's censorship of the issue of race as a determining factor, has led to the deliberate suppression of the work of Frank (and others). Nonetheless, the accuracy and validity of their observations remain as true as ever, and provide the real answer for the fall of the classical Roman civilization.

[Back to White History Main Page](#)