

Canadian Heritage Alliance :: Articles :: Erik the Norseman :: Just Who? Is an Aboriginal?

Thursday, February 24, 2005

[GET INVOLVED](#)

[SITE MAP](#)

[RESOURCES & MORE](#)

[MESSAGE BOARD](#)

[Search the Site](#)

[Email Newsletter](#)

[HTML](#) [Text](#)

Articles: Erik the Norseman
Staff Journalist - email - bio

Just Who? Is an Aboriginal?
By Erik the Norseman
Canadian Heritage News July 2002

According to the latest archaeological evidence, some twenty to twenty-five thousand years ago the first human settlers began arriving in North America. They came across the Bering land bridge and down through the corridor between retreating glaciers. They were NOT related to current 'Native' populations. They were Caucasoid and the ancestors of Kennewick man. The glaciers started advancing again, driving the Caucasoid peoples South. The glaciers then isolated these peoples from further human migrations.

After some eight thousand years, the glaciers again retreated and new waves of migrants began working their way East and South from Asia into the Americas. Archaeologists have traced these migrations. These new peoples have been identified, racially, as the ancestors of modern Aborigines (Amerinds). Their remains have been found and dated. Their tools and weapons were distinctive. By these means, their gradual migration South can be traced.

As the ancestors of the Amerindians moved South, they encountered the ORIGINAL (Caucasoid) peoples who were following the retreating glaciers North. The result was a war of extermination. This can be concluded from the fact that there remains no trace of those original Caucasoid peoples amongst the current 'Native' populations. The claim, by Indians, that Kennewick man was their ancestor is absurd! They murdered him. They didn't make love with him. The definitive evidence of this can be found in the remains of Kennewick man himself.

Kennewick man died violently. Embedded in his hip bone is a stone spear point. The features of this artifact are distinctive and has been positively identified as being made by the invading Amerindians (for lack of any other suitable racial designation).

The above should prove that whatever title to land current Amerinds lay claim to is held by adverse possession. Can 'any' people who hold title by way of adverse possession make claim to ABORIGINAL title?

The extermination of the ORIGINAL, Caucasoid Aboriginal peoples of the Americas by invading Amerinds does not put an end to the Aboriginal - Land claim issues.

As these new arrivals spread South and East, some settled along the way. These were displaced, conquered and scattered, by succeeding migrants who in their turn would be displaced etc., until the sea level rose and cut off the migration route.

Thereafter, we know from archaeological evidence, that the various Indian 'Nations' were engaged in almost continuous warfare. Warfare resulting in conquest of land, dispersal and assimilation of peoples etc. This continued until the White Man arrived and eventually put a stop to it.

Along the North West Coast, for example, the current Amerindian Nations are engaged in treaty negotiations and Court battles for Aboriginal rights and title. Since we know that these peoples were not the first Amerindians to occupy these lands, indeed they displaced the previous occupants by force, their only right to these lands is the right of might.

Another example: The Aztecs were a primitive nomadic people who managed to conquer a much higher civilization in Mexico before they greeted the Spaniards as 'Aboriginals?'

Again the question must be asked. Can a people who hold their land by way of adverse possession, through conquest, be considered ABORIGINAL? We must also ask, "Why, considering the circumstances and history, should an Indian's claim to special rights and land take precedence over that of a White Man?"