

*The Algonquian Conquest
of the
Mediterranean Region
of 11,500 Years Ago*

by
Samuel Poe



PublishAmerica
Baltimore

© 2008 by Samuel Poe.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the publishers, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review to be printed in a newspaper, magazine or journal.

First printing

All characters in this book are fictitious, and any resemblance to real persons, living or dead, is coincidental.

PublishAmerica has allowed this work to remain exactly as the author intended, verbatim, without editorial input.

ISBN: 1-60563-847-1
PUBLISHED BY PUBLISHAMERICA, LLLP
www.publishamerica.com
Baltimore

Printed in the United States of America

Dedication

I will dedicate this book to the Anishinabek and all other Native Americans who are paying an horrific price so their white brethren can live upon their beloved land. It is my belief that the white brethren of the Native Americans will soon abolish all Native American Reservations and Reserves so the white race does not have to deal with their Native American brethren. That event may occur shortly or it may occur at an later time, but that event is going to happen because the white brethren of the Native American has no honor whatsoever concerning their Native American brethren, who they have expressed in so many dishonorable acts that they will use those dishonorable acts to get what they want from their Native American brethren which, to no ones surprise, is centered on only greed. White people will reject this books subject because they are not willing to acknowledge the inevitable. As for Native Americans it will be extremely important for them to pass this book down to their descendants for if they don't, it simply means that their white brethren will have successfully avoided the inevitable.

Acknowledgment

I would like to acknowledge William W. Warrens classic 19th century book “History of the Ojibway People,” because without Warrens valuable historical work I just may never have dared to admit that the Anishinabek are the Atlanteans from Atlantis. Future scholars will continue to refer to Warrens classic 19th century book “History of the Ojibway People,” when they research the worlds Totemic Systems or Caste Systems, and the bible as well. Warrens classic 19th century book is about the most valuable history book ever written. Although nearly everyone will not recognize William W. Warrens classic 19th century book “History of the Ojibway People,” those who are aware (even if they lack education) of the Anishinabek, will definitely want Warrens classic 19th century book about the history of the Anishinabek, a part of their book collections.

Contents

Chapter One	
<i>Western Europe</i>	9
Chapter Two	
<i>Italy</i>	23
Chapter Three	
<i>Pompeii</i>	33
Chapter Four	
<i>The First Greeks</i>	41
Chapter Five	
<i>Northern Africa</i>	51
Chapter Six	
<i>Egypt</i>	68
Chapter Seven	
<i>The Middle East</i>	77
Chapter Eight	
<i>The Great Floods</i>	85
Chapter Nine	
<i>The End of Algonquian Rule</i>	92
Chapter Ten	
<i>Other Possible Algonquian Colonies</i>	172
Chapter Eleven	
<i>The Legacy of the Atlanteans</i>	270

Western Europe

My how busy our ancestors were so long ago civilizing the world. It may have been 11,500 years ago or even much further back in time (the Story of Atlantis does suggest in a way that the first Atlanteans possibly showed up in the Mediterranean Sea region, long before 11,500 years ago), when the first Algonquians arrived at the present location of western Europe. It may have been possible that north Africa was settled by the Algonquians first, yet I will start in western Europe to begin with, then include the rest of all of Europe, as I believe the Algonquians settled all of Europe. Great Britain was back during those days, part of the continent of Europe, because the ocean during those times was much lower than it is today apparently. The location of Great Britain is to many Atlantean believers, the actual location where the Atlanteans originated, and they believe it is from Great Britain that the Atlanteans eventually spread out into Europe, Africa and the Middle East, yet Atlantis was actually located much further westward along the eastern coastline of Canada and the United States.

Stonehenge and the other ancient ruins in Great Britain, may of likely been constructed by the Atlanteans, and not constructed by Celtic people, as we are presently told. The climate of Great Britain during the ice age, was much colder than it is today, but from climate statistics of the present time, we know that because of the surrounding water, especially southern and western Great Britain, even during the ice age, were what we might want to consider, mild 11,500 years ago. It may have been possible that even during the ice age, the climate of Great Britain may have been warm enough to grow crops, but proving that is very difficult. It is at the present time, nearly an ideal climate in southern England for the existence of palm trees.

Of course, the reason for the cool to mild climate of southern England, is the Atlantic gulf stream, which originates much further south in the Atlantic Ocean near the New World. If the gulf stream for some reason stops flowing, we may experience severe climate changes that will effect all of mankind, and sadly a great many people will lose their lives from starvation and diseases, as a result of much

colder weather. There may be more very ancient Atlantean ruins other than Stonehenge, if Stonehenge was constructed by the Atlanteans, located in Great Britain only a few feet under the soil waiting to be discovered if, as I believe, the Atlanteans settled what is now England. And, of course, at the present time many people believe that just off the coast there, could be more ancient ruins of some of the Atlantean settlements, and since England was part of Europe 11,500 years ago, they could be right. But the task of actually getting everything needed to discover ancient Atlantean settlements beneath all that water, will be extremely difficult and expensive.

No doubt southern Europe, during the ice age, must of experienced severe cold weather, but the winters may have been much like the winters experienced in southern Canada and the northern United States, now. And temperatures well below zero must have been frequent during the winters there, during those ancient times, if there was indeed an ice age during those ancient times. Summers in southern Europe, during the ice age, certainly had to be warm, but not like the summers experienced there now. And certainly palm trees did not grow in southern Europe during the ice age.

Southern Europe extended further south during the ice age than it does now. And obviously the Mediterranean Sea was smaller and looked very different during the ice age, compared to the present time. And obviously the Atlanteans found sailing the Mediterranean somewhat easier and faster than present navigators do, as a result of that smaller size. The fact of the existence of the Mediterranean Sea, is probably why the Atlanteans conquest (they were probably the late arriving Carthaginians) of the Mediterranean region, was so successful.

We also have that humongous worldwide rainstorm mentioned in the bible which lasted 40 days, to also take into serious consideration as being responsible for not only the destruction of Atlantis, but also for the presence of the present day Black Sea, Caspian Sea, Mediterranean Sea, and the Great Lakes of the United States and Canada, including Cedar Lake, Great Slave Lake, Lake Athabasca, Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipegosis, Lake Winnipeg and also Hudson Bay. In Canada alone, all those large Canadian lakes probably merged with Hudson Bay and the Great Lakes of Canada and the United States, to form one humongous body of freshwater.

Over time, Hudson Bay eventually became saturated with the water of the Arctic Ocean. We need to search the entire area of Canada east of the Rocky Mountains, to the Arctic Ocean, to Hudson Bay, to the Great Lakes of Canada and the United States, for the existence of any possible ancient Atlantean ruins, for we do have historical climatic records which indicate that that region may

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

have been tropical 11,500 years ago. Sounds far too much like nonsense but it must be taken very seriously. Why? That entire region was at one time one humongous body of water, and once that humongous body of water began to recede, it may have buried those ancient Atlantean settlements with the soil of the earth.

Much later, the Romans duplicated the Atlantean conquest (actually Rome's Empire was larger than that of the Carthaginians) of the Mediterranean, and they were fortunate to have the Mediterranean Sea to aid them during their wars of conquest, as the Carthaginians did of course. We have no choice but to believe that the Atlantean conquest (again they were probably the Carthaginians) must of taken as long or even longer than the Romans conquest of the Mediterranean region, which commenced during Rome's final battles to bring all of Italy under their control.

Let us envision that there was no human population whatsoever anywhere around the Mediterranean Sea region, when the first wave of Algonquian settlers showed up (of course long before the Carthaginians), and the possibility that it may have taken only a few short decades for the Algonquians to colonize the entire Mediterranean Sea region. Although it sounds far fetched for the first wave of Algonquians into western Europe, to have entered an land void of any human population, the theory is rightfully one that shouldn't be ignored.

If only one group of Algonquians (that's out of the first wave of Algonquian settlers ever to live in Africa and Europe) was responsible for settling all of the Mediterranean Sea region, their descendents would deal with the Carthaginians (they were likely the Atlantean invaders mentioned in the Story of Atlantis, who invaded the Mediterranean Sea region 11,500 years ago), who would eventually subdue many Mediterranean kingdoms after commencing their conquests some 11,500 years ago.

Gradually, I assume, the Atlantean leaders of both the first wave of Atlanteans and then the later Carthaginians, must of ordered expeditions to start colonies in the locations in southern Europe, that they felt were good locations for agriculture operations and their villages. Any people that the Atlanteans came in contact with in southern Europe, if there was an Aboriginal people of Europe before the Atlanteans arrived, from what I know of historical events, were either outright driven out of their original homelands, seeking new territory in other locations, or they had been conquered by the military of the Atlanteans and, afterwards, absorbed by the Atlanteans.

Yet the historical records indicate another entirely different scenario (the existence of human evolution), which can be taken to represent an European

landscape with no human population then, yet I have no choice but to assume the existence of an Aboriginal people of Europe the white race is partially descended from. The region where the present countries of Portugal and Spain are located, may of seen the first Atlantean settlers coming directly from England, if the Algonquians settled England that is, to put forth their efforts at making the lands there productive for them.

And certainly that region of western Europe, must of filled the Atlantean leaders with thoughts of wealth to be gained, as well as more importantly, thoughts of expanding their empire, that is if they were united in their attempt to colonize, which I don't believe the first wave of Algonquians were, yet they may of been. The Iberian tribes are likely their descendents. When the Carthaginians conquered that same region they were obviously just as impressed with that beautiful land as were the Iberians, and even the much later arriving whites, who brought that same region under their control by using their military might, by defeating both the Carthaginians and the Iberians.

During the ice age southern Spain was connected to northern Africa, and that obviously was recognized by Atlantean leaders Southern France, nearer to England than the Mediterranean Sea, may have been settled by the Atlanteans, but I have to admit I am uncertain if that was possible, because of the climate of that region, even though that region does not frequently experience severe cold weather at the present time, yet that ice age must be taken seriously.

That region of southern France, must have been explored by the Atlanteans (that includes both the Carthaginians and the Iberians), but because of its northerly location I feel they may of avoided that area if there was an ice age then, as an area to build their settlements, yet I realize I may be wrong. It is not easy to have to deal with their ice age theory, for we do have historical evidence (I do realize that it may have been altered) in that Story of Atlantis, which suggests that eastern Canada 11,500 years ago, was tropical.

Anyway, the number of Atlantean settlements (both Carthaginian and Iberian) in Portugal and Spain, may have been in the hundreds with the great majority in locations which experienced weather the Atlanteans favored. As for the population of the Atlanteans in those locations, it may have been in the several hundred thousand range or even higher. Of course, the Carthaginians of western Europe may have numbered in the hundreds of thousands or even more, as also the Iberians, yet I wonder which of the two Atlantean kingdoms were the more populous when the Punic Wars were fought.

The appearance of an average Atlantean settlement, can only leave us all to wonder just exactly what they may of looked like 10,000 to 15,000 years ago.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Someone lucky enough to have had the chance to explore the ancient Roman ruins surrounding the entire Mediterranean, and also the ancient Greek and Egyptian ruins in person, may of seen a great deal of the ancient Atlantean civilization in those Roman, Greek and Egyptian civilized ruins. The ancient Atlantean civilization to many people was more advanced than later civilizations, and even our own civilization of the present time, yet I think otherwise. To even compare the ancient Atlantean civilization to the Roman, Greek and even the Egyptian civilizations, absolutely would not be right, minus the Atlanteans ability to navigate the oceans of the entire world, of course, which we know they could, and their highly advanced indoor plumbing system.

But, realistically, who knows for certain. Just knowing that the Atlanteans were sailing from North America to the Mediterranean Sea region, does give the impression of an very highly advanced civilization. We know from history ancient civilizations are almost always more primitive compared to civilizations that exist later. But Atlantis is indeed very mysterious, for they were as advanced as the earths most advanced 15th century civilizations, if not even far more advanced than the earths most advanced 15th century civilizations.

Did the Algonquians construct their European settlements, as well as their North American settlements, using the same building material used by the later Egyptians, Greeks and Romans? Most definitely, of course, otherwise there certainly wouldn't of existed an Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilization. Historically, we know the Atlanteans must of used brick, either clay or mud, and may of took full advantage of certain stones to construct some of their buildings. But were their houses inferior or superior to those of the Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilizations? Large Atlantean cities must of existed throughout the Atlantean Empire, and though it may have been that none of the Atlantean cities had a population over one million people, we can accept the possibility that at least a few of those Atlantean cities, supported populations in the hundreds of thousands. But it certainly was more common for Atlantean settlements to have populations from 10,000, 20,000, 30,000 and 40,000 of course. And certainly the great majority of those Atlantean settlements numbered only a few hundred Atlantean citizens, throughout the empire of Atlantis, be it in North America, Africa, Europe or in the Middle East.

Agriculture operations, during the ice age for the Atlanteans, had to be back breaking work. And the fear of the unknown must of bothered the average Atlantean farmer, who had no choice but to worry constantly about the weather, especially in North America and Europe, where the cold climate must have been very bothersome. Were the crops the Atlanteans grew, the same as the crops the

present day farmers grow? Or could it be possible that the Atlanteans chosen crops were not at all like the crops modern farmers grow? Wheat and corn are two agriculture crops we can be certain the Atlanteans cultivated, but we cannot rightfully claim that the Atlanteans cultivated the same crops, as the later Egyptians and Romans did. I would not be at all surprised if the Atlanteans cultivated plants or vegetables, that are unknown to us at the present time. Lets face it, the great floods may of done far more damage than we know! Just how long the growing season in southern Europe may have been during those times is anyone's guess but, of course, the further south one went the growing season grew longer. Portugal's and Spain's climate conditions, are currently similar to the climate of California and Arizona, and currently it is possible to cultivate certain tropical plants in those locations in Europe. Winter high temperatures in southern Spain currently average in the 60s.

The descendants of the Atlanteans who occupied Portugal and Spain during the ice age, are still located in that region of Europe, even on up into southern France. The Basque people today (the Basque people are likely the descendents of both the Iberians and Carthaginians), occupy central and northern Spain, on up into southern France, and every now and then we are reminded in the news that the Basque people consider themselves to be the original inhabitants of that part of Europe.

Their struggle for freedom is ongoing and recently violence has once again erupted in Spain. Enemies of the Basque people claim the actions of the Basque people to be nothing more than acts of terrorism but, in reality, the Basque people have no choice but to act in that manner. Unfortunately, for the French and Spanish authorities, it appears the leaders of the Basque people will not give in until they are completely independent from Spain and France.

After the Algonquians established their numerous settlements in western Europe and their population grew, the Atlanteans eagerness to expand their territory may of overcame them, and there is historical evidence that supports such an scenario. And its extremely likely expeditions into central southern Europe were certainly started soon after western Europe was settled by the first wave of Algonquians.

And the first wave of Algonquians who headed eastward into eastern Europe are probably directly descended from the Iberians. Eastern Spain, and southeast France, close to the Mediterranean Sea, were obviously known of by the Atlanteans, and obviously that part of Europe was the next location in Europe the Algonquians settled. Colonies must have been started in that region of Europe slowly, but over time the population of those first colonies obviously

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

grew. By the time the Atlanteans had been well established in that region of south central Europe, the average Atlantean citizen being civilized as he was, may of developed wondering eyes, and felt somewhat crowded in, but that's not out of the ordinary as we all know.

Nothing is at all unusual about that, and we know from history those kind of people always stick with their people, and if upon returning to their original homeland with important news, let's say of some undisturbed good farm land, the man certainly would of let his people know of that virgin land. What Atlantean leaders probably wanted to know about that land more than anything else, was the climate conditions. It would be useless to start a colony in a land, which very little is known of about that land. And, of course, the Atlantean leaders must of felt concerned about the original occupants of that country also, if there existed an unknown people there which, I, assume, that there was.

Though we have no knowledge on just how long the Atlantean colonization of Europe was, we absolutely know it did not happen over night, nor did it happen within a year or two. Another bit of information must not be overlooked, and that has to deal with the Atlantean invasion of northern Africa and the Middle East, and if those locations harbored an Aboriginal people also. We can't claim that while the Atlanteans were busy building their civilization in Europe, that the Atlanteans were not at all present in Africa and the Middle East, visiting to determine the conditions within those locations. Atlanteans obviously took their time and carefully made their plans for expanding their kingdoms.

What about the non Atlantean people (it is but a mystery presently if the Mediterranean region had an Aboriginal people), who the Atlanteans had control over in western Europe after eventually subduing them, and just exactly how were they treated by the Atlanteans? If the first wave of Atlanteans did force the Aboriginal occupants of the European territories they conquered into their kingdoms (the Carthaginians as well), did they treat them harshly as apparently many people believe the Atlantis story gives the impression? It wouldn't be surprising if they did, because it is part of human instinct to conduct one's self in the very worst of manners, yet they may of treated them fairly. But was there actually an Aboriginal people of the Mediterranean region who the black and white races may partially be related to? None of us would want to place bets on it!

Although the white race of the present time was not in existence in those days (do not get negative but read the Atlantis story which conceals human evolution within, first, before becoming a little too negative concerning this subject), the Aboriginal people who the white race is partially descended from, was certainly

in existence then in Europe, if there was an Aboriginal people of Europe. And it was those people our ancestors came into contact with and, of course, some of that contact certainly had to include warfare, which most definitely led to our ancestors waging relentless war against the Aboriginal inhabitants of Europe until subduing them, if there was an Aboriginal people of Europe that is.

Life for the average Atlantean citizen may of not been as hard as we assume, but their lives were certainly not in any way easy, as we living in the present time know. Our lifestyle now, to the Atlanteans, if they had had the chance to observe them, would appear to them like the lives their leaders lived. Life expectancy had to be very short for some of the Atlanteans, but I am not so certain about the average Atlantean citizen. Diseases mankind knows at the present time, and for the past 3000 years or longer, may of not existed 10,000 to 20,000 years ago.

In reality we do not know of the diseases of those times, and what they were like, and just how those diseases effected people. I would not be surprised if the average life expectancy of the Atlantean people, was near what the average European, Japanese and American citizen lives to today. But what if the life expectancy of the Atlanteans was longer then, than to ours of the present time? Its fascinating to take it seriously but only in imagination! That bible clearly states that ancient humans lived to extremely old ages! To live for over 1000 years sounds like fiction to all humans of the present time, but we are polluting our earths atmosphere with an endless supply of the necessary requirements to dramatically shorten our lives.

Of the many settlements of the Atlanteans in western Europe which existed long, long ago, for the most part most may have been totally destroyed by the great floods mentioned in the Atlantis Story. I suspect, but I also realize, that I could be wrong, that a few (for all we know it could actually be far more than just only a few) became the new settlements of the much later empires which later followed the Atlantean civilization. It could also be possible that some of the ancient Atlantean settlements in western Europe, survived the catastrophes intact to a certain degree, and are waiting to be rediscovered. If indeed some of the Atlantean settlements survived the catastrophes, but over time were abandoned by the Atlanteans, they could be buried under the English, French, Irish, Portuguese, Scottish and Spanish earth, by only a few feet waiting to be discovered by some future archaeologists.

The Iberian and Lusitanian tribes

From England, the Algonquians may of organized expeditions to explore southern Europe near the Mediterranean Sea area, as an possible location to send

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

their settlers. Their descendents could be the Iberians and Lusitanian's, who were native to western Europe, particularly France, Portugal and Spain, and probably England, Ireland and Scotland as well. They obviously must of saw central and northern Europe as useless, since that area was too cold, and much of that area was covered by glaciers, if they are actually correct about their theory concerning that ice age, that is. The Mediterranean Sea area obviously was warmer, and we know that the Atlanteans were civilized so the climate of that region must have been warm enough to grow crops during that supposed ice age. If the first wave of Atlanteans actually did settle England, Ireland and Scotland their civilized settlements are obviously still in those countries and could be among the current well known cities there. What follows is a list of native tribes of western Europe, including that of the Carthaginians, who were possibly the Lusitanian's.

The Aquitani

Julius Cesar himself described the Aquitani tribe as being an Iberian tribe. Apparently some people believe the Aquitani to have been possibly of Celtic origins it appears. Their homeland was located in southwestern France, but they were probably subjugated by the invading Carthaginians, who likely continued to rule the homeland of the Aquitani up until the Romans invaded in full force. It was Julius Cesar who completely eliminated the Aquitani tribe, yet their descendents are probably among the Basque people.

The Ausetani

Their homeland was located within the Iberian peninsula. Most likely the Ausetani were subjugated by the Carthaginians after their invasion of Europe some 11,500 years ago.

The Autrigones

Their origins are more difficult to correctly determine apparently. Some have suggested that the Autrigones were of Basque origins, while others suggest that they were originally of Celtic origin. Some scholars speculate that the Autrigones originated further north towards Germany. The Autrigones tribe, if they were of Basque origins, were most definitely subjugated by the invading Carthaginians.

The Bastuli

Their homeland was also located within the Iberian peninsula. They were also probably subjugated by the invading Carthaginians as well.

SAMUEL POE

The Cantabri

Many speculate that the Cantabri tribes (apparently there were 11 tribes which made up the Cantabri confederation) were Celtic, yet from Julius Cesar's own observations, he historically recorded that the Cantabri were "related to the Aquitani tribe." Obviously that classifies the Cantabri tribe as being Iberian. The Cantabri are very important for they stood up and fought the invading Romans. The Cantabrian Wars occurred between 29 B.C. and 19 B.C. The Cantabri were apparently fond of living in mountainous regions. As for the Cantabri being subjugated by the invading Carthaginians, we have good reasons to suggest no.

The Caristii

Historians during the Roman times, established that the Caristii people were of Iberian origins. At the present time there is an belief that the language of the Caristii people is directly related to the language of the Basque people. As for the Carthaginians subjugating the Caristii people 11,500 years ago, I would assume that they did or attempted to.

The Cassetani

Cassetani origins also were in the Iberian peninsula where the invading Romans would encounter the Cassetani people, after they dared to take on the mighty Carthaginians for control of western Europe. Cassetani people were possibly subjugated by the invading Carthaginians.

The Contestani

Also one of the many tribes to inhabit the Iberian peninsula, the Contestani people would also eventually be absorbed by the growing Roman Empire, after Rome took control of their homeland. As for the Carthaginians bringing the Contestani people under their rule after they invaded 11,500 years ago, it possibly did occur.

The Cynetes

These people appear to be a bit mysterious, for their origins are not correctly known of, yet many have speculated that the Cynetes people were in fact Celtic. Their homeland speaks of another scenario however. Roman historians claim that southern Portugal was the homeland of the Cynetes people. If southern Portugal was the homeland of the Cynetes people that does suggest that the Cynetes were either an Iberian tribe or an Carthaginian province or colony. We will put the Cynetes people as being Carthaginian over any other assumption, simply because of their southerly homeland.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The Edetani

Also another Iberian tribe the Romans eventually subjugated after subduing the Iberian peninsula, the Edetani people have disappeared as a result of the invasion of the whites. They were possibly subjugated by the Carthaginians and, if in fact the Carthaginians had subjugated them, they fared far better under Carthaginian subjugation than that of the whites.

The Ibercavones

Also another Iberian tribe, the Ibercavones were also subjugated by the invading Romans and disappeared altogether as a result of the unwillingness of the whites to allow their nation to continue to exist. The Carthaginians possibly brought the Ibercavones under Carthaginian subjugation.

The Ilergetes

Also another Iberian tribe, the Ilergetes people were also absorbed by the growing Roman Empire and have disappeared. They were probably subjugated by the invading Carthaginians and, if in fact the Ilergetes people were subjugated by the Carthaginians, they fared very well for some 9000 years.

The Indigetes

Also another ancient Iberian tribe, the Indigetes also suffered the same fate as all other Iberian tribes after the invading Romans subjugated them. If the Indigetes were subjugated by the invading Carthaginians they definitely fared very well under the rule of the invading Carthaginians through some 9000 years.

The Laietani

Also another of the many ancient Iberian tribes that the whites brought under their subjugation, the Laietani people have also disappeared. If the Laietani people were subjugated by the invading Carthaginians they fared very well through some 9000 years of Carthaginian rule.

The Oretani

Also another ancient Iberian tribe that the invading Romans subjugated, the Oretani people have also disappeared. The Oretani people were possibly brought under the rule of the invading Carthaginians, and were allowed to freely exist as an distinct people through some 9000 years of Carthaginian rule.

The Varduli

Also another ancient Iberian tribe that the Romans subjugated, the Varduli

SAMUEL POE

people have also disappeared as an distinct people. If the Carthaginians subjugated the Varduli, the Varduli obviously fared very well under the rule of the invading Carthaginians.

The Vascones

Also another ancient Iberian tribe that the invading Romans subjugated, the Vascones people have also disappeared as an distinct people. They were possibly subjugated by the invading Carthaginians, yet they obviously survived after so.

Excepting the Cynetes people (the Cynetes people were probably Carthaginian), all of the above mentioned Iberian tribes were probably living in the Iberian peninsula when the Algonquians invaded 11,500 years ago from Atlantis. Although all the above mentioned Iberian tribes have disappeared, their descendents are very likely among the Basque people, and can be found among the general population among the people living throughout the Iberian peninsula. Although my assumptions about all of the above mentioned Iberian tribes being subjugated by the invading Algonquians some 11,500 years ago may not be correct, I have to admit that I believe that the Algonquians probably did subjugate all of those Iberian tribes, for I believe that they were all civilized when the Carthaginians invaded.

The Mighty Carthaginians

If we are to select one of the Mediterranean Sea regions Kingdoms which may have been the Atlanteans who invaded the Mediterranean Sea region 11,500 years ago, it will most likely be the mighty Carthaginians. In western Europe, after the first Carthaginians showed up on the shores of western Europe (most likely it was either England, Ireland or Portugal) they most likely then went on the warpath in those above mentioned locations.

During some unknown point in time after the mighty Carthaginians commenced to initiate their Mediterranean Empire, they eventually subdued western Europe's first Atlantean colonists, who just may of been the Iberians. The Carthaginians would rule them probably until the Roman Empire invaded in around 219 B.C. That represents over 9000 long years that the Carthaginians ruled the Iberians. However, the funny thing is the Iberian tribes didn't disappear during the over 9000 years the Carthaginians ruled them, and in fact, some of the Iberian Kingdoms which Rome encountered during the second Punic War, were apparently very willing to determine on their own, the path that they wanted to take which, in some cases, represented independence from both the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Carthaginians and Romans. Although I am not certain if the Carthaginians colonized England, Ireland and Scotland I do suspect that they did. I also suspect that the present day cities of Barcelona, Dublin, Glasgow, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Marseille, Paris and many others located in western Europe, are far more ancient (they were probably first either Iberian or Carthaginian cities) than what we have been taught.

With their foothold firmly placed in western Europe, the Carthaginians obviously didn't stop there, for they would progress on into Italy where they would probably subdue the native Italian tribes (they were likely descended from the first wave of Atlantean colonists) by using their military might. However, we have good enough reasons to speculate that the native Italian tribes rose up to remove Carthaginian power before the arrival of the first whites to Italy. Eventually after establishing themselves in western Europe, the mighty Ojibways, Ottawa's and Potawatomi (they refer to themselves as the Anishinabek) would likely bring the rest of the Mediterranean Sea region, excepting eastern Europe where the mighty Egyptian Europeans lived, under their control.

To the east of France, is the beautiful country of Italy, and Algonquian eyes definitely knew of that beautiful country. Just who were the original occupants of Italy, and were those people related to the original occupants of western Europe? Or was Italy at that time a no mans land which it may have been? If there was an Aboriginal people in Italy, Italy was obviously occupied by the people who the white race is partially descended from, and their land came to the attention of the Atlanteans of western Europe, probably very early on.

Italy to the first Atlantean visitors, must of looked like paradise, especially to the Atlanteans of the colder areas of Europe, if Atlanteans did occupy the colder areas of Europe then. As for the Atlanteans of Portugal and Spain, they certainly discovered Italy's climate conditions to be very similar to Portugal's and Spain's climate conditions, yet possibly somewhat cooler, but certainly warm enough to start agriculture operations. Of course, the Algonquians settled Italy as it is clearly evident that numerous Italian people show Asian features, yet don't tell that to them because its clear they believe the reason for numerous Italians showing Asian features, is the people of the Middle East. What about the Basque people of western Europe? There are probably no longer any pure blooded Algonquians among them, but apparently some Europeans believed, and continue to believe, the Basque people to be an distinct race. They have, although, determined that the Basque people are white, but their conduct tells me that there is a high percentage of Basque people who look Asian.

SAMUEL POE

If the Basque people are descended from the Atlanteans their directly descended from both the Carthaginians and Iberians of course. Their history is obviously extremely ancient and great. It is their ancient lands which should inspire on the Basque people, for they not only inhabited France and Spain, but probably England, Ireland, Portugal and Scotland as well. In fact, the Basque people do have every right to claim all of western Europe as being their beloved lands.

Italy

During the ice age the climate of what is now the country of Italy, may of not been as warm as the climate of southern Spain and Portugal, but the winters in Italy during the ice age were only slightly cooler. I do not know exactly how much larger Italy was during the ice age, but I realize that Italy was larger then, as well as somewhat closer to Africa, if that ice age really existed. Italy during the ice age, was also effected by the extreme cold, and though the climate was much colder it was not cold enough to prevent agriculture. The Algonquians certainly knew of Italy, particularly southern Italy, and it's climate that was ideal for agriculture, from explorations they conducted of that region which, I, assume, were carried out because the Atlanteans were civilized.

Word must of spread among the Atlanteans about Italy being a good location for future Atlantean colonies, and also about the native people of Italy, if Italy did have an non Atlantean population then which, I, assume, Italy did, yet I may be wrong. We must seriously consider that the original occupants of Italy were looked upon by the Atlanteans as a threat, if Italy was inhabited by non Atlanteans before their arrival.

In the far north of Italy are the Alps mountains which, to the Atlanteans, had to be avoided because of the glaciers existing at that time, and the cold of course. Even central Italy's mountains may have been covered by glaciers, especially the taller mountains of central Italy during those times. Italy's coastline was certainly settled first by the Atlanteans, for it is easy for us, and as well, it was also easy for the Atlanteans, to recognize those parts of Italy are the warmer spots of Italy. If we want to attempt to envision just how Italy was settled by the Atlanteans, it probably resembled Atlantean leaders, who likely let greed influence their decisions, decide that an Atlantean colony in Italy was a very good idea, even if meant warfare to establish that Atlantean colony, against the Aboriginal natives of Italy.

About that Atlantean invasion which occurred 11,500 years ago, which must also be included, we know Italy was part of that Atlantean boundary line (it was

in the north of Italy where the Etruscans lived), which from Italy, then went as far west as the European Atlantic. But did the Carthaginians colonize at least some of Italy as I suspect?

Southern Italy, including the island of Sicily, may have been colonized by the Carthaginians so if we are going to choose some location in Italy out of all other Italian locations which may have been colonized by the Carthaginians, we would definitely choose southern Italy, particularly the island of Sicily. Now before those invading Carthaginians brought parts of Italy under their colonization efforts (if the Carthaginians in fact started colonies on the Italian peninsula), Italy was probably colonized by the Atlanteans long before, and in fact, it may have occurred thousands of years before the Carthaginian invasion of 11,500 years ago.

Just who became the descendents of that first Atlantean people to inhabit the Italian peninsula? The Etruscans and Ligurian's obviously stand out from the other suggestions, yet further research must occur by future scholars to attempt to learn of Italy's first Atlantean population, and who their descendents were.

Were the Atlantean leaders very liberal with their citizens, and allowed them the opportunity to migrate to Italy without any kind of military aid? Or did the Atlantean leaders take precautions first, by using their military force first, to subdue the original occupants of Italy? An must question to ask! Its an question that is very easy to answer! I assume since the Atlanteans were civilized, that Atlantean leaders held many discussions together about how the settlement of Italy should be conducted, as would any civilized people, and probably also uncivilized peoples as well. Safety of Atlantean settlers had to be on the minds of all Atlantean leaders, especially the women and children settlers, so the likelihood that the Atlantean military was ordered into Italy first, had to be almost guaranteed, yet from historical records we know to also think otherwise. Wars do not just take a day or two, a month or two, nor only a year or two so the warfare the Atlanteans experienced in Italy against the Aboriginal occupants probably lasted longer than just a few short years, and may of taken as long as several decades, or even much longer.

At some location on the west coast of Italy, the first Atlantean colony in Italy was probably established (that includes both the first wave of Atlantean settlers, and the last Atlantean settlers who were probably the Carthaginians, yet the Carthaginians may have first settled southern Italy). But were those first Atlantean colonies on the coast of Italy, possibly military forts, or just simple villages, or a combination of both? If any form of resistance against the invading Atlanteans existed during the establishments of those first Atlantean colonies in Italy, then

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

those settlements were probably no doubt occupied by the soldiers of the Atlantean military. Obviously when new settlements arose they were located in close proximity to those Italian Atlantean military forts, which could quickly resolve any disputes which may have risen between the Atlantean settlers and any Aboriginal Italian people.

Italian Atlantean agriculture must have been very impressive but definitely the kind of work people living in well off countries now, would not cherish doing. Atlantean religious customs were obviously infused with their agriculture customs, and probably was centered on superstition. And their religion may of to some extent, been influenced by climate, which definitely can destroy civilized mans inner soul.

And superstition among the Atlanteans of those times, did not only effect the everyday lives of those people when it came to agriculture operations, it probably led to the birth of religions which initiated human sacrifice, as well as mental illnesses, corruption, and as well, crime in general. Superstition is very wicked and alive and flourishing at the present time. It may be possible that our ancestors superstitious beliefs may of evolved into some of the mental illnesses experienced by modern day humans.

I will be honest with you and admit that I believe superstition is in fact a common mental illness that must be classified as a mental illness, and also treated with psychotherapy. Unfortunately, superstition will persist on in all humans until that day comes when humans learn of the origins of superstitious thinking and end it for good. When the Carthaginians entered Italy (the Carthaginians may not have colonized any of Italy for all we know, yet we have many splendid reasons to believe they did as you will learn later on) they as well had to deal with the first Italians (for all we know they may have been Algonquians) by using their pure military might against them. If the Carthaginians did initiate a colony in Italy, their descendents could actually be the Etruscans, yet I tend to suspect that the Carthaginians may have forced the Etruscans under their control, over the Etruscans being the descendents of the Carthaginians.

Although I rather choose the Carthaginians conquering some Italian Kingdom (it may have been the Etruscans) then later on were forced to abdicate Carthaginian rule by those first Italians, who used either peaceful means or used war to remove Carthaginian rule, I am very suspicious about not only southern Italy, and that does include the island of Sicily, but other regions in Italy as well, being possibly colonized by the invading Carthaginians.

Etruscans were civilized and mighty long before the Romans used their might to bring Italy under their control, and I will have to single out the Etruscans over

the Ligurians, as being conquered by the Atlanteans who invaded 11,500 years ago. Once the Carthaginians brought civilized Italy under their control, an extremely long period of Carthaginian supremacy over civilized Italy followed. What we need to discover is exactly how long did the Carthaginians rule civilized Italy for.

When white Rome was beginning to flex their might (around 500 B.C.) the Etruscans were obviously independent from the Carthaginians, who were living just to their south in southern Italy. However, we don't know exactly how long the Etruscans had been independent from the mighty Carthaginians, who definitely did not respond in an positive manner when the Etruscans rose up to battle them for control of Italy. When the war between the Carthaginians and Etruscans occurred, it was probably extremely violent and probably very costly in both human lives and wealth of course. However, when that war or wars (for all we know the whites may have aided the Etruscans) had concluded, the Italian Etruscans were no longer under Carthaginian subjugation. If the whites had aided the Carthaginians that war may have occurred only a few hundred years before white Rome had begun their rise to power.

Future Atlantean colonies into eastern Europe, as far as I know, were not successful if the Atlanteans did in fact start colonies in that part of Europe, which I tend to accept that they did. And I look upon the Gypsies or the Egyptian Europeans, as being the descendents of the Atlanteans of eastern Europe. The Atlanteans, after finally subduing the Aboriginal population of Italy (both the first and last invasions), must have gradually increased the number of Atlantean (that includes the Carthaginians) settlements there. Population growth most definitely continued on throughout the early years of the Atlanteans first Italian colony.

And the nearby Mediterranean Sea with its abundant supply of food, was certainly exploited to the fullest by the Algonquians of Italy. Atlantean ships obviously sailed the entire Mediterranean Sea but what did their ships look like? Also, just exactly how large were they? We only can imagine, but obviously their ships were constructed strongly and capable of navigating around the world, or at least the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea!

The Ligurians

These people who were native to northern Italy are fascinating. Their homeland is particularly interesting to debate over, for in some ancient accounts their land actually stretched from Italy all the way to the North Sea. What that does represent is an related group of tribes who were closely related by culture and language, who inhabited south central Europe, on up to central and north

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

central Europe. In one ancient testimony regarding the Ligurians, it was clearly written that it was the Celtic tribes who invaded central and north central Europe, and the Aboriginal peoples they encountered in those European locations, were the Ligurians. So we now can bravely suggest that the Ligurians were the Atlantean tribes driven from central and north central Europe, by the invading whites. Of course, after the Celts had successfully driven off the Ligurians, they would next encounter the Iberian tribes in western Europe.

Interestingly, we have good reason to speculate about the Ligurian tribes not being civilized when the Carthaginians invaded 11,500 years ago, for a great deal of their territories were covered by mountains. Here are the following Ligurian tribes: The Apuani, The Briniates, The Cerdiciates, The Commoni, The Deciates, The Euburiates, The Friniates, The Garuli, The Hercates, The Ilvates, The Ingauni, The Intemellii, The Lopicini, The Oxybii, The Statielli, The Sueltri, The Taurini and The Vagienni.

Even southeastern France was occupied by the Ligurians, who were probably related in some way to the Italian Etruscans. Although the Carthaginians likely subjugated some of the Italian Ligurians (if they were accustomed to civilized life that is), as for all of the remaining Ligurians, I would tend to think that their homelands may have been a bit too far off and inhospitable, for the Carthaginians to bother to attempt to subjugate them. After all, the Carthaginians were most aware of the formidable Alps Mountains, which to the Carthaginians were not only an obstacle which was extremely unattractive, but the mountain range was a major one which could inflict as much loss to human lives as human war could.

Etruria

Were the Carthaginians actually capable of bringing Etruria under their control? Of course, the Carthaginians brought Etruria under their control! I would assume that the Carthaginians did in fact force their way into the everyday affairs of the Etruscan people. I have no choice! But what is elusive concerning that obvious Carthaginian conquest over the Etruscans involves the eventual overthrow of Carthaginian rule by the Italian Etruscans. Although I don't know of any ancient historical records pertaining to the Carthaginians subjugating Etruria and for exactly how long, if historical records do exist I look upon ancient Egypt as being the location which conceals historical records of Etruria being conquered by the Carthaginians.

Historically, the Etruscans were not subjugated until Rome subjugated them. Before the Romans eventually subjugated the Etruscans, the Etruscans were

apparently organized into city states, and not one united Etruscan Kingdom, which would only further aid the growing power of Rome, when the Romans battled the Etruscans for dominance of Italy. But could it have been possible for the Carthaginians, however, to have invaded at a time when the Etruscans city states were united in one Kingdom, and then when the Etruscans forcefully removed the Carthaginian power over them, they eventually endured the ravages of civil war, which then brought their united Etruria Kingdom's demise?

Of course, historians offer another scenario for ancient Italian history which is centered on the Phoenicians controlling much of the Mediterranean region just before the rise of the Roman Empire, and that apparently includes Corsica, Sardinia and Sicily, as well as the islands of Crete and Cyprus. They estimate the time period of when the Phoenicians had numerous colonies spread throughout the Mediterranean region, to have been during the 1st millennium B.C. However, those historians didn't include mainland Italy which is obviously not correct. And obviously the Carthaginians and Phoenicians are the same people. Other Mediterranean colonies historians believe the Phoenicians initiated, include colonies in France, Portugal and Spain, which were in Europe, and all of northern Africa, from the Atlantic, to Libya.

Then Cyprus as we know, was extremely important to the Phoenicians who, from the island of Cyprus, didn't have very far to sail until reaching their eastern most Mediterranean colonies along the eastern coast of the vast Mediterranean Sea. Of course, long before the 1st Millennium B.C. the Carthaginians or Phoenicians, probably had an colony located in Egypt (the Jews do ring a bell of course), but that Egyptian colony obviously didn't last as long as the Carthaginians other colonies. Its not a matter of if the Carthaginians subjugated the Etruscans and colonized mainland Italy, it is a matter of determining exactly when the Carthaginians subdued the Etruscans (it probably occurred well after the first Carthaginian conquests in the Mediterranean region occurred), and exactly when the Etruscans rose up against the mighty Carthaginians to eventually win their independence.

Well before the Roman Empire came into existence in Italy, Rome was a tiny Greek village (Rome was probably first an Atlantean settlement) under the rule of the great Etruscan people. Historically, we are told Rome was founded around the year 750 B.C. by an certain Latin people of that region of Italy. Latin people are likely descendants of the white Greek people of eastern Europe, who migrated into Italy long before the Roman civilization emerged. Could it be possible that Rome is much older than what we have been taught, which presently is considered to be less than 3000 years old? Who knows maybe the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Atlanteans may of first occupied what is now Rome, yet during the Atlantean occupation the Atlantean Rome settlement was considered to be insignificant by the Atlanteans. Apparently, the language of the Etruscan people, as well as the language of the Basque people of Spain and France, are considered to be not related to the Indo-European language family, which includes the languages of the Gypsy people.

I suspect that there could possibly be a relationship between the languages of the Etruscan and Basque people, to the Semitic language family, and if that is true that means they are all Semitic of course. Most definitely Italy's Etruscan civilization is far more ancient and by thousands of years yet, realistically, who knows maybe something is being deliberately hid from the world, concerning an ancient Italian civilization that flourished before that of Etruria.

I would not be surprised if they have miscalculated just how long the Etruscan civilization was in existence for, and it is likely historians have left out a good 8000 years of Etruscan history, be it deliberate, or by accident. Realistically, none of us living at the present time know the exact truth, and even with modern technology, which I know we can't depend on to a great extent, we still do not know for certain exactly what happened during those times.

The Etruscan civilization certainly existed thousands of years before the Roman civilization first took root, and just may be the first Atlantean colony that flourished in Italy. It is the part of the Atlantis story that mentions Italy, that leads me to believe the first Atlanteans of Italy, have to be the Etruscan people who are so well known to us at the present time. But was there another people who are unknown to us presently, who could be the first Atlanteans who inhabited Italy? When the Etruscans ruled the Romans of Italy, certainly the Romans borrowed many Etruscan ideas, some of which we know of, and others that we haven't the slightest hint of. Many people believe the Roman aqueduct, arch, and some other important innovations of the great Roman civilization, such as the gladiator games so well known to us at the present time, were borrowed from the Etruscan people.

We must keep our minds open to the possibility that far more Etruscan ideas and inventions were borrowed by the Romans, while they were the subjects of the Etruscan people. We must accept reality, the Etruscans undoubtedly influenced the whites of Italy in many aspects. Much of the Romans impressive civilized traits obviously were acquired from the Atlantean civilization of Italy. Italy's Atlantean civilization must have been just as impressive as eastern Europe's Atlantean civilization, if not even far more impressive.

The Atlanteans are still living in Italy and they are more than very numerous, although they are very mixed in race now. In regards to Atlantean civilizations,

it would be senseless to accept anyone's theory that the Atlantean civilizations of Europe, Asia and Africa also vanished when Atlantis was destroyed. I can accept the possibility that a great many of the settlements of the Atlanteans of Europe, Asia and Africa, or even most of their settlements, were destroyed by the flood that destroyed Atlantis, but certainly not all of them.

Some of the Atlantean colonies of Europe, Asia and Africa survived on, and we all have to accept that no matter how much one cannot believe such a theory, for it is most certainly true, for if the Atlantean civilizations of the Mediterranean region entirely vanished, the Roman and Greek civilizations would never have come into existence.

No doubt, the Atlantean survivors of Europe, Asia and Africa continued on with their civilized way of life and, of course, the civilizations that followed much later are indeed the descendants of the Atlantean civilizations of Europe, Asia and Africa. The Atlantis destroyed by the flood, was eventually forgotten by the Atlantean people of Europe, Asia and Africa, that is, minus one people of course. For the descendants of the Atlanteans who made Italy their home, they must of over time, forgot their place of origin, and sadly they no longer exist in Italy as a free and independent people, even though I do believe many of the descendants of the Atlanteans of Italy, do recognize, even to this day, that they are very different compared to the rest of the population of Italy.

Unfortunately, the Atlanteans of Italy never kept themselves organized as a people that I know of, like the Basque people of Spain and France currently do, and I must include the Gypsy people most definitely as well. For some reason that I have no knowledge of, the Basque people of Spain and France have stayed together as a people, yet they are very mixed in race obviously. As of now, I have done little research into the history of the Basque people, other than discovering that the Basque people are the original occupants of western Europe, or at least the Basque people consider themselves to be the original occupants of western Europe, and their language is not related to the Indo-European language family which, unlike that of the Gypsies, tells a major story. The Basque people are probably the descendents of the European Carthaginians and Iberians.

It may be that non Basque people also consider themselves the original occupants of western Europe, but if I had my choice I would have to agree with the Basque people, because of the current struggles the Basque people are experiencing, and as well, the Atlantis story. In reality the Basque people have resisted the intruders in their land for a very long time, and it is going to continue on for an incredibly long time. But as for any Basque people admitting to the world that they are the Carthaginian Atlanteans and Iberian Atlanteans, that is a far different scenario.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

There may be other people of western and central Europe, near the Mediterranean Sea, especially southern western Europe, that I do not know of, who possibly could be descended from the first non Carthaginian Atlanteans. It has been so long since the end of the Atlantean Empire, and so many changes have taken place since the end of the Atlantean Empire that, realistically, it is possible that no people existing in southern Europe could be the remnants of the Atlantean people so famous to world history, yet that is very unlikely.

I am optimistic though, and to be honest, I suspect that there are other groups of people living in western, central, northern, southern, and even eastern Europe, who are directly descended from the Atlantean people. I need to study each European countries past history and their recent history, to, if possible, discover anything out of the normal that may exist. What I will look for is language, of course, race issues, and if there is any current unrest among those people against the country they reside in. As for the Atlantean Italians, I reckon that they prefer Italian over anything else.

Another important bit of information deals with the Egyptian Europeans history. The more I think about it the more it seems probable. Instead of the Egyptian Europeans originating in eastern Europe where they are the most numerous in Europe now, could it be possible that their original homeland was located in western Europe, or better yet, Italy? What about the Egyptian Europeans (the Gypsy people) being the descendents of all of Europe's Atlanteans. In Spain the Gypsy population is around 500,000, and its common to see Asian looking Italians. If Spain's Roma population is in fact native to Spain and Portugal as well, they are probably the descendents of the Carthaginians, and the Basque people the descendents of the Iberians.

Historically, we have been educated that the Huns invaded eastern Europe then contributed heavily to the fall of the Roman Empire. However, since the eastern Roman Empire survived on for almost 1000 years after the fall of the western Roman Empire, it suggests that an people from western Europe (the Carthaginians, Iberians and maybe the Etruscans of course) were those Asian people who toppled the Roman Empire. Obviously something is deeply suspicious about the fall of the western Roman Empire, which endured extreme conflicts in western Europe (the Lucitanian and Gallic Wars and others), after defeating the powerful Carthaginians from Carthage.

By the 5th century the Roman Empire was involved deeply in some sort of power struggle in western Europe, with an Asian people who evidently originated in eastern Europe who, of course, are referred to as the Huns. Western Europe, however, still had an significant Carthaginian and Iberian population

which probably numbered in the millions in the 5th century. Did the Carthaginians and Iberians mount some sort of united attempt to win back their independence from Roman rule? If both the Carthaginians and Iberians did in fact unite to wage a war to win back their independence, they won! After their victory over the Romans, a new western Europe emerged which possibly saw Celtic and Germanic tribes settling the former western European lands of the Roman Empire.

However, if the united Carthaginians and Iberians did topple the Romans, they probably did not allow large numbers of Celtic and Germanic tribes to settle on their lands. What eventually brought the whites to dominate in western Europe probably involved wars between the native Carthaginian-Iberian alliance and the invading Celtic and Germanic tribes, and probably diseases. There are historical records of disease epidemics (the black plague and others) occurring in Europe which killed incredible numbers of innocent humans.

If the Carthaginians and Iberians were still far more numerous than the whites in western Europe in the 5th century, that simply means they dominated! If the native Carthaginians and Iberians endured the ravages of disease epidemics after regaining their freedom in the 5th century, their population decline is what brought down their once formidable Kingdom. Did the Carthaginians and Iberians bring Italy back under their control after eradicating the western Roman Empire in the 5th century? We do have an historical record that backs that assumption up! Rome and Rome's western empire, became part of history. However, the eastern Roman Empire survived.

Pompeii

Historically, Pompeii, Italy was founded by the Romans during the early part of the Roman Empire. Or was it? I suspect the Romans may of not been the first inhabitants of Pompeii, Italy. The reason I suspect the Romans were not the original occupants of Pompeii, or the original occupants of that region of Italy, is the nearby volcano Vesuvius.

An active volcano, and one of the most active volcanoes on earth, Vesuvius has erupted numerous times throughout the ages, and that includes the numerous eruptions which certainly occurred during the Atlantean time period. Currently the climate of Pompeii, Italy and the surrounding region, is warm year round, with even mild climate conditions occurring during the coldest month of January. Residence of California, especially central and northern California, if they had the chance to spend at least one winter in the region of Pompeii, Italy would recognize that the winter climate of Pompeii, Italy is very similar to the climate of central and northern California. Average January highs in the Pompeii region are close to the mid 50s, and it probably is not unusual for Pompeii to experience January temperatures that reach well into the 60s on occasions.

Depending on how much more land was above water during the ice age (for all we know the Mediterranean Sea may not have existed 11,500 years ago), it is very likely the climate of the Pompeii region during the ice age, was ideal to support agriculture. Atlantean explorations into the Pompeii region had to occur. And then there is the question of the soil of that area of Italy, which is very easy to answer! We know now that the soil of the region surrounding Vesuvius, is some of the best soil for growing crops in the world, as are other locations that are located close to volcanoes.

In no way can we actually think that the Atlantean people were ignorant of the region of Pompeii, and the richness of that regions resources. If there was any place in all of Italy that the Atlanteans wanted to start colonies, it had to be the Pompeii region. With its ideal climate, and especially the soil of the Pompeii

region, the Atlanteans certainly did not wait to colonize the Pompeii region, unless the Atlanteans experienced frequent warfare with the Aboriginal occupants of the Pompeii region of southern Italy. The location of Pompeii with its excellent soil and ideal climate during the ice age, definitely represents the Pompeii region supporting an very large Atlantean population that may of numbered 100,000 or more people at its height.

Back during the ice age, there probably was not any part of the Mediterranean Sea nearby (again there may not have been an Mediterranean Sea then), because of the more exposed land during the ice age. So as for any connection to ship building or anything that dealt with ocean travel, its likely Pompeii played no role or just an limited role, but obviously Pompeii was not at all a great distance from the Mediterranean Sea during those times. To some extent the Atlanteans of the Pompeii region, had to be in business with the nearby Atlantean navy, if the Atlanteans supported a navy in the Pompeii region, as I believe they once did. Because of the soil of the Pompeii region, the Atlanteans must of built many settlements in the Vesuvius region, and the immediate area surrounding the Vesuvius region.

I would not be at all surprised if the number of Atlantean cities and villages in the Vesuvius region numbered 10, 20 or even more. Definitely, some of the Atlantean settlements of the Pompeii region, may of supported populations that numbered well into the tens of thousands or even more, but I believe the great majority of the Atlantean settlements of those times, were home to only a few hundred people or less, as is the case for the present time throughout the world. Since the soil of that region was, and it still is, excellent soil for cultivating plants, there must have been an incredible number of large and small Atlantean farms in the Vesuvius region during the ice age. At the present time it is not unusual to take in two harvest a year in the Vesuvius region because of the warm climate, but we know that it was not possible during the ice age because of the different climate conditions during those times. The Atlantean farmers must of took full advantage of the incredibly rich volcanic soil of the Vesuvius region, because as we know today, crops grown in rich volcanic soil, are far superior to crops grown in non volcanic soil.

The Vesuvius region, if it indeed was part of the first Italian Atlantean Empire and also the Carthaginian Italian Empire as I believe, had to be considered by the Atlanteans as one of the most important colonies of both those Atlantean Empires. The areas of countries where people see more wealth come in, tend to have larger populations, and also far more crime and unrest among the citizens, and that usually catches the attention of leaders. Military settlements had

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

to of existed in the Vesuvius region, because of the richness of the colony of the Atlanteans, who like all nations find the areas of their territory that produce more wealth, to be their absolute favorites which represents, of course, their utmost will to defend their wealth.

Back to the famous volcano located near Pompeii, Vesuvius. Exactly how many times did Vesuvius erupt during the entire Atlantean occupation of the Pompeii region? To some people it can be answered by experts on volcano's, yet though experts on volcano's may claim their estimates are correct, we absolutely know better! We have to take into consideration the incredibly long Atlantean occupation of the Pompeii region first, above all else.

Their occupation of the Pompeii region may of lasted far longer than 9000 years, and that is being realistic. In fact, the Atlanteans may have inhabited the Pompeii region for upwards to 15,000 to 20,000 years. Let us come up with one severe Vesuvius eruption every 200 years, though Vesuvius may erupt more frequently. In a 9000 year time period that is 40 severe eruptions of the volcano Vesuvius. While certainly many of those eruptions were certainly on a gigantic scale, they may not have been as severe as the one in 79 A.D., but probably close. Realistically, there may of been even greater eruptions than the 79 A.D. eruption which inundated Pompeii and the nearby surrounding region, with new earth.

Those Atlantean settlements that were located closer to the Vesuvius volcano, obviously suffered the same fate Pompeii and Herculanium experienced. Eruptions stronger than the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D., may have taking place during the Atlantean time period and, if so, than some of the Atlantean settlements further away from Vesuvius may have been buried also. Of course, the older Atlantean settlements or, if you prefer, the first Atlantean settlements of the Vesuvius region, could be buried under incredible amounts of earth, and will be extremely difficult to discover, if my theory is correct.

Just how many feet of new earth created after each eruption of Vesuvius, buries the ancient Atlantean settlements is unknown, but the number could be great I assume. I suspect the Roman towns of Pompeii and Herculanium, may of originally started out as Atlantean villages as long as 15,000 years ago (it may go even further back in time than 15,000 years for all we know), and the original foundations of the Atlantean villages, could possibly be buried far under the present Pompeii and Herculanium. It may sound too far out but it's a real possibility. The location of both Pompeii and Herculanium, did not go unnoticed by the ancient Atlantean explorers. Pompeii was rediscovered during the seventeenth century by accident, by someone who was digging a water well seeking water, but instead of finding water what they discovered totally amazed everyone.

Ancient Roman artifacts were brought up from the well instead of water, and the science of archaeology was born soon afterwards. Even to this day archaeologists have not dug up all of Pompeii, nor the nearby Roman village of Herculanium. There will be many more discoveries waiting to be discovered under the remaining sections of both Pompeii and Herculanium in the future, if archaeologists are allowed to dig up all of Pompeii and Herculanium.

What archaeologists have discovered so far from their excavations is remarkable. Much of Pompeii and Herculanium that has been dug up so far, shows ancient Roman buildings and homes that are still in good condition, as well as the ancient streets that covered both cities. Roman artwork also survived the eruption of the volcano Vesuvius, and is also in good condition, though they are very ancient. Presently, I am not aware of any archaeologist who may believe that Pompeii and Herculanium were not the only Roman cities buried by the eruption of the volcano Vesuvius in 79 A.D., but again I have not done research. I suppose there could be more than a few archaeologists who believe that there could exist other ancient Roman villages that once existed in the vicinity of the volcano Vesuvius, and like both Pompeii and Herculanium, were buried under incredible amounts of new earth during the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. Money will be a problem, of course, for any archaeologist who theorizes that there could be many other ancient settlements of man buried far beneath the earth of the Vesuvius region. Government money absolutely has to be involved in such a venture, even though it may be very difficult to obtain, and time consuming as well. Philanthropy is obviously a source for large cash donations, especially from philanthropists who will take far more than a little interest in the subject of the donation asked for. Public awareness of the project is also very important if the project is to be successful.

It is very likely there could be many ancient settlements of man buried under the earth of the Vesuvius region, that sooner or later, because of mans incredible appetite to discover his roots, will be discovered. Modern technology could be put to work in the Vesuvius region, looking straight into the earth to discover if there exist anything out of the normal. Recently, I watched a program about the ancient sphinx which is located next to the pyramids of giza in Egypt. Archaeologists theorize there could be hidden under the sphinx, hidden chambers that contain important information about the history of that time, as well as Atlantis.

They used modern technology equipment to look underneath the sphinx, to determine if there exist any location under the sphinx, that to them resembled a manmade structure. What their modern technology equipment gave them was

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

a picture that to them was promising. We know that it will be extremely difficult for archaeologists to receive permission to dig under the sphinx, and that is only right. Those same archaeologists believe the sphinx to be at least 10,000 years old or even older. And some archaeologists also believe the Egyptians are descended from the ancient Atlanteans which, I realize is extremely difficult for present day Egyptians to accept, as it is also extremely difficult for present day white people to accept, that they inherited the European Atlantean civilization. I have no idea just how far underground that new technology equipment can be used for if the equipment has limits. And I do believe if there were ancient Atlantean settlements buried by the frequent eruptions of Vesuvius, they are buried by far more earth than compared to Pompeii and Herculanium.

Atlantean settlements buried by Vesuvius eruptions that were further away from the volcano, of course, would be buried by less earth than the Atlantean settlements that were closer to the location of the volcano, so if any archaeologist gets the urge to investigate the possibility of discovering ancient Atlantean settlements in the region of the volcano Vesuvius, has to seriously consider the further away from Vesuvius, but not a very great distance away, their chances are far better of actually discovering the elusive ancient Atlantean settlements, or even more ancient Roman settlements that may have been buried by the 79 A.D. eruption of Vesuvius.

Man power, of course, will be crucial to the archaeologists who gets the urge to investigate the entire Vesuvius region for the buried ancient Atlantean settlements. Every inch of the Vesuvius region must be investigated to ensure that the project does indeed stand a better chance of actually discovering the goal of their search. By far, money will top the worries of all archaeologists involved in the project, to discover ancient Atlantean settlements near Vesuvius, and they have to constantly look for donations, especially from philanthropists who are far more than fascinated about actually discovering ancient European Atlantean settlements. Every means must be used to keep philanthropists and their sought after cash donations, involved in the search to discover ancient European Atlantean settlements buried in the Vesuvius region.

That Vesuvius region probably is the best chance we have for discovering ancient Atlantean settlements which will be largely intact. Although if any are discovered in the future, they may not turn out to be the great discoveries that both Pompeii and Herculanium did which, of course, I am referring to the condition of the discovered Atlantean settlement or settlements, they will give modern day humans an excellent opportunity to learn of the roots of civilized life.

Can it be that the frequent ice ages that come and go on our earth (we have reasons to disbelieve ice age theories), are not brought on by what we have been told over the years by experts on the earths climate? Our earths present climate is greatly influenced by the oceans that cover our earth, and recently (within the past century of course) they have discovered circulating in the Atlantic Ocean, the gulf stream and the effects the gulf stream has on the climate of the land areas that surround the Atlantic Ocean.

Warm air coming up from the tropical regions, flows north to the northern hemisphere by way of the gulf stream in the Atlantic Ocean. The cool winter climate of western Europe, especially the climate of Great Britain and Ireland, are the result of the gulf stream located in the Atlantic Ocean. Western North Americas climate is also very similar to the winter climate of western Europe, and that is the result of the Pacific Ocean. Southern Alaska, or the panhandle of Alaska to make it clearer for you, has similar winter climate conditions to Ireland and Great Britain, with average January highs in the upper 30s to the low 40s, and high precipitation that typically falls in the form of rain showers.

Experts think ice ages are brought on when the earths orbit around the sun, extends further away every 100,000 years or so. We all have every right to believe they could be wrong about that theory. During the early 1990s (I believe it was 1991) the volcano Pinatubo located in the Philippines, erupted very violently and the climate of the earth changed soon after the eruption of Pinatubo. Where I live at, even with the elevation for the city at over 3,600 feet, it snowed in late August of 1992, an incredible 3 inches of snow. If you think the snow may of fell the last day of August or even the second to last day of August, you are wrong!

I believe the August snowstorm occurred on August 22nd, 1992. The high and low temperatures for that day and the following day the 23rd of August, 1992 were 38-32 and 39-32. For that time of year for where I live at, it was indeed very unseasonably cold. I was just as shocked as everyone else at that time, and I also recognized how unseasonably cool that entire summer was. The average summer high temperatures for where I lived at during that time were around 15 degrees below normal. To be honest it felt much more like spring time weather than summer time weather, with the highs frequently topping out only in the 60s, when normally the temperatures are in the low 80s.

Volcanoes can bring on short ice ages or at least I believe so, if their theories concerning the most powerful volcano's are true. They have recently discovered that Yellowstone National Park is an incredibly huge volcano that erupts every 600,000 years or so, and a few months ago while I was reading my newspaper, I noticed an article about a lake located in Yellowstone National Park which

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

contained a bulge at the bottom many people thought was growing. It was fairly recent when they actually started their investigations of the bottom of that lake in Yellowstone National Park, so most people believe that the bulge at the bottom of that lake most likely has been there for a very long time.

That still does not ease my worries. I have read that if Yellowstone was to erupt, all people within 600 miles of Yellowstone National Park should evacuate immediately. From where I live at (I believe I may be less than 300 miles from Yellowstone National Park) that information does worry me. In the past one million years there may have been incredibly huge volcano eruptions, that were so huge their eruptions possibly brought on ice ages that lasted for thousands of years. Gravity will keep that volcanic dust and debris in the earths atmosphere long enough for the earth to cool down, and in some cases, cool down dramatically.

Of course, the same can be said for all the manmade pollution we are currently injecting into our earths atmosphere now. However, in the case of humans injecting manmade pollution into our earths atmosphere, it is very different for we are continuously injecting manmade pollution into our earths atmosphere. In fact, gravity will keep it in our earths atmosphere long enough for it to continuously build up and that's not good!

Vesuvius is just one of many active volcanoes on our earth that can erupt suddenly, and cause immediate climate changes for extended periods of time. Eruptions of an huge magnitude can shoot into the earths atmosphere, incredible amounts of earth which very quickly can change the earths current climate conditions. If the eruption of a volcano sends enough earth into the atmosphere, than I believe there is good chance the earths climate will cool down so much that the gulf stream, and the similar streams that flow in our earths other oceans, will cease to flow, and if that happens we can anticipate colder weather.

What will follow certainly will be an extended cold period that will dramatically effect the lives of billions of humans all over our earth. If an ice age does follow a huge volcano eruption the ice age may last thousands of years, but again depending on how cool the earths climate cools down, the ice age may not last that long. The magnitude of the super volcano's eruption could also be a factor deciding on how long an ice age may last for.

Honestly, none of us can rightfully claim that ice ages last for 40,000, 50,000, or even 100,000 years, or even longer. We do not know anything about the life span of ice ages and if your like me, you will find what they actually may claim is not right at all, but just a simple guess they have for the life span of ice ages.

Apparently the gulf stream is why certain parts of the northern hemisphere are so mild during the winter, and the gulf stream in their opinion has to disappear

when there are ice ages. There would be no sense for the existence of any gulf stream in any ocean, especially in the more northerly and southerly areas of our world, while there is an ice age in existence. Yet then we must look up above as well to understand that there is another stream in the earths atmosphere which dramatically can effect our earths climate.

My belief that ancient Atlantean settlements may be buried in the Vesuvius region, is because of the Atlantis story, of course, which is obviously a real historical event that happened 11,500 years ago, plus the volcano Vesuvius and, mainly to be honest, because of the rediscovery of Pompeii and Herculanium. From the Atlantis story I know the Atlanteans settled in Italy, and that certainly includes all of Italy of that time, so it is very likely there could actually exist under the earth of the Vesuvius region, incredible discoveries waiting to be discovered.

Though I have no idea just how many settlements the Atlantean people had in all of Italy 11,500 years ago, I know for certain that the Vesuvius region had to of supported an large Atlantean population, so it is very likely there could of existed during the entire Atlantean occupation of Italy, many large and small, Atlantean settlements in the Vesuvius region.

I know of no archaeologist presently, searching for buried ancient Atlantean settlements in the Vesuvius region of Italy, and I will be very surprised if there has never been a single person that has not shown interest in such a venture. The discovery of ancient Atlantean settlements could possibly never be equaled in the history of archaeology, and we all will be enriched from such an discovery, when and if, it actually ever happens. Realistically, we may never discover the Atlantis that is so famous to world history, which was located in northeastern North America of course, and I mention that simply because the whites are full of ignorance concerning Atlantean settlements along the northeastern coastline of Canada and the United States, so the other choice obviously has to be under the earth of Italy, western Europe or northern Africa. Whoever gets the urge to actually look for ancient Atlantean settlements in Italy, stands an excellent chance of actually discovering the ancient settlements of the Atlanteans in Italy. In fact, maybe even a better chance compared to other locations outside of Italy, minus North America of course. It will be a huge media event very similar to the discovery of King Tuts tomb during the early 1920s, if and when, it happens. But don't bet on it for the whites would probably just as well ignore it.

The First Greeks

The Greek people learned of the forgotten Atlantis from the Egyptians and, yes, the Atlantis story is a true account of an event that happened 11,500 years ago. Apparently the Greek people may of recorded their knowledge of Atlantis during the time the famous event took place, but from some catastrophe (most likely if it were true the great flood that destroyed Atlantis) their written records of their war with the Atlanteans were lost. However, the white race probably didn't exist 11,500 years ago, or if they did, they were obviously not numerous.

Then, to not forget, the Greeks who first recorded the events of the Atlantean invasion of 11,500 years ago, were probably the Egyptian Europeans or Gypsy people. Probably very surprised to learn that their ancestors of 9000 years before their time, stood their ground against the invading Atlanteans, while all other people had been very easily defeated and enslaved (subjugated or conquered is closer to the truth) by the invading Atlanteans, the white Greeks must of taken pride in their ancestors so called victory over the Atlanteans. Supposedly, the Atlanteans met their equals in war in eastern Europe, the homeland of the white Greek people, and were unable to defeat the Greeks of eastern Europe.

What makes the Greek people so special if the Greeks were responsible for defeating the invading Atlanteans? We must remember that 11,500 years ago there probably wasn't any white people in existence, so we would be better off excluding the whites, yet we shouldn't ignore it.

Were the Greek people of 11,500 years ago (the first Greeks the white race is descended from of course) highly civilized like the Atlanteans, or even the Egyptians of 10,000 years ago? Very likely, for their civilization is likely the one that dominates the world at the present time. Obviously to some extent, from what I have read of the Atlantis story, the people the white Greeks were descended from, were highly civilized. But just exactly how advanced was their civilization of the time of the Atlantean invasion? And were they the Gypsies or Egyptian Europeans, as I suggest that they were?

I rather accept an highly advanced civilization in Greece every bit as advanced as that of the Atlanteans, yet there is good enough reason to even consider the first great Greek civilization of 11,500 years ago, as being superior to the Atlantean civilization. And certainly the whites inherited that advanced civilization of Greece, which very likely was of Gypsy origins. Agriculture was certainly practiced by the people the white Greek people of eastern Europe were partially descended from, or related to, because the Story of Atlantis relates to us the fact that the first Greeks were fond of agriculture. And certainly the climate of eastern Europe near the Mediterranean Sea, was warm enough for agriculture to exist then. Certainly, the people the white Greek people are partially descended from, civilization of 11,500 years ago, never equaled their lands descendants civilization that would exist well over 9000 years later, minus a few important facts such as navigating the seas, and probably indoor plumbing, and maybe even certain traits of their agriculture operations as well.

I am suspicious of a possible Greek (either they be white or Egyptian European) outright victory over the invading Atlanteans, reason being, there may not of been in existence 11,500 years ago, an foe anywhere in the Mediterranean region who were powerful enough to defeat the mighty Carthaginians in war.

What is especially demeaning about the Greeks of 11,500 years ago withstanding an outright Carthaginian conquest, can be summed up by claiming that they fled to their nearby mountains to escape from the invading Carthaginians, to carry on an unending guerilla war with them. From present day Bosnia-Herzegovina, all the way down to southern Greece, are numerous mountains which were obviously an obstacle to the Carthaginians, if they in fact actually attempted to subjugate that regions kingdoms, when they invaded 11,500 years ago. For all anyone knows the invading Carthaginians possibly initiated a colony or two in eastern Europe but were incapable of bringing total peace to that region directly as a result of the great determination of that regions kingdoms, to fight for their land and freedom.

If that regions kingdoms did use their mountains to wage an unending guerilla war against the Carthaginians, the warfare may have persisted on indefinitely, or until the Carthaginians gave up all hope of subduing that regions kingdoms, and then reluctantly agreed to withdraw their military personal and probably their civilians as well, from eastern Europe.

What occurred after Atlantis was destroyed when, one by one, the whites by war, conquered all the Atlanteans of the Mediterranean Sea region, could actually represent that suspected white Greek victory over the invading Atlanteans, yet there is obviously a major problem with the time periods. It was only a little over

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

2000 years ago when the whites actually conquered all the Atlanteans of the Mediterranean Sea region, and that is a good 9000 years from the events of the invasion of the Atlanteans. Of course, we are only too aware of the whites conquering all of the Mediterranean regions inhabitants which, to be forthright, ranks as one of human history's greatest feats.

That historical event even surpasses the feat that the invading Carthaginians accomplished 11,500 years ago. The great flood that destroyed Atlantis, also over time, eventually contributed to the whites conquest over the Atlanteans who lived around the Mediterranean Sea a little over 2000 years ago. Yet we can't obviously accept that historical event as being the event that occurred 11,500 years ago, although it is appealing to do so. To put it in sorrowful words, the catastrophe that brought Atlantis to its end did incredible damage to the Atlanteans of not only Atlantis, but also of western and central Europe, northern Africa, and the Middle East and, realistically, that catastrophe is what defeated the mighty Atlanteans.

If that catastrophe had not of occurred than in my opinion, Atlantean rule would of lasted far longer, and obviously the whites who were surrounded by highly advanced Algonquian civilizations, would of faced major roadblocks in their way to dominating the Mediterranean Sea region. Another suspicion I have deals with an Atlantean victory over the people who first inhabited the lands of eastern Europe, who were very likely the Gypsy people, that may of occurred during the Atlantean invasion of 11,500 years ago. It may have been possible that an Atlantean victory or conquest, over the people who first inhabited the lands of eastern Europe, who were likely the Gypsy people, likely occurred, and what the Greek people learned from the Egyptians about the Atlanteans, may have been misinterpreted by the Greeks at the time they learned of the forgotten Atlantis, or soon afterwards. It is not unusual to have information such as ancient historical events deliberately rearranged to make that information more appealing, especially if the information deals with events such as the events mentioned in the Atlantis story.

Although the events mentioned in the Atlantis story occurred 9000 years before the Greek people learned of those ancient events, in reality the white Greek people may have been more encouraged to see to it that their ancestors involvement in the Atlantean invasion was acceptable to the white Greek people.

If the events had just occurred only 50 to 100 years before, than it is very likely the information would not of changed a great deal. I am not the only one of the present time who believes all nations, even of the present time, deliberately change information, or let us be honest now, lie to make that information acceptable to their citizens.

There are examples of those outright lies that have occurred within the past century, which seriously must be investigated to find out what the real truth of the information is. When nations feel that it is necessary to lie to their own citizens, there must be a good reason to conduct themselves in that manner. If the information is serious enough that warfare may result if the truth be known by their people, than their leaders must feel that at all cost their citizens must not know the real information, if only just to avoid war, especially if they know that incredible numbers of people could be killed if the real truth becomes known of.

The white Greek people, when they first learned of the forgotten Atlantis, did not have to worry about any war coming if they lied about their ancestors involvement in the Atlantean invasion, so it is very possible the information was altered for the pleasure of the white Greek people. Now let us look at the Atlantean invasion in a different light that may favor only the white Greek people who, in reality, may of stopped the Atlantians in Italy, but we will not place bets on it of course. Were there any whites in existence 11,500 years ago? Historically, the white Greek people were known around the Mediterranean Sea region, as being excellent warriors. The first great white Greek civilization was is in existence as long ago as 2000 B.C., on some of the islands of the Mediterranean Sea, near Greece. I believe, and also on the mainland of Greece I will be honest and let you know I believe the Atlantians were responsible for those island civilizations, which the whites obviously inherited.

One thousand years later another great white Greek civilization emerged that one day would dominate our earth, but it would not be through the white Greek people of Greece, but the Romans of Italy, that the world would inherit their civilization. 11,500 years ago is an extremely long time, yet was there an ancient white civilization located in Greece 11,500 years ago?

If in fact there existed anything that we might want to call a civilization of white Greek origins 11,500 years ago, we currently have no archaeological evidence to prove it, and there must be archaeological evidence of an white Greek civilization that goes back 11,500 years, which can help to prove to everyone that the whites were victorious over the Atlantians 11,500 years ago. If the whites dominated Athens 11,500 years ago, its likely it was them who through their military strength, triumphed over that powerful group of Atlantians. However, 11,500 years is an extremely long time, and the historical evidence written in the Story of Atlantis suggests to the world, that a birth of a new race of humans occurred. But exactly when did that mysterious birth occur?

There is the Egyptians description of Greek life of 11,500 years ago, which must be an exact description of the Greeks homeland of then. Apparently the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Greeks homeland of 11,500 years ago, was just as fair as it was during the time the Greek people learned of the forgotten Atlantis, but their homeland produced greater amounts of food to feed the entire Greek population of 11,500 years ago, than it apparently did 2500 years ago, according to the Story of Atlantis.

That bit of historical information is extremely valuable to present day humans, as is the historical climatic data in the Story of Atlantis, for it suggests that we have done major damage to our mother earth. Granted, when we invade into our mother earth, we disturb that which is sacred to our mother earth, for our mother earth has in motion the cycle of bringing forth new life so the earth resembles the embodiment of beauty. It is our responsibility to return to our mother earth her ways of establishing new life.

One important fact about the Egyptians description of ancient Athens of 11,500 years ago, deals with Greek life during the seasons. From what I read of the description of ancient Athens of 11,500 years ago, apparently they were known to move from one location to another, which does seem strange for civilized people. Their movements during the seasons resembles a nomadic way of life, but again their movements took place within a very small area.

Housing from what I can only guess, may have been constructed of simple earthly tools such as clay brick or mud brick. To be honest I think it was very possible for their housing to have been firmly constructed of the strongest building materials in existence, since it is written that Greek houses of 11,500 years ago were kept in the family, or handed down from one generation to the next, yet it wouldn't surprise me if some of their housing, or a lot of their housing, was constructed of simple huts. Temples and other important public buildings, no doubt were more likely to be constructed of stones, clay brick or mud brick, and may of resembled buildings of more primitive civilizations such as in the Americas, Africa, and Asia, yet they may have been the partial designs for the much later white Greek public buildings.

In no way can we bring ourselves to even think that the Greek civilization of 11,500 years ago, equaled later civilizations of the same location in architecture, the arts, music, medicine, science or any other important fact of a highly civilized people, yet we don't know exactly what existed 11,500 years ago. Life expectancy for the Greek people and all other people of our earth 11,500 years ago, must of equaled or even surpassed, what modern humans can expect to live to now at the present time. I will again mention the ancient ages the bible clearly states ancient humans lived to, to better illustrate that those humans of 11,500 years ago, may have lived longer than modern humans do. If the Greek people, be them white or Gypsy, actually did defeat the entire Atlantean Empire, all the

wars that it took to defeat the powerful Atlantean Empire, were certainly very numerous, and the warfare had to of lasted an incredibly long time. We can't imagine the incredible number of casualties both the Greeks and the Atlanteans suffered, in warfare that repeatedly visited the two peoples. What I have noticed, and I am probably not the only one, about the Atlantis story, which deserves special mention, is the time period between the start of the Atlantean invasion, and the destruction of Atlantis. Most people will probably accept that the time period to have been an short one, probably within a few decades, while others may consider the period to have been a little longer in time.

I am not in agreement with those who believe that the time period between the beginning of the Atlantean Empire, to the destruction of Atlantis, was short in duration, maybe only at the most, a few decades. The period between the beginning of the Atlantean Empire, and the destruction of Atlantis is unknown, so that leaves open enough time for warfare that may of dragged on for over centuries, or even for over thousands of years.

However, we do have some evidence of an 1000 year period between the Atlantean invasion and the Egyptian Europeans (it could have been the white Greeks but probably not) colonization of the ancient land of Egypt, which definitely suggests that war was occurring then between the Carthaginians and the invading Egyptian Europeans, which can be taken as the necessary proof that a long war was going on between the two warring nations.

Why I suspect there may of been an different outcome other than what history tells us, is the time period between the beginning of the Atlantean Empire of 11,500 years ago, to the destruction of Atlantis. Presently, we do not know when the catastrophe that destroyed Atlantis occurred, and by that, I mean an exact date for that catastrophe, so to me the question has not been answered, and the real conqueror of the Atlantean people was first, Mother Nature. For most people they will accept history and accept that the white Greek people defeated the Atlanteans, and also around the same time period, the destruction of Atlantis also occurred. There may be other people, other than myself, who believe the events that took place 11,500 years ago, are to some degree not at all the truth. That gap in time between the beginning of the Atlantean invasion, to the destruction of Atlantis, to historians, is very simple to answer, if you accept their belief that out of nowhere came the Atlantean people, who within a very short time nearly conquered the entire Mediterranean Sea region, but soon afterwards, the white Greek people organized to make war on the Atlanteans, and within a short time defeated the Atlanteans, and then suddenly an incredible catastrophe destroyed Atlantis, and to top it all the events written of in the Story of Atlantis,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

occurred over a few decades. The Story of Atlantis is written in a way that supports that scenario but we know better!

There was an extended period of time (probably a very long extended period of time) that possibly was in the thousands of years, between the beginning of the Mediterranean Atlantean Empire and their supposed defeat at the hands of the white Greek people, and then the catastrophe that destroyed Atlantis. There is no way I will accept their belief or anyone else's, that that time period between the beginning of the Mediterranean Atlantean Empire, to the catastrophe, was a few decades, or maybe only a century or two.

There is absolutely no sense in believing their estimate of time for the events of the Story of Atlantis, if they do believe it was short in duration, because it is far too short in my opinion. Atlantis may have been destroyed for all we know only 5000 years ago, or around the time of the supposed rise of the Egyptian civilization.

Greek people, at least some of them, I have noticed resemble the Atlanteans, and by that, I do mean the Egyptian Europeans and the Semitic people of course. So I am absolutely certain that the Atlantean people did migrate as far east in Europe as Greece, and even further eastward into even India. Of course, they were very likely the descendents of the first wave of Atlantean settlers. Historically, most people will accept that the white Greek people defeated the Atlanteans 11,500 years ago, using their powerful military to forcibly bring the Atlantean Empire to an end, but I will exclude myself. My belief that the catastrophe that destroyed Atlantis 11,500 years ago also, over time, and by time, I mean 5000 to 6000 years, contributed to the end of the Atlantean Empire, and there was no such white Greek victory over the Atlanteans until the rise of the Romans, to nearly everyone will not be acceptable, and to them for good reasons. It is very likely that after Atlantis was destroyed, that the Egyptian Europeans eventually became enticed to invade the Carthaginian Jewish Egyptian colony, which they successfully accomplished of course.

I suspect that the people the white race were descended from, if there was an Aboriginal people of Europe when the first Atlanteans showed up 11,500 years ago (it may have occurred probably thousands of years even before that ancient time), were very light in skin color, and like the Bushmen people the Algonquians encountered in Africa (historians have got to convincingly prove that the African Bushmen people inhabited Africa before Native Americans), were the Aboriginal occupants of Europe, before Algonquian settlement commenced 11,500 years ago (it was probably even much further back in time than that 11,500 years) throughout western Europe. But it wouldn't surprise in

the least if the people the white race were partially descended from, lived somewhere in the Middle East, or even closer to India.

Like the Bushmen people of Africa, those Aboriginal occupants of Europe, if they did live in Europe, which I doubt, could possibly still be in existence but I wouldn't bet on it. Whites of the present time are their descendents and, as well, the whites are also partially Native American from interbreeding with them. White people can write all the books, newspaper and magazine articles, and other forms of literature, about white people migrating to North America 20,000 years ago or even further back in time, and that they were the first race to live in the Americas, but they are not fooling no one! What the whites are doing, and this is in regards to the DNA evidence as well as the Story of Atlantis, which conceals historical evidence of human evolution, is covering up an DNA relationship which exists between Native Americans and Egyptian Europeans and Semitic people (I will refer to the Carthaginians), who are Native Americans.

Its not a matter of "how did the DNA of Europeans show up in North America?" but "how did the DNA of Native Americans show up in Europe, Africa and the Middle East?" We know the answer to that! The Story of Atlantis clearly tells us all how our ancestors DNA got to Europe, Africa and the Middle East. And I am convinced that the white Europeans conspired shortly before 1492, to invade all of the New World, largely as a result of that Story of Atlantis, and greed was their one and only motivation.

The Egyptian Europeans

According to historians the Gypsies originally lived in the ancient country of India, and supposedly they were entertainers who traveled from location to location, and that is how they ended up in the heart of Europe. But I have every right to believe those historians are wrong about Gypsy history! The Gypsy languages are part of the Indo-European language family, and though that may not represent a lot to most people, it does leave me with the impression that the Gypsies are native to Europe. If the Gypsy languages are part of the Indo-European language family, make no doubts about it, that does likely mean the Gypsies are native to Europe, and they can't deny it!

What sets the Gypsies apart from the whites of Europe, of course, is race. But how can these two people of different races speak languages which are of the same language family and, which does include numerous languages spoken in India? If my theory that the Gypsies are indeed native to Europe is correct, than just where in Europe did the Gypsies originate? Western Europe can be taken into consideration as the part of Europe where the Gypsies originally lived,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

but a much likelier location in Europe where the Gypsies originated, is eastern Europe, or to be precise, the region from what is now Greece, to the Caucasus Mountains.

The white race originated in the Caucasus Mountains, and it was from those mountains that the whites spread out into Asia, Europe, and as well Africa and, later the Americas, New Zealand, and Australia. Since the Gypsies and whites speak in languages which are considered related, it may have been possible that the whites were descended from the Gypsies, which I know will not go very well among many people.

But are the Gypsy people related to the Algonquians of North America? I need to do research on the Gypsy languages to determine if it resembles the language of the Algonquians, more so than that of the whites. If the Gypsy languages do not show a closer resemblance to that of Algonquian, compared to the languages of the whites, than obviously that would mean there is no relationship between the Atlanteans and the Gypsies. It would not surprise me if the Gypsies and the Atlanteans are related. But when and where, did the Gypsies separate from the other Atlanteans, and eventually come to speak their own distinct language? If the Gypsies and whites are of the same race, just when and where, did these two people reach the end of the road then went their separate ways, of course, yet somehow overtime became in race, distinct from each other? The Indo-European language family occupies an area that stretches from the Atlantic all the way to India, but most of Europe was originally occupied by the Atlanteans who, of course, supposedly speak a non Indo-European language. The whites certainly could of during an ancient event very long ago, conquered all peoples that lived from the Atlantic Ocean to India, forcing them to speak their language, and obviously that theory can't be thrown into the trash, because it may of actually occurred but probably not!

Mysterious as they are, the whites according to the Atlantis story, lived in Greece, or the people they are descended from did. But if the whites actually lived in Greece 11,500 years ago, and they and the Gypsies are of the same race, those whites who lived in Greece 11,500 ago may have been the Gypsies, which is likely true. Could it have been possible for certain groups of Gypsies to have migrated to the Caucasus mountains, and eventually over time evolved into the white race?

That may of happened, but there is no convincing evidence that I know of to support such an theory. At the present time the Gypsies continue to live throughout Europe, and as well northern Africa, the Middle East, and the Americas. However, only sixty years ago the Gypsies of Europe were nearly

exterminated by the German people during World War II, when they were forced into concentration camps to be deliberately killed. Anywhere from 250,000 to over 4,000,000 Gypsies, were murdered by the Germans during World War II, all because the Gypsies were not considered to be white in race, by the German people.

Presently, the Gypsy population has rebounded to close to six million, and that includes Gypsies of Europe, Africa, the Americas, and other locations. And the Gypsy languages continue to be spoken by the Gypsy people. And certainly the Gypsies have not lost their identity, and may never lose their identity. But as time progresses more and more Gypsies are converting to civilized life, and in fact, in Europe only 10% of the Gypsy population continues to live a nomadic lifestyle, and that could over time, result in the Gypsies losing their racial identity. But the Gypsy people have managed to stay together for longer than we know for certain, so its very likely the Gypsies will always know, who they are and where they came from, which I believe has always been Europe.

I think it is very important that the Gypsy people not let the white Europeans tell the Gypsy people, who they are and where they came from. And the Gypsies must face reality, the Gypsies are native to Europe! The Gypsy languages are the only proof the Gypsies need that they are native to Europe. And as for being of Algonquian descent I am not at all convinced that they aren't. If the Story of Atlantis is true we can place the Gypsies of eastern Europe (of what is now Greece) expanding down into northern Africa (Egypt and Nubia) around 10,000 years ago, where they would battle the Carthaginians for control of the eastern Mediterranean region.

Northern Africa

As I mentioned earlier in the book, it may have been very possible that the Atlanteans chose northern Africa to colonize first, but maybe not, and I mention that because it is mentioned in the Story of Atlantis, that the Algonquians settled Europe before they settled Egypt. However, that can also be taken to represent the vice versa of course. Climate conditions during the ice age in northern Africa, certainly were a bit warmer than the climate of southern Europe, and obviously that had to be recognized by the Algonquian people (the first wave of Algonquian settlers of course), who made Africa home sweet home.

Northern Africa now, is almost entirely covered by the Sahara Desert, which at the present time is still expanding in all directions. Currently, some of the earth's hottest and driest weather occurs in the Sahara Desert of northern Africa. But the Sahara during the ice age, if it did exist then, was only a fraction of the current size of the Sahara Desert. There is the possibility that the Sahara Desert did not exist 11,500 years ago, if there was actually as we are told now, far different climate conditions which included even severe frequent cold spells and, of course, higher precipitation amounts.

I have not done any research about northern Africa's past climate, so what I will write about is from what little I have seen or read by accident, concerning what the climate conditions of northern Africa, and what northern Africa may of looked like during the ice age. Presently, northern Africa experiences little rainfall and extremely hot summers and mild to warm winters, minus the Mediterranean Sea coastline.

However, during the ice age northern Africa was much wetter and cooler with no desert conditions at all, or it may have been possible that the Sahara Desert existed but only covered a very small area in Atlantean times. Instead of desert scenery the land of northern Africa 11,500 years ago, was lush, green, and full of vegetation much of the year, because of the greater precipitation amounts. From northern Africa, next to the Mediterranean Sea, someone of 11,500 years

ago possibly could have walked all the way to central Africa, and not have to worry about not finding water.

Of course, at that the present time that is not at all possible because of the huge Sahara Desert, which lies between the Mediterranean Sea and central Africa. If the Sahara Desert existed 11,500 years ago, we could only imagine just how much smaller it was compared to the size of the Sahara Desert today. The end of the ice age is what caused the incredible growth of the Sahara Desert, which obviously grew more uglier with each amount of precious water disappearing from the soil beneath it. And at the present time many are worried that the Sahara Desert is, or it seems to be, expanding further and faster. Global warming or global cooling, is thought to be contributing to the ever expanding Sahara Desert, but the real cause may still be within our mother the earth or humans, which is probably correct of course.

Atlantean explorations of northern Africa (those first wave of Atlantean settlers of course) certainly were carried out to discover the people, climate, and the existence of good farmland to start colonies. Central Africa, or at least the northern part of central Africa, may have been explored by the Atlanteans, since there was no Sahara Desert to prevent the Atlantean explorers from penetrating that part of Africa.

As for any Atlantean colonies that may have been started in the northern part of central Africa, we have no evidence to support such a theory (if Nubia was initiated by the Atlanteans 10,000 year ago, it can be used to prove that Native Americans did start colonies in the north part of central Africa however) that the Atlanteans became permanently settled in north central Africa. However, we can't count out the possibility of the existence of Atlantean colonies in the northern part of central Africa of 11,500 years ago, even excluding Nubia, because of the different climate conditions then. To put it in different words, the Atlanteans were more willing to settle in areas where climate conditions were warmer and wetter, because of their agriculture operations, so I tend to accept the high likelihood of the first wave of Atlantean settlers venturing further down into north central Africa, to permanently live there.

The invading Atlanteans (this is in regards to the Carthaginians), from what we know of the Story of Atlantis, settled all of north Africa, and it is because of that that I believe the highest concentration of Atlantean people existed in north Africa. Northern Africa's Atlantean population certainly had to be in the millions, and among the millions of Atlanteans of northern Africa, had to be incredible numbers of the Aboriginal occupants of northern Africa, who certainly were the Bushmen people (again they are going to have to convincingly prove that the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Bushmen people were the Aboriginal people of Africa), whose homeland is primarily in central and southern Africa now.

We know from reading the Story of Atlantis that the Atlanteans mistreated the Aboriginal occupants of northern Africa and, likewise, they also mistreated the Aboriginal occupants of the Middle East, and the Aboriginal occupants of Europe as well (again they are going to have to convincingly prove that there were Aboriginal peoples there and that they were in fact horribly mistreated by the Atlanteans), which obviously represents slavery. But were all those locations originally occupied by an Aboriginal people? And I keep repeating that because it can't be ignored. Though the black Bushmen population may of not exceeded the population of the Atlanteans of northern Africa, they were most likely numerous but not so numerous as to pose a threat to the Atlanteans of northern Africa. And as well, they would eventually evolve into the black race of north central and northern Africa over time, and likely so as a result of interbreeding with other races.

Were the Carthaginians of north Africa impressed with the north African lands they brought under their control? Most definitely! North Africa's land was obviously far more attractive 11,500 years ago than that same land is currently, so I assume that the Carthaginians were quite smitten with their African lands.

Once the mighty Carthaginians gradually commenced their north African conquests over the first Atlanteans who colonized north Africa, I can only wonder exactly just how long the wars to bring the first Atlanteans of north Africa under Carthaginian subjugation actually took. Since we know that the Numidians were subjugated (historians may say otherwise) by the Carthaginians, we can actually place the Numidians living in north Africa before the invading Carthaginians did. Numidian lands stretched from Algeria, all the way to what later would be known as Cyrene, which was located in the north African country of Libya. So after the Carthaginians had forcefully subjugated north Africa's Numidians, the Numidians would obviously know the rule of the Carthaginians for at least 9000 long years.

By the time Rome got brave enough to take on the full might of the mighty Carthaginians, they discovered that they had some Numidian sympathizers in north Africa. Rome also discovered at the same time that they had Iberian sympathizers in the Carthaginians western European colonies.

Of course, what that represents is evidence of an relaxed Carthaginian attitude towards those African and European Kingdoms, that they subjugated 9000 years earlier. That simply means that the Carthaginians were not the kind of subjugators who were looking out for #1. Although the Carthaginians did

subjugate north Africa's civilized kingdoms, that certainly doesn't mean all of those north African civilized kingdoms were conquered by the invading Carthaginians. To the west of the Numidians lands, were the Atlas Mountains in both Algeria and Morocco, which were definitely an obstacle to those invading Carthaginians, who probably attempted to subjugate either an unknown Moroccan Kingdom or an unknown western Algerian Kingdom, but were possibly unsuccessful as a result of those Atlas Mountains, which probably prevented the Carthaginians from conquering some of those ancient kingdoms.

If there existed unknown north African civilized kingdoms in both Algeria and Morocco, their citizens very likely fled into those Algerian and Moroccan Atlas Mountains, to escape Carthaginian subjugation over them, and their descendents may have been those Numidians who sympathized with the Romans. Of course, the exact same may have occurred in the Carthaginians Iberian colonies, which included France, Portugal and Spain. Roman intelligence probably actively sought out Iberian sympathizers living in the French and Spanish mountains, and even probably among those who lived throughout France, and were possibly subjugated by the Carthaginians. What made the Roman Empire so wealthy and great was the Roman defeat of Carthage in the several wars the two people fought against one another. The empire of Carthage the Romans absorbed, included most of northern Africa, as well as France, Portugal and Spain in Europe (for all we know England, Ireland and Scotland as well), and when the Romans took into possession the entire land area of the empire of Carthage, from that point on the Roman Empire was undefeatable, until possibly the rise of the Huns.

Western Africa near Portugal and Spain, must have been the first location in Africa colonized by the first wave of Atlantean settlers. But the likelihood of Atlantean colonies first appearing further eastward, especially near Egypt, can't be dismissed. Of course, Egypt must have had an Atlantean colony which predated that of the Carthaginians, and then that of the Egyptian Europeans.

After all, the land may have been very different then, and in fact, the Egyptian land then may have been just as beautiful and even more productive than the Algerian and Moroccan lands. From the northwestern coast of Africa, the first wave of Atlantean settlers from Europe or America, possibly settled down to start agriculture operations, or to carry out trade with the Aboriginal occupants, or even to make war on the Aboriginal occupants, which is probably closer to the truth.

There had to be good farm land in that region of Africa when the first wave of Atlantean settlers arrived, to attract the Atlantean people to settle that area and

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

to keep them there. Their progress may have been slow at first, mainly because of an small Atlantean population, and also probably because of the threat of war from the black people of that region. Because they were civilized, with many civilized settlements, and produced an incredible amount of food from the richness of the farm land of that region, the Atlantean population certainly grew to the point where new settlements had to be planned and initiated, to meet the needs of the fast growing population of the African Algonquian people.

Northern Africa of 11,500 years ago, had to of had far more land that was suitable for agriculture operations, than northern Africa currently has. Atlanteans knew of the richness of that land 11,500 years ago obviously, if what they believe the land of north Africa looked like 11,500 years ago, is close to the truth. It is only but in our imagination now, to actually view the African lands of all the western Sahara and the nearby Mediterranean Sea, as being lush and sporadically inundated with fields of the earths most productive forests, yet when the first wave of Atlantean settlers, and the late arriving Carthaginians, first looked upon those African lands the view may have resembled just that.

The area between extreme northern north central Africa and to within close proximity of Egypt, was possibly settled next by the Atlanteans and, of course, the obvious Numidians were probably their descendents. But just where did the African Atlanteans eventually migrate to from northwestern Africa's Atlantic coastline first? The answer is not an easy one! And the great distance could signify a migration first to eastern Algeria or maybe to Tunisia (Carthaginians were obviously very fond of the Tunisian region), where the location was ideal for voyaging the vast Mediterranean Sea, and it still continues to be.

But what about the Atlanteans first settling Libya? I assume (probably everyone would) that the Atlanteans slowly did, after they established their first colonies on northwestern Africa's Atlantic coastline, migrated slowly eastward, and all the while, established new Atlantean colonies along the way, minus Egypt of course. When the time came for establishing new settlements, the Atlanteans likely let greed enter into their lives, and we of the present time know how powerful greed is, and how greed can work for you, and also how greed can destroy you. Wealth to be gained from new agriculture operations, slavery, and war effect people in a horrible way, and it is probably the thought of becoming wealthy that pushed the Atlantean people to continue on with their migration eastward.

Southward migrations also occurred but I have no idea just how far south Atlantean immigrants managed to migrate to. They must of migrated southward at least a good 200 to 300 miles, and I would not be surprised at all if the Sahara

Desert, especially the northern part of the Sahara Desert, conceals underneath it, very ancient Atlantean settlements that existed at least 11,500 years ago. Atlantean farmers found plenty of land to cultivate in the region that now is the Sahara Desert then, and may of constructed irrigation systems to water their crops, so the remains of ancient Atlantean irrigation systems, and also of the numerous Atlantean farms, should be searched for also, by any archaeologist who may decide that he or she thinks, it would be well worth the time to investigate.

Interior northern Africa was probably settled by the Atlanteans, but the number of Atlantean cities and villages there, was probably not anywhere near the number of Atlantean cities and villages that were within 200 miles of the Mediterranean Sea of course. Fear had to be a major problem for the Atlanteans who made their homes in the interior of northern Africa and rightfully so. Any settlers that happen to be located a great distance from the safety of the center of their nations settlements or man power, are at risk of being attacked by their enemies who happen to freely exist in their vicinity, and though now a days its not that common, in those ancient times it was.

The coast of northern Africa, next to the Mediterranean Sea, was heavily populated by the Atlanteans of course, as are all coastal areas today. Atlantean naval bases existed in many of those Atlantean communities of course, for war and trade purposes, undoubtedly. African Atlantean fishermen obviously took advantage of the Mediterranean Sea. Seafood had to be a big business among the African Atlantean fishermen. I assume that there must have been a great deal of competition for the, acquiring and the distribution of that seafood, especially if there existed any African Atlantean colonies, who were independent from other African Atlantean colonies.

Of course, the coastline of the Mediterranean Sea of northern Africa during the Atlantean occupation, disappeared long ago when the ice age finally came to an end, taking with it unknown numbers of Atlantean cities and villages, that may never be rediscovered. That same fate also happened to all the other Atlantean cities and villages of southern Europe, and the Middle East, which once existed next to the coast of the Mediterranean Sea. There could exist under the Mediterranean Sea, near the coasts of Europe, Africa and the Middle East, numerous sunken ancient Atlantean settlements waiting to be rediscovered. To carry out an task such as looking for ancient Atlantean settlements underwater, will be very dangerous and time consuming, not to mention very expensive, so it is highly unlikely that there will ever be an all out search for ancient Atlantean settlements, which may of existed all around the Mediterranean region, but are now under the Mediterranean Sea.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Sometime after establishing the first Atlantean colonies in northwestern and north central Africa, near the Mediterranean Sea of course, the Atlanteans obviously started colonies in close proximity to the present location of Egypt, and in fact, in Egypt itself. We know from the Story of Atlantis that Egypt was colonized by the first civilized people of Greece, yet the Carthaginians actually had every opportunity to initiate an colony in Egypt, 1000 years before the Egyptian Europeans did.

Then we must remember that it wouldn't be very surprising if before the first Carthaginians and Egyptian Europeans colonized Egypt, that an earlier group of Atlanteans, likewise, found Egypt to be desirable, and laid out farms and villages throughout Egypt, and did so along the Nile River, and in those parts of Egypt nowhere near the Nile River, as well. Again Atlantean colonies may of reached well into the interior of that part of Africa, and may of existed in the present locations of Chad, Niger, and that general vicinity of that part of Africa. Atlantean land explorers may of even from the interior of Africa, made their way into what is now Ethiopia and Somalia, but the great distance, especially for those times, makes it highly unlikely Atlantean land explorers eventually reached Ethiopia and Somalia. But as for exploring Ethiopia and Somalia by way of the Indian Ocean, that's another story!

It may of been in northeastern Africa, when the first wave of Atlanteans, and also the Carthaginians, sent their first exploration parties into what is now the present locations of Israel, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia, which the Algonquians obviously settled. But again we know that the Atlanteans were excellent sailors, and who knows, they may of first explored the Middle East, by coming directly from North America first.

The Red Sea was known of by the Atlantean people obviously, and they had to of used the Red Sea to explore the immediate region surrounding the Red Sea, including Ethiopia and also Somalia, and possibly as a means to travel to their Pacific Ocean territories, if they did as I believe, start colonies out in the vast Pacific Ocean. All of north Africa, north of the equator, may have been well known by the Atlanteans, and if so its likely the Atlanteans either frequented that part of Africa to live there, or to learn of the resources of that land, or just to pay a friendly visit. After the first wave of Atlanteans had established all their colonies located throughout north Africa, and even into the interior of Africa, the Atlanteans obviously grew and multiplied. Then with the coming of the invading Carthaginians, the full greatness of the African Atlantean Empire was obviously reached if, that is, all of northern Africa before the Carthaginian invasion, was never united in one kingdom. With their colonies located in both Europe and

Africa, the Carthaginian Atlanteans had little to worry about concerning possible threats to their glorious empire (excepting the mighty Egyptian Europeans of course), and way of life, which likely was something a bit similar to the way we live, but a way of life we would frown upon.

But little did they know (we would be extremely wise to suggest otherwise, prophecy of course!) after they had settled that location of our earth, incredible changes would eventually occur, which would have horrific consequences for them much later on. Their concerns of those times probably dealt with economic needs, military needs, crime, education (for at least some of the Carthaginian citizens), and also the general healthcare of the Carthaginian people. Northern Africa's Atlantean population may of outnumbered the Atlantean population of both Europe and the Middle East, and it is likely that for the most part, Carthaginian Atlantean leaders considered their colonies of north Africa, especially during the early years of the Carthaginian Empire, to be far more important, militarily and economically, compared to the rest of the Carthaginian Empire if, they were, as I suspect, united at one time.

The land of north Africa 11,500 years ago, was probably a farmers paradise, and an entrepreneurs dream for making a fortune obviously, but the same can't be said now. That same land today is nothing compared to what it was 11,500 years ago, that's because of the extreme climate change which occurred thousands of years ago. If we had the chance to actually know what north Africa looked like 11,500 years ago, there would not be a lot that we would recognize now that existed 11,500 years ago. Capitalism existed among the Atlantean people of 11,500 years ago, maybe not exactly how capitalism functions now, but still they certainly were just as enthusiastic as a modern capitalist when it came to conducting their everyday business activities. Money may of existed among the Atlantean people of 11,500 years ago, but more than likely the business they conducted used trade goods as a means to purchase merchandise. There must have been a great many Atlantean cities and villages spread out all over north Africa, which were home to many wealthy Atlantean entrepreneurs, who exploited north Africa's and the nearby Mediterranean Seas, unlimited available resources there for the taking.

Their homes could of resembled the homes of the later capitalists of the Egyptian Empire, and also of the Greek and Roman eras, with 10 to 20 room homes or even more rooms, an common occurrence even 11,500 years ago among the Atlanteans. If those Atlantean entrepreneurs were anything like the entrepreneurs of the modern time, than they also owned large land estates that they exploited to the fullest. The life of the average Atlantean was certainly hard,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

of course, with very long work hours and, of course, very little wealth to show for all their hard work. Indeed, very similar to the life most of the worlds current population endures.

Homeless people existed in the Carthaginian Atlantean Empire, unless the leaders of the Atlantean people were compassionate and saw to it that homeless people were giving housing, which I really doubt, simply because of the world of the present times unwillingness to give aid to the homeless, which to me signifies it has always been that way. Sadly if homeless people of the present time receive aid, it is not from their leaders, but from religious people who, in my opinion, are doing more good for the world than wealthy people currently are. What would the world of the present time be without the generosity of religious people. Religious people will always be there in time of salvation, and I would not mind it if they actually ruled. They obviously have more compassion.

Atlantean entrepreneurs obviously took capitalism as seriously as entrepreneurs of the present time do, and maybe even more so. They certainly abused their wealth to see to it that what they wanted done was going to get done. We can only imagine how hard life was for the average Atlantean, as well as what their penalties were for committing crimes, and what their clothing and their housing resembled, and above all else, what food they had to eat. Wealthy Atlanteans, of course, had all varieties of food to eat, and lived longer lives than the average Atlantean citizen and, of course, the same holds true at the present time throughout the world.

From the Atlantic coastline of northwestern Africa, the Atlanteans spread out southward and eastward, bringing with them their civilization, which eventually would support hundreds if not thousands, of their cities and villages, not to mention the incredibly numerous farms, which they needed to grow their food crops to feed their people. The Atlanteans did not create their civilization of northern Africa overnight obviously, but their civilization of northern Africa started in one location, and then eventually (most likely over several centuries), spread to the rest of northern Africa.

Their population including that of their slaves, if they did own slaves, may of numbered in the millions. And it is fact that most of the Atlanteans lived a life that none of us of the present time would want to live. Interbreeding with the black Bushmen population of northern Africa was very common undoubtedly, and that interbreeding definitely produced new races of humans.

It has been so long since the first Atlantean settlements were laid out in northern Africa, and so much mixing with the black population has occurred, as well as with the later whites, that the possibility of the existence of a group of

pure blooded Atlantean people is unlikely, but those mountains there probably tell another story. I need to do research to discover if there actually could exist in all of northern Africa, some pure blooded Algonquian people at the present time. Anyway, the descendents of the first wave of Atlantean settlers (they may have been the Numidians) and also that of the mighty Carthaginians, at the present time, just may be the Berbers of north Africa.

The Berbers and Bedouins

Berber history is one that is a mystery but if we researched Berber history we would obviously discover an relationship existing between the Berbers and Atlantis. The Berbers are the descendents of those Atlanteans who invaded Europe, Africa, and the Middle East 11,500 years ago and before. Although we have no evidence to support the theory that the Egyptians and the Semitic people of Africa and the Middle East, were possibly originally part of the Berbers of northern Africa, it is, in my opinion, most likely close to the truth. And its their close proximity to the Atlantic Ocean which gives the hint of them being the fathers of the Semites of Africa and the Middle East. However, concerning Egypt, I realize the Egyptians may have first originally lived in eastern Europe (the Egyptian Europeans of course) so that actually can represent that the Egyptians are not related to the Berbers and Bedouins. However, as for the likelihood of an earlier Egyptian people who predated the Egyptian Europeans, that's different of course.

The name "Berber" is not what the Berbers call themselves, but the name originated from the Greek word barbarians, which may mean foreign language apparently. In their language, which nearly 10 million Berbers speak, they call themselves Amazigh (that does sound very similar to A-nish-in-a-bek, which is what the Ojibways, Ottawa and Potawatomi call themselves), or translated, it means Free People.

Interestingly, we get the name Amazon from the Amazigh people, whose name may just be derived from Anishinabek. According to historians their original homeland was to the east in the present location of Saudi Arabia, but I do not believe Saudi Arabia or the Middle East, was the original homeland of the Berbers. There is one location that is very fascinating to a great many historians, because they do not know just exactly how the Berbers managed to get there. The reason I believe the Berbers original homeland was Atlantis, is they are Semitic, and as well, the historians belief that the Berbers have occupied northern Africa for longer than recorded history. To me it is no coincidence that the invasion of the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago, and the date given for just how

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

long the Berbers have occupied northern Africa for, currently coincide to a degree, so I actually do see a link of some sort in a special kind of way. I realize that historians are more than just a little curious about the Berbers, and although they give the impression that they believe the Berbers are not the Atlanteans, I sense that they are in a reluctant way, giving hints that the Berbers are the Atlanteans from Atlantis.

Of course, the exact same could be said for the Gypsy people. Currently, the Berbers are fiercely independent, even though they are under Arab control, in many of the countries of northern Africa that they currently occupy. Algeria, Burkina-Faso, Egypt, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger and Tunisia is the African home of the Berbers. Their current population in those African countries may exceed 50 million.

Though at the present time, the Berbers do not have their own country, as they are currently widely separated living in several countries in northern Africa, that was not the case thousands of years ago I believe. If the Berbers predate the Carthaginians, the Berbers country may of extended from the Atlantic Ocean all the way to Libya, or even to close proximity to Egypt.

In fact, the Berbers may be directly descended from the Numidian Kingdoms of northern Africa. The Berbers territory 11,500 years ago, may of reached into the present countries of Chad, Mali, and Mauritania. The reason I believe that the Berbers colonized Chad, Mali, Mauritania and maybe even other parts of north central Africa, is because we know that the Sahara Desert did not exist 11,500 years ago, or it was only a fraction of its current size then. The Berbers of 11,500 years ago, did not have any obstacles in their path to prevent them from colonizing north central Africa, with the exception of the original black Bushmen occupants, who were at a disadvantage, for they were not civilized. If the Berbers are, as I suspect, also related to the Carthaginian Atlanteans who invaded north Africa, than in reality it is my belief they could be responsible for the later civilizations of Carthage, and even some of the Middle Eastern civilizations well to their east.

We would, however, first have to prove that the Berbers are directly descended from the Carthaginians and not the Numidians. If we ever do discover who the Berbers are descended from, I suspect that it will have been both the Carthaginians and the Numidians. Although its not possible at the present time to discover the true origins of the Berbers, we will definitely have better tools to use in the future, to discover if the Berbers are the Carthaginians, or the Numidians, or both. Another people of north Africa, who are closely related to the Berbers, are the Bedouin people, who also inhabit certain parts of

the Middle East. The Bedouins were, and some still remain, nomadic in lifestyle, and apparently the nomadic way of life is preferred over the sedentary lifestyle by those Bedouins who adhere to the nomadic way of life. I reckon its only because they were born into that inhospitable lifestyle, which to anyone who has been fortunate enough to have been born into the luxuries of civilized life, would certainly dread to the very end.

What will certainly occur in the future, in regards to those people who are so unfortunate to have been born into a nomadic lifestyle, will be the eventual disappearance of that worthless and degrading way of life. In some sort of special way, we are fortunate to live in a time when that nomadic way of life still exists in certain parts of our earth. But hopefully we will actually see the time come when the nomadic way of life will finally be abolished for good. I wouldn't be surprised at all if some of the last of the people, born and raised, into the nomadic lifestyle, longed to return to that nomadic lifestyle after settling down to the luxuries of civilized life. But most certainly most will become addicted to the many advantages civilized life offer.

North Africa's Berber civilization of 11,500 years ago, which most certainly was either Carthaginian or Numidian, of course, unless another earlier civilization existed in the same location we presently do not know of, that outdates all of northern Africa's Atlantean civilizations, obviously contributed significantly to the even greater civilizations along the eastern coastline of the Mediterranean, which would eventually to a degree, be inherited by the more advanced civilizations of the Greeks and Romans, which would follow much later.

Historically, we are told that the Carthaginian civilization and empire, did not arise until 2800 years ago, which is most definitely off by nearly 9000 years. Other important facts concerning that Carthaginian civilization, are exactly how large was the Carthaginians land empire, excluding the Mediterranean of course, and probably the most important one, if Egypt was conquered by the Carthaginians. Then the possible Berber link to the Carthaginians needs to be better understood, if we want to learn everything necessary about the past history of Carthaginian northern Africa.

Historically, the Bedouins of Africa and the Middle East, are thought to have been converted or conquered, by the prophet Muhammad nearly 1400 years ago, and were later part of the Moslem armies that spread Islam. From what I have learned about the history of the Bedouin people, it appears that the Bedouins spread into northern Africa after that region had been conquered by the Moslems nearly 1400 years ago. I believe it was likely that the Bedouins occupied all of northern Africa, or at least central northern Africa, and eastern

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

northern Africa, long before the Arab conquest. At the present time the Bedouins are found in the Middle Eastern countries of Israel, the countries of the Saudi Arabian peninsula, and all of northern Africa, all the way to the Atlantic Ocean. They have much in common with the Berbers of northern Africa but, of course, what I mean is, the Bedouins do not have their own country, but are like the Berbers, only one of many ethnic groups of the countries that they currently live in, including that of Israel.

Like the rest of the Arabs of Israel or Palestine, many of the Bedouins left Palestine after the war of 1948, but a great many of the Bedouin people chose to continue to live in Israel, and with the full privileges of the citizens of Israel, ensured for them of course. Most Bedouins currently do not live like their nomadic ancestors of so long ago, and in fact, increasing numbers of the Bedouins, wherever they live, are migrating to cities to find employment or to start a business with the hopes for a better life.

The history of the Bedouin people I believe starts with the first wave of Atlantean settlers of northern Africa, which likely occurred long before 11,500 years ago. Over time, I believe that the Bedouins separated from the Berbers, or one of the other Semitic Tribes of Africa, and eventually migrated into eastern Africa, and from there, they spread into the Middle Eastern countries they now occupy. Although the historians theorize otherwise, I believe that the Bedouin people never left northern Africa, or at least northern eastern Africa, and they may of possibly even continued to keep in contact with their kin located in the Middle Eastern countries all along, after their kinfolks migration to the Middle East came and went.

Algeria, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia are predominantly Berber countries, although they are considered to be Arab counties because of religion and language. Currently, the Berbers make up about 75% of Morocco's and Algeria's populations, 60% of Libya's and Tunisia's populations, and around 2% of Egypt's population. I do not know if the Berbers will ever gain full control of Algeria, Libya, Morocco, and Tunisia, but I suspect that the Berbers would favor full Berber control in all those countries, and by that, I mean, their language and customs would dominate of course.

The total population of the Berbers is presently over 50 million, and that includes the many Berbers who live in Europe and the New World, which in those locations alone, they total 4 million or more. It has been a very long time since the Berbers were a free people, unmolested by outside influences, yet they have not forgotten that they once ruled their own everyday affairs. The Arabs, who are related to the Berbers, have dominated since the seventh century, and

continue to do so today, even though, in too many cases, they are a minority among the Berbers.

The Canary Islands lie off the coast of northwestern Africa, about 70 miles from the mainland of Africa. Historians know that the Canary Islands have been inhabited for as long as recorded history, but what they do not know is how the islands original human occupants, who were the Berbers, forgot how to build boats and sail. Of the possible reasons for why that may of occurred, it is the end of the ice age or the destruction of Atlantis, which may have been responsible for bringing on amnesia to the Canary Island Berbers. The Canary Islands may have been connected to the mainland of Africa during the ice age, or there may have been far more islands that were part of the Canary Island chain, during that ancient time period, which brought them closer to mainland Africa.

When the great flood all of a sudden occurred, it either flooded the land area that connected the Canary Islands to the mainland of Africa, or the many islands that once existed during the ice age were inundated by the great flood, and vanished beneath the Atlantic. The flood is certainly why the Berbers of the Canary Islands lost their knowledge to build boats and sail. What I suspect the islands resembled before the great flood, was likely more islands which were likely larger then, compared to the present day Canary Islands. What we have to accept is that during the ice age there obviously was already in place on the Canary Islands, an sizeable population of the Berbers, who were definitely civilized. When the Berbers of the Canary Islands were rediscovered by the Spanish, the Spanish discovered that the Berbers of the Canary Islands still made use of wheat, or were still practicing agriculture. The Spanish were amazed by the presence of the Berbers of the Canary Islands, and may of thought they were the Atlanteans of the long forgotten Atlantis, as also long before the Spanish, the Romans apparently did to.

What fascinates me is the Europeans insistence that the Berbers of the Canary Islands had blond hair and blue eyes, kind of similar to the Europeans insistence that certain tribes of Native Americans on the northern plains of the United States and southern Canada, likewise, had blond hair and blue eyes, yet I wonder if there is truth in it. During the time of the Roman Empire, the Romans by an accident, discovered the Canary Islands, but over time the islands again would be forgotten by everyone, and I do believe the reason the Canary Islands were forgotten again by Rome, was because of the very little literature circulating during those ancient times.

Obviously, the Romans didn't consider the Canary Islands as being so significant that they deserved to be well known of by the average Roman citizen.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

If the Canary Islands had been overflowing with rich resources, we all know that the Romans would have responded quite differently of course.

When the Romans expanded their empire after defeating Carthage in the Punic Wars, they gradually moved into northern Africa. As a result of the Roman invasion a great many of the Carthaginians fled into the interior of northern Africa, apparently taking refuge in the Sahara Desert, and in the mountains of northern Africa. That alone suggests that the Carthaginians were fleeing from the Romans for they probably would have either enslaved them, or thrown them in their murder matches at their many stadiums. The fleeing Carthaginians or Berbers, obviously sought out those areas in their former lands where the Romans would have an extremely difficult time apprehending them, such as deep into the mountains which northern Africa has plenty of, especially towards the northwestern coast and, generally, the most inhospitable places. From reading the Story of Atlantis I know that the Atlanteans were highly civilized, and that all of northern Africa was part of their very large empire. My theory about the Atlantean civilization of northern Africa and what the fate of that ancient civilization was, deals mainly with the Berbers being the founders of the civilization of Carthage, as well as also being partially Numidian. That Carthaginian civilization was almost totally destroyed by the Romans and, realistically, the Romans did destroy the civilization of Carthage totally, and what an act of pure evil that was. However, there yet remains ruins of those Carthaginian settlements (the civilization the Romans partially inherited) located in northern Africa, especially northwestern Africa.

It was most definitely the Berbers (they are probably descended from the Carthaginians and Numidians to), who controlled the Carthaginian Empire of northern Africa. And why on earth acts of outright pure evil which include the total destruction of a civilization occur, is not at all difficult to search for the correct answer, about why such events actually occur! Carthage was destroyed to erase from the memory of that glorious civilizations founders, of their great history. Its also very likely that other Atlantean civilizations, particularly of Europe, were totally destroyed by the Romans, and there is absolutely no good whatsoever that comes from events such as those. All that comes from committing acts of pure evil is absolute violation, pain, misery and the dishonor of educating the young of the truth of their history. History, or the history that we know presently, may of started with the invention of the printing press but, of course, I do have to mention the monuments of Egypt, the Americas, and other locations, because they are historical records, which are obviously far more ancient than they are considered to be. The printing press may have been invented

in China, but I do think many Europeans consider the printing press to be one of their inventions for some reason, which could be based on facts.

When the Europeans put the new invention of the printing press into full use, an new age was born, and what followed has greatly changed our world. In reality many of the new inventions over the past few centuries, were invented because of the existence of the printing press. If the printing press had never been invented, than most likely the world we know at the present time, would not exist. What brought about this modern world we live in, was the greater numbers of people who eventually learned to read and write.

Though most people in the industrialized nations are literate, there are still a great many people in the third world countries who are unable to read and write. Imagine how far advanced the human race would be if all people on earth were literate. When the day comes when all earthlings are capable of reading and writing, there will no longer be any need to advance civilization, simply because knowing how to read and write, is the most important innovation of civilized life.

Since the Sahara Desert is in fact the hottest location on earth, archaeologists must search for the elusive African Atlantean settlements during the cooler months, for the heat will be too great in the hotter months. And I do believe that the Sahara Desert does conceal more than only a few of those ancient African Atlantean settlements. I doubt if the Romans destroyed all the empire of Carthage, simply because Carthage is far more ancient, yet I have no knowledge on just how far south the Atlanteans constructed their African settlements, so it is wise to search the entire Sahara Desert for those ancient Carthaginian and Numidian settlements, especially in the areas where the desert has clearly accumulated over the ages.

Present day Berbers and Bedouins are probably also mixed in race as a result of intermarriages with the blacks and whites. And as for the Berber people themselves actually considering themselves to be the descendents of the Atlanteans, that's another totally different story, yet they must realize that if they accept an Atlantean origin, they will have to change their current accepted history, which was forced on them by the Europeans, and then start its beginnings to at least 11,500 years ago.

There have been, and will be again, many destructions of mankind, is a line from the Atlantis story that must be taken seriously. Most of those catastrophes were, according to the Egyptians, caused by fire and water. I am not skeptical about that and I believe that they may be correct about our earth going through prolonged heat ages and cold ages. Yet what causes those events if they truly

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

occur? I have done some research and I have discovered what I believe to be an cooling trend occurring, instead of that so called global warming they constantly bombard everyone with.

Why on earth are we being bombarded with what appears to be some deliberate mistake, but what I can't deliberately call an outright lie? For some reason they chose to conduct themselves in that manner, and it can be as a result of numerous decisions on their part which are directly linked to the bad effects of the modern world we live in. That jet stream (Jet Streams) in the earths atmosphere or heaven, is likely what brings on cold ages and heat ages.

All the proof we need to prove the jet stream (Jet Streams) initiates cold ages and heat ages, is knowing that on occasions parts of that jet stream (Jet Streams) pour down southward bringing cold arctic air. What that simply represents, is all of that jet stream or jet streams, can actually pour down southward even, heaven forbid, but we know better, during the summer time, and continuously stay in those southerly locations for centuries or longer. We will want to closely examine the functions of the earths jet streams in the coming future, to learn what, good and bad effects, those jet streams bring.

Egypt

We know that the Egyptian civilization was in existence 10,000 years ago from the Story of Atlantis, but we do not know for certain if the first Egyptians of 10,000 years ago were Semitic, or if they were black. Of course, I am referring to the historians belief that the first Egyptians were black. You may find that somewhat disturbing, yet in reality Africa likely was first inhabited by Native Americans, and I assume many will find that even more disturbing.

Some people believe that the Egyptians are related to the Atlantean people, and may have immigrated to Egypt from Atlantis very, very long ago. I have heard, and I also realize, that the first Egyptians may have been black. But were those first black Egyptians in any way civilized, if Egypt was in fact first inhabited by blacks? If the first Egyptians, who were supposedly to have been black, were civilized, than the Egyptian civilization so well known at the present time, is of their creation!

If the first civilized Egyptians were immigrants from Atlantis, than the Algonquians are the creators of the Egyptian civilization so well known at the present time. What actually needs to be known of by the entire world is Egypt's true origins. Egypt's true origins may have come from Greece (the Egyptian Europeans) and they are one of the most successful races of people in existence. From Greece, the Gypsies some 10,000 years ago discovered an attraction to Egypt's Nile River.

I realize clearly that this subject is very sensitive so I will leave room to include a black presence in Egypt, even fully well knowing that the Carthaginians very likely brought Egypt under their control some 1000 years before the Egyptian Europeans invaded, and that the Carthaginians probably subjugated an unknown Atlantean Kingdom already in existence in Egypt.

It may have been possible that there existed a group of black Egyptians in Egypt (they just may have been the Egyptian Kingdom the Carthaginians subjugated), who the Algonquians encountered who were to some degree

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

civilized (probably very similar to the original people of Europe and Asia of that same time period). Sounds very rude I know, but future archaeologists and historians are going to have to unlock the mystery about who first inhabited Africa and Europe, for at the present time we all have every right to ignore white and black historians. What followed in Egypt afterwards, may have been a mixture of black culture, along with that of the customs and culture of the Atlantean people. It would not be right to claim that the great Egyptian civilization that followed was entirely of Atlantean origin, because in reality the great Egyptian people and their civilization, could actually be much older than what we believe, but again the Atlantean people could be just as old, or even much older than the black Egyptians, if Egypt was first inhabited by blacks.

And clearly the whites will only accept a black Egyptian civilization first, which was flourishing when the Algonquians first showed up, simply because if there was not a black Egyptian civilization in place when the Algonquians first arrived in Egypt, it would mean that the white race and all other races, are not directly evolved from the black race of Africa. That subject is extremely taboo!

The Greeks learned of the forgotten Atlantis from their Egyptian neighbors nearly 2500 years ago. Apparently the Egyptians of that time, recorded their knowledge of the forgotten Atlantis on their monuments, and also on papyrus rolls. The Greeks were told that the forgotten Atlantis existed 9000 years before their time, and that the Atlanteans originated on an island in front of the straits of Gibraltar, and from that island which, of course, is North America, they invaded western Europe, Asia and northern Africa, bringing with them wars of conquest, and their civilization.

The Greeks learned from the Egyptians Story of Atlantis, that the Atlanteans enslaved (subjugated is a more preferable way of putting it) all who they fought, and also that the homeland of the Atlantean people was able to produce two crops a year because of a warm climate. However, that information was likely altered after 1492, or that part of the Story of Atlantis is fact, and if it is, it simply means the earths climate was significantly warmer 11,500 ago. Its hard to believe but where I currently live at (the State of Montana in the United States) the climate conditions of 11,500 years ago were either sub tropical or entirely tropical as the Story of Atlantis hints at if, that is, the Egyptians were correct.

How did the Egyptian people know Atlantis so well? To us of the present time, it is hard to understand since Egypt is close to 3000 miles or more from the Atlantic Ocean, and then another 3000 miles from Atlantis. I believe Atlantis is where the Egyptians originated, and the Egyptians obviously stayed in contact with their far off kin, by using the Mediterranean Sea to travel to their original homeland!

The distance from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea during the ice age (the Mediterranean was likely cut off from the Atlantic Ocean then), was not at all a great distance, and certainly the Atlanteans laid down foundations for settlements in the area between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, so they could ease the burden of Atlantean travelers then.

Those Atlantean settlements are most likely underwater now since the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, are connected at the present time. The land surrounding the western Mediterranean Sea, must have been heavily populated by the Atlanteans, and possibly supported a large Carthaginian naval base after the Carthaginians commenced their invasions and conquests. If the Carthaginians did invade Egypt, they very likely used that western Mediterranean naval base of theirs to forcefully subjugate the first Egyptians. Although the Egyptians admitted that the Atlanteans ruled all of northern Africa or Libya, all the way to the ancient land of Egypt, we are definitely left with an absent thought concerning the likelihood of an Carthaginian conquest over the first Egyptians. Are we to take that to represent Egypt was left unconquered by the invading Carthaginians? Of course, the Carthaginians made themselves were very much at home in Egypt, after the mighty Carthaginians showed up, yet it can't be ignored if only to continue to follow what the Story of Atlantis definitely suggests.

For some purpose the Carthaginians may have found it necessary to exclude Egypt (I am referring to the possibility that the invading Carthaginians did not conquer Egypt) in their conquests plans, and I reckon I know why they excluded Egypt. Egypt must have had an mighty military if they stopped the Carthaginians from subjugating Egypt. And the evidence of the Egyptians being victorious are clearly located on the ruins and monuments, that are scattered throughout Egypt, if anyone wants to combat the task of proving that the Egyptians defeated the Carthaginians in that long ago war.

I will now focus more on the likelihood that there existed before the Atlantean immigration to Egypt, an black Egyptian civilization that we know nothing about. Egypt is so old and so much of ancient Egypt has disappeared, that it will be very difficult to investigate the possible existence of not only a black Egyptian civilization of 11,500 years ago, but an black Egyptian civilization in Egypt that is far older than 11,500 years. If Egypt was first a civilization of black creation, the evidence to prove it may be written on the monuments scattered throughout Egypt, and I do take that seriously. Or to give the reader a clearer picture, archaeologists should search for and find, the proof throughout Egypt, that blacks were the first civilized Egyptians, because it may be a reality. Future archaeologists and historians will obviously have the better tools and technology to combat the difficult task of unlocking the true origins of Egypt's past.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Of course, we know from the Story of Atlantis, that originally eastern Europe was where the Egyptians who toppled Carthaginian Egyptian power lived, and it was from that beautiful location of Europe (Greece) that the Egyptian Europeans left to colonize Egypt some 10,000 years ago. What influenced me to consider the Gypsies to actually be the Egyptians so famously well known at the present day, is the clear willingness of European historians to admit that they originally believed that the Gypsies originated in Egypt, that is until they thought it over than decided that the Gypsies originally lived in India. The truth is the Gypsies are native to eastern Europe, and were the people who laid down the foundation for Athens at least some 11,500 years ago. I clearly understand why European historians can't accept that, and it largely deals with a close relationship with the Gypsies, that I believe they rather not bring out into the open.

I know the Egyptian people visited the lost Atlantis so well known today, and probably quite frequently. Their description of Atlantis to modern people is a description that only could come from visiting Atlantis. The Egyptians knew the size of Atlantis almost accurately, if we dare to believe them.

The city of Atlantis was located near the coast of the Atlantic Ocean, and was home to a large percentage of the Atlantean people. Somehow the Egyptians knew the land of the Atlantean people very well, well enough to know that there existed a plain just outside the city that extended 330 miles long, and they also knew the width to be 110 miles. The Egyptians must of paid frequent visits to Atlantis to know the land of the Algonquians so well, and also their religion, laws, and other facts of Atlantean life.

Atlantean animals, plants, and herbs were well known by the Egyptian people, and that is because Atlantis is where the Egyptians originated. Egyptian knowledge of Atlantis, surprisingly went so far as to know that the Atlantean kings followed certain laws that their ancestors laid down before their time. One of their ancestors laws, and one of the more important laws they had, was a law that very strongly encouraged the Atlantean kings to not make war against one another.

Apparently there was a time in Atlantis when there existed among the Atlantean cities, a great deal of war between one another, or civil war. The ancestors of the Atlanteans apparently created their laws to prevent civil war among themselves, and that may have been one of the reasons their civilization became so great. The Egyptians even knew that in case of civil war, all Atlantean cities were to join together to prevent an absolute victory against them, by the rebel Atlantean city. What shocks me the most about the Egyptians knowledge of Atlantis, is the reason why the Algonquians invaded Europe, Africa and the

Middle East. That part of the Story of Atlantis is where the Story of Atlantis ends, and I do find that very suspicious. How did the Egyptians know why the Atlanteans invaded Europe, Africa and the Middle East?

To most people it is unanswerable, but I know it is because the Egyptians are the Atlanteans, and in fact, they recorded everything that they knew about the Atlantean country, people, customs and, in general, everything of importance that needed to be written of. After the first wave of Atlantean settlers settled in Egypt, contact obviously continued with their kin back in Atlantis, and the Egyptians preserved their Atlantis origins either on monuments or papyrus, if papyrus existed far longer than 11,500 years ago which, it is very likely it did. That is my opinion on just why the Egyptians knew so much about the lost Atlantis! We know from history how information changes over time, from generation to generation, because of human imagination. What starts out originally as a story that is the entire truth, will over time, evolve into a story that is not only true, but because of human imagination, becomes a story that glamorizes certain people and events about that story. It is practiced among all people and continues on even to this very day. Both the Egyptians and their white Greek neighbors, in my opinion, did just that to certain parts of the Story of Atlantis.

Much of human mythology or storytelling, is based on real events that occurred, and to some degree children were why mythology and storytelling, were created by humans. In civilization, mythology would evolve into writing, schools and plays and is one of the main reasons for the invention of civilization by man. Today, we must claim that it is of far more importance to humans, because of all the inventions of the modern age, and it will continue on unobstructed of course. Human storytelling, or mythology from our distant past, is still with us and we should always preserve it as it was, so future generations will know the storytelling or mythology, of their distant ancestors.

Those stories, or the great majority of those stories, are based on real events that occurred long ago, and though they seem fabricated there is in reality, incredible truth within those stories, which can be deciphered through special inspection, if properly carried out by someone who is an expert in the field. Supposedly, Gods were given allotments to populate our earth according to the Egyptians. Atlantis was giving to Poseidon who, after receiving the allotment, brought into this world 10 sons who were twins, or 5 sets of twins. They definitely represent the Ojibways totemic system! The real meaning of that I can't decipher.

It could mean from the original tribe, 10 other tribes emerged and eventually were given by the parent tribe, permission to populate certain portions of the parent tribes country, but they had to recognize the authority of the parent tribe,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

whose king was made king by the God. We can only imagine what the real meaning is and what the real historical event was like. Over time, the real story or historical event, kept the real history, but human imaginations have done wonders to the real historical event. One of the Atlantean sons or tribes, was the tribe closest to the Atlantic Ocean and Europe, in likely what is now Nova Scotia and that immediate region of Canada, including under the nearby Atlantic Ocean. And it was probably from those people that the first Atlantean immigrants arrived to western Europe and Africa, probably well over 11,500 years ago.

That tribe occupied not only Atlantis, but also the many islands between Atlantis, Europe and Africa, if there really were islands between North America, Europe and Africa then which, I kind of doubt, with the exception of those small islands close to Africa and Europe of course. Contact obviously continued with the other tribes of Algonquians back in Atlantis, with even warriors from the other tribes of Algonquians, and their citizens as well, sailing to Europe and Africa frequently, to either trade or to settle down and live. All “Atlantean Tribes” were possibly involved in the migration, or invasion and conquest of Europe, Africa and the Middle East unless, there was civil unrest among the Algonquians, which may of occurred then.

Apparently the Egyptians even knew that the Atlanteans visited far off foreign countries to trade, and because of their successful trade partnerships they became wealthy and very powerful. Just where besides Europe and Africa, did the Atlanteans know of other civilized people to trade with? Incredibly the Egyptians knew so much about the far off Atlantis, including the animals, which included elephants or mammoths, which became extinct when the ice age came to an end here in North America, and incredibly horses which have probably always lived here, their buildings that they constructed, roads, canals, even the sizes of their canals, bridges, and so forth. There is only one way that the Egyptian people could of known so much about the distant Atlantis. The Egyptians came from Atlantis, and it may be that the rest of the Story of Atlantis eventually led to the true origins of the Egyptian people. The rest of the Story of Atlantis is a mystery, not only because it ends abruptly, but because it ends when the story begins to describe just why the Atlanteans invaded, or migrated to Europe, Africa and the Middle East.

All of us would love to know just what the rest of the Story of Atlantis told of. Could it be possible that the information was unacceptable to the first readers of that story, and they decided that the document had to end where it ended? Did the information speak of the origins of all human civilizations, races, future events that spoke of doom for the entire human race? We also do not know

exactly how much further the Story of Atlantis progressed to. It may of only progressed a page or two, but again it may of continued a chapter or two, or even longer. I have no choice, even though none of us at the present time know the real truth behind the disappearance of the rest of the story, but to believe that the rest of the Story of Atlantis contained information that the whites did not want the world to know about. That information possibly not only told of the reason why the Atlanteans invaded Europe, Africa and the Middle East, but it had to be about the exact location and size of Atlantis as well.

Modern Egyptians have to be just as fascinated about the Atlantis legend as everyone else, but I do not know if there are any modern Egyptians, who may believe their origins come from the famous Atlantis. When the Egyptian Atlantean power finally came to an end, when Egypt was conquered by their neighbors to their south, the black Nubians, that may have been when the Egyptian Atlanteans lost their identity. From mixing with the original black occupants of northern Africa for thousands of years, a new race of humans exist in northern Africa now.

To some degree, the Egyptian people of the present time should remember the forgotten Atlantis in their written histories, because it is they, the Egyptian people, who are responsible for our knowledge of Atlantis. And it just may be that we do not know of the rest of the Story of Atlantis, because they did not want the Egyptian people to know of their real origins. The Egyptian people today, in my opinion, along with all other Semitic people, are the descendents of the Algonquians, though they are very mixed in race with the whites and blacks. However, as for the 1.2 million Roma people living in Egypt presently, their plight offers them the false identity we know them as now, but they are in fact the true descendents of the first Egyptians, and the Egyptian Europeans of course. Most archaeologists believe that the Egyptian pyramids were constructed around the year 2600 B.C., or over 4500 years ago. I believe that the Egyptian pyramids were constructed by the Atlanteans as long ago as 11,500 years, either that, or the descendants of the Atlanteans thousands of years later, but not around 2600 B.C. That date is obviously off by thousands of years. We need evidence and lots of it, to support the possibility of the original black occupants of Egypt, as being the builders of the Egyptian pyramids. The obvious problem is determining if the blacks, or the first Atlantean Egyptians, or the Carthaginian Jews, or if the Egyptian Europeans were responsible for building the pyramids.

Before the arrival of the first Atlanteans to Egypt, Egypt may have been entirely black, yet it may have been void of any human population whatsoever. It could be possible that before the Atlantean arrival to Egypt, those black

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Egyptians constructed those pyramids, but I do not think so. And though I can't claim to be 100% certain (I admit that out of respect for black people who may truly be the first Egyptians) its an subject which must not be ignored. I will be honest and admit that I suspect that Native Americans were the first Europeans, as well as the first Africans, which may be very close to the truth. Only heaven knows if in fact Native Americans were the first Europeans and the first Africans.

There could be archaeologists at the present time, who are able to read the Egyptian hieroglyphic writings on the remaining monuments, who know of the real origins of the Egyptian people. If that is so, they know they can try to let the world know the real history of Egypt, as well as all the entire Mediterranean Sea region, but they obviously will face scrutiny, and worst yet, considered not worthy to be an archaeologist by their counterparts. I have no knowledge of how much of the ancient hieroglyphic writings remain in all of Egypt, but from what I do know about what remains of ancient Egypt today, there exist in Egypt at the present time, plenty of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic writings, which could possibly tell us the truth, yet I know getting that truth known of by the entire world, will be extremely difficult.

The Berbers of north Africa (they are very likely descended from the first wave of Atlantean settlers and the Carthaginians of course), to many historians are not closely related to the Egyptian people, minus language of course. Those same historians believe that the Berbers have occupied all of north Africa for longer than recorded history, which clearly could represent that they settled Africa long before the Egyptians did. If that is true, we must seriously not hesitate to openly claim the likelihood of an possible relationship that existed between the Berbers and the first civilized Egyptians, long before 11,500 years ago.

We know that the Berbers and the Egyptians are related because of language, so it is likely that well before 11,500 years ago, they were one people who spoke the same language, and lived in the same settlements. Some time later the Berbers (we may want to refer to them as the Numidians) may of separated into independent colonies, with one of those colonies becoming the first civilized Egyptian people, who are so well known to us at the present time. The Carthaginians would encounter the Berber Egyptians and probably subjugated them as well, after they commenced their Mediterranean conquests some 11,500 years ago. In the future we are going to first have to single out the Berbers, before actually researching the blacks, Carthaginians and the Egyptian Europeans, to discover just who were the first civilized Egyptians, for they are very likely descended from the first wave of African Atlantean settlers.

Egyptian people of the present time, can't forget about Atlantis because it is from Atlantis where the Egyptian people originated. Egyptian historians of the

present time, should keep the forgotten Atlantis alive among the Egyptian people, if they are not currently doing so, as it will do more good than harm to the Egyptian people. I know the Egyptians are probably very much like their neighbors to the north, the white Europeans, when it comes to their opinions about Atlantis, and they likely do not believe that they have any relationship with the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago which, of course, represents race issues! Back to the Gypsies for a final opinion concerning these people who are likely one of the most successful races of humans in existence. There is a tough road ahead to bring to the Gypsy people, their true history, and Egypt is one of the main reasons, yet the Gypsies must understand that there is a reason for the denial which deals not only with Egypt, but it deals with race issues and many other issues as well. Certainly the Gypsy people will never disappear for they are far too numerous. The Gypsies not only colonized Egypt, but they also migrated into Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and, more importantly, they migrated into Bangladesh, India and Pakistan where they eventually became one of the most numerous people on earth.

The Middle East

This region to the east of the Mediterranean Sea, was colonized by the first wave of Atlanteans also. From present day Lebanon to Saudi Arabia, Algonquian immigrants from northern Africa and southern Europe, and possibly even from North America, and even from the Indian Ocean, migrated to, bringing with them their civilized way of life. There are the Jewish people who are native to the Middle East, with their religion that strangely mentions the great flood and their immigration to the Middle East. However, they were probably late arrivals but probably responsible for the flood story which is widely popular throughout the Middle Eastern countries at the present time.

I do not know how long the Jewish people remained in Atlantis for after the great floods. It is possible that the Jewish people tried to keep in contact with both Atlantis, and their kin who surrounded the Mediterranean Sea, but for some reason that contact ended sometime after they arrived to the Mediterranean region.

The Jewish people are very important to world history as they are the people who are responsible for some of the worlds great religions. Judaism, Christianity and Islam are Jewish religions, and it is my belief that those Jewish religions originated in North America, possibly as a result of the great floods, yet again the Algonquian religion may be far older than what I believe the worlds first Monotheistic religion is.

Besides the Egyptians account of the migration of the Atlanteans to the region surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, there is also the Jewish bible which describes the migration of the ancestors of the Jewish people which, proves in my opinion, some kind of possible connection between the flood story mentioned in the bible, and the ancient Egyptians account of the Atlantean invasion, and the flood which occurred immediately afterwards. Was Noah a real man? Or could it be possible that in reality Noah signifies a tribe?

“Nanaabozho” is probably where the name “Noah” originated. I believe there was far more than one ship involved in the Jewish migration to the

Mediterranean region, and the number of Jewish immigrants may have been well in the hundreds, but more than likely the number of Jewish people involved in that ancient expedition was very likely in the thousands to the tens of thousands. I know many people will not agree, and even claim that the flood story in the Jewish bible did not occur, or in reality was totally fiction and was created by storytellers. What disbelievers have to accept as evidence of the Jewish flood story, is the recorded Atlantean invasion by Egyptian historians. Noah's journey may of lasted quite a long time, and they may of somehow got lost at sea during that ancient voyage, which likely may have taking place in order to protect what was obviously extremely important to Atlantean leaders.

All of us know from the Jewish bible that from the description of the flood story, Noah had to be out in the ocean somewhere, and for an long period of time. The voyage of Noah was caused by the great flood that occurred after the ice age came to an end of course, and Noah, or to be precise, the Jewish people, must of lived in Atlantis at that time. I have more than a hunch that the great flood that destroyed the Atlantean civilization, also just before those serious of catastrophes occurred, forced the Jewish people to migrate from North America, to the Mediterranean region. And sadly the Atlanteans of North America returned to an primitive way of life some time later.

In the flood story of the Ojibways, I can't help but see a relationship that exists between not only the names Noah and Nanaabozho, who is the main character in the Ojibway flood story but, as well, the two stories also. To me that can mean only one thing. They can say what they want but the Jewish people were living in North America just before the great floods occurred, and possibly as a result of those horrific floods that very likely killed millions of innocent humans worldwide, it led to the Algonquians seeking guidance from an higher being, and the religion of the Great Spirit was very likely born. To give the reader a clearer picture, the birth of Monotheism was probably born while the Atlanteans were enduring those ancient floods.

The history of the Jewish people is a very horrible history (their evil white brethren have singled them out to inflict injustice), which everyone living now is only too aware of. And there is that other side of the history of the Jewish people, which includes their religions of Christianity, Islam and Judaism. And as well, their contributions to civilized life must not be forgotten.

Forced into slavery (subjugation is probably the truth) by the Egyptians who, according to historians, are Semitic, the Jews endured enslavement (subjugation) for centuries until they were freed by Moses The horrific crime committed against Jewish people during World War II, was far more devastating to the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Jewish people than the nightmare they endured under Egyptian enslavement (subjugation), which probably lasted quite a very long time. Jewish historians today, should add an chapter to their bible about the horrific crime inflicted upon them by their white brethren, but I realize clearly that present day Jewish historians will not accept my message.

Those who believe the Germans committed the crimes against the Jewish people because of religion or because they felt threatened by Jewish domination, have to accept that the Germans were largely racially motivated, as they were also against the Gypsy people, and many other people I might want to add as well, including undesirable whites who, to the Germans, were considered not desirable. Times were right for an war like World War II, and the horrific crimes committed during that horrible war, to occur. And present day leaders should recognize or never forget, that it was the living conditions of the people that also led to those horrific events that killed 6 million or more Jewish people, 250,000 to 4 million Gypsy people, and the tens of millions of other people killed during that horrible war.

When living conditions are terrible the people end up getting very angry inside, and all too often they take it out on those who they feel threatened by, and it does not have to involve race or religion, for genocide to be carried out by angry leaders whose only goal is to inflict acts of outright pure evil on innocent victims whose only wrong was being in the right place at the wrong time. Leaders of the present time, especially in the industrialized countries, must not allow the living conditions of the people to deteriorate to the point where violence starts to repeatedly occur out on the streets.

The bible of the Jewish people, is most likely based on events that really did occur, and to some extent, those events may have been glamorized by the Jewish historians. Egypt was very important to the Jewish people during the early events that occurred in Jewish history. Since, according to historians, both the Jewish people and the Egyptian people are Semitic, we know that they share the same origins.

But I have a theory that long before the Jewish people immigrated to the Middle East, the ancestors of the Egyptian people immigrated first to the Mediterranean Sea region from Atlantis, or were probably among the first wave of Atlantean settlers. If my theory is correct, just how long were the Egyptian people in Egypt, before the Jews first arrived in the Middle East? Egypt is very ancient so it is likely it may have been centuries or even longer, after the ancestors of the first civilized Egyptians laid down the first foundations of their Mediterranean settlements, when the Jewish people eventually started to first

arrive in the Middle East. Like the Egyptians, the Jewish people were to experience invasions and conquests of their nation, but the Jewish people we know suffered far greater atrocities.

To this day wherever the Jewish people are a minority be it in the United States, France, England or elsewhere, they are the dominate minority as usual, and face discrimination partly because of their race. As for white looking Jewish people, their plight offers them the opportunity to blend in with the general white population, and they do side with the white race! That should be very well understood by the Palestinians and all other Middle Eastern Semites. As for World War II, all Semitic people must view that war as being a war that the whites deliberately initiated in order to create a new Israel, and nothing less! Of course, what led the whites to deliberately start World War II was the bible!

The Canaanites

The Phoenician people or Canaanites, are well known in history not just because of their civilization, but also because of their ability to sail the Mediterranean Sea and, even apparently well out into the Atlantic Ocean. In the 7th century B.C., the Phoenicians actually sailed around the continent of Africa, which is considered an incredible feat for those times now, but the Atlanteans certainly would of gotten a good long laugh from hearing of information like that, for I do believe the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago (far long before those times to be realistic) were indeed sailing around the entire world. It is my belief that the Phoenician civilization originated from the civilization of the Carthaginians of northwestern Africa, and the age of the Phoenician civilization is far older than what we believe the age of the Phoenician civilization to be.

And even more importantly, that the Phoenicians were originally part of the Carthaginians Mediterranean Empire, but after the invading Egyptian Europeans separated them from the western Carthaginians, they became somewhat distinct from their close kin of the western Mediterranean. The Phoenicians are far more important to history than we believe they are.

And I believe that the Phoenicians played an very important role (I am referring to their totem) in the Atlantean migration to the Middle East, because of their incredible ability to sail the seas and oceans of the earth. The Phoenicians are well known to us because of the Jewish bible, and also because of their ancient relationship with the Egyptian people, who carried on frequent contact and trade with their neighbors to the north of them.

The Phoenician alphabet is, in my opinion, far more important a contribution to the human race as the religions that originated from Judaism. The Phoenician alphabet is definitely older than the 3200 years we believe their alphabet to be,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

for its extremely likely the Phoenician alphabet originated back in Atlantis, from the Anishinabek syllabic writing system. The Phoenician alphabet gradually made its way to the Greek people of southern Europe around 1000 B.C., and the Greeks afterwards made changes to the Phoenician alphabet, as also did the Romans, but it is still the Phoenician alphabet that is in use at the present time, with the changes of course. Historically, the Phoenicians are supposedly the founders of the Carthaginian Empire that flourished in northwestern Africa, especially in the modern country of Tunisia. I do not believe that because I believe it was the Carthaginians who founded both the empire of Carthage, and much later (that's if the Carthaginian conquest of the Mediterranean was an slow one) the Phoenician Empire located in the Middle East. Its wise for us to not believe European historians who estimate the Phoenician civilization to be only 3000 years old. 11,500 years is acceptable to us.

Strangely, the religion of the Carthaginians involved human sacrifices (they are going to have to convincingly prove that they practiced human sacrifice only, for I suspect that all Carthaginians practiced Monotheism) which, apparently also involved sadly, the sacrifices of children, and even infants. We still have descriptions of how the Carthaginians sacrificed their victims, but I do not wish to proceed further on with the descriptions of those murders.

Human sacrifice has been part of human religions, probably since the birth of religion. And most likely human sacrifices possibly initiated the institution of religion. Our early religious leaders most certainly let superstition overwhelm them to the point where they allowed the act of human sacrifice to occur. Famine, drought, and the fear of the unknown were more than just an simple concern among early human leaders, and it may of led those early human leaders to create religion to ease their fears, and the fears of their people.

Carthaginians were not the only people to practice human sacrifice, as that gruesome practice has been practiced by many nations of people, of all races, and very likely since the beginnings of religion. Mother nature contributed far more to the birth of human religion than we may believe, and I believe that humans have been visited by catastrophes often, enough so that our ancestors searched for guidance's as a result of those catastrophes, and human sacrifices were, unfortunately for all those innocent victims, likely one of them sadly. Our ancestors fears led to superstition, which I believe to be just a simple mental illness, that may of led to most, if not all, forms of mental illnesses. It is superstition that probably led early humans to ask for the sacrifice of another human, to ensure protection against the Gods, who were possibly to early humans, for some unknown reason, angry at them. The Carthaginians and the

Phoenicians instincts for survival, obviously overwhelmed them, as it did other people also, to the point where they eventually started asking for the sacrifice of one of their own kind.

The Atlanteans may of themselves practiced human sacrifice, and in fact, human sacrifice may of originated among the Atlantean people. Monotheism may have been born among the Atlanteans who were confronted with the great floods, but it is possible that the reversal is closer to the truth, and the birth of Monotheism came first, then the religion of human sacrifice followed at a later time, most likely during the great floods, or even after the great floods.

In Saudi Arabia, there arose a religious leader who united either by word or by force, the many Semitic Tribes located in the Middle East, who probably were descended from primarily the first wave of Atlantean settlers, and also the Carthaginians. During the seventh century A.D., Muhammad had a vision that eventually led him to create the new religion known today as Islam. The religion and the civilization that followed Muhammad and his times, were to be very important in many ways to the advancement of human civilization.

Only Christianity has a larger following than Islam, but both Christianity and Islam are descended from Judaism, the religion of the Jewish people. After Muhammad's death the Arabs forced their way into the Persian Empire, Syria, and also the very ancient country of Egypt, and many other nations and, afterwards, they converted the people of those nations to Islam.

Driven to expand Islam, the Arabs ventured as far east as central Asia and western China, greatly extending the size of their great empire to the furthest known reaches of the civilized world then. North Africa was in close proximity to the Middle East, and the Arabs obviously knew northern Africa very well, and also by using their military force, they conquered that land and its people, converting their people to their religion and civilization. Spain and even parts of France in southern Europe, and their people, were also conquered by the Islamic armies, and also converted to the religion of the invading Arabs.

It was the Christians of Europe, who were led by religious leaders unwilling to tolerate the presence of Islam (that's a joke in itself for Christianity, Islam and Judaism are identical religions), and the invading Arabs from the Middle East, who fiercely fought the Arabs, and with but one goal, to drive the Arabs and their religion out of not only Europe, but also the land of the ancient Jewish people. The wars between these two peoples was largely because of religious indifferences, but also to a great degree because the native Europeans felt threatened by the Middle Eastern invaders intruding into their territories. Race is a much better way of putting it!

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

This Christian-Moslem warfare lasted well into the fifteenth century, and finally ended in Spain when the Spanish under the leadership of Ferdinand and Isabella, defeated the Arabs of Spain, sending the Arab inhabitants of Spain into northern Africa as refugees, or forcing them to convert to the religion of Christianity. The Arab Empire did not last for eternity like all other empires.

But it is the Arab religion of Islam which may possibly live for eternity, that is of far greater significance at the present day to hordes of humans throughout the world. Again it is ridiculous to have to deal with Christians, Jews and Moslems not being capable of looking each other in the eye.

Semitic Atlanteans still occupy their ancestors original territories, including all of northern Africa, the Middle East, and the many Semitic Europeans who also inhabit Europe now, as well as the countries that make up the New World. Their contributions to our world are enormous, but it is their religions which, at the present time, dominate our world, that hordes of humans will certainly recognize as being their greatest contribution to human civilization. The horrible conflict at the present time in the Middle East, is the result of European fears of Jewish domination, and racism as well. I know from real life experiences, and television programs, and literature as well, that white European people are in fear of the Jewish people, because they are so successful as a minority group, but racism is involved to, and that is probably the driving force behind the willingness of the whites to actively promote discontent of the Jews. At the same time, however, there are also white Europeans who are attempting to tell the Jewish side of the story, and that really shouldn't be done.

Talk out on the streets and in the media, is about Jewish domination of the financial institutions, entertainment industry, and all other capitalism enterprises, but what those people do not know, or do not want to know of, is the laws of their countries allow not only the Jewish people, but all people of all races to freely choose how to live their lives. Racism is playing an very important role in certain peoples views of other people, and how they conduct their everyday lives.

Jewish people are not wanted in Europe, nor are they wanted in the New World, by certain people whose numbers may be in the minority but could actually be in the majority. And it is my belief that the modern country of Israel exists now largely because of that prejudice which exists among certain people. The Israelis have been giving the full military support of the empire of England, in this current ongoing conflict in the Middle East which has no end in sight.

And it is the incredible fear the Europeans have of the Jewish people that, has and continues, to influence the decisions of the mighty empire of England. Again if you believe that the whites have compassion for the Jewish people, you must

not overlook the clear message coming from those whites who don't want anything to do with the Jewish people. Hardships are now part of the daily lives of the former Arab occupants of Palestine, or as it is known now, Israel. And to make matters all the more worse for the former Arab occupants or Palestinians, the mighty empire of England has indeed made it very difficult for the Palestinian people to arm themselves in this ongoing conflict. As I mentioned earlier, Israel is indeed getting the full support of the empire of England.

And make no doubts about it, the Jewish people recognize the incredible discrimination they face, and are taking advantage of their discrimination against them, and why not, their history is one of great sorrow which will never be forgotten by the entire world.

I believe the Jewish people should forget their European origins, and go back to their original Semitic roots, even as far as speaking only the Semitic language of their ancient ancestors, or in other words, drop everything they acquired in Europe. However, it will take more than just suggestions to entice the Jewish people to view Europe as being their bitter enemy.

And the same can be said for all of the Middle Eastern Semites. Peace will rule the negotiations between the Palestinians and the Jewish people one day and, afterwards, it will be very wise for the Jewish people to become the leaders of the other Semitic people of the Middle East. Their Semitic kin, in my opinion, will be more than willing one day to join together with their Jewish kin to live their lives in peace. The Jews must start to actively side with their middle eastern Semitic kin, and distant themselves from Europe in order for that to occur. I realize that the former Arab occupants of Israel, the Palestinian people, recognize the incredible hatred the Jewish people face, and that the real culprits behind the creation of the modern country of Israel, are the European enemy of the Jewish people, who have gone to incredible lengths to rid their European countries of the Jews sadly.

The Great Floods

Apparently, and this is from hearsay, and that Story of Atlantis, the Atlanteans were looked upon by the Gods as being guilty for wickedness. And little did the Atlanteans know that their days were numbered by those Gods who were, I must argue, a bit disturbed by the wickedness of the humans, yet the wickedness of the Atlanteans, if we actually allow ourselves to believe those Gods destroyed Atlantis (an terrible, terrible predicament which we can't ignore, unfortunately, for we have no choice but to deal with the subject), was obviously not the only reason those Gods made the decision to destroy that advanced civilization which, in all likelihood, all other civilizations can trace their origins to.

According to Egyptian historical records, Atlantis was destroyed by earthquakes and floods. Today, we are told that the earth was in the midst of an ice age 11,500 years ago, and according to experts on the earth's past climate, that last ice age was supposedly a lengthy one. The warnings given by the Egyptians about regular destructions of mankind, and intervals that always followed each destruction, are clear evidence of major damage caused by mother nature and her fury, repeatedly revisiting mankind, and all the rest of animal life on our earth.

I do not believe ice ages last on upwards to 20,000 years or even much longer, and in fact, I believe ice ages at their longest, may last only a few thousand years at their most. And who knows for certain, ice ages may never occur in the manner that they believe they do.

I have every reason to disbelieve that ice ages may occur on a regular basis much like the seasons in the temperate climate regions of our earth. What gives me the reason to theorize ice ages may not be the impressive events they speculate they are, is the description given by the Egyptian in the Atlantis story, which mentions the climate conditions for Atlantis of 11,500 years ago.

That stream from heaven which constantly returns, could represent glaciers but I doubt that. Yet I realize that stream from heaven can represent something else entirely as well. It is clear that we can expect at some future time, a catastrophe

to visit the northern and southern hemispheres of our earth, and if their ice age theory could just be right, than it will be most likely another ice age. However, I wouldn't place bets in favor of their ice age theory. What is striking about Atlantis was its apparent year round warm climate conditions, which apparently was ideal for growing two crops each and every year. Atlantis was located in eastern Canada and the northeastern United States which, if that is true, which I believe it is, would mean something is terribly wrong with their theories concerning an ice age that ended around 10,000 years ago.

Who knows, maybe they altered the Story of Atlantis for some reason, yet I will reluctantly accept their theories of those ice ages which, to them, ended some 10,000 years ago, but only because of their will to insist on the earth enduring earthly ice ages.

It is not easy to decipher the warnings in the Atlantis story about reoccurring catastrophes (we know nothing at all), and the exact time of the lives and intervals of the catastrophes. Halley's comet returns on an regular basis about every 90 years or so, and it is my hunch that those destructions mentioned in the Atlantis story, come and go, in a similar way but, of course, those catastrophes return every few thousand years or so, with some of the catastrophes inflicting on our earth, far greater destruction, than other catastrophes. Of all the destructions mentioned in the Atlantis story, it was the great deluge of all that supposedly destroyed the island of Atlantis.

That horrific catastrophe left signs of its horrible aftermath all over the earth, which are clearly visible to anyone with an keen sense of where to look for the evidence of the destruction. Since we know that that catastrophe was caused by the end of the last ice age, we know the northern and southern hemispheres are far more likely to hold evidence of that horrible catastrophe that brought the highly civilized Atlanteans and their great empire, to an abrupt end. We have no choice but to accept that mother nature was the culprit of that horrible catastrophe.

Further east down in northern Africa, the great flood certainly inundated much of northern Africa's coastline bordering the Mediterranean Sea, with devastating results for the Atlanteans who made all of northern Africa their home. Countless Atlantean settlements that once very long ago, flourished along northern Africa's coastline bordering the Mediterranean Sea, unfortunately were completely destroyed by that horrible catastrophe. Incredible amounts of money will be necessary for any archaeologists who may have future plans to discover ancient Atlantean settlements, that most certainly lie under the Mediterranean Sea.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Of course, the coastline of northern Africa, plus southern Europe, and also the Middle East, that were flooded by the great flood then, are under water now, and we know that the depth of the Mediterranean Sea has to be anywhere from sea level to 650 feet under the Mediterranean Sea, if we are going to actually search for and discover, ancient Atlantean settlements. It would be futile to even think about searching for Atlantean settlements in deeper water.

The Atlanteans of northern Africa paid an horrible price during that catastrophe which, undoubtedly, is very easy for us to comprehend. But I believe the majority of northern Africa's Atlantean population escaped uninjured by the horrible catastrophe, unless that catastrophe struck without any warnings. The same can't be said for the Atlantean population of the island of Atlantis, which was along the northeastern coastline of North America, if the Egyptian historical records are truthful in their description of the last days of Atlantis. From Egyptian accounts, which in reality must of been an eyewitness account, the island of Atlantis was completely inundated by water and, afterwards, a shoal of mud was all that remained. And apparently the Egyptians believed that was why that part of the Atlantic Ocean became no longer navigable. Exactly how could the Egyptian people know of the exact details of the last days of Atlantis?

It is very possible that there existed Egyptian citizens, who were living on the island of Atlantis when the island of Atlantis was completely destroyed by the great flood, and somehow managed to escape the incredible flood, and later they miraculously returned to their native homeland of Egypt, with the news of the total destruction of the island of Atlantis.

If that is not how the news of the destruction of Atlantis was recorded by the Egyptian people, than another possible explanation and likely better scenario, involves the few possible Atlantean survivors of the catastrophe that destroyed the Atlantean civilization of Atlantis, somehow managing to safely make it to northern Africa, then eventually to Egypt, with the terrifying news of the destruction of their entire civilization.

If some Atlanteans did survive the flood and had managed to make it to northern Africa as many will probably believe, they stood an good chance of letting their kin know of the incredible destruction of Atlantis. It is a good 2500 miles or more from the straits of Gibraltar to Egypt (quite a distance for travelers of those ancient times), but not impossible to accomplish, since the Mediterranean Sea was obviously still there, just only smaller in size. There were most likely land areas surrounding the straits of Gibraltar with Atlantean settlements that had the good fortune to escape the destruction, and it is possible if there were in fact Atlantean survivors from Atlantis, that they made their way to those Atlantean settlements either in Europe, or better yet, northern Africa.

Somehow the Egyptian people recorded the total destruction of Atlantis, and to us of the present time, it is an mystery that we have no way to try to solve, unless within the ancient ruins of Egypt, there exist undiscovered written information, that will tell the world the real story, not only of the destruction of Atlantis, but also the origins of the Atlantean people, and their incredibly advanced civilization.

I also believe there are other locations besides Egypt, that conceal important historical information about the Atlantean people and their civilization, and just maybe historical records of the terrible destruction of the island of Atlantis. Some of those locations are in southern Europe, especially Italy, particularly the Pompeii region, which I believe conceals underneath it, future discoveries waiting to happen, of very ancient Atlantean settlements. The islands of the Mediterranean Sea may also conceal important historical records of the ancient Atlantean civilization, as well as the homeland of the Greek people, Greece. Northern Africa west of Egypt, especially the Sahara Desert region, may conceal underneath it historical records of the destruction of the island of Atlantis as well. North America and South America, may hold historical records of Atlantis, and the catastrophe that destroyed Atlantis as well. Egypt, of course, escaped the destruction that destroyed Atlantis, and the many Atlantean colonies that surrounded the Mediterranean Sea, and from the Atlantis story we know just why the Egyptian people had the good fortune to survive the great flood, while Atlantis, and many of their colonies that surrounded the Mediterranean Sea, disappeared, possibly forever. The Egyptians believed they escaped the great flood because of the great river, the Nile, which is the longest river in the world, and the reason that the Egyptian civilization flourished as it did.

One of the few mentioned events besides that of Atlantis, in the Atlantis legend that stands out from others, is the Egyptians apparent climate records of those times. I know that there are people who may, as I do, see in the Atlantis story records of the climate conditions of the time that Atlantis existed. Although I can't claim that my theory concerning probable ancient climate records which are largely linked to the stream from heaven, are correct, which it may be, its Egypt's ancient age that may be all that's necessary to find it reliable.

I believe the Egyptians have known civilized life for as long as 10,000 years or even longer, and the Egyptian people as is mentioned in the Atlantis story, have experienced more than only one destruction. Yet exactly what did the Egyptian mean by stream from heaven? Or what exactly does stream from heaven represent?

At the present time there are many people concerned about global warming, and apparently their culprit is the industrialized world we live in. Power plants,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

heating and cooling systems, and automobiles are polluting earths atmosphere, or at least so they think and they are correct of course. Yet I sense that they are being somewhat truthful and somewhat dishonest with us, but at a cost. They have to take into consideration, especially in the industrialized nations of the earth, the incredible population growth for many of the cities, and all the automobiles and other inventions that are supposedly doing major damage to the earths atmosphere, that are part of the everyday lives of the citizens of those cities, as being responsible for warming or cooling of those cities, while further away from those human settlements, who knows, the climate conditions may still be no different compared to a couple of centuries ago. What is confusing to me is their belief that the earth is warming up which is very likely not the truth.

Cities with very large populations, in my opinion, should not be included when tests are conducted to determine if there is actually global warming occurring. In third world countries there are far less automobiles, and other common inventions found in the industrialized nations in use, so the third world countries and their climate conditions, should be closely studied for possible changes in the earths climate.

For all we know before the next ice age returns, the climate of our earth may really warm up, or in other words, their so called current warming trend may be connected in some way to the destructions mentioned by the Egyptian people in the Atlantis story. If what they are telling us is true we can possibly expect much warmer winters and summers in the future, but I wouldn't take it to the bookie. Realistically, if we are currently experiencing a warm up, it has possibly been in existence for at least a century or two or even longer, yet I believe the historical evidence clearly tells us we are actually cooling down.

Was it the stream from heaven mentioned in the Egyptians historical records that destroyed Atlantis? The return of the stream from heaven is a warning to us and future generations, that has to be taken very seriously or, if not, we can expect incredible destruction effecting all the nations of our earth to occur.

Did the stream from heaven originate from deep space, as I suppose a great many people will claim its meaning to be? Or did the stream from heaven originate on our earth? Glaciers, to those people who have visited one in person, may be claimed out loud by those observers to be streams which originate from heaven, because they obviously in a way resemble a river, coming from and going to, heaven. If there truly was an ice age, those glaciers during the ice age did not go unnoticed by the Egyptian people. And it is their mention of the stream from heaven, that leads me to speculate that the Egyptian people possibly recorded the birth of an ice age, of which, possibly after that ice age ended, destroyed the

island of Atlantis, and the Atlanteans incredibly advanced civilization. If there really was an ice age than certainly the great deluge of all, of course, occurred after that ice age, and that meltdown that followed led to the great flood and total destruction of Atlantis, yet I am not convinced.

Within the earth itself may exist the possible reasons for the frequent ice ages and heat ages. Volcanic activity could possibly lead to extreme climate cooling, and even possibly leading to severe ice ages that last for prolonged periods of time, and do major damage to the earths animal and plant life. It may have been very severe volcanic activity that brought the dinosaur age to an end 60 million years ago.

It is no surprise that the land animals that never left for long, the protection of the earths waterways, such as the crocodilians, amphibians, and other very ancient land animals fond of waterways, survived the destruction that brought the dinosaur age to an end, and possibly many other similar destructions that we do not at the present time, know of. Mother earth holds many surprises that have yet to be discovered by humans, which possibly will greatly enrich human thought and the advancement of our civilization, once humans unlock her mysteries fully. But there may also be unwanted consequences that await humans when we eventually discover what mother earth has not allowed humans to discover up to now. There may lie deep in the earth, or concealed on the surface of our earth, far greater tools to actually discover exactly what happened in the earths distant past, than the instruments or tools, we presently make use of.

The Atlanteans of southern Europe, northern Africa and the Middle East did not vanish when the great flood devastated our earth all those thousands of years ago. Though many Atlanteans of southern Europe, northern Africa and the Middle East were swept away by the great flood, the great majority, in my opinion, survived that horrible catastrophe, and their descendants held on to their civilized lifestyle in Europe, Africa and the Middle East. The same can't be said of the Atlanteans who inhabited the island of Atlantis. I believe as I mentioned earlier, that some Atlanteans survived the catastrophe and may of managed to make it to Egypt, with the news of the horrible fate of the island of Atlantis, yet who knows it may have been possible for other Atlantean survivors to of actually sailed the Atlantic Ocean to other unknown locations as well, besides North America, Europe and Africa. I believe our ancestors settlements here in North America did not vanish forever. Oak Island, which is located in Nova Scotia, I believe is an ancient Atlantean settlement waiting to be revealed, yet its going to be almost impossible. In reality Oak Island is an Atlantean settlement but they are not being honest with us and I reckon for good reasons. I realize that it will not

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

be possible to actually dig up the Oak Island site because not only will they not allow it, but because it may not be possible.

They have gone too great lengths to confuse us about America's Stonehenge, and the Viking settlement in Newfoundland, and as well, I will mention again Oak Island, by constantly telling us all that those settlements were constructed by white people. We also have to deal with the most recent ancient civilized ruins discovered in Nova Scotia (Cape Breton Island), which the whites are claiming was built by the Chinese in 1420.

They are wrong of course! Early in 2005, I discovered on the internet, news of an ancient civilized settlement on North Americas Atlantic coastline, being discovered by an archaeologist who believes that the settlement was constructed by the Chinese some 500 to 600 years ago. Of course, it is not an Chinese settlement, but it is an ancient Atlantean settlement that is at least 11,500 years old or older. From reading the description of the ancient settlement, it is apparently huge in size which is encouraging. I would love to search for those elusive Atlantean settlements on North Americas Atlantic coastline some day, but money will be a problem of course.

The End of Algonquian Rule

What follows in this chapter, are my theories about the fate of the Atlantean people of southern Europe, northern Africa and the Middle East, and their former incredibly advanced civilization, which both the whites and blacks inherited. By incredibly advanced, I mean, I have a belief that the Algonquians were fully capable of sailing the oceans of the entire earth 11,500 years ago.

The Mighty Carthaginians

The Carthaginian Phoenicians

These important people of the Middle East, faced empires to their north and east, who had set their eyes on expanding their territories into the homeland of the Carthaginian Phoenician people, as well as their Jewish neighbors. Supposedly, the Carthaginian Phoenicians did not conquer the seas until around 1000 B.C. or later, but my theory is far different than the accepted history of the Phoenicians. I believe the Phoenicians were more than capable of not only sailing the entire Mediterranean Sea, but also much of the Atlantic Ocean, even much of the Indian Ocean as well.

And I sense that the Phoenicians were at one time, an important group of Atlanteans (probably related to the Carthaginian Jews), who likely were very fond of navigating wherever they felt the breeze would blow. It is also my belief that the Carthaginian Phoenicians originally were part of the Carthaginian Empire of northern Africa, who for some particular reason, became very fond of the eastern Mediterranean region.

Early in Carthaginian Phoenician history, city states existed rather than an united Phoenician people (that's according to historians whose timetable for Phoenician city states is around the 1st Millennium B.C. era, yet long before that era the Phoenicians were possibly part of an united Carthaginian Mediterranean Empire), but all Phoenicians were to some degree united economically, mainly because of trade with their numerous nearby neighbors.

However, if there was an Carthaginian Empire which included Phoenicia, it would mean that not only were the Phoenician city states united, but they were

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

united with the Carthaginian Empire whose capitol may have been located at Carthage, yet it also may have been located along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, or even much further inland towards the east. From 3000 B.C., to just before the Roman domination of the Mediterranean region, the very unstable Middle East was an constant battleground to determine what nation of people controlled the regions people and resources. In Egypt, the Egyptian people developed one of mans first great civilizations, and from the bible and ancient Egyptian writings, we know that the Phoenicians history is just as old as their Egyptian kin's. Apparently the Hyksos people were great conquerors but were they possibly the Phoenicians or Jewish people so well known now?

Apparently the Hyksos invaded from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, down into Egypt, conquering all the civilized peoples of that region. The humiliated Egyptians could not tolerate the rule of the nomadic Hyksos, and within three decades of foreign rule the Egyptians rebelled against their unwanted rulers.

During Thutmose III reign as leader of Egypt, the Egyptians finally brought the power of the Hyksos to an end, and all the while, expanding their own empire, which would include their neighbors to the north, the Carthaginian Phoenicians (that likely includes the Egyptian Jews). The Phoenicians endured the rule of their Egyptian neighbors well, and within two centuries or so of the Egyptian conquest, managed to regain their freedom to function as an independent people once again. After gaining their freedom from Egyptian rule, the Carthaginian Phoenicians flourished as a people, and we are told that the Phoenicians gradually started colonies on the northern coast of Africa as well as in southern Europe, and many of the islands of the Mediterranean Sea as well, but I am very skeptical about those claims as you know. The Assyrians of the Middle East, were next to rise up to bring the peoples of that region under their control, including the Phoenician people. From (875 B.C.—608 B.C.) the Carthaginian Phoenician people knew the rule of Assyrian rulers, and must of greatly disliked Assyrian domination, because during the nearly three hundred years of Assyrian rule, many of the Phoenician people rose up to try to bring Assyrian power to an end, but they did so unsuccessfully. It was the non Atlantean people, the Persians, who eventually initiated theirs, and many of their other Semitic kin of the Middle East, end. The Persians ruled from (585 B.C.—333 B.C.) and did not know their rule over the Phoenicians, to be only peaceful.

Following the Persians conquest over the Carthaginian Phoenicians, the next people to rule the Carthaginian Phoenicians were the Greeks (333 B.C.—64 B.C.) and then the Romans continued the foreign domination over the

Phoenicians (64 B.C.—600 A.D.). Non white rule over the Phoenicians was revived in 636 A.D. when the Arabs forced them into their empire.

The Carthaginian Phoenicians only gained their total freedom in the twentieth century, and they are now an racially mixed people. Then we have the mystery of what occurred from 8000 B.C. to 3000 B.C. to have to give attention to. If the Carthaginians did in fact control an Mediterranean Empire which included Italy, western Europe and northern Africa, they probably also controlled Egypt as well. In the future we are going to want to discover if the Carthaginians invaded an Egyptian land which had an civilized people there, if only to determine if the Carthaginians were responsible for the Egyptian civilization that is so well known presently.

The Egyptian Europeans invade Carthaginian Egypt

Did the Egyptian Europeans invade an Egyptian land already occupied by the Carthaginians? If the Egyptian Europeans subjugated the Egyptian Carthaginians, exactly how did they corrupt that Carthaginian Empire so thoroughly that they were able to force their way into an Egypt which was part of an Carthaginian Empire, which almost encompassed the entire Mediterranean Sea?

By using their military might the Egyptian Europeans may have snuck in to the north African country of Egypt, while the Carthaginians were occupying Egypt, then gradually extended their land base until the Carthaginians of Egypt capitulated to the invading Egyptian Europeans. Of course, the Egyptian Europeans needed an endless supply of everything necessary to successfully keep themselves in Egypt, including the all important allies who would join them when they needed their military aid.

There may have also been an alliance between the Egyptian Europeans and the first Egyptians who predated the Carthaginians. It would be ludicrous to speculate that the invading Carthaginians arrived to Egypt and found the Egyptian land void of any Atlantean or black population, especially when we have that “Atlantean invasion” singled out in the Atlantis story to deal with. If the Carthaginians actually experienced such a scenario, it was very likely the first uprising by the Egyptian Europeans and their possible Aboriginal Egyptian allies, against Carthaginian dominance over the Mediterranean region. Although the Carthaginians were incapable of penetrating into the Egyptian Europeans European lands during their invasion of 11,500 years ago, they were obviously powerful enough to prevent the Egyptian Europeans from dominating them then.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

However, over time the unthinkable would occur to the Carthaginian Mediterranean Empire (if there was actually such a Carthaginian Mediterranean Empire of that magnitude), which signaled to Carthage, the eventual course their glorious empire would endure. If Carthaginian people were the first Egyptians, future scholars will want to seriously dig in for a very long spell to attempt to determine if the Carthaginians inhabited Egypt, before the Egyptian Europeans did or any other people did.

The Carthaginian Jews rebel against the Seleucids

Competition arose between the divided provinces of Alexander the Great's once glorious empire, which resulted in the Seleucids bringing the Jews (in reality the Jews possibly represented the Phoenicians as well) under their subjugation. Seleucid attitudes towards the Jewish religion were extremely corrupted, and in fact, Seleucid policy towards the Jews regarding religion, eventually led to the Seleucids outlawing the Jewish religion, in favor of forcing the Jews to accept Zeus as their religion.

It was a no, no for the Seleucids to intervene between the Jews and their religious faith, for their actions were looked upon by the Jews as being immoral. The Jews were so enraged with the immoral actions of the Seleucids they wasted very little time concluding that "the Seleucids had gone far beyond disobedience." What the Jews did was "retaliate against those who dared to govern their religious course," and not simply defend their right to exist independently from the Seleucids.

After the Jews learned of the Seleucids' great willingness to "change the religion of the Jews," the Jews rebelled against those who thought so highly of themselves that they could "change the religion of the Jews." In the rebellion that followed (it occurred around 168 B.C.) the Jews won their independence, thanks in part to their strong religious faith. That strong religious faith of the Jewish people is why Christianity, Islam and Judaism are thriving at the present time throughout the world. However, the Jews' independence would last less than two centuries, for the Romans had defeated their Carthaginian kin of north Africa by 146 B.C. and would eventually continue to expand their empire.

By the latter part of the 1st century B.C., the Romans were inching their way into the affairs of the Jewish people of Judea. Eventually, the Romans would annex Judea and make it part of the Roman Empire, and it wouldn't take too long for the Romans to realize that the Jewish people were somewhat different than compared to other peoples located around the Mediterranean Sea, especially regarding the Jewish religion, which was quite unlike other religions in the same region.

Rome's leaders could tolerate other religions which coexisted with their own religious faiths, but the religion of the Jews was problematic for certain Roman leaders whose ideal of God was them themselves. They were not only puzzled by the Jews religion, but they were also irritated by the Jews unwillingness to view them as also being a God. The Jews would terribly aggravate the Romans after Rome assumed Judea as one of their provinces, and scores of Jews and Romans would end up killed or wounded when they stood before each other and discovered that they were incapable of looking each other in the eye.

Roman military power was unequaled during the height of the Roman Empire, and Jewish leaders during those times, certainly recognized Roman military superiority, and greatly feared the consequences they faced if they dared question Roman rule in any way. The Jewish rebellions more than angered the mighty Romans who, if provoked during the time of the height of their military power, had no second thoughts about destroying, any and all, who dared to seek independence from the Roman Empire.

It was not only the Jewish people that paid a horrible price during the Jewish rebellions, but the rebellions were also very costly to the Romans in human lives, and also the great amount of wealth that was required to fight the Jewish rebels.

After the Romans partially subjugated the Jewish people (Judea was allowed to elect their own rulers, Judea was still only a client kingdom) a period of relative calm followed, but amongst the Jewish people was an religion which, to compare it with that of the Romans, was quite independently different, and it would also eventually interfere between the relationship between the Jewish people and the Romans, in a major way. Other indifferences existed as well between the Jewish people and their Roman subjugators, which contributed to the Jewish rebellions, which were fought by the Jewish people primarily in order to establish an independent Jewish State.

The birth of Christianity among the Jews

All would not remain well after the Romans brought the Jews under their complete subjugation, for the whites would continue on degrading the Jews and their religious faith. But a new religion was born among the Jewish people which would later on capture the serious attention of Jewish leaders, both religious and political. Christianity actually did spring to life among the Jews, but after the new religion began to gain a following among the Jews, their leaders would react negatively to the spread of the new Jewish religion.

Jewish people had been under the impression for countless generations that salvation would come to their people, but Christianity was awkward to those Jewish leaders, both religious and political, for Christianity obviously offered

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

salvation, but at the same time Christianity appeared to offer the Jews “the worst thoughts of the human imagination possible or, of the possible existence of an anti-Christ.”

It was not because the Jews didn’t believe in Jesus Christ (the Jews definitely believed in Jesus Christ, it is those who believe Jesus Christ is the false prophet that don’t comprehend, they aren’t whistling anti-Christ for no particular reason), who still is extremely important to the Jews. After the Jewish leaders made their abrupt decision to reject Christianity’s awkward message (who could blame the Jewish leaders for rejecting what appeared to them to be the “worst thoughts of the human imagination possible”), Christianity eventually spread to the whites who would eventually become infatuated with Christianity’s more important message of eternal life, which the Jews did likewise. Although the Jewish leaders were definitely turned off by Christianity’s awkward message, they probably didn’t let their hopes down, for although Christianity was awkward to an extent to them, they likely saw some hope and good yet in Christianity. Instead of the promised salvation which the institution of religion offers, those important Jewish leaders undoubtedly realized that something was terribly wrong within Christianity’s awkward message.

The First Holocausts

66 A.D. The Jews rise up against the invading whites

Jewish people had long had to deal with surrounding kingdoms which preyed on the Jewish people, by the time of their 66 A.D. revolt against Roman rule, so the events that followed were nothing new in Jewish history. Religious indifferences (that does include the new religion of Christianity) likely started “The Jewish Revolt” in 66, which can be attributed to Rome’s leaders over Judea, refusing to show respect for the Jewish people.

In 6 A.D. Rome made Judea a province of their empire as well as forcing upon the Jews an Roman procurator, which further went to embitter the Jews of Judea. It was the Jewish Zealots who rose up to defend their land and religious faith against those who were obviously conspiring against their beloved land and religion. Caligula was obviously under the impression that he was the number one guy or God, during the years just before the Jews revolted against Roman rule. Caligula was inclined to put number one above any other subject brought before him, and starting in 39 he ordered that number one should be honored throughout the vast Roman Empire, by forcing the many kingdoms under his control to setup statues of number one. Once the Jews of Judea learned of number one’s appetite for self glorification, it may have stymied the Jews momentarily, but they eventually concluded that number one had some serious

ego problems. Unfortunately, number one was brought the horrible news that the Jews were preparing for war instead of setting up statues of number one throughout Judea.

Everything was now in place for Rome to experience an Jewish rebellion and all that was required was the ignition. For some reason the Jews got far too upset after learning of some Greeks living in their land had sacrificed some birds in front of an Jewish synagogue. Of course, the Jews responded in the proper manner.

That event occurred at Caesarea. Eliezar Ben Hanania was so enraged he made the decision to end the prayers and sacrifices to the Roman Emperor, to instead organize as many brave Jewish men to wage war on the Romans at Jerusalem, which they successfully accomplished. In 4 years of brutal fighting that religious curse would ruin the lives of countless numbers of innocent humans. By the year 70 Rome had brought Judea (Masada continued to resist the Romans until the year 73) back under their control. Afterwards, a period of stability followed and was probably well received by both the Jews and Romans.

Nero was Rome's emperor during the 66 Jewish Revolt, and after being brought the terrible news of the Jewish uprising against his rule, he ordered some 60,000 soldiers under the command of Vespasian, to the troubled land of Judea to quell the Jewish uprising. At first the Romans targeted the coastal region and the north of Judea, where they eventually were successful at quelling the Judean Jews.

However, southern Judea and Jerusalem were still yet in Jewish hands and the Jews dug in for siege warfare against the Romans. After the north of Judea was brought back under Roman control, civil war broke out in the Judea lands still yet under Jewish control. As usual, when civil war breaks out under the conditions the Jews of southern Judea experienced, it can be attributed to those Jews who wanted nothing less than total victory over their subjugators, and those Jews who felt that it was far better to capitulate to their subjugators. Unfortunately, those Jews who wanted total victory over their subjugators actively sought out those Jews who wanted to capitulate to their subjugators, and then waged war on them. Exactly how many Jews were killed by their fellow Jews is not exactly known, but in predicaments such as that ancient Jewish civil war, the number could have been quite large.

Unfortunately, all prominent Jewish revolt leaders in the south of Judea were killed during their civil war, and that very likely hampered the Jews attempt to rid their beloved land of the unwanted Romans. For 4 years the Jews inside Jerusalem prevented the Romans from forcing their way in to take their city. What the Romans did (the Carthaginians under Hannibal's command should

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

have done the exact same to the city of Rome) was pitch their tents around the city of Jerusalem then made themselves at home.

While after establishing their tent city, the Romans went about building an stone wall just as high as the walls surrounding Jerusalem were. Eventually, the Jews living in Jerusalem would learn that it was not a wise decision to leave their city walls, for the Romans had built an trench which surrounded Jerusalem, and when any of the city's inhabitants attempted to leave Jerusalem they were usually captured then paid a horrible price for doing so. They ended up nailed to the cross.

After the siege ended what stood before the city walls of Jerusalem were tens of thousands of Jews nailed to crosses. Romans were not too pleased about having to go through the Siege of Jerusalem. Eventually, Jerusalem capitulated to Rome and the Jewish rebellion became part of history. Unfortunately, the Jews of Judea paid a horrible price for fighting for their kingdoms freedom.

Most reliable estimates for the number of Jews killed during the Jewish uprising is put at 1,100,000 (apparently some of that estimate is for non Jews as well), which is especially large for that time period, but not out of the ordinary of course. Was it a Holocaust? Of course it was!

Rome was not in the forgiving mood after bringing Judea back under Rome's authority, for they would force large numbers of Jews into slavery after defeating the Jews. Romans were so enraged after that war they singled out Jewish settlements individual totems to make examples out of them. In one case the Romans forced 2500 members of an Jewish totem to fight wild animals at Caesarea's amphitheatre. In 4 years of brutal fighting that religious curse would ruin the lives of countless numbers of innocent humans.

By the year 70 Rome had brought Judea (Masada continued to resist the Romans until the year 73) back under their control. Afterwards, a short period of stability followed and was probably well received by both the Jews and Romans, but Jewish leaders were not about to ignore what was occurring then. Too much was put before the enraged Jews for the Jews to simply set it aside and just forget about it. If historians truly want to think of the 66 A.D. Jewish revolt as being "Great," in the war that followed they may want to rethink twice about actually claiming the 66 A.D. Jewish revolt as being the great one.

The Great Jewish Revolt The Kitos War

Once the Kitos War commenced the Jews would take out their frustrations on the whites in the following locations: Cyprus, Cyrene, Egypt, Judea, Libya,

Mesopotamia and Syria. In some of those locations the whites were completely exterminated by the enraged Jews, who were forced by the white Romans to evacuate much of their kingdom, including Jerusalem. At that time the Carthaginian Jews were still devastated by what they endured during the 66 A.D. rebellion. In Cyrene, the Jews wiped out some 200,000 whites. On Cyprus, the Jews wiped out some 240,000 whites. The Jewish people were enraged by what they had endured! For several decades after being forced by the Romans to adhere to foreign non Jewish ways, the Jews rose up to “retaliate against those who dared to intrude within their innocent existence,” and they were most definitely still in the mood to continue the killings after the Kitos War ended.

The whites of Cyprus are exterminated

In 117 the Jews of Cyprus (the island of Cyprus was definitely inhabited by the Carthaginians, Jews and even the first wave of Atlantean settlers before the whites) rose up against the white invaders and, completely, or, nearly exterminated them. Some 240,000 whites were apparently killed by the Jews on Cyprus, which also suggests that the Carthaginian and Jewish population on Cyprus was larger than that of the white Greeks and white Romans, of those ancient times.

It would be useless to even suggest that the whites were more numerous than the Carthaginians and Jews on Cyprus, for if the whites were indeed more numerous they would have been fully capable of defending themselves from the enraged Carthaginians and Jews. Most likely once the uprising had commenced the Jews and Carthaginians went about searching for any whites they could find to only kill them.

That does definitely include those whites serving in the military, along with any white civilians they could get their hands on to kill them. The Jews and Carthaginians were obviously infallible when they waged war on the whites of Cyprus. After the Jews had exterminated the whites living on Cyprus the Romans would return to reclaim Cyprus for the whites, then round up the remaining Jews and Carthaginians living on Cyprus, and remove them to other locations to be slaves or simply used in the many stadiums located throughout the vast Roman Empire, as objects to be killed.

The whites of Cyrene are exterminated

Cyrene was located in Libya and apparently established by the Greeks around 630 B.C., but since some 200,000 white Greeks and Romans were exterminated by the Jews, Carthaginians and Numidians in the Kitos War in Cyrene, that

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

suggest that the Jewish, Carthaginian and Numidian population in Cyrene, was more numerous than that of the white Greeks and white Romans. In other words, Libya or Cyrene was still predominantly Carthaginian and Numidian when those horrible events occurred. Cyrene was probably first Carthaginian or Numidian for all we know, and not first Greek or Roman.

Only after the Greeks had established themselves in Libya did Libya actually take on that cosmopolitan flavor. Alexander the Great conquered Cyrene and the Ptolemy's inherited Cyrene after Alexander's early death. Upon the death of Ptolemy, Apion, Cyrene was turned over to the Romans at the request of Ptolemy Apion's will.

What occurred in Libya was obviously not pretty, for the Jews and Carthaginians did definitely go on the warpath against the white invaders, and with a vengeance. In fact, the Jews and Carthaginians exterminated the whites of Libya or took control of Libya. Something ignited the Jews and Carthaginians to be so infallible while waging war on the whites in Cyrene, they actually were successful at ridding their lands of the invading whites.

After Rome brought the Jews and Carthaginians living in Cyrene back under their control, what encountered the Roman visitors to Libya was a land without any Greeks and Romans. Unfortunately, Rome had to initiate new colonies in Libya for the Jews and Carthaginians totally wiped out their old ones.

The whites in Egypt were possibly exterminated

Not to stop with the genocide in Cyprus and Libya, the Jews also rose up against the whites in Egypt killing an unknown number of whites in Egypt, then took control of Egypt (that event may have been the first time the Atlanteans regained control of Egypt since before the black Nubians rise to power), but that was only to be momentarily. Exactly what was the driving force which ignited the Jews and Carthaginians of the eastern Mediterranean region, to explode in the manner that they did?

With their early success's in Cyrene obviously an inspiration to them, the Jews then marched on to the white Egyptian city of Alexandria (they were led by Jewish leader Lukuas), which was just before their arrival occupied by an contingent of Roman soldiers. However, before the Jewish army had actually made their appearance at Alexandria, the Roman soldiers had apparently fled in utter consternation.

Most likely the Romans knew of what the Jews had accomplished back in Cyrene, and unanimously agreed to flee from the enraged Jews who were about to wage war on them. After the Jewish army discovered that the Romans had left Alexandria to them, the Jewish soldiers went about destroying Alexandria as

best as they could. The Jews singled out Alexandrian pagan temples to wage war on them, and probably did as a means of releasing the great rage within them. The Jews also probably sought out any whites (those whites who didn't flee with the fleeing Roman soldiers that is) they could apprehend to only kill them in Alexandria as well. Afterwards, what impressed the enraged Jews was the fact that they had won and won in a big way against the Romans, but their newly acquired lands would only be theirs for a short while. Up in Rome, news of the Jewish uprisings throughout their eastern colonies and back in their northern African colonies of Cyrene and Egypt, most definitely deeply disturbed them, for they knew that the Jewish uprising was not the ordinary uprising, but that it was a war of genocide.

Not only was Rome shocked by the actions of the very enraged Jews, they were probably dreading sending their soldiers out to reclaim their old colonies, which meant they would have to give battle to the enraged Jews, who were definitely in the mood to get down and do some serious fighting. Rome's leaders had no choice but to respond to the new horrible Jewish uprising, yet they likely knew that the safety of the whites back in Cyrene and Egypt, left Rome's leaders completely powerless to act as their defenders. All Rome's leaders could do was patiently wait until they had sent new Roman soldiers to the troubled Cyrene and Egyptian colonies, to eventually learn of the fate of the whites in Cyrene and those of Egypt.

It would take until late 117 for Rome to subdue Jewish Cyrene and Jewish Egypt, but by then it was probably far too late to save any of the whites who had lived in Cyrene and Egypt, before the Kitos War had commenced. Presently, I do not know the correct estimate for the number of whites killed in Egypt by the Jews, Carthaginians and probably the Egyptian Europeans, but if the same fate befell the whites of Cyprus and Cyrene, was also experienced by the whites of Egypt, it is very likely that the Jews, Carthaginians and Egyptian Europeans exterminated the whites of Egypt as well. Life was not going to get any better for the Jewish people after the Roman Empire became history as we all know. The following 15 centuries were a horrible time for the Jewish people and, sadly it was a time the Jewish people were to experience their nations darkest hours.

After the Romans had become a memory, times changed and new peoples emerged, to continue the struggle for dominance. Europeans, after the fall of the Roman Empire, separated into many independent kingdoms or nations, and gradually lost much of their knowledge of the great Roman civilization. It was in Europe where a great number of Middle Eastern Jewish people ended up living, either of their own free will, or forced to live in Europe.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

By 1948 the Jewish people would gain their freedom once again but at that cost of the freedom of the innocent Semitic Palestinians, who have been singled out to carry the burden for the existence of an new Israel. To this day the Middle East is very unstable, and both the Semitic Jewish people and their Semitic Palestinian kin, can blame that on their white European neighbors. Currently, the Jews are doing just as well economically as western Europe and North America, but the unrest in Israel and the surrounding region, has no end in sight. The Semitic Palestinian people face incredible obstacles in their struggle to regain their land and freedom.

They cannot blame their Semitic Jewish kin because the roots of the unrest in the Middle East are in the hands of their white European neighbors. Make no doubts about it the Europeans are partially racially motivated, as well as influenced by other troubling factors, and would have no second thoughts about involving themselves in a war between Israel and their Semitic kin, if Israel faced total defeat, to aid the Jewish people. They don't want anything to do with them.

Carthage's last years

The Sicilian War

The Battle of Agrigentum

In 288 B.C. out of Italy came a group of Italian mercenaries, who had acquiring land in their thoughts. Their target was an settlement on the northern coast of the island of Sicily which is known as Messina. This white Italian invasion onto Sicily resulted in those Mamertines killing as many men as they could kill in the settlement, in order to bring the settlement under their outright control. Once they had established themselves on Sicily, they would eventually combat the city state of Syracuse, whose military might was impressive enough to force the invading white Italians to beg of Rome's protection and, supposedly the protection of the Carthaginians, yet we won't be so acceptable concerning that bit of historical information. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand just who those invading Italians preferred. Sicily was first inhabited by the Carthaginians and not the white Greeks, who had commenced their own colonization of Sicily before the white Romans did. I suspect that the Carthaginians were also living in southern Italy before the whites arrived and gradually commenced their own colony's in Italy.

This is the time when the Romans would gradually begin their quest to initiate an national navy. After the Romans commenced to plan for their very own national navy and then began to train their sailors as well, for their obvious planned invasion of Sicily, they would eventually discover an willing ally on the

island of Sicily, who was the city state of Syracuse of course. It sounds like a bunch of nonsense but if you truly studied hard you would actually see the sense in it. Of course, the whites already living on Sicily were conspiring with the whites of Italy, to force the Carthaginians to abdicate control over Sicily, to them.

About all you need to understand is Sicily was settled by the Carthaginians or part of the empire of the mighty Carthaginians then. White Greeks had either forced their way onto Sicily long before Sicily eventually became part of the Roman Empire, or they were given permission by Carthage to live on Sicily. Since the Carthaginians military was already long at home on Sicily, it simply meant that they held an advantage. By 262 B.C. the Romans and Syracuse had won control of the eastern part of the island of Syracuse, which most definitely ticked off the Carthaginians, who were obviously by then in the mood for some serious war.

When the Carthaginians learned of the 40,000 invading Romans landing upon Sicily in 262 B.C., it definitely led to anxiety problems. After the Romans and their ally settled on their sinister plans, they commenced to part for the southwestern portion of Sicily where the city of Agrigentum was located, which took place in June of 262 B.C. Within the city of Agrigentum were the city's inhabitants, both civilian and military, and under the command of Hannibal Gisco who, after learning of the approaching invaders, ordered the city to be barricaded against the threat coming their way. He was a wise commander who knew that the odds were against his beloved city and the soldiers he was in charge of. He knew that reinforcements were going to arrive sooner or later from north Africa, but he had to order the city's inhabitants to set in to prepare for an expected long siege to occur while Carthage organized for their defense, and his expectations proved to be correct. However, after the whites arrived the Romans had probably started to think that starvation would bring their Carthaginian foe to their knees during that siege, yet it did not materialize. And once the Romans and their ally caught wind to the over 50,000 Carthaginian reinforcements eventual arrival, which occurred during the winter of 262 B.C. and 261 B.C., they obviously had to deal with their new anxiety problems, for the Carthaginian might was well known of by all around the Mediterranean Sea region.

After the over 50,000 new Carthaginian reinforcements made their way to the Agrigentum region, they eventually found the Romans military camp and then proceeded to prepare to assault the Romans, but to their obvious disappointment they learned that the Romans had decided to fortify themselves, instead of combating the Carthaginians. With the Romans now experiencing their own siege, it would only lead to the Romans making the decision to give battle instead of trying to survive that siege. Their decision to give battle was the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

proper decision for they eventually won the ensuing battle against the Carthaginians of Agrigentum. After the battle the Carthaginians would no longer be the dominant power on the island of Sicily. The Romans and their Syracuse ally were to eventually dominate. The Romans were horrible to the city of Agrigentum's inhabitants, who were forced into slavery after the Romans victory. However, the war for control over Sicily continued on.

The Battle of the Lipari Islands

Evidently Romans were stymied when they first planned together to build warships, but some good luck fell upon the Romans when they discovered an wrecked Carthaginian ship, which was then used by the Romans to make duplicates of. Of course, the Romans would have built extremely reliable warships of their own conceptions, but they knew of the Carthaginian warships great reliability during the times of naval warfare, and even more importantly, that the Carthaginians were unequaled navigators. Naval warfare was new to the Romans so to make a long story a shorter one, the Romans knew how to exploit an opportunity when an opportunity was learned of.

After the Romans discovered the wrecked Carthaginian warship, they immediately (the Romans had evidently constructed the 150 warships in only 2 months) constructed some 150 duplicates to be used for their planned all out invasion of Sicily. It would take more than one naval battle between the Carthaginians and Romans during 260 BC., to eventually learn whose navy was the superior over the other. Rome's navy was caught off guard during the naval battle at the Battle of the Lipari Islands, which is nothing new during naval battles. Put in command of 17 Roman warships, Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio set sail for Messina but little did the Roman naval commander know that treachery awaited him.

He would learn of an apparent group of sympathizers located at Lipara, who had apparently given in to the temptation to give peace over that of war, the rightful opportunity to be tried, yet they were not the willing peace makers they tried so hard to make themselves appear to be. The Romans had unfortunately been tricked into sailing into the Lipari harbor where, without Roman knowledge, some 20 Carthaginian warships were waiting to commence to ambush them. Once the Romans realized that their plight was one which they could not recover from they accepted their predicament by putting up very little resistance against the Carthaginians. Wisely, which is putting it bluntly, the Roman sailors split after learning they were in dire straits. It was an Carthaginian naval victory, but the Romans were brand new to naval warfare against the Carthaginians, who were by that time, professionals at conducting naval warfare.

The Battle of Mylae

After their costly naval battle defeat at the Lipari Islands, and after learning of their first naval defeat against the Carthaginians (the Romans were likely not surprised upon learning of their defeat) the Romans rebounded as any normal nation of people usually do. The Romans were so despondent after their defeat at the Battle of the Lipari Islands, they forged a new plan to be used against the Carthaginian navy which revolved around linking all their naval ships together. The new plan also would make it easier for the Roman soldiers to enter their enemy's war vessels to give hand to hand battle.

During the first moments of the naval Battle of Mylae, the Romans new naval tactics proved to work, for they eventually captured 30 Carthaginian war vessels, which had been a bit stymied by the new Roman naval tactics. After the Romans eliminated about another 20 of the Carthaginian warships, the Carthaginians obviously had started to endure great distress, and in fact, the Carthaginians were to eventually feel compelled enough to unanimously agree to expire their naval battle against the Romans. The first Roman naval victory over the Carthaginians at the Battle of Mylae, was an impressive one which resulted in some 50 or so of the 130 Carthaginian warships which took part in the naval battle, being destroyed or captured by the victorious Romans.

Unfortunately, Carthaginian naval commander, Hannibal (not the same Hannibal of the second Punic War who is still very popular), would be tried by the people he was put in charge of to protect and serve, then found guilty of losing then nailed to the cross for losing to the Romans. Obviously the Carthaginians were just as serious about losing battles as were their Roman rivals.

Of course, during those ancient times the consequences of losing insignificant and major battles during times of war, on too many occasions led to horrible reprisals on those who had the opportunity to lead their people to victory but, instead, brought to them exactly what they didn't want to know of. In the case of the Carthaginian-Roman conflicts more than a lot was at stake, especially in the case of the Carthaginians who were the dominant nation of the Mediterranean region during the years of the first Carthaginian-Roman War.

Rome had little to lose then, but the Carthaginians had a great deal to lose, and both rivals very likely looked upon their fate in that very same manner then. Carthaginians obviously took the war more seriously than the Romans, and when reading of how the Romans treated their Carthaginian foe during those ancient conflicts, it gives the distinct impression that the Romans battled an strong willed and determined foe, who were powerful enough to inflict significant casualties on the Romans. Romans were enticed to treat the Carthaginians without any

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

respect, which is nothing new during times of war. Rome was obviously now powerful enough to control Italy's southern most Mediterranean waters.

The Battle of Sulci

With the news of their victory over the Carthaginians at the Battle of Mylae (the ancient naval Battle of Mylae had took place in 260 B.C.) bringing to the Romans an uplift in spirits, especially about fighting naval battles against a rival who were then the fineness naval warriors in the entire world, it obviously meant to the Romans that their Carthaginian foe were not invincible during naval warfare. After learning of their victory over the Carthaginian navy the Romans then came under the immense urge to create an even more formidable navy of their own, to not only patrol the southern waters of Italy, but their leaders all of sudden became Carthaginian African land hungry. Back in the Carthaginian capitol of Carthage, the Carthaginian leaders were definitely devastated upon learning of the terrible news of their powerful navy's defeat at Mylae. Their main concern was obviously the immense threat that the powerful Romans now posed to the mighty Carthaginian Empire. Carthaginian leaders now knew for certain that their remaining beloved land was in grave danger of being lost to the new power emerging in Italy.

Their beloved land in western Europe and northern Africa along the shores of the vast Mediterranean Sea, now were becoming even far more precious to the Carthaginians, who obviously had countless Carthaginian settlements scattered all over those beautiful lands, and also countless farms to grow the food that they consumed. During that time the Carthaginians were obviously very aware of the white conquests in Italy, in eastern Europe, in ancient Egypt, and especially in their very own eastern Mediterranean colonies, which were gobbled up by the invading Persians and Greeks, who had come down from the north, after they had driven off the mighty Egyptian Europeans.

It must have more than just concerned the Carthaginian leaders to know of how their Egyptian kinfolk were conquered by the white Greeks under Alexander the Great's leadership, only a few short decades before. Their colonies along the eastern Mediterranean Sea were especially hard to part with since they had obviously been extremely precious to the Carthaginians who, in all likelihood, had colonized the eastern shores of the vast Mediterranean Sea thousands of years earlier.

In 258 B.C. a fleet of Carthaginian naval warships, met and battled, an fleet of Roman naval warships. The Battle of Sulci was likely considered by both the Carthaginians and the Romans, as not being too significant for each of their causes. The Romans eventually won the Battle of Sulci but the Battle of Sulci was

apparently a toss in the trash can, for the naval battle didn't give anything especially important to the Romans but, since nothing of importance arose, just another naval victory over the Carthaginians. However, Rome's attention was now starting to focus on expanding directly into the heart of the Carthaginians beloved land.

The Battle of Tyndaris

Without a doubt, the Romans were even far more land hungry after winning the Battle of Sulci in 258 B.C. The Battle of Tyndaris was fought in 257 BC. and involved the Carthaginians and Romans of course, but also the Greeks who inhabited Sicily then. Tyndaris was an Greek town on Sicily, which was apparently inclined to allow the powerful Carthaginians to patrol the region with their military personal, which simply means that the Greeks of Tyndaris were not yet at that time, powerful enough to dominate the powerful Carthaginians. Of course, the Greeks were more inclined to look upon the Romans over the Carthaginians, as being potential allies during the times for war.

And at that time the Greeks of Sicily were knowledgeable to exactly what was occurring, on and around, the large island of Sicily. Much earlier the Greeks had either forced their way onto the large island of Sicily or peacefully settled there, which had already been colonized by the Carthaginians long before the first Greek settlements appeared on the large island of Sicily.

Upon learning of the Romans victory over the Carthaginians in the Battle of Tyndaris, the Greeks of the town of Tyndaris, were obviously delighted to have their settlement liberated from the Carthaginians, who were obviously in control of the Tyndaris Greeks then. Their defeat at the Battle of Tyndaris, had obviously ticked off the Carthaginians who had to endure yet another defeat against the Romans, who were now starting to feel even more invincible against the Carthaginians. The Greeks settlement of Tyndaris, on Sicily, now willingly joined together with the invading Romans in alliance, but the Carthaginians were still in that mood to defend their ancient land of Sicily, from those invaders from mainland Europe.

The Battle of Cape Ecnomus

With their naval victories over the Carthaginians well fixed in their daily thoughts, the Romans then became even more determined to bring Sicily, and the rest of the mighty Carthaginian Empire, under the control of the Italian Romans. Some 330 Roman warships were built, which were to be used by Rome to rid Sicily of Carthaginian control for good, then commence their eventual planned invasion of the remaining African and European Carthaginian lands.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

What is so unique about the Battle of Cape Ecnomus, was the size of the corresponding naval fleets, which were just about equally sized in the number of warships (the Carthaginian warships numbered around 350) and the number of soldiers, who participated in the Battle of Cape Ecnomus, which is considered the largest of ancient naval battles.

Aboard each Carthaginian and Roman war vessel, were at least 250 rowers and soldiers, which brings the total combatants to over 150,000. Very impressive but, to put it very bluntly, it is evidence that both the Carthaginians and Romans were extremely upset with one another, and were feeling the pressures of the instinct to survive on, especially the Carthaginians who, from just knowing how large their naval fleet was at the Battle of Cape Ecnomus, were under extreme pressure to successfully halt the advance of the invading whites from mainland Europe.

What definitely bothered the Carthaginians was the Roman use of the *corvus* (the Roman naval tactic of linking their ships together which gave their soldiers the opportunity to board their enemy's war vessels more easily) and how they could better defend themselves against that Roman naval tactic. It was a mistake on the part of the Carthaginians to plan to protect their vessels from the Romans *corvus* naval tactic.

What the Carthaginians should have outright chosen to do was allow the Romans the opportunity to board their own war vessels then give battle, for the Carthaginians allowed fear of the Romans new naval tactic to make their decisions, and it would be a very costly one for the Carthaginians, who were badly defeated at the Battle of Cape Ecnomus. It proves that the Carthaginians were compelled to think more about being defeated than winning that battle.

No nation wants to go into battle thinking about losing the coming confrontation. The Romans *corvus* naval tactic proves that the Romans were willing to plan in order to win. Unfortunately, in the case of the Carthaginians their plight was one which saw them unwilling to directly confront the new Roman naval tactic. Nearly a third of the Carthaginian war vessels were captured or destroyed by the victorious Romans at the Battle of Cape Ecnomus. It was a terrible defeat that the Carthaginians had to deal with. The Battle of Cape Ecnomus was fought in 256 B.C. off the coast of Sicily, close to where Lacata Sicily, is now.

The Battle of Adys

Rearing to commence their invasion of Carthaginian Africa (we can only imagine the fear and anxiety the Romans had of doing so), Roman soldiers under the command of Lucius Manlius Vulso and Marcus Atilius Regulus (they were

in command of anywhere from 15,500 to 20,000 Roman soldiers) set sail for Carthaginian Africa in 256 B.C. Upon reaching the shores of northern Africa (the location was some 40 miles to the east of Carthage) they made landfall then departed for the interior to near an Carthaginian settlement named Clupea, which was soon attacked by the invading Romans, and then capitulated to the Romans. With their success at Clupea behind them, the Romans were now more encouraged than ever before to get the real war for northern Africa underway. Adys was an nearby important Carthaginian settlement which captured the attention of Roman military commanders who, when were organizing their Carthaginian war plans, had obviously wanted the important Carthaginian settlement taken by their soldiers, in order to stand a better chance of defeating the Carthaginians.

Evidently one of the top ranking Carthaginian military commanders (he was general Hamilcar) was still in Sicily during this time and was urgently requested by his kingdoms political leaders, to return home to north Africa, to participate in the coming confrontation against the invading Romans. General Hamilcar, along with Generals Bostar and Hasdrubal, quickly organized their Carthaginian soldiers to defend the city of Adys, which was already preparing for the invading Romans (they apparently were not too far off from Adys) to siege it. In the following battle at Adys, the Carthaginians were inept while defending Adys.

Instead of continuing to defend Adys against the invading Romans (after gradually accepting that the Romans controlled the battle), the Carthaginians unanimously agreed to flee from the battle that they were losing. The Carthaginians made their way to near Tunis where they would inflict an horrible defeat on the invading Romans. It may have been an clever deploy of the Carthaginians to confuse the Romans.

Evidently when the Romans found themselves in control of Adys, they then began negotiations with Carthaginian leaders to end the Sicilian War. In the Romans demands for ending the Sicilian War, they insisted that Carthage sign over all of Corsica, Sardinia and Sicily to Rome. The Romans needed to take Carthage itself in order to force the Carthaginians to capitulate to Rome and the Romans knew it, yet they definitely wanted the war to end. So after the negotiations failed the Romans had no choice but to give more battle and the Romans eventually paid for it. Carthaginian casualties at the Battle of Adys were minimal, yet most of the Carthaginian soldiers escaped.

The Battle of Tunis

Upon learning of their terrible defeat at the Battle of Cape Ecnomus, Carthaginian leaders in Carthage were definitely shocked and devastated, yet they

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

also knew that the land they walked upon was now in extreme danger of being absorbed by the growing Roman Empire. What the Carthaginian leaders knew would eventually occur was an Roman invasion onto their beloved north African lands, and that they truly had no choice but to prepare for that expected foreign invasion, which would show up on their southern Mediterranean shores sometime in the coming future. They also knew that it would not be an naval battle but, instead, a land battle in which their soldiers had no choice but to give hand to hand battle.

In the battle that ensued after the Romans sailed their soldiers from mainland Europe, to the southern Mediterranean shores of north Africa, the Romans paid a dear price for their bravery and lust for greed for land. Around 12,500 or even more of those 15,500 Roman soldiers who landed in north Africa to give battle to their Carthaginian foe, were either killed or captured by the victorious Carthaginians.

Some 16,000 Carthaginian soldiers participated in the Battle of Tunis, against those 15,500 or so Roman soldiers but, to be included among the weapons of the Carthaginians at the Battle of Tunis, were also some 100 elephants that the Carthaginians put to good use in that ancient battle against the invading Romans. With their soldiers horribly defeated by the Carthaginian soldiers in north Africa, the Romans would suddenly change their plans about commencing an all out invasion of the Carthaginians Empire, by using their navy to invade. From now on the Romans were to stay clear of north Africa throughout the duration of the first war between Carthage and Rome. What obviously occurred was the Romans developed a great respect for the Carthaginians, after the Carthaginian victory over the invading Romans occurred at the Battle of Tunis in 255 B.C.

Upon receiving the horrible news that some 12,500 of their brave Romans soldiers bit the dust in Africa, Roman leaders gradually began to accept that the war with the Carthaginians would not immediately bring Rome the new lands that they desired. An new attitude towards the powerful Carthaginians emerged, which was centered on hate and revenge for what the Carthaginians accomplished at the Battle of Tunis. In Carthage, Carthaginian leaders could relax for the time being after their victory over Rome at the Battle of Tunis, yet theirs was a plight that could not allow for Carthaginian leaders to ignore what was occurring then.

When their eastern lands fell to the Persians then Greeks, it obviously devastated the Carthaginians, who were not as well situated as the Persians and Greeks, who held an land advantage over them, which means they both used that land advantage to its utmost. With this war with Rome, Carthage now had that land advantage and it manifested at the Battle of Tunis. Of particular importance

to Carthaginian leaders during this first Carthage-Rome conflict, had to of been their beloved western European lands, which possibly included England, Ireland and Scotland and how to defend those lands from the Roman threat, for the Romans had that land advantage over the Carthaginians, in that region of the Carthaginians Empire.

During the first Carthage-Rome conflict the Romans should have sent their brave soldiers straight into the western European lands of the Carthaginians, annexing their lands there first. Yet the Romans likely felt invincible when they invaded southern Italy and Africa, where they eventually fought the Battle of Tunis against the mighty Carthaginians.

Before the Romans gradually brought all of western Europe, including England under Rome's control, the white Celts had forced their way into that same region using pure military force. Or did they? The Romans may have been the first whites in England, Ireland and Scotland! The Celts encountered the Carthaginians and obviously Iberian peoples in those regions. Those invading Celtic tribes invaded from eastern Europe, and eventually poured down into France and Spain, but they didn't dominate the European Carthaginians obviously. Of course, that can be attributed to the fact that those Celtic tribes were not civilized.

Those Celtic tribes were also prone to wage war on the Romans, yet when the Carthaginians are included as an possible ally, the Celtic tribes and Romans were most definitely willing to cooperate with each other (that includes going as far as to use deceitfulness), rather than cooperate with the European Carthaginians. After the land battle of the Battle of Tunis, the Romans obviously would think twice about fighting land battles against the mighty Carthaginians, whose number of soldiers killed during the Battle of Tunis was some 800, which is a far cry from the 12,500 Roman soldiers who were killed in the Battle of Tunis. The Battle of Tunis may not have been the worst defeat inflicted upon an foe ever to occur, but the battle was very impressive and must have brought great relief to the Carthaginians, who obviously needed an uplift then.

The Battle of Panormus

Although Rome was firmly established on the large island of Sicily, after the Carthaginian victory in the Battle of Tunis, the Carthaginians were obviously even more enticed to bring the large island of Sicily, back under the control of the islands original occupants. Panormus was an Roman settlement on Sicily and Roman soldiers were stationed there to protect Rome's expansion onto Sicily. After some internal problems which arose after the Battle of Tunis came in went

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

in Africa, the Carthaginians agreed upon a new plan to send more of their brave soldiers to Sicily which, if the islands history during that time is fact, the Romans were largely dominant there. Sicily was obviously very precious to the Carthaginians who had also colonized all other Mediterranean islands long before the whites did, and they were putting up a big fight to keep Sicily under Carthaginian control. The first whites probably colonized Sicily after 500 B.C.

Rome knew of the new Carthaginian military force which had landed on Sicily but they didn't unanimously agree to attack that Carthaginian military force, and that likely was because of what occurred at the Battle of Tunis a few years before. Rome also knew that they held the advantage on Sicily, so the Romans were obviously a bit somewhat concerned, but not so concerned that they abandoned their Sicilian settlements to the Carthaginians. Of course, the Romans were going to defend their new Sicilian settlements and at all cost, and that's what exactly occurred at Panormus, after the Carthaginians commenced to assault an Roman army which was on the outskirts of Panormus, tending to the agriculture needs of that cities inhabitants. Afterwards, the Roman's fled back to their settlement to dig in to protect their settlement by using ditches and the settlement itself, after the Carthaginians attacked them.

Carthaginian commander, Hasdrubal, ordered his soldiers to commence to wage war on everything surrounding Panormus, which his soldiers followed out. Upon the Carthaginian army's approach to Panormus, the Romans then singled out the Carthaginian elephants to wage war on them, to attempt to eliminate the terrifying animals from that confrontation. From just outside the settlements gates, an force of Roman soldiers ordered there to defend the settlement from the likelihood of an Carthaginian forced entrance into their settlement, was ordered to attack the Carthaginian military force just about to attempt to force their way into Panormus.

In the following confrontation, the Romans eventually drove off that Carthaginian army attempting to force their way into Panormus, to bring that Roman settlement under their control. Evidently after witnessing that Carthaginian army depart from their settlement, the Romans were compelled to feel satisfied with successfully defending Panormus, over actually wanting to give chase to the retreating Carthaginian military force, to give more battle.

Roman commander, Lucius Cecilius Metellus, was correct to deploy his brave soldiers to defend the settlement of Panormus, over instructing the Roman soldiers to go into battle against the Carthaginian army which, if they had won that battle, would have given them unobstructed access to Panormus, which would have easily been taken by Hasdrubal's soldiers. It was most definitely

devastating for Carthaginian leaders to learn of Hasdrubal's horrible fiasco at Panormus. After Carthaginian leaders heard of their defeat at the Battle of Panormus, the thought of actually losing Sicily for good sunk in, yet the Carthaginians who continued to live upon the island their ancestors handed down to them, continued to wage a war of their own against the invading Romans and Greeks, but their numbers were not great and, to make matters even far more worse, they were left to fend for themselves by their leaders in Carthage, who were probably war weary to say the least.

Carthage was enduring immense problems during that time. They had lost their eastern colonies along the eastern Mediterranean to the invading whites, and now they had lost their beautiful Italy to them as well. Italy was obviously precious to the Carthaginians, who had long grown accustomed to the pleasures of Italy's bountiful resources, which were definitely among Europe's most productive then.

The Battle of Drepana

Although the Carthaginians would no longer attempt to send huge Carthaginian army's to Sicily (the Carthaginians knew that it would be expensive, and also that the Romans would probably be enticed to stay near their Sicilian settlements, to defend their settlements rather than send their soldiers out to give battle) to attempt to bring Sicily back under their control, their navy was still patrolling the waters around the large island of Sicily, to supply their Sicilian settlements along the coast. The number of Carthaginian ships which participated in the naval battle at Drepana, was around 120, which was about how many ships the Romans had during the Battle of Drepana. On orders to leave the harbor near Drepana, to avoid an approaching Roman fleet which was about to blockade their own ships then give battle, the Carthaginian fleet under the command of Ad Herbal, reacted swiftly by seeking the nearby open sea where they reorganized then sailed back to the Roman fleet of 120 ships, which had corrected itself under their commanders instructions, after their surprise attack failed.

In the following confrontation between Rome's 120 ships and Carthage's 120 ships, the Carthaginians exploited the opportunity which the Romans were first to have, when they attempted to give battle to the Carthaginian fleet while they laid in that predicament with the Roman fleet in front of them, while on the other side, was Sicily. Upon seeing that the Romans were now the guinea pigs, Carthaginian commander, Ad Herbal, swiftly ordered his sailors to attack the Roman fleet. Some 93 Roman ships were captured or destroyed after the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Carthaginians commenced to attack the force of 120 Roman warships. The Battle of Drepana occurred in 249 B.C. Rome was immensely devastated after the news of their navy's defeat at the Battle of Drepana reached them.

It was not so debilitating to Rome's leaders, however, because the Romans were still yet forcing their will over Sicily. But on Sicily, were those remaining Carthaginians left there to defend their island from the invaders, and their cause was one which was receiving diminishing respect and support from Carthage. For the next 8 years Carthage didn't do much to attempt to bring Sicily back under their control. Money was likely insulting the debates back in Carthage, about how to respond to the horrible Roman threat occurring on mainland Europe. However, by 241 B.C. the Carthaginians had obviously thrown out their disagreements then unanimously agreed to attempt to once again save their Italian colony.

The Battle of the Aegates Islands

On March 10, 241 B.C. the Carthaginians would finally lose their beloved Italian colony for an extremely long time. Obviously just knowing that Carthage is across the Mediterranean Sea in north Africa, means that the Romans had the advantage over the Carthaginians, who had to extend great amounts of their wealth to provide for their empire's defense. Of course, far more money is required to equip their soldiers with battle ships so they could sail to that part of their empire to defend that region from the immense threat that their citizens faced. To make matters far more worse for the Carthaginians, when their brave soldiers landed upon that Italian land of theirs to defend it against the invaders, too often their foe sought siege warfare over open warfare, when time of battle commenced. That alone represents the likelihood of an prolonged war. Of course, an prolonged war presents losing great amounts of wealth. All nations are prone to using siege warfare for siege warfare works to their advantage.

Of significant concern to Rome's leaders before the Battle of the Aegates Islands occurred, was supplying their soldiers with new warships to combat the Carthaginians. During the Battle of Drepana, the Romans had 93 of their warships destroyed or captured, while after that battle nearly all of the remaining Roman warships were destroyed in a storm. So new warships had to be constructed by the Romans in order to defend their new Sicilian colony against Carthage. On Sicily, just after the 249 B.C. Battle of Drepana occurred, to 241 B.C., the Sicilian Carthaginians still holding on to Sicily (that includes Hamilcar Barca, who was the popular Hannibal's papa) continued their land war against the invading Romans, but their plight was one which received little assistance

from Carthage, which likely brought their tolerance down to as low as it could go. Some 250 Carthaginian warships under the command of Hanno, were organized to set sail for Sicily to answer an Roman threat which had commenced after the Romans had constructed some 200 new warships, then began showing signs of using them.

Romans were once again enticed to bring certain Carthaginian Sicilian settlements under their control in 241 B.C., to finally rid Sicily of control of the islands true owners. Their targets were to finally cut off the little assistance the islands Carthaginian defenders under Hamilcar Carta's leadership, were receiving from north Africa and probably western Europe, and to then set their goals on the rest of the Carthaginians Empire. Lilybaeum was laid siege by the Romans, who then were instructed to wait patiently for the anticipated Carthaginian response to the hostile actions of the invading Romans.

The wait would not be an extraordinary long one. Upon learning that the 250 Carthaginian ships were on their way, the Romans under the command of Gaius Lutatius Catulus, first agreed for an blockade of the soon to arrive fleet of 250 Carthaginian warships, but once Roman scouts caught wind to the Carthaginian fleet of 250 warships taking a nap, they exploited the golden opportunity before them. After learning about the fleet of 250 Carthaginian warships about to contact the islands Carthaginian defenders badly in need of their assistance, the Romans then acted to exploit that golden opportunity. Around half of the Carthaginians 250 warships were destroyed or captured after being caught off guard by the victorious Romans. Afterwards, back in Carthage, Carthaginian leaders had obviously seen enough of the war for Carthaginian Italy, and then bravely agreed to agree to formally sign over their remaining Carthaginian Italian lands (that includes other Mediterranean islands besides Sicily) to the victorious Romans. Their hearts were definitely broken for they definitely cherished their Carthaginian Italian lands.

With the end of the war for Carthaginian Italy now behind them, Carthage was stunned as well as depleted of so much of their wealth, it left their citizens poorer as well as in grief for what their children, brothers and sisters, uncle's and aunt's, nephew's and niece's, and cousins endured throughout the long Sicilian War. However, their plight was not over with yet for they definitely knew from their historical intercourse with those invading whites, that the invading whites would eventually come down with the land hunger appetite once again. The Sicilian War likely commenced around 1000 B.C. when the first groups of civilized whites commenced to rigorously settle Italy (they possibly first settled in the north of Italy, then gradually settled southern Italy where there may have

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

existed numerous Carthaginian settlements) and probably without the consent of Italy's first inhabitants, or using deceitful measures to gain exactly what they wanted from the first inhabitants of Italy.

What now remained of the Carthaginian Empire was located in western Europe and northern Africa, and obviously became all the more precious to the Carthaginians than ever before. It would show itself during the next Roman invasion into the Carthaginian Empire, when the bad blood existing between the Carthaginians and Romans, erupted again in extreme violence, which was centered on land hunger. That war would follow some 22 years after the first Carthage-Rome War ended in 241 B.C.

Their western European lands were now in danger of being lost to the expanding Romans, who were not only infringing on the eastern edges of their western European lands, but they also had that land advantage over the Carthaginians, who were headquartered back in north Africa. To sum it all up, the Carthaginians were then probably more concerned about their western European lands than their northern African lands, which were sheltered by the Mediterranean Sea.

After the Carthaginians were defeated in the Sicilian War, their western European lands became far more attractive to them, but not as a location for only propagating their farms, cities and towns, but to build up their military strength there in order to defend their beloved western European lands, from the ever expanding whites, who had first used their military might to annex their beloved lands along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, then to annex their beloved Italian lands and, to not forget, who were now at their doorsteps in western Europe. Their wealth back in north Africa, now went into building up their military strength in western Europe for the anticipated new Roman invasion, yet Carthaginian leaders should have also used large amounts of their wealth to build up their African military might around Carthage and the rest of their north African lands, to be as formidable as was their military presence was in western Europe.

Unfortunately, the Romans knew of the Carthaginians weakness back in Carthage during the second Punic War, and eventually would capitalize on their insecure north African defenses. Money was obviously the reason why the Carthaginians chose to defend western Europe with larger numbers of their brave soldiers, than back in Africa, where the Carthaginians may have also felt somewhat secure but not obviously 100%. The Mediterranean Sea was large but was navigable to the Romans, and obviously the Carthaginians knew of the Romans ability to navigate the Mediterranean Sea.

By 219 B.C., the land hungry Romans were up to no good once again in Spain this time. Of course, the Romans had actively sought out non Carthaginian allies in Spain, to entice trouble for the Carthaginians, in order to commence the all out white invasion of western Europe (the whites had already made their intrusions into western Europe by 219 B.C. but western Europe then, may have been predominantly non white, including England, Ireland and Scotland) to take that land from the original inhabitants. Although the Romans had won Italy, what occurred during the 219 B.C.-201 B.C. Carthage-Rome War, must have shocked the Italian Romans terribly. Carthage put forth an incredible effort to retrieve Carthaginian Italy from the Italian Romans, and the Romans were extremely fortunate after the conflict to continue to exist as an empire. Historians insist that Hannibal's soldiers were to a large extent Gaul's, Hispanics and Numidians but most of those people living in Carthage's western European lands were Carthaginians, which means so were Hannibal's soldiers.

Hannibal and all other high ranking Carthaginian military leaders, had obviously anticipated further Roman expansions onto Carthaginian lands, so to put it bluntly, they were waiting for those land hungry Romans to commence their quest to get more of their land. Upon learning that the Spanish city of Saguntum, had agreed with Rome to become distant from Carthage, it ignited the Carthaginians to prepare for war to defend their remaining western European lands from the land hungry Romans, who they knew all along would eventually show up in western Europe. The stage was now set for the remaining Carthaginian European lands to be feuded over. And during the conflict, the Romans would be forced by the Carthaginians to defend Rome from Hannibal's soldiers, who laid siege to the Romans capitol but were incapable of bringing the Romans to capitulate to them. If Hannibal's brave soldiers had forced Rome to capitulate to Carthage, it is very likely all of Europe would be extremely different now. Without a doubt, the event that occurred during the Carthaginian siege of Italy, may just be the single most important event in white European history.

219 B.C. Rome invades the Carthaginian Empire

The Battle of Saguntum

In 219 B.C., the long anticipated Rome threat did emerge once again. Saguntum was in Spain which was part of the Carthaginian Empire. France, Portugal and Spain were obviously precious to the Carthaginians, whose people had long exploited the best the French, Portuguese and Spanish lands offered for humans. Other western European lands inhabited by the Carthaginians, were likely parts of France, and probably England, Ireland and Scotland. Those

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

locations likely once long ago, well before the whites had invaded, had large Carthaginian populations. What triggered Hannibal to send his Carthaginian soldiers to attack Saguntum, was nothing less than pure Roman greed for obtaining more Carthaginian land. Hannibal could not tolerate the Romans intruding into the affairs of the Carthaginians, and upon learning that Rome had found an camouflaged ally in Saguntum, Hannibal had enough, then reacted swiftly to that long anticipated Roman threat, by ordering his soldiers to take Saguntum.

Afterwards, those Carthaginian soldiers who were stationed in Portugal and Spain by the Carthaginian leaders back in Carthage, well before the 2nd Punic War commenced, and those native western European Carthaginians who were already serving for their kingdoms protection, were ordered to prepare for all out war against the invading land hungry Romans whose appetite for Carthaginian land was endless. Once they were assembled (that includes the elephants used by the Carthaginians) Hannibal would lead them to Italy to commence the war that the Romans wanted to occur, in order to get the remaining Carthaginian lands.

The Battle of Lilybaeum

Once the news of a new war erupting between Carthage and Rome was received by leaders of both warring empires, both empires commenced to prepare for the coming conflict, including preparing their navies. Sicily was still obviously cherished by Carthage's leaders as well as Carthage's average citizens there. Once Carthage's leaders knew war was now in progress they ordered some 35 of their navy's ships to set sail for Sicily to attempt to once again bring Sicily back under Carthage's control. Their first target was the Lipari Islands which, in the Carthaginian war plans, was to be raided by the Carthaginian fleets sailors.

However, what resulted afterwards, was the Carthaginian plans of attacking Lilybaeum being intercepted by spies who relayed that bit of information straight to the Romans. Now knowing of the impending Carthaginian naval fleets certain approach to Lilybaeum, the 20 Roman ships which participated in the Battle of Lilybaeum, waited patiently to commence their defense of Lilybaeum, then upon seeing the approaching Carthaginian naval fleet, set sail to give battle to them. In the ensuing naval battle, the Romans dominated by boarding several of the Carthaginian warships which resulted in the Romans capturing all seven of them, and also nearly 2000 prisoners. After learning of their horrible defeat at Lilybaeum, Carthaginian leaders would think twice about sending out their navy to combat the Romans on Sicily. What likely influenced the Carthaginians to

avoid an all out naval war against the Romans, was probably the Romans ability to dominate during naval war, and also knowing that the Carthaginians could freely access Italy.

The Battle of Cissa

Evidently the Greeks had already established themselves in Carthaginian Spain, yet they may have done so by first living in Spanish Carthaginian or Iberian settlements such as Tarraco, which historians believe was an Greek town. The Greek settlement of Tarraco was located in northeastern Spain and it was obviously causing the Spanish Carthaginians a lot of trouble then. Of course, the Greeks were allied with the Romans, and in fact, both the Greeks and Romans were conspiring then to invade Carthaginian western Europe, as well as Carthaginian Africa. Of course, Carthage continued to station their brave soldiers in not only Spain, but also in north Africa, after Hannibal and his huge Carthaginian army was ordered to invade Italy.

Before Hannibal departed for Italy he had brought the troublemakers (most likely they were Greeks and also Romans) in that region of Carthaginian Spain, and probably southern France (it was that region closest to Italy or northeast Spain along the Mediterranean coast, southern France was also likely considered by the Carthaginians as their land, as well as possibly England, Ireland and Scotland), back under Carthaginian control.

However, the invading Greeks and Romans were not impressed with the swift actions of the powerful Hannibal, and made the decision to send for reinforcements to aid their invading settlers in Carthaginian Spain and France, after they learned that Hannibal exited for Italy. Hannibal's brother, Hasdrubal Barca, and nephew, Hanno, were left in charge of Carthage's remaining soldiers in Spain and France (obviously Carthage sent most of the Carthaginian soldiers to Italy under Hannibal's command, and their number may have exceeded well over 100,000), where the Carthaginians possibly felt somewhat secure but obviously not 100%. Upon receiving the urgent request of their settlers back in Spain and France for military assistance, the Romans organized over 20,000 soldiers to reinforce their invading colonies in France and Spain, which were brought by Hannibal back under Carthaginian control. Romans used the Mediterranean Sea to send their over 20,000 new reinforcements to Carthaginian France and Spain.

It was Hanno who led the brave 11,000 Carthaginian soldiers into battle against those 22,200 invading Roman soldiers. It was not a pretty battle scene, especially when we know that the Romans had outnumbered the Carthaginians by a 2 to 1 margin. Evidently Hanno was deeply concerned about the recently

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

conquered Greek and Roman settlements inhabitants who, after learning of the new Roman reinforcements arriving to aid them, were showing signs of open rebellion against Carthage.

Even though Hanno knew the size of the Roman reinforcements, he truly had no choice but to act quickly in order to prevent the Romans from gaining control again of that region of the Carthaginian Empire. Rome's obvious goal during this event was to get a secure foothold in that region of the Carthaginians Empire, so they could take it by force. Brave Hanno wasted no time in defending his empires beloved land, and though he ended up losing to the invading Romans, as well as being captured by the Romans, his efforts were heroic indeed. Afterwards, the Romans did gain an permanent presence in that region of the Carthaginians Empire. Some 6,000 brave Carthaginian soldiers fell at the Battle of Cissa.

The Battle of Ebro River

Although the mighty Carthaginians were forcing their will in Italy in 217 B.C., on the other hand, in and around Spain, the Romans were dominating the naval scene. It may have been the Roman navy which likely kept the Romans in existence during the second Carthage-Rome War. The Romans were capable of continuing to stay in contact with their invading settlers in the western European lands of the Carthaginian Empire, yet they were finding it difficult to outright dominate the Carthaginians there, even with the number of Carthaginian soldiers in that part of Carthage's Empire limited as a result of Carthage's attention being set on totally subjugating the Romans in Italy (anywhere from 100,000 to 200,000 Carthaginian soldiers were likely stationed in Italy under Hannibal Barca's command, while in the Spain region there were far less Carthaginian soldiers to defend that region of Carthage's Empire), yet their soldiers were able to combat the over 20,000 Roman soldiers there and keep that region of Carthage's Empire in their control.

From the southern France region near the Mediterranean Sea, is where the Romans had their foothold on Carthage's European lands and periodically raided the Carthaginians in France and Spain, and they were dead set on staying there. To the north, the Romans obviously had allies in the Celtic tribes who were not about to side with non whites, even if history suggests otherwise.

Carthage didn't need Hannibal to command their brave soldiers in their western European lands, what they needed to do was to send far more of their brave soldiers to defend their western European lands from the invading Romans, but those Carthaginian leaders were obviously under immense pressure to think about totally subjugating Rome, as well as the welfare of their citizens

and their empires wealth. Reluctantly accepting that the invading land hungry Romans were now in Carthage's European lands unobstructed, the Carthaginians under Hasdrubal Barca's command, organized some 40 warships to head for the location (it was near the Ebro river) to attempt to rid their beloved lands of the invading whites. In the following naval battle between Carthage and Rome, the Romans once again dominated the Carthaginians. 29 of the 40 Carthaginian warships were destroyed or captured in the battle. Afterwards, some of the Celtic tribes (obviously the Celtic tribes were fairly recent newcomers to that region and were likely considered by Carthaginian leaders as being troublemakers) who inhabited that region of Spain and who were under Carthaginian control, commenced to rebel against Carthage, which only made matters all the more worse for Carthage (for quite some time Carthage focused their attention on their rebels instead of the invading Romans) during that horrible time period. For the next 6 years the Romans would have a difficult time while in Carthage's western European lands, which can be attributed to what Italy was enduring.

The Battle of Dertosa

In 215 B.C., Carthage was ruling Italy by using their military might, but back in Spain the Roman army had grown by a few thousand more and was slightly over 30,000 soldiers when the Battle of Dertosa was fought. The Romans had found allies among certain tribes in the France and Spain region, which would wreck havoc furthermore for Carthage's soldiers stationed in that part of their empire. Those French and Spanish tribes were instrumental in keeping Rome's military presence in the France and Spain region alive. I haven't the slightest idea on just how many of those French and Spanish tribes warriors gave their military aid to Rome, yet the Romans were just satisfied they had some allies there. The target of the invading Romans and their allies, were certain Carthaginian Spanish towns which would be laid siege to by the Romans, including Ibera.

Carthage was in tune to what the Romans were up to and under Hasdrubal's command, left to liberate those Carthaginian settlements of the invaders grip. After commencing fighting for the first time, the two warring empires would for 5 long days do light fighting. By the sixth day they then proceeded to intensify the fighting. Rome had over 10,000 of their brave soldiers and over 22,000 of their allied soldiers, including their French and Spanish tribes allies. Carthage's force was some 29,000 strong. In the major battle that followed the Romans would win it and inflict heavy casualties on the Carthaginians under Hasdrubal's command, but they also suffered heavy casualties themselves.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The Battle of Cornus

Carthage's leaders would attempt once again to seize control of the large Mediterranean island of Sardinia, which Rome had apparently used deceitfulness to acquire in 238 B.C. Of course, Carthaginians were living on Sardinia long before the Romans and Greeks, and with their soldiers dominating Rome in Italy, Carthage's leaders were obviously enticed to bring Sardinia back under their control, yet their brave soldiers would pay a horrible price attempting to do so. During this time (216 B.C.—215 B.C.) Carthage's leaders were concerned still about the war in Italy as well, and had ordered reinforcements specifically for Carthage's army in Italy, yet problems infected those reinforcement plans of Carthage, which usually do occur during time of war.

Rome already had some of their soldiers on the large island of Sardinia, yet they managed to send in reinforcements, which brought the total of Roman soldiers on Sardinia to over 21,000. Carthage's number of soldiers and Sardinian allies was 16,500. For several long grueling hours Carthage's soldiers fought to bring back Sardinia to their kingdom once again, but the Romans eventually wore out the Carthaginian soldiers will to give battle, after they overpowered an contingent of Sardinian soldiers aiding the Carthaginian soldiers. Once the Romans had driven off that Sardinian contingent, they commenced to attack the main Carthaginian line of defending soldiers, who were then annihilated. It was a horrible defeat for the Carthaginians to endure, and their dreams of returning Sardinia back under their control were dashed, after Carthage's leaders heard of their failure to retake Sardinia. Anywhere from 6,000 to over 10,000 Carthaginian and Sardinian soldiers were killed at the Battle of Cornus.

The Battle of Castulo

By 211 B.C., the invading Romans were increasing their offensive against the Carthaginians in the Spain region again, particularly central Spain, which definitely spooked the Carthaginians. Unfortunately, some of the Iberian tribes of France and Spain (apparently the Iberian tribes were a mixture of native Iberian, most likely the descendents of the first wave of Atlanteans to enter that region, and the late arriving Celtic tribes, who probably were becoming more numerous at that time) were not cooperating with the Carthaginians and the Romans, and in fact, some were waging their own wars against the two warring empires, which probably did more damage to the Carthaginians of course. Rome actively sought out some Iberian allies and was well received by them, and in fact, those Iberian allies of Rome sent 20,000 of their soldiers (that does seem to speak of them being more Celtic) to aid Rome's effort to conquer the Carthaginians. Most likely those Iberian Roman allies came from northern Spain, but particularly in France,

especially in east central France, where the Celts were by that time very well established and probably numerous as well. With the Romans eagerly and bravely wanting to invade central Spain and even southern Spain, they set off on their planned military expedition, after learning that the Carthaginian army had split into two contingents, which then led the Romans to separate into two contingents also. One Roman contingent was led by Publius Scipio, while the other was led by his brother Gnaeus Scipio.

Rome did not do well in the two battles they fought against the Carthaginians in the Carthaginians western European colony in 211 B.C. The first battle, which is historically known as the Battle of Castulo, Rome fought and lost against the Carthaginians, involved an Iberian force of some 7500 soldiers the Roman army decided to attack because they felt they would eventually be surrounded by them, and 18,000 Roman soldiers under the command of Publius Scipio. The battle had commenced during the early morning hours, which isn't anything out of the ordinary, and since the Romans were obviously more than twice as large as the Iberian force, the Romans were having their way very early on during that battle. However, Numidian reinforcements under the command of Masanissa, showed up to aid the Iberians and gradually the battle began to alternate. By the time the Carthaginian soldiers under the command of Hasdrubal Gisco, made their appearance the Romans almost immediately ceased their effort to continue on with that battle, to instead flee.

That obviously represents the Romans were probably beginning to lose that battle by the time the Carthaginian soldiers showed up. Roman commander, Publius Scipio, was killed in the battle while he bravely led his soldiers down south of that Ebro river to battle the Carthaginians. Publius Scipio's brother, Gnaeus Scipio, led another contingent of Roman soldiers and some of the Romans Iberian allies (some of the Romans Iberian allies deserted apparently around this time) into another battle after the Battle of Castulo, and fared no better than his brother Publius.

The Battle of Ilorca

After some of their Iberian allies departed for that neutral path, Roman commander, Gnaeus Scipio, eventually became overcome with those thoughts of being not so powerful anymore, yet the Roman commander was left with the option of heading back towards northern Spain, where the Romans had invaded from southeastern France, where the Romans had invaded from Italy. For some reason Carthage's leaders were inept towards defending their western European colonies from the invading Romans, yet we only need to understand that the great majority of Carthaginian soldiers were in Italy flexing their might. Granted,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

it was Italy which dominated Carthage's leaders thoughts and feelings towards Rome, which was only rightfully so for the real problem was in fact in Italy, but Rome did have their foothold in Carthage's western European colonies then.

However, the Roman threat in Carthage's western European colonies was not a major one (after the Carthaginian victories at Castulo and Ilorca it would diminish even more), but certainly it was an persistent one, especially in regards to the Iberian tribes, who the Romans without a doubt took serious advantage of. This new Roman invasion into central Spain likely did upset Carthage, yet Carthage would obviously continue to focus on Italy.

After Gnaeus Scipio made the decision to head back towards northern Spain, he eventually led his soldiers by starting their journey back to northern Spain, in the dead of night, which he likely ordered because he knew the Carthaginian army was nearby. However, during the following day a small portion of the Carthaginian army caught up to the fleeing Romans and then commenced to give battle to them, which continued on until darkness came and, unfortunately, the rest of the Carthaginian army under the command of Mago Barca and Hasdrubal Gisco.

In the remainder of the battle the Carthaginians eventually overwhelmed the Roman army, nearly totally wiping it out, and that includes killing Gnaeus Scipio. Rome may have established themselves in northern Spain after winning the Battle of Dertosa (the Battle of Dertosa was fought in 215 B.C.), but the Roman attempt to establish a foothold in central and southern Spain was thwarted by the Carthaginians, who probably were aware of Rome's intentions and had planned wisely just in case the Romans went and got their courage up. Some 22,000 brave Roman soldiers fell at the Battles of Castulo and Ilorca.

The Battle of Baecula

Rome and their allies went on the offensive once again in the Carthaginians Spanish colony in 208 B.C. It is likely that the Carthaginians were going to attempt to reinforce the Carthaginian army stationed in Italy once again, around the time the Battle of Baecula was fought. Rome had obviously reinforced their military presence in the Carthaginians western European colonies by 208 B.C., using their own soldiers of course, but also by enlisting willing Iberian and Celtic allies into their army. Rome was in the Carthaginians western European colonies to not only invade, but to attempt to prevent the Carthaginians from reinforcing the Carthaginian army stationed in Italy under Hannibal's command. Once Rome and their allies met up with the Carthaginian reinforcements under Hasdrubal Barca's command, a battle followed which resulted in many casualties for the

Carthaginians light troops and their Iberian allies, yet the Carthaginian reinforcements under Hasdrubal Barca's leadership, escaped on into southern France then eventually made it to Italy.

In the battle the Carthaginian casualties were around 6000 killed and around 10,000 captured, but most were likely from their Iberian allies. Around 10,000 Carthaginian soldiers under Hasdrubal Barca's command did make it to Italy. However, what the Carthaginian army stationed in Italy under Hannibal's command badly needed, was another 100,000 to 200,000 Carthaginian soldiers.

With each attempt by the Carthaginians in Spain to reinforce the Carthaginian army in Italy, they faced obstacles in their path which hampered their capability to succeed. If the Romans and their allies weren't edging their way on to their path in France and Spain, the Spanish Carthaginians then would stand before the magnificent Alps Mountains, which are extremely treacherous, yet could likely be crossed (that does include by huge army's) if done properly. Once they made it to Italy, they then had to deal with the Romans who obviously took the time to guard important stops throughout northern Italy. Although the Carthaginians faced hazards when they attempted to reinforce their Carthaginian army in Italy, they vibrantly went about organizing their soldiers, and their allies soldiers, to attempt the dangerous mission of sending Carthaginian reinforcements to Italy. However, the Carthaginians were not so successful at accomplishing their goal of reinforcing their army in Italy, which is a rather discouraging fact. If Carthage had succeeded in sending larger numbers of Carthaginian reinforcements to serve in Italy under Hannibal's command, the Carthaginians may have won that war they should have won.

The Carthaginian Siege of Italy

The Battle of Ticinus

This was evidently the first battle to occur in Italy between Carthage and Rome, during the second Carthage-Rome War. The date the Battle of Ticinus was fought was in November of 218 B.C. The Battle of Ticinus was not a major one but more of an slap on the face rather than an all out brutal fight.

After the Romans enticed trouble for the Carthaginians in the Carthaginian Spanish city of Saguntum, Carthage sent their approval for Hannibal to commence to bring the war to the Romans homeland afterwards, which Hannibal eagerly went about doing. Since Rome's leaders were under the spell of an ally who inhabited the Spanish lands of the Carthaginians whom, to the Romans, were in dire need of liberation (we know that Rome could care less for their so called allies back in Carthaginian Spain and also the Carthaginians, for

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Rome was looking out for Rome's best interests), it obviously was something Rome believed they had the power to do.

Roman commander, Scipio, was ordered by his superior officers to rescue the city of Saguntum from the Carthaginians, who in all likelihood were bringing back to Carthaginian control, an Carthaginian city which, from years of interactions with foreign peoples, had gradually taking on an cosmopolitan flavor (the Carthaginians were probably very open about interacting with foreign peoples in their communities) that eventually made the city very mixed in race. Unfortunately, if that actually occurred the whites ended up using it to further advance their own causes, or to start the second Carthage-Rome War, to better let you understand of the point I am trying to make. Obviously, if to only further make an example of Saguntum, before the whites settled Italy, they likely first lived in Etruscan settlements such as probably that of Rome. By the time the whites became numerous enough in those Etruscan Italian settlements such as Rome, they eventually began to flex their own power which, when the conditions were favorable towards it, they gradually started their own white settlements, which would obviously then escalate into rebellion (with the help of allies of course) such as what occurred at Saguntum. That same scenario also likely effected the Egyptian Europeans.

Hannibal and nearly 6000 Carthaginian soldiers under his command during the Battle of Ticinus, gave battle to the troublemaking Romans under Scipio's command that November in 218 B.C. and were victorious. Once the battle had commenced, Hannibal's Carthaginian soldiers eventually broke the Roman's will to continue the fight, which resulted in the Romans exiting the battle they were losing to Carthage, to head for an nearby Roman town. Both the Carthaginians and Romans casualties were minimal, but Carthage did win the battle.

The Battle of Trebia

Some 40,000 to over 100,000 or more brave Carthaginian soldiers (the real number of Carthaginian soldiers under Hannibal's command in Italy was likely well over 100,000) were assembled by Hannibal (dozens of war elephants were also included) to invade Italy, to attempt to end the land hunger the Romans were so eagerly expressing to the mighty Carthaginians. The Romans had grown wealthier and mightier also, over the past 100 years but were still a young empire, but the Carthaginians were still wealthier and mightier, and that would be obvious to the Romans, when the Carthaginians took the war to the homeland of the Romans, an event which shook the foundations of Rome.

The Romans would learn during the 2nd Punic War that their empire was definitely young and very fragile, when their first true test as an expanding empire

fell upon them. Of course, the Romans had some respect for the mighty Carthaginians, but the first Carthage-Rome War was tiny compared to what occurred during the 2nd Carthage-Rome War, and by the time the Carthaginians laid siege to Rome, the Romans respect for the mighty Carthaginians had grown tremendously.

Before Hannibal's force of 40,000 to 200,000 Carthaginian soldiers stood the Alp's, an mountain range Hannibal knew offered the Romans some security, but could be crossed but with difficulty. Hannibal knew his Carthaginian soldiers were going to experience great hazards as well as fluctuating climatic conditions on the way over the Alp's, and that the likelihood of discontent arising among his soldiers would be a real likelihood, so Hannibal truly had no choice but to give in to the welfare of his soldiers emotions, and also their general well being, on the way over the Alp's. Of course, Hannibal was very successful at it! Upon reaching the highest passes then traversing over them, the 40,000 to 200,000 Carthaginian soldiers under Hannibal's command, eventually descended towards their enemy, who were aware of their movements (an insignificant battle was fought at Ticinus river which enraged the Romans) in their northern Alps mountains. When the news of their soldiers being incapable of halting the advance of the approaching Carthaginians at the battle near the Ticinus river was received and obviously despised by Rome's most important leaders, Roman leaders knew their young empire was in trouble. It meant that the Carthaginians now had access to all of Italy.

Northern Italy, especially in the higher elevations, snow does occasionally fall from time to time during the colder winter months, and in December of 218 B.C. at least some Italian locations were enduring problems with snowy weather, and amongst those locations was where the Battle of Trebia was fought. Roman leaders ordered over 40,000 more soldiers to commence to head for the invading Carthaginians, who were in the northern part of Italy and obviously going to force their way down into all of Italy if the Romans didn't respond to the immense threat their young empire was facing.

Carthaginian leaders back in Carthage and western Europe, must have found that time period somewhat irresistible, for they knew that if their soldiers could make their way into Italy without the Romans halting their advance, it could mean the young Roman Empire, would be absorbed by the Carthaginians. Although the Carthaginians were defeated in the Sicilian War only a couple of decades earlier, Carthaginian leaders knew that the Romans had a slight advantage (Sicily was only a few miles from Italy, while Carthage was a bit further away from Sicily) over Carthage during that conflict.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Now the Carthaginians had before them, the golden opportunity to invade Italy from the north, and if it was carried out successfully they knew that they would hold the advantage over Rome. Although I am not aware of the correct number of Carthaginian soldiers from north Africa who were drafted (most likely they came from the Carthaginians military totem) into the Carthaginian military to serve in western Europe, I assume that the number was high because obviously the Carthaginians were anticipating the Romans to continue expanding their empire. Probably well before the 2nd Punic War was actually fought, western Europe was appearing to Carthaginian leaders as their best hope at stopping the expanding Romans.

To be fairly reasonable about Carthage's most important leaders during the 2nd Punic War, I do get the impression of those Carthaginian leaders having their hopes up high, and in fact, I assume that after they learned of the good news about Hannibal's Carthaginian military force descending down into Italy successfully, they were anticipating Hannibal to quickly destroy Rome. However, wars are not fought to just determine who will be the better warriors. Unfortunately, wars are fought with "intelligence in mind" far too frequently, and you definitely want to call it "the instinct to survive on to live another day." What Carthage's most important leaders wanted more than anything during the second Carthage-Rome War, was Rome to capitulate to Carthage.

Instead, however, what Carthage's most important leaders should have done after learning of their Roman foes willingness to resort to siege warfare, was commence the large scale Carthaginian colonization of all of Italy. That includes going right up to the Rome city gates and gradually laying down foundations for Carthaginian homes, business's, schools and hospitals alongside Rome's city gates. Kind of sounds insane but for all we know it may have ticked off the Romans so immensely they would have ended their siege warfare strategy, then bravely sent their soldiers out to confront the invaders in their midst.

While the Carthaginians were holding Italy in a siege, they should have also at the same time, sent their settlers to Italy to colonize all of Italy. The Carthaginians should have laid down the foundations for hundreds of new Italian Carthaginian settlements throughout all of Italy when they had that opportunity to do so. If they had actually done that in 218 B.C. for all we know by 201 B.C. the Carthaginian population of Italy may have been significant. In fact, the Italian Carthaginian population may have been numerous enough to send tens of thousands of Italian Carthaginian soldiers to combat the Romans. If the Carthaginians had bravely (Carthaginian leaders would have balked at the thought of sending large numbers of their settlers to a region where war was

occurring) commenced to colonize all of Italy by sending only a couple of thousand Carthaginian families every year, by 201 B.C. the Italian Carthaginian population may have exceeded 150,000. There is only one rule when siege warfare commences between a stronger foe who dominates a weaker foe who resorts to siege warfare to avoid the inevitable. The stronger foe should never give in to siege warfare strategy's by accepting to abide by the weaker foes actions. Simply put, the Carthaginians and any other nation of people who find that they can dominate a war but have to deal with their foe resorting to "that siege warfare strategy," must find other alternative methods other than giving in to their foes actions. In the case of the Carthaginians, that other method should have been the large scale Carthaginian colonization of all of Italy.

When the Carthaginians eventually accepted that their fate would be one which dealt with a Roman foe unwilling to submit to defeat, we can only imagine the immense hate for their Roman foe which built up inside the Carthaginians, and the respect also that the Carthaginians held for the young Roman Empire's immense will to freely exist on. The stubborn and fiercely independent thinking Romans, were obviously infuriating Carthage during the second Carthage-Rome War by refusing to acknowledge that they had been defeated. The same probably occurred to the Egyptian Europeans when they confronted the first whites into Europe and were unable to dominate them during time of war.

In the case of the Egyptian Europeans they fled from the invading whites to continue to freely exist on. Unfortunately, Carthage was able to dominate the Romans during time of war, but they were incapable of forcing the Romans to submit to the Carthaginians demands of capitulation.

Hannibal ordered some 2000 of his soldiers to find an location alongside the Trebia river, to set up an ambush of the Romans, after learning of the location of the huge Roman army sent to give battle to his brave soldiers. With the rest of his soldiers, Hannibal then attacked the camping Romans, but it was only halfheartedly in order to entice the Romans into pursuing the fleeing Carthaginian soldiers who attacked their camp, so those 2000 other Carthaginian soldiers waiting to ambush the Romans, could in fact ambush them. After the Carthaginians attacked the Romans camp then retreated away, the over 40,000 Roman strong army gave pursuit to the retreating Carthaginian soldiers and what followed next was not pretty. Those brave Roman soldiers entered an planned annihilation of them, which was carried out very successfully by Hannibal's Carthaginian soldiers.

After catching up to the retreating Carthaginian soldiers an fierce battle ensued in which the Carthaginians eventually forced the Roman cavalry to flee

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

from the battle scene. Once the Carthaginians had successfully forced the Roman cavalry to flee, those 2000 other Carthaginian soldiers waiting in ambush, and the Carthaginians own cavalry, then went to work finishing off the remainder of the huge Roman army. What followed next was the remaining Roman soldiers fleeing from certain death to a nearby Roman settlement. Rome was stunned to learn that some 20,000 of their brave soldiers fell at the Battle of Trebia. The Battle of Trebia was fought on December 18, 218 B.C.

Thoughts of resorting to siege warfare was going to start entering the minds of Roman leaders after they learned of their horrible defeat at the Battle of Trebia, but they still had the stomach to try and drive off the invading Carthaginians. Roman hate for the Carthaginians was going to multiply after the Battle of Trebia and the horrific Battle at Lake Trasimene, where the Romans hate for the Carthaginians would start to overwhelm the Romans.

The Battle of Lake Trasimene

Far too many brave Roman soldiers had already fallen to the mighty Carthaginians, but what occurred at Lake Trasimene would reflect upon Romans minds, that eventually far many more were going to be killed during this war against the mighty Carthaginians. Hannibal's Carthaginian army was now in Italy permanently, and Rome's Senate had no choice but to respond to the invading Carthaginians, who were likely going to show up at Rome itself some day soon, if they didn't act quickly. Badly in need of new recruits as a result of losses the Romans endured during previous battles against the Carthaginians, four new Roman legions were raised by Rome to bolster up the already existing Roman army.

Afterwards, the Roman army was split with one contingent under the command of Gnaeus Servilius Geminus, while the other contingent was under the command of Gaius Flaminius. Flaminius replaced Roman commander Sempronius (he was in charge of the Roman soldiers during the Battle of Trebia) then ordered his troops to depart southwards towards Rome, in order to defend the city (obviously Roman leaders were more concerned about Rome than attempting to prevent the invading Carthaginians from progressing further than they had already) from an anticipated Carthaginian assault on Rome, which the Romans knew all along was the goal of Carthage. Hannibal's scouts caught wind to the retreating Roman army which then led Hannibal to think over the situation before him.

Hannibal probably knew that the retreating Roman army was heading towards Rome to defend their capitol from his soldiers, so he ordered his

soldiers to follow as quickly as they could, to most likely get to Rome first, in order to either attempt to take the city, or to prevent the Roman army under the command of Flaminius, from reinforcing Rome. During the race to Rome (the Carthaginians may have reached Rome before the Roman army did), the Carthaginians attempted to sway over to their side, already then existing Roman allies in Italy. By the time of this Carthaginian Siege of Italy, the Etruscans were obviously a minority within even their own cities and villages, and when Hannibal attempted to disunite those Italian Kingdoms already under Rome's command, he encountered an mostly ignorant response.

What followed next was the Roman army under the command of Flaminius, firmly settling into camp somewhere near the Rome region, which was supposed to be protected, yet the Carthaginians went on the warpath throughout that region. What possibly enticed the Romans to remain in their camp, was likely to create an decoy of some sort, to either deliver their Carthaginian foes a soon to be fought battle, or to simply keep the Carthaginians from converging on Rome to attempt to take the city. However, one thing is certain and that was the Romans were shocked and terrified, about the horrible predicament before the city gates of Rome. Throughout the Rome region and all of northern Italy, people were probably expecting the worse for their young empire to eventually occur.

Whatever the reason for the Roman army's unwillingness to leave their camp, their stubborn attitude did lead to the Carthaginians waging war in the nearby countryside. The Romans were not going to remain indefinitely encamped while the Carthaginians were forcing their will throughout the region, and most likely it was all part of an Roman plan to save Rome from the possible capitulation to Carthage.

Once the Roman army agreed to combat the invading Carthaginians who were ravaging the surrounding region, they commenced to set off to find and give battle to Hannibal's soldiers, but Hannibal's soldiers first found the approaching Roman army. When the news of the Roman army leaving their encampment was received by Hannibal, he ordered an ambush of the Romans to be set up, which was chosen to be near Lake Trasimene. Before the arrival of the huge Roman army of some 40,000 Roman soldiers, the Carthaginians carefully took to their concealed positions to await the arrival of their Roman foe, who were soon to pay a dear price.

After the Romans were enticed into an small skirmish with a few of Hannibal's soldiers (Hannibal apparently used that tactic to confuse the Romans), Hannibal then ordered the Carthaginian cavalry and infantry, who were concealed in the nearby hills, to ambush the huge Roman army below them. After the initial Carthaginian assault on the Roman army, the Roman army was then

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

separated into three confused and terrified groups. One of those groups of Roman soldiers was pinned in by the lake and Carthaginian soldiers, which left too many of the Roman soldiers with the options of swimming to safety or drowning. The two other groups of Roman soldiers were eventually defeated by the Carthaginians within three hours of the start of the ambush.

Among the killed was the brave Roman commander, Flaminius, who was among the Romans who had drowned during the battle. Only about 6000 Roman soldiers were fortunate to have escaped from that battle, but they were eventually captured by the Carthaginians a day later. Some 30,000 brave Roman soldiers fell at the Battle of Lake Trasimene, and another 10,000 ended up as POW's. To make matters far more worse for the Romans to endure, shortly after the Battle of Lake Trasimene (it was either one or two days later) the Carthaginians learned of some 4000 new Roman soldiers in their vicinity, who were to be used as reinforcements, then found them and then eradicated them.

What the Romans did afterwards is nothing new during time of war, for all nations resort to using every means available to them, while at war against a stronger foe. In the case of the Romans, they closed their city gates to commence siege warfare, and in fact, for the next year the Romans didn't attempt to bolster up their courage to actively give battle to the ticked off Carthaginians, who knew that to take Rome or any other large Roman city, would be extremely time consuming and difficult. And we can only attempt to imagine just how angry the Carthaginians were to have to deal with an foe who were not willing to submit to defeat. The proud and independent thinking Romans, may have been fortunate to have inhabited an land which had long been a land where war occurred, and occurred on an frequent level.

Of course, siege warfare was nothing new in Italy, and when siege warfare occurred there it was utilized to the utmost, in order for the settlements survival. Rome's walls were built for siege warfare in mind, and probably a lot more so than the average Carthaginian settlement. Carthage was obviously by the time of the second Carthage-Rome War, an ancient empire, and in Carthaginian north Africa the Carthaginians were more so at ease because from the Atlantic to Libya, their lands were protected by the Mediterranean, and to the south was the huge Sahara Desert, which means in north Africa the Carthaginians really didn't have major rivals, excepting possibly that of Egypt, and maybe some other lesser foes.

As for Carthaginian western Europe it was obviously by the time of the second Carthage-Rome War, an land which was becoming more unstable, especially towards the north where the Celtic tribes were located, and towards the northeast in the vicinity where southeastern France and northeastern Spain are. That region was sought after by the whites because it was rich and beautiful,

as were the north African Carthaginian lands. If the Carthaginian settlements in western Europe were built with the likelihood of siege warfare in mind, I don't know if they were as protective as that of the Romans. In north Africa, the Carthaginians obviously had defense structures surround their cities but they were obviously not as impressive as the Romans. From now on the Romans would live in fear of the mighty Carthaginians in their midst. And Rome's leaders had no choice but to keep their hopes up high and thoughts of the beautiful Carthaginian lands frequent, in order for their empire to survive on.

They knew their Carthaginian foe was out there and ticked off, and obviously the thought of sending their brave soldiers out to give battle to them, was not a pleasant one but they knew that eventually they would have to send their brave soldiers out to give battle to the Carthaginians again, and when it happened about a year after the Battle of Lake Trasimene, the greatly angered Carthaginians took their frustrations out on the Romans with a vengeance. The Romans would only want to forget about the Battle of Cannae.

The Battle of Cannae

Those brave Roman soldiers obviously wanted to defend their kingdom, yet they knew that their Carthaginian foe was a mighty one who were probably then, the most powerful fighting force in the world. For a year the Romans dared not set foot on that major battle ground, and during so, were probably in great fear of the inevitable occurring. However, the mighty Carthaginians were incapable of entering Rome and forcing the stubborn, proud and independent thinking Romans, to accept the inevitable. Back in Carthage, we can only imagine the immense outrage and anger Carthage's proud leaders felt towards Rome's unwillingness to submit to defeat. Carthage's leaders were probably still finding the thought of totally subjugating Rome irresistible, but as time dragged on they obviously began to worry. They were winning that war yet they knew they could lose everything that was precious to them. Rome's leaders feared the inevitable, and their hate for Carthage was probably boiling over by the time they sent their brave soldiers out to defend their kingdom once again at the Battle of Cannae, an battle which would expand that hate the Romans had for Carthage beyond control.

Some 87,000 brave Roman soldiers would go into battle against an mighty Carthaginian force of 48,000 and lose horribly to them. It is not pretty to learn of the facts of the Battle of Cannae, that's for certain. There would be no ambush but both warring empires lined up their brave soldiers and then commenced to give battle. Over time the mighty Carthaginians tore the Roman soldiers to

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

pieces. Anywhere from 50,000 to 70,000 brave Roman soldiers were killed in the Battle of Cannae.

In all likelihood more warriors were killed in a one day battle at the Battle of Cannae than any other battle before those ancient times. Around 16,000 brave Carthaginian soldiers were killed or wounded during the horrible Battle of Cannae. Historians may say the Carthaginian army was made up of many different peoples but they are wrong of course! There is no way on earth an army of many different peoples can accomplish something like that. That Carthaginian army was well trained and Carthaginian, and was determined to defend their beloved lands against those who were obviously letting them know that they wanted their birth rights.

Once Carthage's leaders heard of their soldiers victory over Rome at the Battle of Cannae, they very likely thought Rome was theirs, and who could blame Carthage's leaders if they in fact had believed that the Romans would now submit to defeat. However, as time dragged on it obviously became clear to Carthage's leaders that the Romans were not the average empire. Any normal nation would have probably capitulated after what the Romans experienced against the mighty Carthaginians in a few major battles.

Rome dug in for further resistance against Carthage, and that obviously did not go well with the Carthaginian leaders, who were probably stunned and beginning to wonder aloud, what is going wrong? People all over the Carthaginian Empire were likely just as stunned as their leaders were about Rome's great will to stay independent. Even more judgmental about Carthage's citizens, deals with how they reacted to the many casualties their brave soldiers endured and their attitude towards that horrible war. Wars are not well received and most likely Carthage's leaders were hearing complaints from their citizens about that horrible war they were winning. Carthage had Rome completely surrounded which, when an event such as that occurs, usually means capitulation by those who are completely surrounded.

Once Carthage's leaders accepted that Rome was not going to capitulate after the Battle of Cannae, their situation likely started to resemble to Carthage's leaders, an predicament rather than just a simple problem which would work out well once the inevitable was understood. After the Battle of Cannae, Carthage's leaders would obviously have no choice but to take the war even far more seriously than they had already done so. Rome refused to acknowledge the inevitable and race was obviously one of the factors determining Roman leaders attitudes towards the mighty Carthaginians who, to the Romans, were not worthy enough to rule Rome's people.

Carthage's brave soldiers had Rome where they wanted Rome (they were literally having their way with Italy), and were obviously anticipating capitulation, yet they had to wait and wait and wait some more, and all the while, while they ruled Italy without Rome's consent but by using their pure military might, they encountered the deafening roar of ignorance. Carthage could only go as far as their wealth took their brave soldiers, and during their brave soldiers stints in Italy, they had to deal with a people not willing to be governed by them. And it dragged on and on and on. Simply put, that is what defeated Carthage's brave soldiers who, after their victory over Rome at the Battle of Cannae, now were dealing with an foe who were without any military, yet they would win that war for some stupid reason.

Romans were so thoroughly infected with the guilt for losing, some of Rome's military leaders openly suggested in order to survive on they should search for the aid of other nearby kingdoms who would more than willingly provide them with salvation. And most likely after their horrible defeat at the Battle of Cannae, the Romans got into their ships then set off for those other nearby kingdoms to beg for forgiveness. They obviously knew that Carthage now ruled Italy by using their pure military might, and if Rome was going to survive on they had no choice but to use every means available to continue to exist independently.

Hannibal's patience and will to triumph must have been very strong, yet while he led his brave Carthaginian soldiers on the warpath in Italy, he witnessed his foe hide behind closed walls nearly 100% of the time. However, after the news of the Carthaginians victory over Rome at the Battle of Cannae was received by Italy's inhabitants, some good would come for Hannibal and Carthaginian leaders back in Carthage. I know that Sicily was once part of Carthage's Empire (the first Carthage-Rome War was fought over Sicily), yet I also suspect that the Carthaginians possibly had an insignificant colony in the south of the Italian peninsula as well. Anyway, after southern Italians heard of Carthage's victory over Rome at the Battle of Cannae, almost all of them were enticed to join with Carthage, which Hannibal and Carthage's main leaders, must have rejoiced in.

How did the Romans survive while the Carthaginians ruled Italy by using their pure military might? What the Romans obviously had the ability to do was navigate the Mediterranean Sea while Carthage ruled Italy by using their pure military might. Rome was obviously staying in contact with those Greeks (I must include other surrounding peoples as well) who saw eye to eye with them, to their east and other locations, who very likely supplied them with everything necessary to survive on, and that includes the obvious weapons of war to combat the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

invading Carthaginians, who were ravaging Italy during their stint in Rome's kingdom.

The Conspiracy

In 215 B.C. with the first phase of the 2nd Punic War well underway (Carthage had rather easily defeated Rome but Rome was far too proud to accept defeat), Carthage's leaders were obviously not satisfied, and who could blame them if they in fact felt that way. Carthage returned southern Italy back to Carthage's control (if southern Italy was once inhabited by the Carthaginians) and controlled the rest of Italy by using their military might, but obviously not with Rome's consent. Carthage's leaders must have been extremely outraged to have to send their brave soldiers out to those Roman cities to attempt to enter those Roman cities to force the defeated Romans to accept peace. What would also soon infect Rome's historical course was the first Macedonian War Rome fought against Macedonia (it is a complete joke to believe that Macedonia was willing to side with Carthage against Rome), and those apparent Greek uprisings on Sicily against Rome's so called subjugation over them, which just doesn't add up.

If it actually was the truth Rome's Empire would have bit the dust. Realistically, what was occurring then was an conspiracy amongst the whites to protect Rome and those other white kingdoms own causes as well, from the obvious likelihood of an total Carthaginian conquest of the entire Mediterranean Sea region, which Carthage's leaders knew very well could be accomplished by their brave soldiers, if all those white kingdoms didn't act together. The whites were not about to let non whites dominate the Mediterranean Sea region then.

What is obviously the fact is all the whites of the northern shores of the Mediterranean Sea were in great shock and immensely terrified, after learning of Rome's horrible defeat at the Battle of Cannae, and their attention was centered on the mighty Carthaginian threat. There was no Greek or Macedonian uprisings against Rome, it was all an cleverly organized plot to defend Rome against the mighty Carthaginians, who in all likelihood were now fighting not only Rome's Empire but also the Greeks and Macedonians as well, or the second Carthage-Rome War had now spread to the Greek and Macedonian allies of the Romans, who were now fighting for Rome's survival. It is absolutely ridiculous to even dare to think that Rome's war against Carthage, would escalate into an Rome war against Macedonia at the same time.

What obviously had occurred after the Battle of Cannae, was an formal agreement amongst the whites of the northern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, to defend their lands against the mighty Carthaginians. From eastern Europe, the

Romans were likely supplied with the military aid of willing conspirators, while some of their other allies (most likely the Macedonians) took the form of the snake (everyone knows of the whites affection for speaking in the forked tongue) to sneak up to the mighty Carthaginians, and then begin to speak in the forked tongue. The Carthaginians had no choice but to deal with the suspicious activities occurring then, by playing along with what was obviously to them, something that could not be trusted. With Carthage now in control of Rome's Empire (without Rome's consent of course) the real war for control of western Europe would explode into an even larger conflict, which would involve far many more people. Instead of only the Romans fighting the mighty Carthaginians, we now can insist that the Romans military power had grown anywhere from 2 to 5 times from its original strength, as a result of the proud Romans willingness to actively beg of their neighboring white kingdoms military aid.

Of course, Rome's leaders did the right thing by begging of their neighboring white kingdoms military aid. They knew they were not capable of dominating the mighty Carthaginians and probably even dreaded going into battle against the mighty Carthaginians alongside their white allies. Before the brave Carthaginian soldiers in Italy, would now be an even larger more formidable fighting force, which would come by land and come by sea, to liberate Italy from their military might. Carthage's proud leaders were definitely inundated with immense feelings of distrust for their neighboring white kingdoms along the northern shores of the Mediterranean Sea. In their France, Portugal and Spain lands they had to deal with the invading Celts, Greeks and Romans who were obviously cooperating together.

Most of Carthage's brave soldiers were in Italy dealing with an foe who were doing everything in their power (they piled up everything they could around their settlements to prevent Carthage's brave soldiers from entering their settlements) to refuse to allow Carthage to rule them, and so Carthage was lacking the manpower to rid their western European lands of the invaders. Just knowing that Rome and their allies were established in their western European lands must have greatly infuriated Carthage's leaders, yet Carthage's leaders were not about to allow their soldiers in Italy to leave Italy. With Carthage now dominating the war for control of western Europe, for the remainder of the war the conflict would be one where intelligence would be used. The conflict had now spread to include all of southern Europe's whites, who were now conspiring to bring western Europe under their control.

Unfortunately, Carthage's leaders had no allies to turn to for military aid, for they were pinned in by the Atlantic to their west, and the Sahara Desert to their

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

south, and to their east were their mortal white enemies, who were now conspiring against them. For the time being Carthage's proud leaders had no choice but to be content with what their brave soldiers had accomplished for their kingdom.

The Nola Battles

It must have been worse than frustrating for the Carthaginians to attempt to force their way into some of the Roman Empire's cities. Under Hannibal's command, the Carthaginian soldiers would attempt on three different occasions to force their way into the Italian city of Nola, to get that Italian city's inhabitants to accept defeat. We can only imagine just what the ticked off Carthaginian soldiers would have done to that city's inhabitants, if they had forced their way in after their third attempt. Those Carthaginian soldiers were forced to extend so much time and energy trying to get into that city to force that city's inhabitants to give peace a chance and were incapable of doing it. For some reason they were stopped. Those events the proud Carthaginian soldiers endured at Nola and other Roman cities, were ridiculous and not necessary.

Most situations such as Nola's usually end with capitulation, yet the Romans were driven by some obvious fear (race likely played some role in those events) that encouraged them to ignore the peace offers of Carthage. The first Carthaginian attempt to force Nola to accept peace occurred in 216 B.C. The second Carthaginian attempt to force Nola to accept peace occurred in 215 B.C. The third Carthaginian attempt to force Nola to accept peace occurred in 214 B.C.

The Battle of Beneventum

Hannibal was obviously constantly in dire need to keep in touch with his kingdoms leaders back in Carthage about how the war was going, but even more importantly about the necessary reinforcements Hannibal would need to keep the Carthaginians in Italy for good. Hannibal was successful in keeping up to date with his kingdoms leaders, yet the Carthaginians obviously had extreme difficulties using the Mediterranean Sea to send Carthaginian reinforcements to Italy, as well as difficulties sending Carthaginian reinforcements from France and Spain, to Italy. On one occasion when Carthage ordered more Carthaginian reinforcements to Italy to bolster Hannibal's strength it met with dismal failure. In 214 B.C., Rome and their allies carefully observed the movements of new Carthaginian reinforcements under the command of Hanno, then gave battle and triumphed over them.

It likely did not go well with Hannibal once he heard of Rome's victory at the Battle of Beneventum, for he knew he needed reinforcements (Hannibal also needed the necessary weapons of war as well) badly, if the Carthaginians were going to bring the entire Roman Empire under their rule. In the France, Portugal and Spain region the Carthaginians obviously had numerous settlements which, could and did, produce weapons of war. However, obstacles stood before the Carthaginians when they attempted to send reinforcements and supplies to the Carthaginian army in Italy under Hannibal's command. One obstacle were the Celts, Greeks and Romans, while the other was the Alps mountains, which were obviously dreaded by everyone then when war was in progress.

The Battle of Tarentum

In 213 B.C., things were pretty much nothing new during this war between Carthage and Rome. Rome was not going to allow Carthage to rule their empire even if it meant building incredible defensive works around their settlements. Rome was obviously using that Mediterranean Sea to pay visits to neighboring white kingdoms to beg for their willing handouts, which probably included everything related for war purposes, including that of manpower. In the state Rome was in after the Carthaginians completely destroyed them, you would think that there would be no way on earth for the Romans to recover "on their own." Of course, you would be correct! During these quite years the Romans were full of hate for what Carthage had forced them through, and it obviously kept building and building, yet the Romans were not alone for they had their neighboring kingdoms who were sympathetic towards their horrible, horrible predicament.

Those sympathetic kingdoms were instrumental in Rome's eventual victory over mighty Carthage, for they would contribute everything that was necessary for Rome to battle on against the mighty Carthaginians, who would pay a horrible price for the immense land hunger of those invading Romans, whose land hunger got the Romans into that horrible predicament that they were in. Rome and their allies would now begin their quest to stand up and fight the mighty Carthaginians for control of Italy. With Hannibal's conquest over southern Italy, Carthage's leaders would have to do with just that, but they obviously knew from instinct that Rome had succeeded in preventing Carthage from ruling the Roman Empire, by preventing their soldiers from entering Rome and other important Roman cities, to force them to accept defeat.

Although Carthage had the great majority of their kingdoms soldiers stationed in Italy, it was extremely difficult for Carthage to reinforce their soldiers stationed in Italy under Hannibal's command, for Rome dominated the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Mediterranean Sea, and to the west in the western European lands of the Carthaginian Empire, the invading Romans successfully established themselves but more importantly they had Celtic allies there as well, and both allied peoples there were enticed to make raids on the Spanish Carthaginians, to attempt to alter their war plans.

Once Rome had mustered their courage up to resume fighting the mighty Carthaginians (their target was southern Italy), Rome and their allies singled out the capitol of Campania, Capua, which was apparently well liked by Hannibal who had apparently wintered there. When Rome's leaders heard of Hannibal's departure from Capua (Hannibal, if history is correct, departed for Tarentum, which was the wealthiest city of southern Italy and still under Rome's control, to attempt to take it), they and their allies acted by assaulting Capua while Hannibal was gone.

Most likely Hannibal was setup by conspirators, yet I could be wrong. Anyway, some 10,000 Carthaginian soldiers under Hannibal's command must have freaked out when they entered Tarentum and did it easily (the conspiracy) then within a short while brought the city under their control. Meanwhile, after Hannibal brought Tarentum under his control, he received the disturbing news that his winter home (Capua, the capitol of Campania) was being assaulted by the invading Romans. Hannibal was obviously infuriated with the Romans actions, yet did Hannibal sense that Rome had been busy over the years establishing military alliances with nearby neighboring kingdoms? With Rome's new willingness to combat Carthage again for control of Italy, Carthage would have to not only combat Rome, but Rome's allies as well.

At this point in time Carthage controlled Italy (without Rome's consent of course) as well as Portugal and Spain, and southern France as well, which the Carthaginians must have found delightful to have lived there for so many thousands of years, yet Carthage was now facing an multitude of conspiring kingdoms whose goal was to eliminate the glorious and ancient Carthaginian Empire. The Battle of Tarentum took place in 212 B.C.

The Battle of Capua

As we know, Hannibal led his brave Carthaginian soldiers to capture the southern Italian city of Tarentum, yet while the Carthaginians were capturing Tarentum the Romans and their allies snuck up to Capua to attempt to retake the Italian city. During this time Rome was also busy along with their allies, who obviously supported the Romans both with weapons of war and manpower to combat Carthage, in north Italy and other Italian locations, and in fact, Rome and

their conspiring allies had successfully retaking some locations already under Carthaginian control. The stubborn and proud Romans and their allies (they included allies from those eastern Mediterranean region kingdoms most likely to replenish the already fallen brave Roman soldiers) bravely sent over 40,000 of their soldiers to the Capua region to combat the Carthaginians, whose number was likely less than that of the Roman confederation at the Battle of Capua.

When the Roman confederation commenced their assault on the Capua region in early 212 B.C., they initially combated an insignificant Carthaginian military force under the command of Hanno the Elder, who was ordered to the Capua region by Hannibal. While most of Hanno the Elder's Carthaginian soldiers were away from their encampment searching for food, the Roman confederation struck then took their encampment, which then left the Capua region without an significant Carthaginian military presence. With Rome now dominating the Capua region the call for more Carthaginian reinforcements from concerned Carthaginians in the Capua region, was received by Hannibal, who then ordered two thousand more Carthaginian soldiers to the troubled region. Rome also ordered more reinforcements to the Capua region but they were ambushed (the Roman commander of those Roman reinforcements, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, was apparently fallen by death) by Carthaginian soldiers.

Afterwards, Hannibal showed up with his brave Carthaginian soldiers then setup camp near Mount Tifata. Within three days both warring empires gave battle, which was fought determinedly by both empires soldiers, but over time the Carthaginians wore down the Romans, yet when an approaching unknown military force was spotted the battle immediately ceased. Although the Romans were given way during the battle or beginning to lose, if the battle had not ceased the Romans would have rejoiced in knowing that the approaching military force were Roman reinforcements. Unfortunately, Rome lost control of the Capua region after the Battle of Capua ceased, yet the Rome confederation was on the offensive and would be back to the Capua region again in the future.

The Battle of Silarus

Another major battle occurred in 212 B.C. between Carthaginian soldiers and the soldiers of Rome's confederation, which resulted in another setback for Rome's confederations attempt to control Italy once again. After the Carthaginians and Romans ceased their battle at Capua upon realizing another unknown military force was about to intervene in their battle, the Roman soldiers participating in the Battle of Capua were compelled to separate which,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

unfortunately for the Romans and Roman commander Claudius who led one of those two contingents of Roman soldiers, Hannibal ordered his soldiers to follow them and it would lead to the events at Silarus.

Rome's soldiers under the command of Claudius, managed to avoid a direct confrontation with the pursuing Carthaginians, but apparently one Marcus Centenius (he appears to have been very brave and eager to prove to his kingdoms leaders, that he was fully capable of leading his kingdoms brave soldiers into battle against the Carthaginians), induced Rome's powerful Senate into granting the brave soldier his opportunity to give battle to the Carthaginians. Centenius must have been very well pleased after learning that he was put in command of around 16,000 soldiers, yet he would learn the hard way that the Carthaginian soldiers were not so easy to go to battle against and be defeated.

From what I have learned about Centenius leaves little doubt that he appeared to be not very well trained as an Roman commander, but his fate was about the same as some of the other brave Roman commanders who went to battle against the Carthaginians. Hannibal's Carthaginian soldiers spotted the Roman army under the command of Centenius first (this tactic worked very well for the Carthaginians) before the Romans spotted the Carthaginians, and when that occurs during time of war, it can cause extreme havoc later on during the heat of battle, as it did eventually do at the Battle of Silarus.

Once the Carthaginians became aware of the large Roman army searching for them, as usual they quietly went about taken care of the business of preparing an ambush, and during the ambush that followed the Romans would pay a horrible price. If the Roman army had even the slightest hint of an foe somewhere before them just before the ambush commenced, it probably wouldn't have mattered anyway.

Either the Romans would have had to of been in that golden situation where they were the ambushers (if they really were going to win that battle), or the regular old fashioned style battle without the treachery of the ambush (if the Romans were going to win that battle), because when an foe is ambushed all too frequently they end up being defeated. Centenius bravely charged on his brave soldiers after the Carthaginian ambush commenced, yet the surprise Carthaginian attack disrupted the once calm Roman soldiers so thoroughly it eventually led to their disintegration as an military force.

Over time, Rome's surprised soldiers would fall one by one while they attempted to reorganize to defend their disorganized army from the fierce Carthaginians, who enjoyed the luxury of being well organized, or under the spell of an well carried out ambush plan. By the time Rome's Etruscan allies split from

the horrible Carthaginian ambush, all the Carthaginians had to do was finish off the remainder of the once large and formidable Roman army, and they did so very well! Some 15,000 of Rome's soldiers and their allies soldiers, fell at the Battle of Silarus, while the remaining 1000 soldiers of Rome were ordered by their leaders to join the other Roman survivors of previous battles against the Carthaginians, as the form of some punishment.

Although Rome endured another setback at Silarus, Rome was obviously building (with the support from neighboring kingdoms) another larger and even more formidable army, to attempt to retake Italy from Carthage, and over time Rome and their allies would get the best of the mighty Carthaginians.

The Battle of Herdonia

Rome's confederation was a bit on the busy side fighting battles against Carthage during the year 212 B.C., which includes the first Battle of Herdonia. Carthage's leaders were very likely very upset with Rome's unwillingness to be ruled by Carthage, particularly with the many casualties the Carthaginians were suffering as the conflict dragged onwards, yet then wealth must be included as well, because once that wealth goes all too often that wealth is very difficult to replace, especially during those ancient times. Rome was proving to Carthage to be so inept while at war against Carthage, and at the same time so willing to refuse to accept the inevitable, it must have drove Carthage's leaders right up the wall, pounding on them in great anger.

Its amazing that the Romans actually organized several more army's during this time throughout Italy to combat the invading Carthaginians. Of course, Rome had allies who contributed to Rome's defense, for Rome's own casualties during the early years of this second Punic War were very significant to say the least. It must have shocked Hannibal to realize that Rome had several more Army's edging in on his strongholds throughout Italy, yet Hannibal and probably Carthage's main leaders, may have known exactly what Rome was up to. Carthage's leaders knew it would be extremely difficult to reinforce their Carthaginian army in Italy under Hannibal's command (the Romans dominated the Mediterranean Sea, and in France and Spain the invading Celts, Greeks and Romans were capable of penetrating to those Carthaginian reinforcements attempting to reinforce Carthage's army in Italy, and either preventing them from accomplishing their goal, or seriously disrupting them) so that alone greatly bothered Carthage's main leaders, who not only had to deal with sending reinforcements to that Italian conflict, but they also had to deal with the invading Celts, Greeks and Romans who were busy fighting a war in Carthage's western European colonies against the Carthaginians as well.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The war in Carthage's western European colonies may have not been as violent as Carthage's war was in Italy, yet it contributed to Carthage's horrible problems then. Exactly when the first white tribes penetrated into Carthage's western European colonies is a mystery, yet it likely occurred centuries before the Carthage-Rome Wars. France was obviously part of Carthage's Empire, yet maybe not all of France, but certainly southern France. It was obviously in southern France where the first white tribes penetrated into Carthage's western European colonies, and when they did it did not go unnoticed by Carthage's leaders, who obviously responded to the threat those primitive white tribes were. After those first primitive white tribes made their way into Carthage's western European colonies, the Greeks and Romans would follow but they were civilized, and probably exploited the opportunity that the primitive white tribes in southern France obviously advertised before them. Rome's confederation agreed again to enter the Capua region, after losing their grip on the region during the fiasco that occurred there earlier, yet the Carthaginians were enticed to head eastward into Apulia, where an contingent of Rome's confederation's army was already stationed there. Rome's confederations army in the Apulia region numbered around 18,000 and were under the command of Fulvius. Evidently, from historical records the size of Carthage's army at the Battle of Herdonia was slightly larger than Rome's confederation's army, which isn't surprising because Rome's confederation had several large army's operating throughout Italy at this time. Evidently the Romans didn't catch wind of the Carthaginian army until they neared Herdonia, but once the Romans knew of their enemy's presence they all agreed to commence to give battle to the Carthaginian army.

While Rome's soldiers prepared for battle, Hannibal ordered some of his soldiers to search for those areas where escape routes may be hidden to await the likelihood of an Roman retreat from the upcoming battle to be fought, which they went their way to carry out. Once the two warring empires lined up for battle they immediately went at, and apparently it didn't take the Carthaginians too long to begin to get the better of the Romans. Once the Carthaginians had noticed the Roman soldiers losing their grip during the battle, the Carthaginians then found those locations in the battle where they could surround the losing Romans to eventually force them to disintegrate, which eventually did occur. Only about 2000 of the 18,000 brave Roman soldiers survived that horrible battle.

After the Battle of Herdonia Hannibal marched his soldiers to Tarentum to stay away from the invading Rome confederation. Hannibal was likely in shock to realize that for some reason Rome was full of new life to wage new war against

Carthage. Rome's casualties were very significant, and in fact, anywhere from 100,000 to 200,000 brave Roman soldiers had already fallen, and Hannibal and Carthage's leaders obviously knew of Rome's horrible casualties. To make matters even more confusing to Carthage they controlled southern Italy, but for some reason Rome was full of new energy. Of course, there was an coalition of southern European kingdoms aiding Rome to defend Rome from the Carthaginians. Hannibal's retreat to Tarentum likely occurred as a result of realizing that now before them was an new huge Roman army.

The 2nd Battle of Capua

Rome again attempted to retake Hannibal's former winter home in 211 B.C. and succeeded this time. After the Romans successfully took Capua it marked the turning point in this second Carthage-Rome war. With Rome besieging Capua in 211 B.C. Hannibal made the decision to lead a contingent of his brave Carthaginian soldiers to attempt to take Rome. After the Carthaginian soldiers under Hannibal's command reached Rome, they commenced to attempt to enter the Roman capitol but met with dismal failure. Why on earth they couldn't manage to tear down a small portion of Rome's city walls then enter Rome, is a bit mystifying to me! However, siege warfare is really not that strange but with the relentless will to proceed on, the people being besieged will do everything in their power to avoid the inevitable.

Of course, the people who are besieging can also find that great will to proceed on until they manage to enter the settlement they are besieging to force it to capitulate. The Carthaginians obviously could have built an secure ramp that towered over Rome's city walls (realistically, the Carthaginians could have built as many ramps to enter Rome as they wanted to), and then battled into Rome or any other Roman city, to force them to capitulate. The Carthaginian casualties would have been significant, yet most likely the Carthaginians would have persevered on until they entered those Roman cities then eventually taken those Roman cities. Unfortunately, the Carthaginians were incapable of entering Rome for some strange reason and they eventually lost Capua afterwards.

The 2nd Battle of Herdonia

Rome was still on the offensive in Italy in 210 B.C. and likely so because of the Carthaginians being incapable of successfully winning that war. And why not the Romans obviously knew that they had the advantage of using siege warfare as a measure of preventing Carthage from winning that war. After the Carthaginians discovered that the Romans were negotiating with a segment of

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

the city of Herdonia's population (the Romans were obviously searching for willing allies in the city of Herdonia), it infuriated the Carthaginians into taking military actions against the Roman army in the Herdonia region. Once Hannibal and his Carthaginian soldiers had prepared for battle against the Romans in the Herdonia region (their movements apparently caught the Romans off guard, that likely aided the Carthaginians in the following battle), the Roman army under the command of Fulvius Centumalus, commenced to form into battle preparation then the 2nd Battle of Herdonia commenced. The 20,000 Roman soldiers under Centumalus's command, were eventually surrounded by the 30,000 Carthaginian soldiers under Hannibal's command and then nearly wiped out.

Some 17,000 brave Roman soldiers, including Centumalus, fell at the 2nd Battle of Herdonia. Carthaginian casualties were far less of course. The Carthaginians were apparently discontented with some of Herdonia's citizens after the battle, for they eventually were compelled to rid the city of Herdonia, of them, after winning the 2nd Battle of Herdonia. The Carthaginians were probably at this time extremely upset with the Romans, who were not willing to be ruled by Carthage. From now on the Carthaginians would be on the defensive against the Romans and their allies.

The Battle of Numistro

With the Carthaginians now on the defensive in Italy in the year 210 B.C., their emotions about that horrible war that they were winning must have frustrated them terribly. Hannibal had led his brave Carthaginian soldiers to one victory after another over the Romans (those Carthaginian victories over the Romans were obviously an extremely important inspiration for the Carthaginian army in Italy), which inflicted probably hundreds of thousands of casualties on both the military and civilian population of the Roman Empire, whose population was not truly major when that 2nd Punic War was being fought.

The Romans again battled the Carthaginians in Italy (this battle occurred near Numistro, Lucania) with better results than earlier previous battles against Hannibal's brave soldiers. Rome's brave soldiers were led by Marcus Claudius Marcellus in the Battle of Numistro, which was apparently a battle which neither the Carthaginians nor the Romans were capable of winning. However, since Hannibal ordered his brave soldiers to retreat from the battle after that battle had lasted a long time, it hints at some event occurring late in the Battle of Numistro that led to Hannibal withdrawing from the battle scene. The Romans may have started to get the better of the Carthaginians, or maybe Rome was reinforced, or maybe the Carthaginians were in limited supply's of weapons of war. Anyway,

Hannibal in fact commenced to withdraw his brave soldiers and the Romans would pursue the Carthaginians afterwards.

The Battle of Asculum

Hannibal had apparently led his brave soldiers to the Asculum region after the Battle of Numistro (the Carthaginians possibly lost that battle, although the battle is considered to have been undecided by scholars) abruptly concluded. In 209 B.C., Rome's brave soldiers under Marcus Claudius Marcellus's command again, found the Carthaginians under Hannibal's command in the Asculum region. Evidently the Romans may have lost the Battle of Asculum, for the Roman commander Marcus Claudius Marcellus, was not politely dealt with by Rome's leaders after they heard of the results of the Battle of Asculum. It is clear that the Romans had failed in their objective during the Battle of Asculum, yet the Battle of Asculum is considered by scholars to have been indecisively fought. Another clear fact is the Carthaginians were even more on the defensive during this time.

The 2nd Battle of Tarentum

As we know already the Carthaginians had captured the city of Tarentum in 212 B.C., but Rome and their allies arrived again in 209 B.C. to attempt to retake the wealthy Italian city from the Carthaginians under Hannibal's leadership. For some reason the Carthaginians were not capable of keeping the Romans out of Tarentum, which was quite unlike the Romans ability to prevent the Carthaginians from entering Roman cities like Rome. Anyway, the Romans under the command of Fabius Maximus, eventually recaptured the wealthy Italian city of Tarentum in 209 B.C. by using deceitful means apparently.

We can only imagine the immense hate and anger that the Carthaginians were feeling around this time period. Meanwhile, in Spain, the Carthaginians were not doing any better around this time period (209 B.C.—208 B.C.), and in fact, the Carthaginians in Spain were doing worse than the Carthaginians in Italy, and that can be attributed to the lower numbers of Carthaginian soldiers (most of the Carthaginian soldiers were stationed in Italy) stationed in western Europe, and the disloyalty of many of the native Iberian tribes who instead of looking upon the Romans as being intruders, were compelled to look upon the Romans as being instrumental in liberating them from the mighty Carthaginians. Over time those Iberian tribes would learn that the Romans were looking out for the best interests of the Roman people.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The Battle of Grumentum

Carthage was very likely war weary by 207 B.C. and extremely, extremely frustrated with Rome's will to continue to fight on. Carthage's leaders had great difficulties sending their reinforcements from north Africa and western Europe, to their army stationed in Italy, and without a doubt that greatly infuriated Carthage's proud leaders, who had obviously known that if they could somehow manage to get large numbers of their reinforcements into Italy under Hannibal's command, they would most likely force Rome to capitulate. Hannibal would learn after the Battle of Grumentum that his brave brother, Hasdrubal Barca, who had somehow managed to enter Italy with some Carthaginian reinforcements earlier, would end up being killed in a battle that followed the Battle of Grumentum.

In the Battle of Grumentum the Roman soldiers were commanded by Gaius Claudius Nero (he would lead Rome's soldiers in the battle that Hasdrubal Barca was killed in), who may not have defeated the Carthaginians under Hannibal's command in the Battle of Grumentum, but the Romans apparently didn't lose either. Once the indecisive battle was abruptly ended, the Romans took off for lands to the north where they would have to deal with Hannibal's brother.

The Battle of Metaurus

Undoubtedly, the Battle of Metaurus was considered by the Romans as the most important battle of the 2nd Punic War. Hannibal's brother, Hasdrubal Barca, had reached northern Italy in 207 B.C. with those Carthaginian reinforcements he had been ordered by Carthage to send to the Carthaginian army stationed in Italy. However, Hasdrubal Barca likely made an extremely serious military blunder when passing through the beautiful Alps Mountains. When Hannibal Barca led the Carthaginian soldiers through the Alps Mountains over 10 years earlier, they faced Celtic tribes who harassed them along the way, which hampered their progress over the Alps Mountains. When Hasdrubal Barca led those Carthaginian reinforcements over the beautiful Alps Mountains, he probably unknowingly was deceived by both those Celtic tribes and the Romans as well. Hasdrubal Barca's military blunder was allowing large numbers of those Celtic warriors to serve in his army. He should have known better!

Anyway, Hasdrubal Barca had reached northern Italy (he was ordered there to bring the necessary equipment to wage siege warfare against Rome, apparently the Carthaginians were going to attempt at this time to put forth their full effort at entering Rome and forcing Rome to capitulate) with his Carthaginian reinforcements, the Celtic warriors, and the weapons of war to combat the

Romans. However, after Hasdrubal Barca and his Carthaginian reinforcements entered northern Italy, spies went to work for Rome's benefit. Hasdrubal Barca had apparently sent messengers to Hannibal to the south (the message was apparently an plan for attacking the city of Rome), but somehow they were captured (probably because of those Celtic infiltrators) by the Romans, who learned of the Carthaginians plans.

Two Roman armies, one with Gaius Claudius Nero as their commander, and the other with Marcus Livius as their commander, reached to within a half a mile of Hasdrubal Barca's reinforcement camp, which was picked up on by the Carthaginians, who became weary of the nearby Romans who were preparing to give battle to them (the Carthaginians knew that they had been stabbed in the back) then initiated their departure. For some reason Hasdrubal Barca made the decision to lead his soldiers back to Gaul. By this time I wonder if Hasdrubal Barca was suspecting that among his ranks were spies, for on their way back to Gaul the Carthaginians were enticed by certain infiltrators amongst them, to take the wrong path back to Gaul. The Carthaginians under Hasdrubal Barca's command were led to the Metaurus river apparently, where they had no choice but to follow its course to find a location on that river where it would be favorable to cross it.

Exactly just how many Celtic warriors were amongst Hasdrubal Barca's reinforcements is suspicious, yet probably by this time Hasdrubal Barca was having second thoughts about allowing the Celts to have the opportunity to influence his war efforts. Come early one morning, Hasdrubal Barca had noticed that the two Roman armies were within reach of his Carthaginian reinforcements, including those drunk Celtic warriors (for all we know those drunk Celtic warriors were so drunk they waged war on the Carthaginians), which left him with but only the horrible decision to end their retreat to commence to battle the nearby Roman armies.

A total of around 37,000 Roman soldiers participated at the Battle of Metaurus, and around 30,000 Carthaginians (I have no correct number of Carthaginian soldiers who participated at the Battle of Metaurus, but I do know that many of them were Celtic, and some were Iberians, but maybe 10,000 is close to the correct number) under Hasdrubal Barca's command. In the battle that followed, the Romans eventually overwhelmed the Carthaginians who were so infiltrated with outsiders, it rightfully led to their defeat at the Battle of Metaurus. Hasdrubal Barca was killed in battle while he bravely led his brave soldiers on.

Unfortunately, Hasdrubal Barca made an military blunder which eventually led to Carthage's defeat in the 2nd Punic War. Afterwards, Carthage would no

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

longer seriously attempt to send reinforcements to their army in Italy, for the war had gotten the worse of them, and in fact, the immense wealth that Carthage was blessed with had obviously deteriorated. Then the average Carthaginian citizen was an obstacle Carthaginian political leaders had to endure.

Hannibal was left to fend for the Italy he had brought under his control. Back in Carthage, if the Carthaginians thought that Rome would not bother paying a visit to their beloved north African lands they would be greatly disappointed. Carthage's beloved lands were why the Romans bothered to invade their western European colonies. Carthage had won that war but Carthage lost. On October 19, 202 B.C., the Romans and their Numidian allies finally defeated Hannibal and the Carthaginians in the Battle of Zama, which was located near the city of Carthage. Some 20,000 brave Carthaginian soldiers fell at the Battle of Zama as well as Carthage's glorious ancient empire. Carthage's leaders sued for peace afterwards.

In 146 B.C., the Romans finally eradicated Carthage for good when the defenseless city's inhabitants were finally forced to accept capitulation for good. It is degrading to read of scholars belief that the Carthaginians hired mercenaries to fight their wars for them. Carthage drafted their own soldiers to fight their wars, and did limitedly accept soldiers from their subjected kingdoms, particularly Numidia and the Iberians, and also from Celts, and probably other white kingdoms. That liberalness on the part of Carthage's leaders probably contributed to Carthage's demise.

If the Carthaginians military caste or totem, was so large it made up about half the population of the Carthaginians, it would be reasonable to enter an estimated population of the Carthaginians military caste or totem (this estimate is only for men) to be around 250,000, which may have been close to the actual number of Carthaginian soldiers. Add on another 250,000 for women or their wife's, and another 1,250,000 for their children, and we then get an rough estimate of 1,750,000 members of the Carthaginians military caste or totem. We can use that Carthaginian military caste population number to get an not so reliable total population of the Carthaginians. It may have been anywhere from 3,500,000 to 5,000,000. Certainly after the 2nd Punic War concluded the Carthaginian military caste population had declined significantly.

If we have learned anything of value about the 2nd Punic War it has to be "wars can be won but lost while being won." Carthage easily defeated the Romans, yet they eventually did lose that horrible conflict. Although the Carthaginians of north Africa and western Europe had been subjugated, there was that one group of Carthaginians located in the eastern Mediterranean Sea region who obviously aided the Jews when the Jews rose up to take on the mighty Romans on several

occasions from the first century B.C. to the 2nd century A.D. Those eastern Carthaginians and Jews were compelled to refuse to accept Rome's subjugation over them, and they and the Romans, paid dearly for their inability to agree upon accepting peace.

The Numidians

Scholars refer to the Numidians of north Africa as being of Berber origin, which could actually be correct, yet maybe not! During the second Punic War Rome found an willing ally among the western Numidians who were known as the Massaesyli. Evidently the eastern Numidians (they were known as the Massyli) were allied with Carthage. Although the Carthaginians likely brought native peoples of north Africa under their control after they invaded in 9500 B.C., and those native peoples probably did include the Numidians, the Numidians may have shown up long after the Carthaginian invasion in 9500 B.C., or may have actually been Carthaginian.

What is so strange about this Numidian problem is the likely fact that Carthage ruled all of northern Africa, from the Atlantic to probably Egypt and beyond. If the Numidians were in fact not Carthaginian, I assume that there's the slight possibility that they originated out of that ancient Carthaginian Empire but where? Were the Numidians really closely related to the Carthaginians? Let us assume that those Numidians originated elsewhere (for all we know maybe Europe, they may have actually been Greeks who snuck their way into some Carthaginian settlement, then over time became more numerous such as the scenario at Saguntum) then somehow made their way throughout the Carthaginian Empire to settle down and live afterwards. Far fetched but that is likely how the whites made their first intrusions into Europe's Atlantean colonies. The whites just didn't walk in and take over!

Most likely the whites were well received by Atlantean settlements or welcomed. However, over time the Atlanteans would learn about the treacherous whites. Anyway, it is very disturbing to know that Rome had willing allies within Carthage's north African kingdom, as they also did in Carthage's western European colonies. I am not certain if historians are correct in regards to the Numidians, yet if north Africa was colonized by the first wave of Atlanteans their descendents just may have been the Numidians. Maybe the Numidians wanted to get rid of their Carthaginian subjugators, yet what actually occurred was a new subjugator (the Romans) took over the rule of their ancient kingdom.

The first Punic War had no clear victor but the Romans at the conclusion of that war, certainly were far more happier compared to the Carthaginians, who

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

had to give in to Roman ownership of the island of Sicily. Sicily was possibly first invaded by the white Greeks who, upon their arrival to the large island of Sicily, probably found Sicily to be inhabited by the Carthaginians, and probably other people such as the Etruscans as well. Rome obviously wanted to colonize Sicily and once they had secured their foothold in southern Italy, they likely started to discuss their likelihood of invading Sicily. Rome did eventually get the courage up to deliberately invade Sicily as we know.

The second Punic War started 23 years after the first Punic War ended and, of course, the reason for the second Punic War was the expansion of the Roman Empire, as was the first Punic War of course. The second Punic War started in 218 B.C., and lasted until 202 B.C., and its most famous military leader was Hannibal, who was young at the beginning of that war, not to mention very intelligent. The young Carthaginian military leader quickly won the respect of his Roman enemy.

From Spain, Hannibal was ordered to take his large army to march to the homeland of their Roman enemy, even knowing that the Alps were an obstacle in their path. Hannibal succeeded in crossing his army over the Alps, but at the cost of many of the lives of his soldiers and animals, including many elephants. The Romans must have been shocked by the invasion of their beloved Italy, as Hannibal by military force, brought Italy under his control, but he decided afterwards to march to southern Italy (that is the suspicious part of the 2nd Punic War) to seek out possible allies, and from there later attack Rome itself. Did the Carthaginians only want southern Italy or all of Italy?

Maybe after the Romans commenced to bring new life into the 2nd Punic War (the Carthaginians may have been satisfied with controlling only southern Italy, and when Rome's decision to increase their attacks on the Carthaginians in Italy were accepted by Carthage, the Carthaginians had a change of mind) Carthage gradually began to rethink about northern Italy as a possible colony! What definitely isn't an ignorable subject was Carthage may have only wanted to bring southern Italy back under their control.

After the Carthaginians had established themselves in Italy (Carthage was obviously not prone to give their full effort to take northern Italy for some reason, but it most likely may have revolved around the Romans refusing to accept defeat, or in fact southern Italy was their colony) southern Italy was eventually brought under the control of Carthage. Now that says something that's out of the ordinary! I am not certain if Carthage ever established an Carthaginian colony anywhere on the Italian peninsula, but what eventually occurred after Hannibal led his brave Carthaginian soldiers to victory over

Rome, is quite suspicious. Did Carthage only want to retrieve an Carthaginian Italian colony located in southern Italy? I assume that if Carthage had truly wanted to they would have ordered Hannibal to take the majority of his soldiers then attacked Rome until Rome capitulated, which definitely would have happened if the Carthaginians had actually relentlessly attacked Rome until the inevitable occurred. However, Hannibal would eventually bring southern Italy under the control of Carthage and avoid taking Rome, which Hannibal most definitely would have done if he had been allowed to.

For what appears like pure nonsense would lead to the disintegration of the Carthaginian Empire. Military blunders do occur and when the Carthaginians decided to not take the time and effort to seriously try to force Rome to capitulate to Carthage, one of the greatest military blunders in all of history definitely occurred. Of course, Rome initiated the second Punic War by deliberately invading and enticing trouble in the western European colonies of Carthage, which prompted Carthage's leaders to order Hannibal to invade Italy with anywhere from 40,000 to 200,000 Carthaginian soldiers (most likely the total number of Carthaginian soldiers who invaded Italy was over 100,000) to wage war on the Roman Empire.

But were they specifically instructed to bring the entire Roman Empire under Carthage's control? Or were they instructed to only bring southern Italy (Carthage may have had an southern Italian colony at one time before the rise of Rome) under Carthage's control. Unfortunately, Carthage was incapable of focusing their attention on totally conquering the Roman Empire and they would eventually pay a horrible price for their ineptness. Carthage had the Roman Empire in the palms of their hands, yet they let the Roman Empire slip away.

What Carthage didn't do the Romans used to their advantage, as while Hannibal was in Italy the Romans raised tens of thousands of more soldiers to invade Spain and northern Africa. After Rome rebounded from their early horrible defeats against the Carthaginians, the new Roman soldiers commenced to gain the advantage after the Carthaginian soldiers under Hannibal's command were caught in a horrible trap with the Mediterranean to their west, south and east, and the Romans and the Alps Mountains, to their north. Hannibal and his Carthaginian soldiers, were undefeatable in war, but the Romans used their intelligence and with neighboring kingdoms willing to assist them, eventually became the stronger, and that was why the Romans were victorious in the second Punic War.

The third Punic War (149 B.C.-146 B.C.) started when the Romans demanded of the city of Carthage, the removal of all the Carthaginian citizens of Carthage to the interior of north Africa, or face total destruction from the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Roman military. Carthage still had its pride and Carthage paid a horrible price when they refused. Does it sound familiar to you. The lucky survivors were forced into slavery and the end of the Carthaginian dominance era followed. Hannibal lived on after the 2nd Punic War concluded, and in fact, Hannibal wanted to continue the struggle against Rome.

Hannibal was definitely an powerful figure in Carthage after the 2nd Punic War concluded. In Carthage's government, Hannibal felt it was necessary to take his kingdoms constitution and rewrite it, as well as to actively combat the obvious corruption (unfortunately, corruption exists in all nations governments, it has since who knows when) in his kingdoms government, which Hannibal probably believed that certain leaders in his kingdoms government were responsible for the horrible plight of their kingdoms citizens, after the Carthaginians sued for peace.

Rome didn't take kindly to Hannibal's actions (we must remember that the city of Carthage was still independent after the conclusion of the 2nd Punic War) concerning Carthage's government, and exactly what the Carthaginians should do, especially regarding the Romans. After Rome concluded that Hannibal was going to attempt to get back the empire of his people, Rome's leaders didn't hesitate to let Hannibal know of their displeasure of his actions. Hannibal was forced to seek asylum among the Seleucids of Syria from the Romans, who would have probably had him executed, if they had somehow managed to apprehend Hannibal. While Hannibal was in Syria, war broke out between the Romans and Seleucids, which the Romans were victorious.

After Rome's victory, part of the agreements the Romans forced on the Seleucids included handing over Hannibal to the Romans. Hannibal was obviously in great fear (he likely thought that the Romans would not only kill him) of how his death would be so instead of reluctantly accepting his fate, Hannibal committed suicide in 183 B.C., while he was in Bithynia. Hannibal was obviously in fear of the Romans, and after learning of Rome's request that the Seleucids hand him over, he then sought protection in Bithynia after the Seleucids lost their war against Rome in 190 B.C.

Hannibal had easily defeated the Romans but lost. Unfortunately, the blame can be focused on many possible culprits, but once the Carthaginians had established themselves in Italy they were in southern Italy. That does represent that the Carthaginians were only inclined to invade Italy to retrieve an southern Carthaginian Italian colony. Hannibal didn't need to request of his kingdoms leaders that they send him the necessary siege equipment to take Rome, for Hannibal could have constructed on his own the necessary siege equipment. Hannibal obviously had the manpower and everything necessary to accomplish

that on his own. The mistake occurred early on when the Carthaginians under Hannibal's command, failed to bother to take the city of Rome.

After the Romans realized that the Carthaginians were focusing their attention on southern Italy, Rome's leaders may have breathed an air of relief. If Hannibal had taken Rome during the first phase of the Carthaginian invasion of Italy, Rome would have bit the dust. Carthage did not invade Spain and ignite the 2nd Punic War. Most likely the Carthaginians endured an uprising of either an Iberian Kingdom or maybe an Celtic Kingdom, they had long subjugated. Rome took advantage of that particular kingdoms request for their protection by launching their own invasion into Carthage's western European colonies. That is what (the land hunger of the Romans) ignited the 2nd Punic War.

The Carthaginian Lucitanian—Roman Wars

Obviously the Lucitanian people of Portugal were not white, nor were they likely of Iberian origins. Historians have suggested that the Lucitanians were originally from the Alps Mountains, who for some good reason migrated all the way to Portugal. However, Portugal was most definitely colonized by the invading Algonquians (the Carthaginians) some 11,500 years ago which, if that is actually true, suggests that the Lucitanians were in fact the European Carthaginians. The following are the Carthaginian colonies in western most Europe: Bracari, Callaici, Coelerni, Cynetes, Equaesii, Grovii, Interamici, Leuni, Luanqui, Lucitani, Limici, Narbasi, Nemetati, Paesuri, Quaquerni, Seurbi, Tamagani, Tapoli, Turduli, Turduli Veteres, Turdulorum Oppida, Turodi, Vettones and Zoelae. Historically, the dominant Carthaginian colony located in western most Europe was apparently that of Lucitani. When the city of Carthage rose up to defy the Romans from 149 B.C. to 146 B.C., the Romans were already well before the 3rd Punic War commenced, at war with the European Carthaginians. What that definitely suggests to those who are aware of those two ancient historical events, is an clear relationship.

Was their some kind of European Carthaginian resistance movement against Roman rule, which escalated eventually to the city of Carthage, in an attempt to reestablish the Carthaginian Empire? Anyway, after Rome somehow managed to defeat the mighty Carthaginians of north Africa during the 2nd Punic War (the 2nd Punic War ended in 201 B.C.), Rome would press on against the Carthaginian Lucitanians in Portugal where the Romans would once again instigate serious discontent among the European Carthaginians. By 194 B.C. the Romans had worn out their welcome and a new war commenced which would go on for another 15 years against the Carthaginian Lucitanians.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Undoubtedly, Carthage had been pacified by Rome by the time of the first military engagements between the European Carthaginians and the invading Romans in the first Lucitanian War, which lasted from 194 B.C. to 179 B.C., which made Rome's efforts at defeating the European Carthaginians all the more easier. Before the Carthage-Rome Wars, north Africa was most definitely where the Carthaginians were the most numerous, and once Rome had eventually eliminated the city of Carthage's dominance, north Africa would not participate heavily in the Carthaginian European-Rome Wars. The Carthaginian-Roman Wars do kind of resemble the Ohio War that the Three Fires Confederation fought against the invading whites from 1755 to 1832. I have included Black Hawk's War in that time period, for there is too much suspicion surrounding Black Hawk's War, which suggests that the Fox and Sac tribes were not involved in that 1832 conflict.

In all likelihood the Carthaginian-Roman Wars commenced in the Carthaginians southern Italian colony where the Romans used their navigability capabilities to defeat the Carthaginians of north Africa. Then Rome got the courage up to actually invade the western European colonies of Carthage (Rome's leaders probably concentrated largely on the city of Carthage during the 2nd Punic War), which they were successful at doing. After Rome brought Carthage to accept peace Rome's leaders obviously knew that western Europe was theirs and they didn't hesitate to commence to release their unending appetite for land. Land hunger was why Rome was intruding in the affairs of the European Carthaginians, and that greed eventually escalated into open conflict. It didn't take too long after the 2nd Punic War concluded for the Roman Empires new war with the Carthaginians to commence.

For much of the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., Rome was constantly battling the native inhabitants of western Europe, and that also includes the many Celtic tribes who were moving into western Europe via Germany, Italy and Switzerland. Those wars Rome fought in Gaul are referred to as the Gallic Wars. Those Celtic tribes also had to fight the Atlanteans of western Europe as well, which definitely wasn't an easy task for the Celts, many of whom, were accustomed to life on the constant go, which was unlike the way of life Europe's Atlanteans lived which, for most, if not all of western Europe's Atlanteans, was fixed or civilized.

The Rebirth of the Carthaginian Empire

By the 4th century Christianity had become well established in the vast Roman Empire, and likely played a major role in the collapse of the western Roman Empire, which occurred in probably the late 4th century. After Constantine

legalized Christianity in the Roman Empire, the religion was then forced throughout the western colonies of the Roman Empire, including northern Africa where the Carthaginians and Numidians lived. Other factors besides religious intolerance, which brought on the Carthaginian, Egyptian European, Iberian and Numidian rebellion of the 4th and 5th centuries, were probably the welfare of the Carthaginians, Egyptian Europeans, Iberians and Numidians who were subjugated by the Greek Romans, as well as that of race issues of course. Of course, the Huns were the Carthaginians, Iberians, Numidians and eastern Europe's Egyptian Europeans, who were in some form of alliance with western Europe's Carthaginians and Iberians, during the so called Hunnic Wars. We will now expand further on with what occurred during those ancient times, whose historical events were deliberately rearranged (they did so for some particular reasons) long ago.

Pope Saint Leo The Great is forced to pay Tribute

That event occurred in 452, but Rome was obviously forced to capitulate decades earlier. By pure military might the once again formidable Carthaginians and their Egyptian European, Iberian and Numidian allies toppled Rome. In one of civilizations greatest historical feats the combined Carthaginian, Egyptian European, Iberian and Numidian alliance, had organized their soldiers to combat their Greek Roman subjugators, and what followed was astonishing for they reclaimed their once former empire, which included Italy, northern Africa and western Europe. However, in eastern Europe they were content with victory! During the second Punic War the Carthaginians nearly brought Rome to capitulate to Carthage, yet what occurred during the rebellion of the 4th and 5th centuries, definitely brought Rome to capitulate to the mighty Carthaginians and their allies. After Pope Saint Leo The Great capitulated to the Huns, the Carthaginians brought Italy back under their control. It had been an extremely long time since Italy was under Carthaginian control. But even more importantly, the Carthaginians brought northern Africa and western Europe back under their control.

The Carthaginians Conquer the Entire Roman Empire

However, the pesky white Greek Romans of eastern Europe were dealt with in a manner by their Carthaginian subjugators, which allowed them the opportunity to coexist alongside the Carthaginian Empire of Italy, western Europe, and north Africa and that would later on bring down the new Carthaginian Empire. Evidently, Carthaginian leaders were more than willing to "accept tribute payments from their white Greek Roman subjects," instead of

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

bringing the eastern colonies of the Roman Empire, into the new Carthaginian Empire. Those tribute payments that the white Greek Romans were forced to pay to the mighty Carthaginians, were not always paid to the Carthaginians, which definitely prompted the Carthaginians and their allies, especially the Egyptian Europeans, to get a bit too upset with their white Greek Roman subjects. Anyway, in eastern Europe the Egyptian Europeans rose up to create the Hunnic Empire about this same time period, just to the north of the remainder of the Roman Empire (the conquered Roman Empire) of eastern Europe.

Atilla and the Dowry

This event is fascinating for the mentioned western Roman Empire probably represents all of the Roman Empire, and the Huns (Carthaginians of course) adding the western Roman Empires land into their lands. Atilla ruled the western Roman Empire but he wanted all of the Roman Empire. In his quest to conquer all of the Roman Empire, Atilla sent his soldiers (that includes the Egyptian Europeans) straight into eastern Europe to attempt to bring the remaining Roman Empire to capitulate to him, which he obviously succeeded at doing! What followed was Byzantine rulers agreeing to pay tribute to Atilla (that represents subjugation) but they never truly followed their agreements out fully.

If we want to pinpoint a date for the Carthaginian conquest over Rome, it would probably be in 410, when Rome was sacked or conquered. By 550, the new Carthaginian Empire had collapsed internally, and since then the whites have ruled. Justinian the Great (this should help you learn exactly why he received that unique name), the leader of the eastern Roman Empire during the first half of the 6th century, rose up to organize his Greek Roman soldiers to again invade the new Carthaginian Empire to attempt to reclaim Greek Rome. Of course, Justinian the Great succeeded at bringing Italy and much of western northern Africa and parts of western Europe, back under white Greek Roman rule! For almost 150 years the Carthaginians, Egyptian Europeans, Iberians and Numidians ruled their own daily affairs, but they had to deal not only with invading white tribes (mainly of Germanic origins), they also had to deal with those white tribes who were already long established on their lands, as well as the white Greek Romans, who colonized their beloved western European and northern African lands, long before.

Sounds like a bunch of bull, especially to white people I would assume, but we must remember that the western Roman Empire vanished (it was gobbled up by the Carthaginians), yet the eastern Roman Empire survived, though as an subjugated kingdom which paid tribute of course. Anyway, I realize nearly

everyone will disregard this bit of very sensitive historical information. However, the Atlanteans themselves should carefully study those historic events which occurred between 350-550 to come to their own conclusions concerning those historical events. Before anything else we will put the Carthaginians first, over that of the Celtic and Germanic tribes, who were evidently uncivilized then. All one needs to know is that the mighty Carthaginians originally inhabited the western colonies of the Roman Empire, and the Carthaginians were still civilized and very numerous when those events occurred, and that speaks a great deal!

Perhaps when the Roman Empire brought England under Roman subjugation, is when the first whites gradually settled down throughout what is now England, Ireland and Scotland to live permanently. Although white historians strongly believe that the whites originally lived in England, Ireland and Scotland long before the Roman Empire came into existence, it will be extremely important for the Atlanteans themselves, to do future research on this subject, if only to satisfy their own curiosities.

For some reason the Atlanteans were compelled to get up and send their powerful military straight into that Mediterranean Sea region 11,500 years ago. Most people will probably choose “greed” over any other possible reason for the Atlanteans making the decision to invade and then bring the many different Mediterranean Kingdoms under their control. Then we have that subject of prophesy to also not ignore! If Atlantean leaders were under that prophesy predicament (we know just how powerful prophesy is at the present time, prophesy has been part of human life since ancient times) they just may have sincerely believed in it but, they may have taken prophesy a bit too far, and in fact, we might want to conclude that the Atlanteans took prophesy “way too far,” if prophesy drove on the mighty Atlanteans to invade and, then conquer, most of the Mediterranean Sea region.

For all we know the Atlanteans may have been the first people to take prophesy “way too far.” In fact, the Atlanteans may have been driven by prophesy to invade the Mediterranean region (probably a lot of other regions as well) to attempt to continue to hold on to what was obviously extremely precious to them. Their hearts were obviously in with keeping that beautiful Mediterranean region a part of where they originated at. Of course, the Atlanteans were just as aware of prophesy as modern day humans, and they as well took prophesy just as seriously as modern day humans do.

The Semitic Arabs

Possibly the last location colonized by the Algonquians (of course, they likely predated the Carthaginians), the Middle East today is largely a desert. During the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

time of the first Atlantean immigrants into what is now the Middle East, that was not so, and there certainly had to be considerable amounts of good agriculture land around long before 11,500 years ago, and a favorable climate that supported agriculture operations. The Semitic people of the Middle East, I believe are descended from the Atlanteans of northern Africa, or they could possibly be descended from the Egyptian Europeans.

The Arab people who are so well known today, originated in what is now Saudi Arabia during the seventh century A.D., and it was the birth of a new religion that influenced the Arabs incredible civilization and empire, and their expansions. In a short time these Semitic people of the Middle East, created an empire that stretched from China to western Europe. For the most part these Semitic people have escaped total European domination, thanks to their location in the Middle East, which is very unusual, yet their black and white brethren are obviously living among them, and they are largely mixed in race as well.

Their kin in northern Africa, the Berbers, may be under the rule of Arabs but both the Arabs and the Berbers are of Semitic origin, and do not need to greatly worry about possible European domination at the present time. The empire and civilization of the Arabs, greatly changed European civilization, as the Europeans rediscovered very important Roman and Greek historical documents and ideas, that they lost after the fall of the Roman Empire, from the Arabs. Like their Jewish kin, the Semitic Arabs greatest contribution to human civilization may be their religion, which at the present time has close to one billion followers worldwide, and may one day in the future, surpass Christianity as the worlds most popular religion.

We know the Semitic Arabs at the present time, are still concerned about the recent events of the past sixty years in Palestine, but unlike their involvement in the earlier years of the Palestinian-Jewish conflict, presently, their involvement in that conflict is limited, which is probably due to the influence of the empire of England. It may be that the Semitic Arabs do not see any sense in continuing their united support for their Palestinian kin, against their Jewish kin, because they know the empire of England will not tolerate anything less than a Jewish State, even if it means initiating war to accomplish just that. The Semitic Arabs know that the Jewish people are also Semitic, and they also know about the horrible crime committed against their Jewish Semitic kin during World War II, and the Arabs also know that racism was one of the instigators that led to that horrific crime.

Sooner or later the conflict in the Middle East will reach its end, and the empire of England will have accomplished the successful creation of the nation

of Israel. Sadly the former Carthaginian Arab inhabitants of Palestine are the main victims of that conflict presently, and the Palestinian future has nothing of value, unless they can somehow manage to unite their communities, economically and politically, as a way to survive as a people. There is no sense in continuing their struggle against Israel because in reality Israel is not their enemy.

Their enemy is indeed the white Europeans. The Semitic Palestinians need to organize their communities, economically and politically, to see that their people do survive as a people, and that their people are well taken care of, instead of continuing to protest against Israel. Surviving as a people is far more important, especially when its extremely clear its absolutely hopeless to put up resistance of any kind.

The empire of England has the entire world in the palms of their hands, to do with as they please, and that should be well understood by all wise Palestinian leaders. Palestinian leaders should recognize that the only way the Palestinian people are going to survive as a people, is by intelligent leadership that puts the welfare of the Palestinian people above everything else. If the Palestinians do not do that they will disappear forever. Make no doubts about it, the world could care less if the Palestinian people disappear altogether as a people. I realize that proud and determined Palestinian leaders will continue their struggle for the return of their land, and sadly they have very little support and they know who they can blame that on. The Jews have to have incredible resentment against white Europeans for the horrific crimes inflicted upon them by the white Europeans, and I do believe the Jewish people have not spoken their lasts words about the horrific crimes they were forced to endure by their white brethren.

The Egyptian Africans

The Egyptian-Kush Conflict

The Egyptian people are very important to the history of human civilization, and some people may claim that there are no people who are more important to the history of human civilization than the Egyptian people. The Nile River is why Egypt existed in the first place, and without the almost yearly flooding of the Nile, agriculture could never thrive in that part of our earth. Egypt is almost entirely a desert now with summer maximum temperatures that frequently hit 110 degrees or even hotter. But during the ice age the Atlanteans probably knew the climate of Egypt, as an temperate place (if there really are ice ages) with warm to hot summers, and cool winters, and also a wetter place compared to Egypt at the present time.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Modern historians consider the time period from 3000 B.C. to 2500 B.C., to be the beginning of the great Egyptian civilization, but I am not among them. My theory about the origins of the Egyptian people, will be unacceptable to most, because I believe Atlantis is where the Egyptian people originated. It is most likely that the first wave of Algonquian colonists into eastern Europe, were the ancestors of the Egyptian people now known historically, yet there is that 1000 year period between 9500 B.C. and 8500 B.C. when the Egyptian Europeans had as of yet, entered Egypt. That 1000 year period is extremely fascinating for I suspect that the Carthaginians ruled Egypt then.

We know that Egypt is at least 10,000 years old, but as for the ancestors of the Greek people of southern Europe (probably the Egyptian Europeans), they are 1000 years older according to the Atlantis legend. Though none of us have knowledge of the history of the Egyptian people from 8500 B.C. to 4000 B.C., the Egyptians and their civilization, most certainly existed then, and changed with the changing times. At the height of the Egyptian Empire there existed no other nation of people (excepting possibly the Carthaginians) who were powerful enough to put the fear in the Egyptian people. Egypt will always be remembered by historians as the first great civilized nation of people, even though there is important historical evidence that suggests otherwise. Early Egyptian conquests against their neighbors, apparently included an Egyptian conquest against their Nubian neighbors to the south of Egypt, in the present location of Sudan. But did the Algonquians settled that region first as I believe, after they settled Egypt.

During the time of this feud between the blacks and Egyptians, the Egyptians, if history is correct, were independent and thriving which, not to forget certain historical records, does suggest that the Egyptians were never subjugated by that invading Atlantean force, who were probably the Carthaginians. If the Egyptians had been subjugated by the invading Atlanteans, the Atlantean subjugation over Egypt was not to be a long one. If Egypt was subjugated then won their freedom later on, the Egyptians did so by rising up against the invaders into their beloved land, and by using their pure military might to rid Egypt of them. Anyway, worse was in store for Asian Egypt for new races of humans emerged after the Mediterranean had been settled with countless civilized communities.

War between Egypt and Nubia, started around 1550 B.C., and lasted to around 1450 B.C., when the Egyptians under the leadership of one of their kings, finally conquered the Nubians, who happen to be black and were just as civilized as the Egyptians, or so they tell us. Egyptian rule over Nubia, lasted nearly 500 years but, unfortunately, for the Egyptian people their Nubian subjects grew tired of the rule of their northern neighbors, and new warfare again erupted that

in the end saw the Nubians turn the Egyptian people into their subjects. I consider the Nubian conquest over the Egyptian people as possibly the date when Atlantean rule over Egypt finally came to an abrupt end.

Though I can't rightfully declare I am correct, I believe that it is close to the truth, unless there may of occurred sometime during the time period of 9000 B.C. to 3000 B.C., another conquest of the Egyptian people by another people that we have no knowledge of presently, who were unrelated. I believe that the blacks in reality, came up from the south of Sudan, from maybe Ethiopia, or somewhere in that vicinity, and after adopting the civilized lifestyle of the Egyptians, they eventually conquered the Egyptians, including their Nubian territory.

In fact, I will admit that its likely the Nubian conquest over the Egyptians took place long before the current accepted date for that historic event. By 662 B.C. the Nubian rule over Egypt had come to an end, as new nations arose to the north of Egypt, who were slightly more advanced and certainly far more powerful militarily. From the end of Nubian rule, to the rise of the first great white civilizations, the Egyptians were in control of their own affairs, but that was only to be short lived. After the Nubian conquest over Egypt, the Atlantean Egyptians witnessed wave after wave of new conquerors and peoples, and because of that they became so mixed in race that a new race of people or Egyptians, emerged.

I don't believe the blacks conquered the Egyptians, including their Nubian territory, in the year historians tell us the events occurred, which is around 750 B.C., but I believe the blacks actually conquered the Atlantean Egyptians probably somewhere between 3000 B.C. to 9000 B.C. And if that is correct, it would certainly mean that black people have been civilized an incredibly long time, which I would not at all be surprised is actually the truth.

Hints from a few historians and archaeologists, about a possible Atlantis origin for the Egyptian people are easily noticeable, but there is in place a taboo, or at least I think so, that it would be very wise not to openly discuss the possibility of an actual Egyptian link to Atlantis. I freely admit that I believe that the Egyptian people are the Atlanteans, and I know most people will declare that I am wrong. Presently, I know very little about what archaeologists have truly learned from the remaining hieroglyphics on the monuments and ruins of Egypt, but I am more than curious about this subject, as I believe they know something that most of us do not have knowledge of currently. That knowledge which is unknown to most of us, may involve historical records about Egyptian connections to Atlantis, or to go one step further, there could actually be important evidence which involves DNA found in the very numerous mummies of Egypt, which links the Egyptians to Native Americans as well.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The Egyptian Europeans

The Egyptian European—White European conflict

Up in Europe, particularly in the Greece vicinity where the Egyptian Europeans originated, the fate of the Egyptian Europeans was a bit different than the fate of the African Egyptians who were absorbed by invading blacks and whites, and were incapable of dominating them during time of war. In the Greece vicinity, after the whites gradually expanded their territories, which were most definitely in the midst of the Egyptian Europeans, they eventually forced their way into the heart of Egyptian Europe by using their military might, but they were not capable of subjugating the Egyptian Europeans until after Rome's western empire collapsed. In fact, what is probably more than just remarkable about the Egyptian Europeans during the time of the existence of the mighty Roman Empire, deals with the Egyptian Europeans thriving as a people then, for they are very likely the Huns. Of course, the Huns combated the mighty Romans and did so successfully, or they prevented Rome from subjugating them. That fact says a great deal about the Egyptian Europeans.

After the collapse of Rome's western colonies, what eventually followed was civilization being adapted by nearly all of Europe's whites, who would eventually become so numerous they would completely surround the Egyptian Europeans in a manner which separated the Egyptian Europeans from each other. Once the whites had surrounded the Egyptian Europeans and became more numerous, they would eventually "ignore the Egyptian Europeans," which represents the whites not trading with them, recognizing them, carrying on diplomatic relations with them and basically viewing them as being worthless. That is what finally subjugated the once mighty Egyptian Europeans. Indeed, the Egyptian Europeans were formidable, and in fact, they may have been the most powerful of the non whites of the Mediterranean region, excepting probably the Carthaginians. Egyptian Europeans can proudly claim that they were subjugated by the whites but only after they were rightfully not dominated by the whites during time of war.

The Etruscans

The Etruscan—Roman War

We have been given good enough reason to believe that Italy's Etruscans are the Carthaginians, yet we also know of other tantalizing historical evidence which suggests otherwise. Long before the mighty Roman Empire existed in beautiful Italy, the Etruscan people and their wonderful civilization flourished. Yet are the Etruscans the Italian Atlantean Carthaginians (they obviously controlled Italy or

at least most of Italy, with southern Italy likely under Carthaginian control)? Or are the Etruscans truly an separate distinct people from both the whites and Atlanteans as well? I mention that because, realistically, before the rise of the Etruscans, there may have existed in Italy an civilization of unknown creation. Yet I must single out the Etruscans and refer to their ancient predicament even though I suspect that they were Carthaginian, but likely not! The Etruscan civilization supposedly existed no later than 1000 B.C., or close to three centuries before the founding of Rome.

Obviously the hard part is determining who were the last Atlanteans to colonize the Mediterranean region. Two suggestions prevail and they are the Carthaginians and the Etruscans. Since Italy is mentioned in the Story of Atlantis as being part of the Atlantean Empire, we should then look upon Carthage as being their capitol, for they may have ruled all of northern Africa, which is definitely a major accomplishment that suggests that Africa was far more important to them. Anyway, at their height the Carthaginians Empire included Europe, from Italy to the Atlantic (that likely included England, Ireland and Scotland), all of north Africa, and all of the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea as well. If they also ruled other far off lands as the Story of Atlantis suggests, it would have included all of North America, possibly all of South America, some parts of Australia, Indonesia, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Polynesia and Taiwan. But we must remember that they were from North America, or their capitol was first there in North America. If their empire did include all those regions it may have been the largest empire ever.

Just prior to the whites gaining control over Italy, they had forcefully brought eastern Europe (eastern Europe was the homeland of the mighty Egyptian Europeans) under their control by driving out the mighty Egyptian Europeans, but they didn't bring the mighty Egyptian Europeans under their subjugation, for they only went off to find new real estate where they could continue to exist independently from the invading whites. The Egyptian Europeans likely fled to more northerly European locations such as Hungary, Romania and the Ukraine to better resist the onslaught of the invading whites.

Before Rome became the power Rome eventually became, they were the subjects of their northern neighbors, the Etruscans, for much of their early years, and that bit of information is mysterious to me because if the Etruscans are the descendents of the Atlanteans, it represents an Italian Atlantean conquest over the white Italians. Yet if it does it likely occurred at a time when there were very few whites in Italy, or during the period when the whites were first beginning to fight their way into the heart of Atlantean Europe. There was constant contact between the Etruscan people and their Roman subjects, which resulted in an

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

exchange of architecture, language, religion, and the arts also, and among them the Romans borrowed from the Etruscan people their knowledge of the construction of sewers, aqueduct's, bridges, the arch, and much of their religious beliefs.

Sadly the Etruscan people may of influenced the Romans to popularize the gladiator games, as the gladiator games are probably of Etruscan origins. Likewise, the Etruscans willingly borrowed from their neighbors and former subjects, the Romans, many of their construction, arts, and religious innovations also. I would hope that the Romans did not totally destroy the Italian Atlantean presence in Italy, yet it wouldn't surprise me if that occurred. I sense that the Italian Atlanteans civilization was one of especially great importance.

Some historians believe that the Etruscan people are in some way related to the Semitic people of northern Africa, and the Middle East. I, myself, think that the Semitic people and the Etruscans are related, but also as well, the Basque people of western Europe can be classified as Semitic to, yet the Basque people, and the Etruscans of Italy, are definitely more closely related to each other than they are to the Semitic people. It is far more likely they will discover any relationships if they exist, between the Basque people and the Etruscans of southern Europe, simply because they lived side by side each other. The same also applies to the Berbers of northern Africa, who must be the Semitic people more closely related to the Basque People and the Etruscans, if they are as I believe, closely related, simply because of their close proximity to the Basque people.

Around 753 B.C. Rome was founded by the Latin people of that region. I believe the Latin people are Greeks, who originally lived further to the east in what is now Greece and Turkey or, possibly, and I base this on accents, the Slavic people. Southern Italy was most likely the first location colonized by the invading Greeks, if they did invade from the east, who brought with them their civilized way of life that one day would dominate not only the Mediterranean region, but also the entire earth. The Greeks who lived in close proximity to the Etruscans, certainly had respect for their neighbors civilization and military power, and you know from reading earlier they were under Etruscan rule early in their history.

Once the expanding Greeks founded their first permanent settlements in Italy, over time they likely evolved into the Latin Europeans who later on impressed the world with the Roman Empire. By 510 B.C., the Latin's had become very numerous and weary of their Etruscan neighbors subjugation over them, and under the leadership of Brutus Junius, they made war against their unwanted Etruscan rulers. After the Latin victory the Republic of Rome

followed, but the Etruscans proved to be more than willing to attempt to win back, by war, their former Roman subjects. The Roman military prevented the Etruscans from succeeding and afterwards, one by one, the Etruscan city states fell to the Romans powerful military, and the Etruscans eventually lost their identity forever. The Roman conquest of the Etruscan city states started in 396 B.C., and by the beginning of the second century B.C., the Romans had conquered all of the city states of their Etruscan neighbors.

But the Etruscan people did not disappear forever they were absorbed by the ever growing empire of Rome, and likely were allowed by the Romans to freely choose where to live in the Roman Empire, during certain peaceful times. Though their language is no longer spoken, there remains many words of the Etruscan language that were written on monuments, or on other sources. Their language is considered mysterious because we presently do not know which language family the Etruscan language belongs to.

During the years when Rome was first flexing their own military might against the Etruscans, the Etruscans were apparently in some form of alliance with the mighty Carthaginians on occasions. The Greeks were on the move into western Europe, which was obviously known of by the Etruscans but especially the Carthaginians, who were before the rise of the Greeks then Romans, the mightiest empire of the Mediterranean region. Originally, the Greeks were from Asia Minor and were prone to fighting with the mighty Persians, particularly around 800 B.C. to 550 B.C. when the two warring white peoples were trying to dominate one another.

Directly as a result of the intense warfare between the Greeks and Persians, the Greeks were compelled to expand their lands further out into the western Mediterranean Sea and the surrounding northern lands. That is probably how Rome was founded. After gaining their stronghold in Italy, the whites would eventually give battle to the Etruscans for the ownership of all the beautiful land of Italy. Not very many historical records of those ancient European wars has survived on to the present time, but at least we do have some historical records of those ancient historical events. As we already know, the Etruscans once ruled the Romans before the Romans eventually became the mighty Roman Empire. That was when the Etruscans were yet powerful enough to force their will. However, once the whites were well established in Italy things would begin to change slowly at first, but then at an accelerated speed once the whites gained more land and resources, or became more wealthier. What follows are a few of the battles which the Etruscans and Romans fought.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The Battle of Alalia

This very ancient battle involved the expanding Greeks, and the military alliance of the Carthaginians and the Etruscans. Historians do not know of the exact date when the Battle of Alalia occurred, but anywhere from 540 B.C. to 535 B.C. could be correct. This ancient naval battle involved nearly 200 ships and was an decisive victory for the Carthaginians and the Etruscans. The location of the Battle of Alalia apparently occurred off the Corsican coast. Before the Battle of Alalia occurred, Corsica was apparently shared by both the Carthaginians and the Etruscans. Of the 60 Greek ships which took part in the naval battle around 40 of them were either destroyed or captured by the Carthaginian-Etruscan alliance. Of the 120 Carthaginian-Etruscan ships involved in the Battle of Alalia, the total number of their ships destroyed or captured is not presently known of. It doesn't take a genius to determine just why the Battle of Alalia actually occurred. Both the Carthaginians and Etruscans were trying to halt the expansion of the invading Greeks who, during that time, were making their way into the heart of southern Europe. By this time the Greeks were established well and the Etruscans were on the defensive in their homeland.

The Battle of Cumae

Another naval battle between the Etruscans and the expanding Greeks occurred in 474 B.C. Etruscans were still flexing their muscles in 474 B.C. to halt the expanding Greeks into their beloved land. However, in their attempts to defend their beloved land from the Greek invaders, the Etruscans were incapable of preventing the invading Greeks from settling more of their beloved land. The location of the Battle of Cumae, which the Etruscans were defeated by the expanding Greeks, was in the Bay of Naples. After the Etruscan defeat, the Etruscans as an free and independent people were near their end. However, for the time being the Etruscans were yet a part of the action to determine who controlled that land.

The Battle of Lake Vadimo

By the time the Battle of Lake Vadimo occurred (the battle took place in the year 309 B.C.) the Romans had so thoroughly dominated the Etruscan city states it apparently had left only two Etruscan city states willing to rise up to give battle to the Romans, to attempt to regain their once glorious might. Roman soldiers were not in for an quick and easily won battle at Lake Vadimo, nor were the Etruscan soldiers who participated in the Battle of Lake Vadimo, going to quickly give in. After the two rivals with the control of beautiful Italy in their

thoughts, met on the battlefield, what followed was apparently an long battle which neither foe was capable of controlling. Over time, however, the Roman soldiers began to wear down the Etruscan soldiers they were battling, which arose as a result of Roman determination to prevail, and other unfortunate circumstances which the Etruscan soldiers were dealt during the intense battle against their Roman rivals. Although the Etruscans were not the equals of the Carthaginians, they were proud and determined to survive the onslaught of the invading whites, and that manifested during what many describe as the largest land battle between the Etruscans and Romans ever to occur.

Interestingly, and this is out of my own confusion, the Romans didn't flat out demand of the defeated Etruscans their absolute total subjugation to Rome, after the Etruscans were defeated at the Battle of Lake Vadimo. In the Etruscan-Roman agreements to end the war an truce was agreed upon which was to last some 40 years. Probably the greatest desire of the Romans in the treaty agreement, was the land of the Etruscans which was demanded of by the Romans. For the time being the Romans would obviously be satisfied with the new real estate they forcefully acquired from the Etruscans. It meant further growth for the Romans, and their leaders would patiently wait while their kingdom grew more populous and more wealthier, to resume their never ending quests of expanding their empire.

The Battle of Populonia

In the ensuing 27 years after the Battle of Lake Vadimo, the Romans had obviously laid down the foundations for many more new Roman settlements throughout the new land they forcefully acquired from the Etruscans. Sooner or later the land hungry Romans were going to deliberately entice trouble with the still independent Etruscan city states left in Etruria. That event occurred in 282 B.C. and very likely arose directly as a result of the Roman determination to acquire more land for their people. The Romans were victorious against the Etruscans at the Battle of Populonia in 282 B.C.

Once the Etruscan city states (their civilization is known historically as Etruria) had been completely assimilated by the Romans, the Etruscans would lose their identity. Unfortunately, the Etruscans had to deal with the invading whites from their north as well as from their south. Of the tribes of whites who forced their way upon the beautiful land of the Italian Etruscans (they were the Celts and Latin's) the Latin's would eventually dominate the Etruscans in Italy. However, the Celtic tribes were accustomed to waging war upon Italy's inhabitants as well, yet the Celts were kept to the north and the west, where they eventually forced

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

their way into England, Ireland and Scotland and then replaced the original Native American population there.

Obviously just from knowing of the historical records of those ancient times, the Etruscans were not the equals of the mighty Carthaginians, and especially not of the mighty Egyptian Europeans, who were possibly the mightiest of the non whites of the Mediterranean region then. What is so impressive about the Italian Etruscan civilization deals with certain aspects about their contribution to human civilization. The city of Rome was likely founded by the Etruscans and not the whites.

If that is true it would simply mean that the city of Rome is far older than the 2750 years we believe the age of Rome to be currently. Rome had grown very wealthy by the time they controlled Italy, and the Romans were very aware of the mighty Carthaginians glorious empire (the Carthaginian Empire was by the time Rome controlled Italy, already a good 7000 to 8000 years old or even older), whose land and wealth was definitely greatly admired by the land hungry white Romans. Unlike the Etruscans 36 so called city states, Rome was to encounter an Carthaginian Empire which stretched from the shores of western Europe to southern Italy, to the eastern Mediterranean Sea's coastline, and probably all of northern Africa excepting, possibly Egypt.

Other Possible Algonquian Colonies

The Polynesians

If we are to believe what historians theorize about the origins of the Polynesian people, then the Polynesian people originally lived in southeast Asia, and possibly as long as two thousand years ago, the first Polynesian immigrants from the mainland of Asia, arrived at one of the first islands of the Pacific Ocean that the Polynesians colonized. That is not so easy to believe, especially when we know that the Algonquians, or Atlanteans if you prefer, from the mainland of North America, were fully capable of sailing from North America to Africa, and Europe as well, as long ago as 11,500 years ago. It is, or it was possibly, a good three thousand miles, that separated North America from Africa and Europe 11,500 years ago, and if my theory is correct that the Atlanteans were fully capable of sailing from North America to Africa and Europe 11,500 years ago, than I believe the Atlanteans were also fully capable of sailing around the entire world 11,500 years ago at least.

From New Zealand, to Hawaii, to Tahiti the Europeans forced their way onto the lands of the Polynesian people, taking their land and leaving them with very little remaining land to call their own, yet the Polynesians have survived. Even if the Polynesians were not in any way related to the Atlanteans, what they accomplished nearly two thousand years ago, is not only remarkable, but unthinkable for those times. Long before the Europeans, or any other people got their courage up to explore the worlds oceans, the Polynesians had long settled the Pacific Oceans islands, and keep in mind that the islands colonized by the Polynesian people were separated by thousands of miles, and in some cases the islands were separated by a distance greater than North America is to Africa and Europe.

The Polynesian languages are in fact related to the languages of the Filipinos, Indonesians, the Chamic languages of Cambodia and Vietnam, as well as to the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

languages of the very far off (it is in close proximity of eastern Africa) Madagascar, and Malaysia as well. In fact, the language family is called Malayo-Polynesian. Historians theorize that the Polynesians were driven from Malaysia by invaders possibly from some distant location on the mainland of Asia. But I theorize that Indonesia, Malaysia, Cambodia and Vietnam may of possibly been first inhabited by some native Asian people, and that the Atlanteans who were, of course, the Polynesians, were intruders on their lands.

Of course, the Polynesians are directly descended from Native Americans. Although white historians adamantly believe that the Polynesians are native to what is considered as Polynesia now, I believe that the Polynesians are native to what white historians consider Australasia, Melanesia and Micronesia, and not intruders. The whites and blacks are late intruders to what they consider Australasia, Melanesia and Micronesia Since much of the ocean depth around Australia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea and the Philippines is from sea level to 650 feet, that suggests that before the great floods occurred that region may have been above water.

The New Zealand Polynesians

These Polynesians were fortunate to have colonized the beautiful islands that make up New Zealand. In comparisons, probably only Australia is the largest set of land that the Polynesians colonized, and they probably colonized Australia by coming directly from the nearby New Zealand islands. New Zealand's Maori people or tribes, were not like the Polynesians of Hawaii who were inclined to deal with the invading whites in more of an peaceful manner. After Captain Cook discovered for England (other Europeans were first to pay a visit to New Zealand) the beautiful islands of Maori New Zealand, it wouldn't take England too long to discover an attraction for the beautiful and bountiful lands of the Maori Tribes. England would also eventually learn that the Maori were very defensive of the beautiful and bountiful lands that their ancestors handed down to them. Starting probably in the 1780s, the whites would frequently show up in Maori New Zealand to conduct business activities such as sealers and whalers who were very anxious to be permitted by the Maori, the opportunity to hunt for the seals and whales which frequented their waters.

We are also taught that escaped convicts and deserters (most likely their truly referring to black slaves) were problematic to New Zealand's Maori people as were they also to Australia's Polynesians. About 1830 we are taught that the population of the whites and blacks among the Maori of New Zealand was apparently some 2000, but within the next few decades that number would dramatically multiply. The Maori referred to the whites as Pakeha Maori.

Many of those Pakeha Maori were inclined to live like the Maori, which does suggest that they were blacks instead of white, and probably closely related to the blacks that the whites let loose in Australia. Maori history is very similar to that of the Native Americans along the eastern coastline of Canada and the United States, particularly concerning the Europeans weapons. Once the Maori had established trade ventures with the invading whites, they eventually began to acquire large numbers of European guns, which led them to use them on each others distinct tribes, which resulted in the complete annihilation of some of those Maori Tribes, as it had also happened in North America. Even more demeaning to the Maori, they fell easy victims to the European diseases which they also had never known of. Some historians have estimated that upwards to 50% of the Maori New Zealand population was eliminated directly as a result of those European diseases.

Come the late 1830s, problems were arising between the Maori and the invading whites and blacks, which didn't go unnoticed by English leaders whose attention was most definitely focused on eventually sending large numbers of their settlers to Maori New Zealand, to take their beautiful and bountiful lands. It was Christian troublemakers who did a lot of complaining to England's leaders, who included Queen Victoria. Queen Victoria actually had the nerve to claim that Maori New Zealand was English New Zealand in January of 1840. The brave Queen Victoria's actions were definitely illegal but still yet brave, yet the English queen probably knew that the Maori of New Zealand would stand up to defend their beautiful and bountiful New Zealand lands, from her corrupted subjects. Once the Maori were enticed to negotiate a treaty with England (its very likely that most if not all of the Maori chiefs didn't understand just what the Treaty of Waitangi true intentions were) after Queen Victoria bravely proclaimed that their land was now part of England, a great many of New Zealand's Maori chiefs signed that treaty, minus a few important Maori chiefs of course.

It wouldn't take too long for some of the Maori to rise up and complain bitterly about the illegal actions of the invading English. One Edward Gibbon Wakefield, who was apparently a captain (he also was an principal officer in the New Zealand Company), was under the impression that the Maori had sold them an large tract of their land, which he in turn sold to English settlers who would learn that the Maori didn't agree with their illegal actions. Two outraged Maori chiefs (Te Rauparaha and Te Rangiheta) paid a visit to Wakefield to debate his illegal actions. They both loudly protested to Wakefield that the land was theirs and they hadn't sold it to the English. Wakefield went and got brave

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

and proclaimed that the intentions of the English were to send their surveyors to the disputed land to survey it, and if any Maori decided to get brave enough to protest their illegal actions, they would be apprehended.

The Wairau Affray

Around 1843 the first disputes between the New Zealand Maori and the invading English would occur. The Maori were obviously aware and extremely concerned about the English who had built an English settlement around Nelson, which was on New Zealand's south island, and probably was in existence directly as a result of the Maori having been given the impression that the English would use that settlement for trade purposes with them. However, what followed was the deliberate English acts of purchasing land from the Maori in order to allow English settlers to settle Maori land in that region. Many of those groups of English settlers who purchased that Maori land from the Maori, would learn that the Maori didn't comprehend the agreements made, which suggests that the whites were speaking in the forked tongue. Anyway, what would occur after the disputes erupted were usually settled, but one apparent group of English invaders was too impatient to wait to end their dispute with the Maori, then unanimously agreed to use violence to get that Maori land that they were there for.

However, the two previously mentioned Maori chiefs, continued to pursue an peaceful resolution to the land disagreement by conducting negotiations with more powerful English leaders, yet the two Maori chiefs probably didn't understand that the only reason that they were in a land dispute with the English, was directly as a result of England's most powerful leaders, who were probably constructing some sort of conspiracy to get that Maori land. Wakefield sent his surveyors to survey that Maori land he thought was legally England's land, but they were intercepted by around 100 or Maori warriors under the command of Maori chief Te Rauparaha, who was not about to allow the English to have their way. In the following fiasco, the enraged Maori warriors destroyed the survey equipment of the invading English, then apprehended the English survey team then led them back to one of their nearby villages.

Upon hearing of their survey team's arrest by the enraged Maori, those impatient English I have previously mentioned, agreed to return to chief Te Rauparaha to arrest him for his apprehension of the English survey team, and the destruction of their survey equipment. After reaching the Maori village where chief Te Rauparaha resided, the Maori chief was obviously in the mood to conduct peace negotiations for he permitted some six of those English officials

to release their complaints about his actions before him. What chief Te Rauparaha received, however, was an atmosphere of war surrounding those six English officials who were more than a bit upset with the brave Maori chiefs actions.

Chief Te Rauparaha angrily explained to the embittered English that he was protecting his peoples domain when he ordered his brave warriors to destroy the English survey equipment and arrest them. In response, those six English officials bravely told chief Te Rauparaha that they were placing him under arrest, and in fact, those six English officials got brave enough to produce the handcuffs before the deeply angered Maori chief's eyes, which definitely captured the outraged Maori chiefs full complete attention. With the Maori chiefs anger fully evident now before them, it embittered those six English officials on even further more, for they then escalated the disagreement to the point of no return by warning the Maori that they would order their soldiers who had accompanied them, who were waiting patiently just outside the village, to commence to fire upon their village. When a threat such as that one is given it usually ends up igniting a war and that is what occurred after the Maori received and comprehended the English warning. The battle that followed was a short one as well as an Maori victory.

Many of the English soldiers involved in the battle fled only to be captured by the enraged Maori then killed afterwards, probably to avenge the deaths of the Maori villages inhabitants, some of whom were women and children. Some 22 of those English soldiers of that English war party were killed in the battle and afterwards. However, if the English had insisted upon an more peaceful attitude with the Maori, they all probably would have lived to see another day come and go, but within their minds were thoughts of greed for themselves, and it was that insatiable appetite for wealth that produced the battle that occurred on June 17, 1843.

After the news of the battle was received by the English in New Zealand, English settlers widely protested that retribution should occur, but the English were at fault for there being a battle on June 17, 1843 against the Maori, for the Maori were attempting to peacefully settle the dispute with the English settlers at the moment that battle commenced, by negotiating with those more powerful English leaders. Unfortunately, selfishness was the determining factor on June 17, 1843 when the subject of land was debated between the invading English and the Maori. Although the invading English and the Maori had fought a battle on June 17, 1843 it didn't lead to an all out war, which likely occurred as the result of the main New Zealand English leaders keeping their heads calm and

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

straightforward, while the Maori attempted to negotiate with them over the very, very sensitive issue of land ownership. However, the peace which followed would not last too long after the peace came.

The Flagstaff War (March 11, 1845-January 11, 1846)

Were intelligent enough to understand what brought forth the Flagstaff War. When the Maori signed the Waitangi Treaty in February of 1840, they unknowingly signed for future wars against the mighty English Empire. Undoubtedly, the English spoke in the forked tongue while negotiating the Treaty of Waitangi with the native Maori of New Zealand, who probably were enticed by the invading English into accepting that the only reason for the English being so willing to negotiate a treaty with them, was to establish trading posts (obviously the English considered the trading posts to be future English cities and villages throughout beautiful New Zealand and not sites to carry on trade ventures with the New Zealand Maori) throughout New Zealand so trade could be conducted between the Maori and the invading English.

Of course, the English requested of the New Zealand Maori some of their beautiful land in order to establish those trading posts and to probably farm that land to feed the trading posts inhabitants. On May 21, 1840 England formally annexed Maori New Zealand, which to England and English citizens, represented Maori land was now theirs for the buying and selling, even if meant that the native Maori were incapable of comprehending the very unlawful actions of the English.

It really didn't matter anyway, for even before that date the invading English were already busy initiating problems with the native Maori of New Zealand, which were centered on purchasing Maori land to sell to the invading English. Sooner or later an war (not just an battle) was going to erupt between the New Zealand Maori and the invading English, over the very sensitive issue of land ownership, or who were the true owners of the disputed land. All that was required was the wars ignition for the Maori to stand up to defend their land. An prominent Maori chief, Hone Heke, who signed that 1840 land debacle treaty, who had probably established in his thoughts that the English were only referring to conducting trade ventures with his subjects, by 1844 knew that the invading English were definitely up to no good.

After an female Maori went to live with an English butcher in Kororareka, Hone Heke and several of his warriors or body guards, went to that town to retrieve the Maori female from that English butcher. Most likely Hone Heke was in the mood for standing up to the invading English to prevent them from taking

their land, which Hone Heke by the time of that event, definitely knew that the English were conspiring to do. While Hone Heke and his warriors were in Kororaraka, they eradicated the English flagstaff from their view for it must have immensely ticked them off.

Obviously by destroying that English flagpole the Maori were letting the English know that an “atmosphere for war” was now floating throughout that region of beautiful New Zealand. Shortly afterwards, Governor Fitzroy arrived to the Kororaraka region along with 170 English soldiers, which the Maori (that includes Hone Heke) obviously learned of (Fitzroy requested of the nearby Maori to come for a conference to attempt to peacefully come to a resolution about the unfortunate incident) after his arrival. Many Maori chiefs did in fact go to that peace conference, excepting Hone Heke who was obviously in the mood for war. If Hone Heke had been willing to give peace a chance he certainly would have shown up at that peace conference, so once the English gradually accepted that Hone Heke was still in the mood for trouble they knew that a war was going to come. Meanwhile, another unfortunate incident occurred among another nearby Maori tribe who are known as the Nga Puhi, whose leader, Kawiti, obviously became somewhat embarrassed with his own stature after learning of “the brave actions of Hone Heke.” Kawiti was definitely influenced by Hone Heke’s actions and that was really all that was necessary for the Maori who participated in the Flagstaff War, to go on the warpath against the invading English.

After the peace conference Hone Heke destroyed the new English flagpole which the invading English had constructed after the first one was destroyed by the outraged Maori under Hone Heke’s leadership. More English soldiers were then ordered in to raise a new English flagpole but after learning of the new flagpole’s construction, the Maori once again destroyed that new English flagpole. With the raising of a new stronger fourth English flagpole, the English made the decision to build a guard post around it to attempt to stop the enraged Maori from attempting to destroy it. Getting wise to the predicament Governor Fitzroy requested for more reinforcements to bolster up the present number of English soldiers in the Kororaraka region, for the war that was soon to come. On March 11, 1845 the enraged Maori showed up a fourth time at the English flagstaff but this time the Maori would have no choice but to use extreme violence to destroy the fourth English flagstaff, if they actually wanted to destroy that English flagstaff, and that’s exactly what occurred. Upon the arrival of the brave Maori warriors to the English flagstaff, and the guard post, and brave English soldiers who protected it, the Maori warriors were ordered to not only

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

destroy the English flagstaff, but to kill those English soldiers who protected it as well, which they eventually did successfully.

During the time that the Maori were attacking the English guard post that surrounded the symbol of their outrage, Kawiti and his warriors rose up to attack the town of Kororareka, to rid their land of the invading English hordes. Upon learning that the Maori were attacking Kororareka, the 100 or so English soldiers stationed in Kororareka were ordered to defend the city against the enraged Maori, while the city's inhabitants attempted to evacuate Kororareka by boarding the nearby English sailing vessels that were located in the nearby bay, which was done successfully by them. The town of Kororareka was burnt down by the victorious Maori afterwards. Some 46 English were killed or wounded during the battles.

What the English did afterwards was actively search for Maori allies who possibly would aid their cause, which they were successful at doing. It was common at that time for intertribal warfare between Maori tribes and that was obviously known of by the English, who found willing Maori tribes (most likely they were embittered enemies of those Maori tribes waging war on the invading English) who were willing to join the English cause, but the English very likely spoke in the forked tongue to those Maori tribes who allied with the invading English. Of course, the English made promises to their Maori allies that they never intended on keeping, which were very similar to what the English also used throughout the eastern United States, before the American Revolutionary War, and even after the American Revolutionary War.

The burning of Pomere's Pa

On April 30, 1845 the English who had already been reinforced with new arrivals of their own troops, arrived at an Maori pa (an Maori pa represented an fortified village of the Maori who constantly fought amongst themselves, so to better withstand the onslaught of their enemy's assaults on their villages, their villages were constructed specifically with survival at the top of the list of concerns, which does resemble the siege war tactics of the Europeans) known historically as Pomere.

With their arrival to the Maori village of Pomere, what greeted the English military force was an Maori chief of Pomere who evidently wasn't an enemy of the English (he apparently was considered as neutral), but that didn't stop the English from apprehending the neutral Maori chief, who probably wasn't in the best of moods after being taken prisoner by the English, and after learning about what the English eventually did to the village he was the chief of. After being taken

prisoner by the English, the Maori chief instructed his warriors to not give battle to the English, which they were coherently successful at doing. After the English soldiers took control of the Maori village of Pomere, they were ordered to torch the village to eradicate the settlement for good, including the trade goods that the Maori and English were inclined to exchange while conducting trade business with each other.

The Battle of Puketutu

With the Maori pa of Pomere no longer in existence, the next Maori pa that the English definitely wanted to eradicate was the Maori village where Hone Heke resided. Hone Heke's village was located alongside Lake Omapere. And his village was evidently not too far from certain enemy's he likely had to deal with from time to time, who the English (probably through spies) knew would probably side with England if they spoke in the forked tongue well enough to them, which they definitely endeavored in quite successfully. When the English arrived at their Maori allies village of Okaihau (the village was not too far from Hone Heke's village) they were politely welcomed by the villages inhabitants, who were definitely looking out for themselves, and probably thought that the English were in a special kind of way, there to aid them in their ongoing struggle against their nearby enemy's, who were standing up to the invading English in order to prevent the invading English from taking their beloved land.

Once the small force of English soldiers had established themselves in their Maori allies pa, they then agreed to first visit the region where Hone Heke's pa was located to determine if Hone Heke's Maori pa would be easily taken by them, or if in fact Hone Heke's Maori pa was strongly constructed. After the English rendezvous at Hone Heke's pa they carefully decided that the Maori pa was definitely going to be difficult to take, especially without their big guns, but not impossible. On May 8, 1845 the English soldiers carefully made their advance towards the Maori village of Puketutu (Hone Heke's pa) then opened up fire on the Maori pa by using some 12 rockets but they had little effect on the villages inhabitants.

With the battle now under way the Maori sent their brave warriors to defend their pa outside the villages walls, to give battle to the English soldiers assaulting them. They put up stiff resistance bravely, but over time the English soldiers gained the advantage over them, which then resulted in the Maori warriors retreating back into their village to join with the remaining Maori warriors to continue on with the battle against the invading English soldiers. Unfortunately, the English would eventually realize that Puketutu was too strongly built to take

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

without using their big guns, so after reluctantly accepting their unfortunate circumstance the English made their decision to head back to their base. The Maori had paid a dear price while bravely defending their homes against the invading English, suffering some 127 casualties, including 47 killed. English casualties at the Battle of Puketutu was some 52, including 14 killed.

The burning of Kapotai's Pa

English assaults on Maori villages continued on after the English lost the Battle of Puketutu on May 8, 1845. The English were obviously bent on destroying those Maori pas that they felt were part of their goals of winning that war, which in the English war plans simply meant to bring as many of the Maori into a neutral path as they possibly could. Under the command of Major Bridges, three companies of English soldiers were instructed to pay a visit to the Maori pa of Kapotai, to destroy that Maori village. On May 15, 1845 they arrived to the Maori village of Kapotai but found that the pas inhabitants had managed to flee before their arrival, which probably relieved their anxiety a great deal. After the English soldiers discovered that the Maori pas inhabitants had fled they were ordered to torch the village which they followed out. It was just another destroyed Maori pa but the effect was probably monumental to that Maori pas inhabitants, who had no choice but to seek refuge amongst friends. The war was still in its early stages but the Maori were definitely feeling the effects.

The Battle of Te Ahu Ahu

Unfortunately, the Maori have to deal with the unfortunate Battle of Te Ahu Ahu, for the battle involved only the Maori. Of course, one group of Maori were at war with the invading English, while that other group of Maori were in alliance with the English. Not too much is known about the Battle of Te Ahu Ahu. Hone Heke was inclined to return to the pa of Te Ahu Ahu after the English lost the Battle of Puketutu. And after arriving to Te Ahu Ahu, Hone Heke apparently left for another nearby settlement a few days later, to acquire to the basic needs of life. In his absence from Te Ahu Ahu, an Maori ally of the English (probably at the request of the English) gathered their warriors to attack Te Ahu Ahu, which they were quite successful at doing. The results may appear not significant, but it did force the Maori under Hone Heke's command to concentrate on retrieving their lost pa, instead of focusing their attention on the invading English, which obviously was why the Maori allies of the English were instructed to take Te Ahu Ahu.

Hone Heke must have felt extremely frustrated about the predicament which befell him after his brave warriors were driven from their battle against the Maori

allies of the English, who were probably given by their English allies, their weapons so they could stand the obvious better chance of defeating them. Some 400 to 500 of Hone Heke's brave warriors gave battle to some 300 or more of those Maori allies of the English, but they were incapable of driving them from Te Ahu Ahu, or defeating them. To make matters all the more worse for Hone Heke, he was severely wounded in that battle. Hone Heke's pain included the pain of knowing that his fellow Maori had capitulated to allowing themselves to become the allies of the invading English, which was an action they would obviously regret doing later on. The Battle of Te Ahu Ahu occurred on June 12, 1845.

The Battle of Ohaeawai Pa

Of course, Hone Heke recovered from his severe wounds he received while battling the Maori allies of the English at the Battle of Te Ahu Ahu, but he was obviously still healing when the Battle of Ohaeawai took place less than two weeks after the Battle of Te Ahu Ahu occurred. The English made their decision to resume their war against the Maori after the Battle of Te Ahu Ahu was fought, and their next target was Ohaeawai Pa, which was apparently an location that Hone Heke ordered his people to, where they could construct defensive works also around an pa named Pene Tau as well.

On June 24, 1845 the English and their Maori allies commenced to assault Ohaeawai Pa by using their big guns to bombard the Maori village. However, after a day of bombarding the Maori pa the English became somewhat desperate at their situation, then they decided on moving their big guns closer to the Maori pa for, to the English, an better opportunity at destroying that Maori pa. Using their big guns, the English continuously bombarded that Maori pa for two more days but without bringing the Maori inhabitants to capitulate. In their desperation the English soldiers under the command of Despard, were ordered to use an frontal attack on the Maori pa, which probably shook their nerves terribly, for they knew that their big guns were ineffective and to use an frontal attack definitely meant that the Maori could shoot them down like sitting ducks. However, the decision wasn't up to those brave English soldiers but it was commander Despard who was given the power to decide their fate.

Those brave English soldiers lined up to carry out the orders given to them by Despard, and within ten minutes almost 100 brave English soldiers had fallen. Despard was obviously far more desperate after his brave soldiers lost the battle, and probably with immense regret he ordered an English retreat from the Maori pa, which wasn't carried out however. Instead of retreating back towards their base, commander Despard had an change of mind, which kept the remaining

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

English soldiers and their Maori allies where they were. And when they received new supplies of ammunition the English put them to use by continuing to bombard the Maori pa. The siege continued on until July 8 when the English woke up to discover that the Maori pa they had been bombarding since July 24, had been abandoned by the Maori inhabitants, who escaped to another location where they quickly constructed a new formidable village to defend themselves against their English enemy. After the Maori inhabitants fled the village the English completely destroyed it. English casualties during their frontal assault were 99, including 33 who were killed.

The Battle of Ruapekepeka Pa

With their departure from Ohaeawai pa, the fleeing Maori under the command of Kawiti and Hone Heke, established themselves within that new pa, which was named Ruapekepeka. During early December of 1845 the English assembled new soldiers for an planned assault on Ruapekepeka, which was located in extremely difficult terrain but the English were determined to reach the new Maori pa. After some two weeks of marching through difficult terrain the English soldiers with the big guns necessary to wage siege warfare, arrived at Ruapekepeka, then commenced to bombard the Maori pa on December 27. For the next 15 days the English continuously bombarded Ruapekepeka without success. However, during the early morning hours of January 11, 1846 the English would discover that no commotion was coming from the pa, which led some of the English soldiers to bravely enter the pa, which they discovered was occupied by only a few Maori.

After the English had crept into the pa they were startled by the entrance to the same pa, of an large number of Maori warriors. Once the two bitter enemies realized that there was no escaping from a battle a battle ensued in which the English eventually won. English casualties numbered 41, including 12 killed. The Battle of Ruapekepeka was the last battle of the Flagstaff War. In the aftermath of the short war the English bravely allowed both Hone Heke and Kawiti to remain free. Both Hone Heke and Kawiti were brave enough to stand up and fight the invading English, and the English apparently had respect for them. Total English casualties during the short Flagstaff War were 246, with 82 killed. Total Maori casualties during their war against the mighty empire of England were anywhere from 140 to 250, with anywhere from 50 to 100 killed. More discontent among other Maori tribes was already in place when the Flagstaff War was being fought, and that discontent was centered on the large numbers of invading whites who were trespassing on Maori lands without Maori consent.

And soon after the Flagstaff War became part of history the invading English were at war again against another Maori tribe who were immensely enraged about those invading white settlers who were not only squatting on Maori land, but they went about treating the native Maori with very little respect, which definitely made the already enraged Maori, all the more willing to fight them.

The Hutt Valley Campaign

An greed for land was responsible for bringing on the events which occurred during the Hutt Valley Campaign during the year 1846 in Maori New Zealand. The original inhabitants of the Hutt Valley were Maori tribes who were driven out early during the so called Musket Wars (very similar to the Beaver Wars the Native Americans of eastern North America fought against each other) that the Maori tribes fought amongst themselves after acquiring European guns. After the three original tribes were driven out by the more powerful tribes, those more powerful tribes eventually moved in to settle their land.

Their rage must have sorely persisted on after being driven from their original homelands by those more powerful tribes, for after they established a good relationship with the invading English, they did England a favor (very much like what the Fox, Illini and the Iroquois League did to the Three Fires Confederation during the Ohio War) they sold their original homelands (those lands the more powerful tribes conquered from them) to England without the consent of the true owners. Of course, England was very delighted about the willingness of the Rangitane to sell the land of those more powerful tribes who conquered their lands. After falsely agreeing that that land was now theirs, the invading English went about seriously sending their settlers to that land, which was definitely still the land of those Maori tribes who had rightfully conquered the land from the original occupants.

After reluctantly accepting that the lands true owners were going to stand up and defend their land, the invading English assembled around 1000 men, including those Maori allies of theirs, to forcefully take their beloved land. Around late February of 1846 was when the conflict started to burden the lives of the native Maori and the invading English. England's military plans obviously included destroying their enemy's dwelling places, and on February 27, 1846 the English destroyed the Maori village of Maraenuku. Maori warriors were busy around that same time searching for white farms to eradicate them. During invasion situations it is customary for the natives to willingly locate those invaders homes within their homeland, to destroy them and also the invaders, to thwart their attempts at getting their land, but the Maori were not so willing to eradicate the white settlers it appears during the early stages of this conflict.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Throughout March, April and May the Maori were actively waging war on the invading English, whose numbers were definitely still quite insignificant then, for if that region had actually been occupied by large numbers of English settlers, far many more whites would have been killed or wounded. On one occasion during May 16, 1846 the Maori attacked a group of English invaders at a location known as Boulcotts Farm, where they inflicted some 16 casualties on the English invaders. However, nothing major would occur throughout the Hutt Valley Campaign, which can be attributed to many circumstances. By June of 1846 the defiant Maori leaders were induced to order their people to flee to more safer northerly locations, where they could probably live without the thought of the invading English showing up to destroy them and their homes. What was eventually accomplished by the Maori during the Hutt Valley Campaign, was their right to continue to exist without being subjugated by the invading English. However, that's all the good that came from their attempt to thwart England's effort at settling the Hutt Valley. Afterwards, the Hutt Valley was settled by the invading English.

The Wanganui Campaign

What ignited this dispute was apparently the region where the city of Wanganui was located. Wanganui was an English settlement of course, which was probably during the early stages of the city's development, an trading post where both the native Maori and the English, could carry on conducting their trade business ventures. However, by 1846 (Wanganui was established in the year of 1841) the native Maori of the Wanganui region were not only extremely alarmed by the settlements bulging population, but they were also extremely alarmed about the white settlers who were starting farms around the Wanganui region. At the most an trading post should have been occupied by maybe on upwards to ten to fifteen men (the English could have filled their trading posts with predominantly native Maori), and including their families the population may have reached some 50 to maybe 75. However, by 1846 the population of the Wanganui trading post was likely exceeding 200. To the native Maori of 1846, of the Wanganui region, the Wanganui trading post was not resembling an trading post, but it definitely was resembling an white city. We can only imagine the great fear and rage those Maori of the Wanganui region were feeling towards the invading whites. The Maori of the Wanganui region were not about to sit back and do absolutely nothing about how the invading English were operating in the Wanganui region.

Some of the Maori of the Wanganui region were sent by their chiefs to aid their kinfolk who had taken part in the Hutt Valley Campaign, which the English

were not at all pleased about after the campaign had concluded. English leaders should have dealt with the Maori who inhabited the Wanganui region with far greater respect, for if they hadn't apprehended and even executed one, some of those Maori leaders and warriors who participated in the Hutt Valley Campaign, the Maori uprising in the Wanganui region possibly would have been averted. Directly as a result of the Flagstaff War and Hutt Valley Campaign, the white settlers of the Wanganui region became too overly concerned about the native Maori of the Wanganui region, who were definitely proving to the invading whites that they would participate in wars against them, if their nearby kin requested of their military assistance.

By December of 1846 the English reluctantly sent some 200 soldiers to the Wanganui region to quell the disturbed emotions of their settlers there, yet their actions were observed by the native Maori who definitely knew for certain after observing the arrival of those 200 English soldiers, that they had been stabbed in the back by the invading English, who had probably earlier asserted to the Wanganui regions native Maori population, that the intentions of the English were solely to carry on trade ventures with them. After the 200 English soldiers established themselves in a fortification known as the Rutland Stockade, by April of 1847 an atmosphere for war was hanging around the Wanganui region that only required an ignition, which took effect after an friendly Maori was accidentally shot (the friendly Maori was only wounded) by an English sailor. Many of the native Maori of the Wanganui region were very supportive of peace evidently, for some of their leaders were inclined to accept the unfortunate incident as simply being an horrible accident, which befell the friendly Maori who was wounded. However, within the population of those Maori of the Wanganui region were many, including Maori leaders who were suggesting war, who saw the incident in another totally different view. It was probably under the orders of those extremely angry Maori leaders, that several Maori warriors swept down onto an English homestead where they killed one woman and three children. Since there was obviously an division existing among the Wanganui regions Maori population, the Maori leaders who favored a war against the invading English were enticed to point the finger of blame for the murders of the English woman and three children, on those friendly Maori, which definitely suggests that those Maori leaders who favored a war against the invading English were desperate to get those friendly Maori to join them in a war against the invading English.

Their hearts were definitely shattered after they learned that those friendly Maori snitched on the Maori culprits who conspired to carry out the murders of the English woman and three children, and the subsequent executions of four

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

of the Maori who conspired to carry out the murders of the English woman and three children. Unfortunately, for the invading English and their friendly Maori allies, their actions infuriated those Maori leaders who favored a war against the invading English.

The Siege of Rutland Stockade

Upon learning that the English had executed four of their warriors for carrying out the murders of the English woman and the three children, the deeply angered Maori leaders were quick (apparently within only one day, the four Maori warriors were executed on April 26, 1846) to respond to the executions of four of their warriors. On April 27 an force of Maori warriors descended upon the English military fort of Rutland Stockade, which they were incapable of taking. After the Maori Siege of Rutland Stockade commenced, the English sent more of their reinforcements to bolster the number of English soldiers there. Since the Maori were not capable of bringing the English military fort's garrison to capitulate, Maori leaders didn't let the opportunity to eradicate the many English homesteads or farms, surrounding the Wanganui region, spoil their warriors efforts at waging war on the invading English.

However, it didn't take the English settlers very long to realize that their lives were in danger and the English settlers correctly determined that they should seek safer havens. All the Maori warriors could do was burn down the many homesteads or farms throughout the Wanganui region, for those English homes had been abandoned by the time they commenced to wage war on them. On May 19 of 1846, the Maori assembled their warriors to again attempt to force their way into Rutland Stockade to bring the English garrison to capitulate, but the fort had been supplied with enough modern day English weapons of war for the English garrison to thwart the Maori onslaught against the English fortification, which definitely ticked off the Maori warriors and their leaders. After the failure to bring the English garrison in Rutland Stockade to capitulate, most of the Maori warriors were ordered by their leaders to leave for the immediate surrounding region, to probably regroup and get badly needed rest.

Since the English were not going to depart from their fortification to give battle to the Maori warriors, it very likely instilled in the Maori leaders who ordered their warriors to wage war on the English fortification, a great deal of regret for actually attempting to storm the English fortification. What European guns and ammunition the Maori had by the time most of the Maori warriors were ordered to patrol the surrounding region of Wanganui by their chiefs, had most definitely dwindled away, so that alone was bringing on very negative thoughts to the Maori.

A month later the number of English soldiers in Rutland Stockade had grown to some 750, which was an sufficient enough number of soldiers for English commanders in Rutland Stockade, to send some of them out of their fortification to initiate raids on the Maori who were controlling the immediate Wanganui region. However, the actions of the English led to the Maori concluding that to counter the English military fortification which was sporadically sending their soldiers out to raid the Maori who were laying siege to their fort and the immediate region, was to construct their own defensive works in order to better defend their warriors from the bothersome raids the English soldiers were ordered to carry out.

After the English learned about the new Maori defensive works which were not too far from Rutland Stockade, they were enticed to respond to the Maori who were now digging in, for what obviously appeared to the English, an long stay in the Rutland Stockade region. An contingent of English soldiers was ordered to head for the location of the Maori defensive works to eradicate what the Maori had already successfully built, but their movements were discovered by the Maori whose leaders then ordered their warriors to set up an ambush of the approaching contingent of English soldiers. In the following battle the Maori warriors were eventually driven from their position by the English soldiers, but they continued to fight on against the English onslaught, which didn't please the English too well, for they were enticed to bring out one of their smaller cannons to use on the Maori warriors.

In a attempt to reverse the battle they were now losing to the English, Maori leaders ordered some of their warriors to single out the English position where the small cannon was wreaking havoc on their warriors, to attempt to destroy the English small cannon, which was then carried out successfully, but not without the English ordering an counterattack which eventually drove the Maori warriors who had attacked the English position where the small cannon was being used, and the remaining number of Maori warriors, back to their defensive works or barricades. Although the English bravely attempted to eradicate the Maori defensive works they failed, which wasn't well received by the English commanders back in Rutland Stockade, after they were given the news of their soldiers failure. After the Maori warriors were driven back within their barricades, they easily defended them against the English onslaught that came after their retreat back to their defensive works or barricades.

After the intense battle the war was over. Unfortunately, the English did eventually succeed in defeating the Maori during the battle at the Maori barricades, but only in the heart. What likely brought the Maori chiefs to accept

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

defeat was an limited supply of modern day European weapons of war, which were mandatory if the Maori wanted to actually wage a war against the mighty British Empire, who had an unlimited supply of modern day European weapons of war. Then the discontent among many of the Maori who had taken part in the short war, was definitely burdensome to Maori leaders as well.

Unfortunately, those Maori leaders who actively waged war on the English, also had to deal with those friendly Maori who befriended the English, and that was probably the toughest part of their horrible predicament. A few days after the battle at the Maori barricades, Te Mamaku ordered his brave warriors to depart from the immediate region of Wanganui and Rutland Stockade. Te Mamaku bravely stood up to defend his subjects land against the invading English, who likely snaked their way onto the land of Te Mamaku's subjects. The Wanganui War was the last Maori uprising against England before 1860, and the war definitely represents the initial stages of the will of the Maori to stand up to the English snakes, who definitely used the forked tongue to snake their way onto Maori land. Little did the Maori realize while they were negotiating the 1840 treaty with England, that their English brethren were speaking to them in their famous forked tongue.

Of course, the English promised the Maori that their only happiness was to establish trading posts within their territories so they could trade with them, yet while they were filling up the innocent Maori with the immense promise of becoming wealthier by trading with them, the English were already making their plans for settling all of Maori New Zealand. The English obviously colonized New Zealand using the very same method that they used to colonize North America. They only needed to negotiate with the native Indians and Polynesians, by using the promise of the European trade and the greater wealth that the European trade would bring to them.

Those European trading posts in North America and New Zealand that the English undoubtedly requested of the native Indians and Polynesians of North America and New Zealand, definitely appeared to the Indians and Polynesians just as what the English promised them to be. However, the English didn't consider those trading posts that they requested of the Indians and Polynesians, to be constructed on their lands in order to conduct trade business with the English, to be simple trade stores to trade with the native Indians and Polynesians. On the contrary, the English all along used the construction of those English trading posts on Indian and Polynesian lands, to be the future sites of English cities and towns. It was definitely one of the sickest events in all of human history.

It has all been one long lie perpetuated by the English who, when they first appeared among both the native Indians and Polynesians, first observed the

activities, attitudes, enemies, numbers and above all, “the military strength of the Indians and Polynesians they first came into contact with.” In other words the English never intended to be simple traders whose only goal was to make it rich by trading with Indians and Polynesians. On the very first day the English showed up on North American soil they were obviously already planning to colonize North America. Of course, the very same can be said of New Zealand. And, of course, any normal nation of people with those sinister thoughts of invading another peoples beloved land, hidden, will always conduct themselves in that very same manner.

The First Taranaki War

In 1860 the Maori of New Zealand’s north island were crushed emotionally after the English negotiated with an insignificant Maori chief, who was enticed by the English into offering to sell them some 600 acres of prime Maori land. What crushed the emotions of New Zealand’s north island Maori was the simple fact that the English were corresponding with an Maori representative who didn’t have the power to sell Maori land to anyone, let alone to the foreign English. Upon hearing of the insignificant Maori leaders apparent land sell to the English, those Maori leaders (including Wiremu Kingi) who did have the power to do with their subjects beloved land as they saw fit, were obviously disgusted with the actions of both the English and the insignificant Maori leader, and let it be known to the invading English that they disapproved of the land sell.

When the then governor (Thomas Gore Browne) received the disappointing news of the true Maori leaders refusal to accept the land sell as being legitimate, the poor fellow had no choice but to ignore their demands to not attempt to settle the land which the governor believed was legitimately sold to the English. His actions would definitely bring forth greater problems, which we can be very certain that Thomas Gore Browne was very aware of, yet he truly believed that the Maori had legitimately sold them some 600 acres, and he was not about to let the thought of the Maori rising up to defend their land, become bothersome to him.

By 1860 the English had become very numerous in New Zealand, which probably can be attributed to the fact that the Maori had not been a problem to English settlers since the late 1840s, which was when the first wave of English-Maori conflicts abruptly ended. In fact, the English may have outnumbered the native Polynesian population of New Zealand in the year 1860 which, if it is actually based on the truth, suggests that a great many native New Zealand Maori had perished from European diseases and other abnormalities. During the years when peace ruled the affairs of the Maori and the invading English, a new Maori

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

attitude towards each other developed that gradually led to the Maori forming the King Movement. The Maori organization was initiated mainly to prevent the sell of Maori land to the invading English, who the Maori knew would most definitely snake their way onto the land that their ancestors handed down to them. By 1860 the Maori were definitely better organized than they were during the 1830s and 1840s, when the Maori were prone to looking out for #1, instead of looking out for all Maori tribes.

Thomas Gore Browne refused to acknowledge that the 600 acres the English purchased from the insignificant Maori leader, was still part of the domain of Wiremu Kingi. And then to protest more the cause of the invading English, he ordered the English 65th regiment under the command of Colonel Gold, to prepare the land for English settlement, which simply meant he was going to use war to settle the disputed land of course. When Wiremu Kingi received the horrible news that the English were going to use their military to establish themselves on the land of his subjects, the Maori leaders thoughts were obviously full of dread yet he stood firmly strong in the position he was blessed to be in, and then organized some 80 of his warriors to confront the invaders who believed that they now had the right to settle the beloved land of his subjects.

The Battle of Te Kohia

Not forgetting the war customs of their ancestors, Wiremu Kingi instructed his 80 brave warriors to build an pa where the Maori warriors could better defend themselves against the coming English onslaught against them, which would include the use of the English big guns of course. Confronting the 80 Maori warriors were some 500 well armed English soldiers, who apparently had two 24 pound howitzers to use to bombard the Maori pa. For several long hours the English repeatedly bombarded the strongly constructed Maori pa but even with all the bombarding the Maori pa withstood the English bombarding. However, as for the 80 Maori warriors inside that pa, it must have been extremely frightening to endure the constant English bombing, for during some point after the English commenced to bombard their pa, they were forced to unanimously agree to evacuate their pa, for safer havens. Although the English were incapable of forcing the Maori to surrender, they had to reluctantly accept that the battle was no ones victory. And they knew that the Maori would continue on with the struggle since the Maori refused to capitulate.

The Battle of Waireka

With the Maori obviously agreeing to continue the war against England after the Battle of Te Kohia, the English settlers became an even greater burden to those English leaders of New Zealand, who were in charge of their well being.

After learning of an group of English settlers who were engaged in an desperate battle for survival against the Maori, some 300 English soldiers, including recently inducted untrained English soldiers or settlers, were ordered to head for the location where the English settlers were caught in a trap of some sorts. On direct orders from their superior officers, the 300 English soldiers separated into two contingents, with one of the two English contingents consisting almost entirely of trained soldiers. Unfortunately, that other contingent of English soldiers, it appears, was almost entirely consisted of newly inducted settlers.

Their superior officers gave one contingent of English soldiers (the trained English soldiers) the duty of marching inland to reach the location where the Maori were laying siege to the English settlers. Once they started their march to their target they eventually encountered stiff Maori attempts to thwart their effort to give aid to the English settlers who were being besieged by the Maori. In fact, the Maori were quite successful at controlling the movements of the well trained contingent of English soldiers, for their continuous assaults on them led the contingent of well trained soldiers to flee to New Plymouth. The second contingent of English soldiers (the newly inducted settlers) were ordered to march to the location where the Maori were besieging an group of English settlers, by following the beach. As happened to the contingent of well trained English soldiers, the Maori kept their sights on the contingent of untrained English settlers after learning their movements, then they commenced to repeatedly fire upon the contingent of untrained English settlers, which eventually led them to flee to an farmhouse which was fortunately in their vicinity.

Their fear must have been immense but the untrained English soldiers did have at least some form of protection against the enraged Maori who were attacking them. That fear probably dealt with the knowledge of knowing, that all the Maori had to do was repeatedly set fire to the farmhouse they were safely inside, in order to eventually defeat them. However, good luck was with the contingent of untrained English soldiers, for out of nowhere the attention of the Maori eventually became disorganized. Some sort of loud commotion was coming from a nearby location and it led the Maori who were assaulting the farmhouse where the contingent of untrained English soldiers was, to end their assault to check out what all the loud commotion was about. Their instincts were probably telling the Maori warriors who were besieging the farmhouse where the untrained English soldiers were, that the noise they were hearing was probably a battle. Of course, the instincts of the Maori were correct. After realizing that the Maori had ended their siege, the contingent of untrained English soldiers inside that farmhouse, wasted no time fleeing for safer havens. Although

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

three separate battles occurred not much human life was lost during the heat of those battles.

The Battle of Puketakauere

After the Battle of Waireka, inaction fell upon the war scene but not for too long. Around two months after the March 28, 1860 Battle of Waireka, the thought of peace ruling was probably starting to set in among the wars combatants, which really shouldn't occur during any war which hasn't been officially concluded. Wiremu Kingi was meanwhile busy tending to the affairs of defending his subjects livelihood, which was the land their ancestors handed down to them, and that simply represents "reorganizing" of course.

Continuing to use the battle strategies of his ancestors, Wiremu Kingi instructed his warriors to build another pa in early June of 1860. But what probably brought the English to plunder their thoughts even more downwards was the location where Wiremu Kingi instructed his warriors to build the new pa. Once realizing exactly where Wiremu Kingi ordered his warriors to build the new pa, it obviously led the English to reluctantly accept that another intense battle would definitely come. Wiremu Kingi bravely had his warriors construct the new pa a mile from the English military base located at Waitara. That alone obviously suggested to the English that the Maori under the leadership of Wiremu Kingi, were more than willing to give battle to the invading English. What probably infuriated on even more so in the minds of the English, was the simple thought of knowing that the Maori warriors were not anywhere as well armed (I'm referring to modern day weapons of war of course) as the English definitely were then. Yet the Maori were making it clear to those invading English that they would bravely stand up to defend the land that their ancestors handed down to them ages ago.

Starting on June 23, 1860 the 200 or so Maori warriors concealed inside their pa, commenced to prepare to defend their beloved land against the invading English, which led the English to organize some 350 of their soldiers, including two howitzers, on June 27, 1860, to attack the newly constructed Maori pa. Before reaching the pa the 350 English soldiers were ordered by their commanding officers to separate in three contingents with the intentions of surrounding the Maori pa (it was surrounded by hills) in order to thwart any possible Maori retreats from the coming battle. However, the Maori warriors were also ordered by their commanders to conceal themselves in pits, which were cleverly constructed in front of their strongly built pa. It is very likely that the English were deeply under the impression that all of the Maori warriors were

inside the pa, and had no inclination whatsoever of the concealed Maori in the pits just outside of their pa.

Upon hearing the orders to advance on the Maori pa, the brave English soldiers commenced to carry out their instructions but they were not anticipating the intense gunfire from the concealed brave Maori warriors in the pits in front of their pa, which almost broke their spirit to continue the fight, after the hidden Maori warriors in the pits opened up fire upon the advancing English soldiers. Afterwards, out of the pa, came the terrifying sight of Maori warriors brandishing their war axes (you might want to describe them as being tomahawks), which definitely represented to the English soldiers, that they would soon have to endure hand to hand fighting against the Maori warriors.

During some point after the surprise Maori assault from the pits and then the charge of the war axe brandishing Maori warriors departing their pa, the English soldiers eventually became to defensive, which led them to agree to retreat from the battle they were not capable of dominating. Some 66 brave English soldiers were killed or wounded during the Battle of Puketakauere. It was a horrible defeat the English endured but they were obviously confident that nothing major would befall their New Zealand colonies as a result of their defeat at Puketakauere. Maori casualties were probably lower than that of the English.

After the Battle of Puketakauere, inaction again fell upon the war scene. Later on in September and October of 1860, a couple of insignificant military engagements occurred but nothing from either the English nor the Maori, would be instrumental in advancing their goals, excepting probably the nudging eagerness to refuse to engage in open battles. By November the English discovered that the Maori were in the process of building another pa, which they definitely knew was not at all a good sign, so with obvious utter reluctance, the English organized an contingent of their soldiers to pay a visit to the location where the Maori were building their new pa. Once they reached the location where the Maori were building their new pa, good luck again aided the English soldiers who were ordered to eradicate the Maori new pa, for upon their arrival to the pa the Maori were still building, the Maori were apparently not taken care of the business of war, which is an punishable offense by all military commanders. If the Maori warriors had kept themselves alerted to what was occurring around them they may have stood an excellent chance of defending themselves and the pa that they were still in the process of building.

Anyway, the English soldiers fell upon the Maori warriors building the pa which probably startled them, and in fact, they probably were incapable of reorganizing for they eventually fled leaving the English in control of the pa unfortunately. In this case the English had taken care of the business of war by

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

scouting the movements of the Maori, which definitely only helped the English cause. After the English scouts actually discovered the Maori in the process of building new pas after the Battle of Puketakauere, the English would carefully approach the pa then build trenches which would start at an far enough distance away from the pa that it offered the English some form of security, then gradually extend the trenches closer and closer to the pa. It obviously made defending the pas far more difficult for the Maori warriors.

But even more significantly it led the Maori commanders to begin to realize that their predicament was one which would tremendously effect the attitudes of their brave warriors whose lives were at stake while enduring the onslaught of their English enemy. By March of 1861 the Maori were definitely feeling the horrible effects of war against the mighty English Empire and through the efforts of Governor Browne (the English were not willing to accept peace well before the actual ceasefire took effect) the English reluctantly agreed to an ceasefire. That event occurred on March 18, 1861. That land sell which ignited the First Taranaki War, was not forgotten of after the ceasefire agreement. The English would probably half heartedly agree that it would be in the best interests of keeping the peace alive, to formally return the disputed land back to the original owners, which the Maori definitely were very appreciative of.

The Waikato War

Following the First Taranaki War, the King Movement (the King Movement did actively participate in the First Taranaki War), which was organized to adhere Maori tribes in the Waikato region into some form of confederation to better defend themselves against the invading English hordes, would have no choice but to respond fully to the English threat that was about to inundate their territories. By 1863 the invading English were unanimously agreeing to invade the territories of the Maori tribes that made up the King Movement. Unfortunately, the English had no choice but to reluctantly accept that their predicament could not afford them the opportunity to negotiate with the King Movement to peacefully get their land. Nearly all of New Zealand's north island was still Maori land during the early 1860s, and that was most clearly understood by the English, especially the average English settler in New Zealand whose appetite for foreign land was endless to say the least.

That foreign land which brought on the appetite that the English were incapable of controlling, was the instrument which sparked the deliberate invasion thoughts into English leaders daily thoughts. Unable to control their appetite for foreign land led New Zealand English leaders to request of their

empires leaders back in England, for the necessary soldiers (they may have requested of some 10,000 English soldiers) and weapons of war to invade the land of the tribes of the King Movement, so they could get that foreign land in order for English settlers to settle down to live upon. All was definitely not well for the Maori tribes of the King Movement whose leaders had probably been anticipating the English to commence an all out effort to get their beloved land. Their main concerns were, of course, the land that their ancestors handed down to them ages ago, and the modern day European weapons of war that were most definitely required, if they were actually going to wage war against the mighty English Empire.

England deliberately invades the Waikato Region

Under immense pressure to acquire new foreign lands in order for English settlers to settle down to live upon, led England to appoint General Duncan Cameron to take charge of England's deliberate invasion into the Waikato region. If any of the Maori living on New Zealand's north island on July 9, 1863 didn't sense anything strange about the actions of the English, that all definitely changed after Governor Grey ordered all of the Maori living south of Auckland on that particular day, to be removed to another location. It was no laughing matter to those innocent Maori who were unfortunately removed, and to the rest of the north island's Maori population. On July 12, 1863 some 2000 English soldiers crossed over into the territory of the King Movement where they would establish their first camps, and from there they gradually began to advance towards the Waikato river. Their first military engagement against the Maori would occur soon afterwards when they gave battle to a small force of Maori warriors at Koheroa and defeated them.

For the next three months the invading English military force went through the process of establishing their presence in the territory of the King Movement, but throughout the early stages of the English military invasion, the warriors of the King Movement were specifically instructed by their commanders (they knew they had to do something about the supply of weapons of war and food supplies as well) to single out targets along the English supply line into their territory, in order to corrupt or destroy the English supply line, which was partially successful. However, the English were successful at establishing their military in the King Movements territory, which was obviously well understood by the King Movements top leaders. Its probable that if the English thought they could actually successfully establish their military within the territory of the King Movement, English leaders knew that it would be one step closer to instilling in

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

the thoughts of the King Movements top leaders, the thought of accepting the inevitable, yet the Maori bravely continued on of course.

The Battle of Mere Mere

While the English had successfully invaded the King Movements territory by land, another large force of English soldiers (it appears the number of English soldiers who took part in the landing was some 1200) boarded two English armored steamers to sail up the Waikato river, where they landed at Takapau, but their movements were known of by the Maori who had been instructed by their commanders to form a defensive line at Mere Mere, which was the target of the 1200 English soldiers aboard the two English war vessels. They were assaulted by an poorly armed Maori force but they easily drove them off. Apparently the Maori defenders had English cannons but not the necessary reliable ammunition (cannonballs of course) to fire upon the two English war vessels.

I assume that if the Maori had those necessary cannonballs the outcome would have probably been far different than it actually had been. Instead of cannonballs the Maori defenders were forced to use other far less reliable material, which were, it appears, simple rocks and scraps of metal tightly forced into the shafts of the cannons. That alone suggests not much damage could have been inflicted, of course, on the two English war vessels, excepting probably inflicting more damage on the English soldiers onboard the two war vessels of course, which is exactly what occurred. With their failure to stop the invading English soldiers onboard the two English war vessels an reluctant part of their thoughts, it eventually led the Maori defenders at Mere Mere to agree to flee from the scene to an more southerly location where they could reorganize in order to defend themselves from the coming English onslaught that they knew was soon to be upon them. The events which occurred at Mere Mere took place on October 31 and November 1, of 1863.

The Battle of Rangiriri

Come November 20, 1863 the Maori had reorganized sufficiently enough to give battle to the English military force searching for them. After the Maori fled Mere Mere they eventually dug in at Rangiriri to await the coming English onslaught. Again the English used their war vessels to approach the Rangiriri region as they had done at Mere Mere, as well as their land troops who were instructed to approach the Maori defenders at Rangiriri, by coming from the north.

On November 20 the English had found the Maori at Rangiriri and commenced to advance on the Maori defensive line, which proved to be extremely reliable to the Maori defenders who bravely defended themselves from the more numerous English soldiers who were definitely better armed than they were. For quite some time the English were capable of penetrating certain spots in the Maori defensive line, which at first was well received by the English. However, those spots in the Maori defensive line were locations where a minority of Maori warriors were located by their commanders. Most of the Maori warriors were probably in the middle of the Maori defensive line and it was probably from them that most of the 132 casualties inflicted upon the English soldiers, came from.

It was definitely by nightfall not looking good to the English commanders of that English military force assaulting the Maori warriors at Rangiriri, for they knew that their brave soldiers had definitely been in a major battle. Their thoughts were definitely still centered on continuing the intense battle against the Maori warriors at Rangiriri, and probably anticipating far more casualties if the intense battle actually persisted on to the next day and beyond. However, when the first light of the next day came an unexpected event occurred which brought on great relief to both the English soldiers and the Maori warriors, who were engaged in a major battle at Rangiriri. During the night the defensive Maori were obviously feeling the immense pressures of defending their defensive line against the better armed and more numerous English soldiers assaulting them, and apparently their top commanders had not only talked among themselves but probably requested of their brave warriors, their opinions about the battle they were fighting against England, and exactly what their plans should be. At some point the Maori commanders made the decision to raise the white flag of surrender in the coming morning, which probably shocked the English as well as relieved them. After the Maori surrender the English took some 180 Maori warriors as POW's. Afterwards, what the Maori did was retreat to Paterangi, where they would construct another defensive line to again battle their English enemy, who they knew would come searching for them to eventually bring the war to its end, which occurred soon afterwards of course.

The Tauranga War

This conflict was directly related to the Waikato conflict. England was fully aware of the Maori tribes to the east of the Waikato region, who were supplying the King Movement with weapons and even more importantly, their own warriors to defend their lands from the invading English. And to prevent the eventual integration of the widely separated Maori tribes into one fighting force,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

and to quell the King Movements allies, the English had to act accordingly in order to continue to dominate. England's plans were focused on sending an military expedition to the region (the Bay of Plenty) where the Maori were organized to supply the Maori of the King Movement with the necessary weapons of war and warriors, to force the Maori of that region out of the war.

Upon their arrival to the Bay of Plenty, the English then established their military presence but not without the native Maori acting accordingly to the great disturbance which was forced upon them. Within a short while the native Maori (Ngai Te Rangi) established a posture of defiance which the invading English had no choice but to respond to. Eventually the native Maori commenced their custom of establishing an defensive fortification or pa, within a short distance of the new English military base, which definitely brought the invading English military expedition to accept that a battle between them and the native Maori, was soon to be fought. After learning of the new Maori defensive fortification, the commander of the English military expedition to the Bay of Plenty, Colonel Greer, was compelled to ask for more reinforcements which was granted to him. By the time the new reinforcements arrived the conflict in the Waikato region was already over so that alone made the English military expedition to the Bay of Plenty region an almost guaranteed success.

After the new English reinforcements arrived the total number of English soldiers in the Bay of Plenty region grew to over 1700. Although the Waikato conflict was over the news hadn't reached the Maori of the north islands east coast, and apparently some 700 warriors from the Maori of the east coast had assembled then commenced their trek towards the Maori of the King Movement, who had obviously requested of their desperately needed military aid. Even during this time period the English had Maori allies who were more than willing to side with them, and after learning of the Maori reinforcements trek towards the King Movements territory, the English used the forked tongue to entice the Arawa tribe (the 700 Maori warriors were evidently passing through their territory) to prevent them from accomplishing their goal. On April 7, 1864 the English Maori allies successfully prevented the 700 Maori warriors from aiding the King Movement Maori which, unfortunately, all Maori must live with today.

The Battle of Maketu

Later on during that April a battle was fought between the native Maori and the English invaders at an settlement known as Maketu. The English were first to establish their presence there then shortly afterwards, the Maori warriors, who eventually commenced to surround the English invaders while they dug their

trenches to defend themselves from their better armed English enemy. Unfortunately, England's Arawa allies were most willing to supply the English invaders with some 300 of their warriors, which definitely immensely infuriated the east coast Maori who were defending their land against an invading people, as well as attempting to aid the King Movement Maori at the same time. England not only used their land forces to assault the native Maori, but they also used their naval vessels as well to bombard the defending Maori. Eventually the continuous English assaults forced the defending Maori to slowly retreat further away from their English enemy, but the English continued to assault the fleeing Maori, and then the retreat eventually became an all out "run for your life," in order to live to see another day for the fleeing Maori, who not only had to fight the English invaders but they also had to fight against their own Arawa kinfolk. Unfortunately, the defending Maori had to seek out swamps to flee through to escape from the English onslaught, but they were not entirely annihilated.

The Battle of Gate Pa

Their misery must have shook them, during and after, the fiasco at Maketu, but the east coast Maori of the Tauranga region, were not yet willing to capitulate to the invading English, whose number of soldiers was more than their own. What the 230 Maori defenders had to face at the Battle of Gate Pa were some 1700 better armed English soldiers, but their English enemy would pay a dear price for battling them. On April 29, 1864 the English invaders commenced to fire upon the Maori fortification known historically as Gate Pa. It was no small matter for the English put 15 of their big guns to good use on the Maori fortification, and in fact, after some 8 long hours of continuous bombardments, the English paused to carefully inspect the damage that they had inflicted on the Maori pa, to determine what their next moves should be.

After carefully inspecting the condition of the Maori fortification the thumbs up was given to 300 English soldiers to storm the Maori fortification to finally bring, in the hopes of the English, the Maori defenders to capitulate. It was obviously still too early for after the 300 brave English soldiers commenced to carry out their orders, over 100 of their number were either killed or wounded by the Maori warriors, who were yet still very much alive and kicking in their defensive fortification. About the only good that came from the battle the English would have accepted, was the departure from the Maori pa of the remaining uninjured and wounded brave Maori warriors.

Evidently they could no longer take the intense battle they were fighting against their English enemy and after they had successfully stopped the English from forcing them to capitulate (it occurred during the following night) they

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

agreed to evacuate their defensive fortification to seek safer havens. The Battle of Gate Pa is historically remembered as being the one battle between the Maori and invading English, which the Maori inflicted more casualties on the invading English. Though the Maori had quickly constructed their pa it proved to be extremely versatile against the English bombardments, and in fact, the English evidently believed that they had utterly destroyed the Maori defensive fortification, but they were proven incorrect of course. Whatever the Maori used to construct their defensive fortifications was definitely strong enough to withstand the continuous English bombarding. I wonder if the English learned anything of value from the building materials used by the Maori to build their pas!

The Battle of Te Ranga

After the Battle of Gate Pa the English were enticed to attempt to peacefully bring the Tauranga War to an end, yet the east coast Maori had yet to capitulate in their thoughts, to ending their armed resistance against the mighty English Empire. Since the English knew from past experiences while at war against the Maori, that when the Maori would construct new pas or defensive fortifications, it signified the utmost willingness of the Maori to continue on with their conflict with the English themselves and all other enemies, it led the English to willingly patrol the Tauranga region searching for the Maori attempting to construct a new defensive fortification, and it didn't take the English an extremely long time to encounter the Maori doing just that.

Colonel Greer was instructed to patrol the immediate region surrounding their home base with some 600 English soldiers, to lookout for the Maori attempting to construct an defensive fortification, and on June 21, 1864 they discovered some 500 Maori warriors in the process of building a pa. Colonel Greer was evidently not in the mood to immediately give battle to the 500 or so Maori warriors, for he first sent for more reinforcements, which soon arrived from the nearby English military base. After the English grouped they commenced to give battle to the 500 or so Maori warriors, who were by the time of the start of the battle, in a rather lopsided predicament. If the new English reinforcements had not been requested of by Colonel Greer, the 500 or so Maori warriors may have stood a much better chance of preventing the English from dominating them.

Unfortunately, the 500 or so Maori warriors were incapable of defending their position against the more numerous and better armed English soldiers, and when the Maori warriors learned of their commander Rawiri's death, it took

SAMUEL POE

their remaining will to continue the battle from them. Colonel Greer's actions were righteous of course, because he knew that the English would stand a far greater chance of defeating the 500 or so Maori warriors, if they outnumbered them. After the English victory at the Battle of Te Ranga, it likely led the English to start to seriously think that the Tauranga War was probably over, and they were correct, if they had actually thought that the war was over. Once all of the defiant Maori who had taken part in the Tauranga War, had learned of their defeat at the Battle of Te Ranga, they obviously reluctantly accepted the inevitable. However, the invading English were involved in another war with another Maori tribe in another location, so the invading English didn't have much to celebrate about after winning the Battle of Te Ranga.

The 2nd Taranaki War

Although the 1st Taranaki War between the Maori warriors and the English soldiers had dwindled away (you might want to describe it as an halt to open battles), the conflict between the invading white settlers and the Maori, was still very much smoldering in the Taranaki region, which the English were only too aware of. And in response to the continuous raids the English soldiers retaliated by launching their own raids on Maori settlements. And sooner or later the raids were going to erupt into another all out war, which would finally occur in the year 1864. On April 6, 1864 an group of English militia and English settlers, were roving about the countryside and happened upon crops grown by the Maori, which they eventually destroyed. Their actions didn't go unnoticed by the Maori who definitely were not in the best of moods after learning of the unlawful actions of the invading English.

A group of Maori warriors fell upon the English instigators who had apparently dosed off after doing their dirty work and ended up killing 7 of their number and wounding another 12. Evidently the English instigators had become a bit too weary of their days work and made the decision to take the time to refresh from the business of destroying the food crops of the Maori. It is obviously no easy task to destroy ones food supply's and after the crimes the English committed, rest was probably mandatory for those English who resorted to that extreme measure. What made matters far more worse for the English, was their unfortunate mistake to not pay attention to what was occurring around them after they took the moment to recuperate.

The Battle of Sentry Hill

Military blunders occur far too frequently and all peoples endure them during time of war. On April 30, 1864 the Maori would endure the horrible effects of

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

military blunders after they mistakenly gave off warning shots, before they assaulted an English redoubt which was occupied by some 70 English soldiers and settlers. After hearing the commotion coming from nearby, the English soldiers and settlers knew that they were about to be assaulted, so no time was wasted to prepare themselves for the coming confrontation against the Maori warriors who, if historians were correct, were under the influence that they had the power to ward off the English bullets. That occasion was not the first such event to occur where a people were so positive that their enemy's weapons would do them no harm whatsoever if fired upon by their enemy. Within a short time the Maori would unfortunately learn that they had been fooled by those who were responsible for instilling in them "the great belief that their enemy's weapons would not harm them."

After the massacre the lucky ones who survived the massacre were probably looking for someone to blame for the 100 or more Maori warriors who were killed or wounded during that horrible massacre. They reluctantly accepted their fate and did as they were instructed to by their commanders, and advanced towards the English redoubt where the English soldiers and settlers inside their fortification, were obviously more than just puzzled by the suicidal actions of the brave Maori warriors. Unfortunately, the Maori warriors only inflicted one casualty on the English soldiers and settlers hidden within their redoubt, and that was just as demoralizing as what the Maori warriors own casualty's were, to the Maori.

The Battle of Moutoa Island

On May 14, 1864 another battle between the Maori themselves took place which the Maori, unfortunately, have to live with. One Maori fraction was apparently living in the Wanganui region and thriving directly from the conduct of business with the invading English. Further away from the town of Wanganui where the Hua Hua movement (apparently the Hua Hua movement was responsible for instilling in the Maori the belief that the English weapons or bullets, would do the Maori no harm) was well accepted by the Maori, their leaders had targeted the town of Wanganui to destroy it. However, the word got to the Maori who were living in closer proximity to Wanganui that the Maori of the Hua Hua movement were planning to attack the town of Wanganui. What followed will be very difficult for the Maori to have to live with.

After hearing of the attentions of the Maori of the Hua Hua movement, the Maori who were living in close proximity of the town of Wanganui, let it be known to the leaders of the Maori of the Hua Hua movement that they would defend the white English town, or fight for the invading English. An agreement

was made between the two warring Maori tribes to set a date and place for a battle, which was May 14, 1864 of course. Again the Maori warriors of the Hua Hua movement were under the influence that their enemy's weapons would do them no harm whatsoever during the massacre at the Battle of Moutoa Island. Some 80 or more of the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement were killed or wounded within a short time after the battle commenced.

This event is one which all Maori would want to forget forever. However, they have to live with this historic battle which saw one Maori tribe defending the English, against an Maori tribe who were fighting for their freedom and beloved land handed down to them by their ancestors. Of course, the invading English were appreciative of the Maori who defended their right to take way their peoples freedom and beloved land handed down to them by their ancestors. After the horrible massacre the English erected an monument to honor the 15 Maori warriors who were killed defending the English right to take away their peoples freedom and beloved land handed down to them by their ancestors.

Early 1865 Military Offensives

With the increased warfare occurring during 1864, English leaders reluctantly increased the number of English soldiers in the Wanganui region to some 1200, which was eventually discovered by the defiant Maori whose leaders were definitely upset after learning of the 1200 English soldiers under General Cameron's command, setting up their military camp some 20 km to the north of the town of Wanganui. Although the Maori were outnumbered by the English soldiers (evidently only around 400 or so Maori warriors participated during the intense two day battle against the 1200 English soldiers) they were obviously very determined to defend their beloved land against the invaders. This two day military offensive initiated by the Maori occurred during the latter part of January of 1865, and it was somewhat successful but only as far as forcing the English to seek a safer location where they could regroup and receive new reinforcements. Nearly 60 English soldiers were killed or wounded during the two day military offensive against the defending Maori. It was obviously clear to the defending Maori after the late January 1865 military offensive, that their English enemy were now digging in within their territory to seriously fight to take their beloved land from them.

Weraroa Pa

Later on in 1865, the invading English would single out an Maori pa known historically as Weraroa Pa, to eradicate the important Maori settlement. Sir

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

George Grey was responsible for instructing the English soldiers to advance upon Weraroa Pa, which occurred during the latter part of July of 1865. However, before the important Maori pa of Weraroa was taken by the English, other events occurred, including an English victory over the Hua Hua warriors at Te Ngaio. Evidently General Cameron resigned in February of 1865, directly as a result of being incapable of following orders which were given to him by his superior officers. The English General was so disagreeable with his instructions he was enticed to warn the soldiers he was put in charge of, to use extreme caution if they were forced to carry out those orders that he obviously did not want to take responsibility for.

Once the new commander took charge he accepted the orders that General Cameron refused, but the soldiers were especially confident in the warnings given by Cameron, and that likely aided them during their battle against the Hua Hua warriors at Te Ngaio. The Hua Hua warriors found the English soldiers who were instructed to advance further into their domain and commenced to give battle. It was apparently not a good day for the Hua Hua warriors at Te Ngaio, for their English enemy were capable of dominating them at Te Ngaio, and in fact, it was another unfortunate battle where the Hua Hua warriors endured heavy casualties. It was an combined force of English and Maori (it was apparently the Ngatihua Maori tribe who defeated the Hua Hua warriors at Moutoa Island who aided the English at Weraroa) who fell upon the Maori inhabitants of Weraroa.

After the combined English and Maori military force advanced on Weraroa, they became fortunate to have entered the Maori pa undetected, for the inhabitants evidently put up little resistance against their enemies. No casualty's occurred during the English surprise attack on Weraroa, which is very fortunate because if the settlements Maori inhabitants had kept themselves alerted to what was going on around their pa, most likely an siege which would have inflicted significant casualty's, and not immediate capitulation, would have occurred.

The Battle of Pipiriki

Close to the same time the English were dealing with the Hua Hua of Weraroa, they were also dealing with a force of some 1000 Hua Hua warriors at Pipiriki. Although the 200 or so English soldiers were outnumbered 5 to 1 at the Battle of Pipiriki, good luck aided them during the 11 day battle. That good luck was probably in the form of few modern day weapons of war the Hua Hua warriors could depend on. On July 19, 1865 the 200 or so English soldiers under the command of Captain Brassey, were assaulted by the 1000 or so Maori

warriors, and for 11 straight days the Hua Hua warriors proved ineffective at bringing the English soldiers within their defensive structures, to capitulate to them. By the 11th day or July 30, new English reinforcements arrived and their arrival obviously brought the 1000 or so Maori warriors assaulting their comrades, to accept the inevitable.

Their defensive structures aided the English soldiers overwhelmingly during the long 11 day battle, for the total number of English casualty's during the long 11 day battle was only two wounded soldiers. For the rest of the Second Taranaki War (it would last until November of 1866) the English would be on the offensive and the Hua Hua warriors on the defensive. Time after time the English would fall upon Maori settlements then, not only destroy them, but kill any Maori who were so unfortunate to have not escaped. Although by November of 1866 the Second Taranaki War had become part of history, the Maori of the Taranaki region were still yet determined to continue on defending their beloved land against the invading English.

The East Cape War

Also in 1865, the English invaders had to deal with the Hua Hua movement along the east coast of New Zealand's north island. As with the other unfortunate circumstances which befell the brave Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement, when they actively battled their land hungry enemy, they would endure heavy casualty's while fighting the white invaders and their Maori allies. It suggests that the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement were poorly armed during their struggle to defend their beloved land from the land hungry English invaders. Although the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement did have European weapons of war, what European weapons of war they were fortunate enough to possess was definitely very limited, for from the historical records of their military engagements against their English enemy and their Maori allies, I get the picture of an people who were incapable of equally fighting their enemies. Obviously, which is probably righteous, the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement had no source of supply's of modern day European weapons of war, while they waged their war to defend their lands from the invaders.

However, that didn't stop the brave Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement from actively battling their enemies even without the necessary modern day European weapons of war. It was most definitely the leaders of the Hua Hua movement who instilled in their warriors the great will to fight to protect their lands from the invaders, even if it meant using only axes, bows and

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

arrows, knives, spears and war clubs. There may be historical evidence that the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement were under the spell that the bullets of their English enemy would do them no harm whatsoever, but they were probably enticed to accept that unfortunate belief by their leaders in order to encourage them to want to fight to defend their beloved lands from invaders. To sum it up, what caused the heavy casualty's the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement endured, was an very limited supply of modern day European weapons of war or, to really get serious, they fought their English enemy using mainly the weapons of war their ancient ancestors used.

To further the cause of their movement to defend their beloved land against invaders, the leaders of the Hua Hua movement worked extremely hard at enticing Maori tribes whose leaders were incapable of being very willing to use their seats of power to defend their subjects beloved land against invaders. Actually instead of using their seats of power to defend their subjects land against invaders, those Maori leaders became a bit too upset with the actions of the Hua Hua leaders, and in fact, some of them demanded from the English, for their military aid to prevent the Hua Hua movement from disrupting their subjects opinions. Of course, the invading English were most willing to come to the rescue of their puppets, and they then both together joined their military might to actively wage war on the poorly armed Maori from the Hua Hua movement. Military engagement after military engagement, saw the Maori from the Hua Hua movement lose to the invading English and their Maori allies.

During October of 1866 some Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement established their presence near the settlement of Napier, which evidently outraged the settlements inhabitants enough to lead them to request of their leaders for military aid, which came in the form of English soldiers and their Maori allies under the command of Colonel Whitmore, who eventually left their base then surrounded the Maori warriors from the Hua Hua movement at Omaranui. Eventually the English and their Maori allies fired upon them after they refused their request to surrender to them. What followed after the Maori from the Hua Hua movement refused to accept peace was an massacre which nearly killed all of the defiant Maori from the Hua Hua movement.

At the November 1865 Battle of Waerenga a Hika, the English and their Maori allies successfully took the Maori pa that they had laid siege to which, from reading the battles description, the Maori warriors in their pa left their defensive position apparently while carrying white flags which suggests that they wanted to surrender to their enemies assaulting them, but they had their weapons apparently and then used them on their English enemy. I don't believe that

scenario of course. I believe that they surrendered to the English but the English deliberately murdered 60 of the 200 or so Maori warriors who surrendered to them, to make an example of them. It commonly occurs during time of war.

As for those who remained within their pa (some 400 apparently) another two days of fighting followed then they surrendered. The events which occurred in the East Cape region during 1865-1867 would escalate into Te Kooti's War. Of course, what brought on the events of 1865-1867 arose directly as a result of English settlers commencing to settle down on Maori land. Unfortunately, the great majority of Maori leaders were not willing to defend their subjects land against invaders, and that is probably why the Hua Hua movement succeeded at attracting such a significant following among the Maori civilian population. It is degrading to have to deal with Maori tribes aiding the invading English hordes but it can't be ignored.

Te Kooti's War

Very puzzling but even more heroic, were the actions of the Maori leader, Te Kooti. Te Kooti had apparently sided with the English invaders during the East Cape War. For some specific reason Te Kooti was incapable of accepting the Hua Hua movement, and in fact, he actually joined with the English invaders to fight the Maori from the Hua Hua movement. That suggests that there may have been certain things about the laws of the Hua Hua movement that Te Kooti found extremely undesirable. Evidently he was especially fond of trading with the English, but like most Maori of the 1860s he knew that the English were not in New Zealand simply to trade with the native Maori. During the Battle of Waerenga a Hika, Te Kooti apparently was somewhat confused about his role in that predicament he found himself in.

Although Te Kooti had shown up to support the English he evidently was caught supplying the Maori pas Maori inhabitants with weapons of war. It was probably Te Kooti's brother who snitched on him, and we can only imagine the great discontent Te Kooti felt towards his predicament, especially for his brother, after he was arrested by the English. He was found to be innocent of the charges forced on him, then allowed to return to his everyday affairs. However, the English had obviously kept their attention focused on Te Kooti for not too long after the charges were dropped, he was eventually arrested again on charges of selling some English military plans away. As with other defiant Maori of that time period who were found guilty by the English, Te Kooti was eventually sent as an POW to the Chatham Islands, where his great discontent definitely grew by leaps and bounds.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

During Te Kooti's early tenure as an POW, he found an willing eagerness to accept the religious path. He evidently started the religion of Ringa Tu while he was a prisoner on the Chatham Islands, which made him somewhat of an celebrity among his fellow POW's. Te Kooti was under the impression that his tenure as an POW was to be simply put, a rather short one, of only about two years. However, his English subjugators spoke in the forked tongue, which was not out of the ordinary then. His English subjugators made the decision to extend the prison terms of the Maori POW's on the Chatham Islands, and that was most definitely a terrible shock to Te Kooti, after he learned of the new prison terms handed out by the English.

Te Kooti was definitely not accustomed to prison life (there are quite a few who are drawn to prison life for its freedom from the great burdens capitalism, unfortunately, offers for the majority) for he probably immediately began his quest to escape after learning of the new harsher prison terms handing out by the English. On July 4, 1868 Te Kooti successfully led the 163 male POW's on the Chatham Islands in a revolt for freedom. In all, the 163 male POW's escaped along with 64 of their women and 71 of their children. After breaking out of their confinements they entered the English armory to gather what weapons they could, then they boarded an newly arrived English naval vessel which had just been captured by a group of Maori POW's. By July 10, 1868 they arrived on mainland New Zealand then commenced their trek to seek asylum in the King Movements territory, but they had the English hot on their trail of course. On July 20, 1868 the English under the command of Reginald Biggs, caught up to the fleeing Maori under Te Kooti's leadership, and a battle followed in which the English were incapable of dominating. That battle took place at Paparatu. Following the battle at Paparatu, two more battles between the fleeing Maori under Te Kooti's command and the English, took place.

One occurred at Te Koneke while the other occurred at Ruakituri. Both military engagements were Maori victory's for they eventually made it to their destination, which was to establish a camp at Puketapu Pa. After the fleeing Maori established their camp in close proximity to Lake Waikaremoana, Te Kooti probably began to feel a little bit more secure than he had since who knows when, but the Maori leader definitely knew he hadn't seen the last of his English enemy and their Maori allies. Te Kooti was by this time, feeling the horrible negative effects of what he had endured over the past few years, and it likely manifested in the form of reoccurring thoughts of retaliating against his English enemy and their Maori conspirators, who had done him wrong. He had been snatched on by his fellow Maori then imprisoned by his English enemy, so he truly had every reason on earth to look at the world as being against him.

Te Kooti evidently wanted to become the supreme Maori leader, and who could blame Te Kooti if he actually wanted to become the supreme Maori leader, yet his attitude towards becoming the supreme leader would eventually do more harm than good for the Maori people in general. By late October of 1868 the Maori of the Waikato region and the spiritual leader, King Tawhiao, had eventually come to learn the truth about Te Kooti and the Maori under his leadership. Upon learning that Te Kooti wanted King Tawhiao to peacefully abdicate his seat of power to him, it drove the spike of separation deep into the earth they lived upon. It was a military blunder of course, for Te Kooti and the Maori under his leadership, to have conducted themselves in that selfish manner. If Te Kooti had requested of King Tawhiao and the Maori under his leadership, to join in an confederation to fight the invading English, than most likely Te Kooti's request would have been granted. However, the spike of separation had been driven into the earth they lived upon, and King Tawhiao rightfully established in his thoughts, that Te Kooti was his bitter enemy, who wanted nothing less than to overthrow him and then take his subjects land.

Te Kooti was warned by King Tawhiao to not enter his subjects land. Te Kooti was probably heartbroken and eventually even more negative, upon learning that King Tawhiao was not willing to bow down to his request. And after the terrible news was received by Te Kooti, new thoughts emerged in his mind which led him to think of other plans instead. Of course, those thoughts were centered on retaliation. On November 10, 1868 Te Kooti could no longer control his already extremely negative attitudes towards the world around him, and since he had by that time several hundred warriors (the number of Maori warriors under Te Kooti's leadership increased after many more escaped from prison, which suggests that there were many disgruntled Maori at that time) he knew he had the manpower to inflict on his enemies, the retaliation he had been thinking of for so very long. On that night the warriors under Te Kooti's leadership fell upon the settlement of Matawhero, killing some 54 of the settlements inhabitants, including 20 Maori. In the days following the horrible massacre at Matawhero, Te Kooti's warriors were ordered to search for any Maori in the vicinity who identified with the English, to apprehend them so they could be executed for the injustices they inflicted on their fellow Maori.

On November 12, 1868 Te Kooti played out his retaliation fantasy at an Maori pa known historically as Oweta Pa. That Maori pas leader, Paratene Pototi, starred in Te Kooti's daily retaliation fantasy of course. Evidently Paratene Pototi did Te Kooti wrong by having him imprisoned. But what made matters all the more worse for Paratene Pototi when he got Te Kooti in a world of trouble, was his cowardly action of kicking and beating Te Kooti while he was

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

waiting in chains to be transferred to his prison cell by the English. Who could blame Te Kooti for singling out Paratene Pototi for punishment for not only getting him imprisoned, but for deliberately beating him while he waited in chains to be sent to serve out his prison term. After Paratene Pototi and six of his fellow Maori chiefs of Oweta Pa were apprehended by the Maori warriors under Te Kooti's command, they were executed for the injustices that they inflicted on the defenseless Te Kooti and the Maori people in general.

After these first events of Te Kooti's retaliation fantasy, Te Kooti made bitter enemies of certain Maori tribes and the English of course, and then his enemies then began their process of organizing their military might to fight the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership. By early 1869 Te Kooti knew his enemies were after him so he led his people to Makaretu, but after their arrival there they had a change of mind and then decided to leave for Ngatapa, where their Maori and English enemies eventually found them. Then on January 5, 1869 the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership attempted to escape from Ngatapa, but not all of the 800 Maori under Te Kooti's leadership were fortunate to have escaped from their bitter Maori and English enemies. Evidently their Maori and English enemies had captured 270 of the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership, and after requesting of certain information from them they unanimously agreed to deliberately kill 120 of their 270 Maori POW's, who were Maori men.

However, Te Kooti and the Maori who considered him to be their leader, were still free but without a land of their very own. Their destination after the nightmarish fiasco at Ngatapa, was the Urewera Mountains, but that land was home to the Tuhoe tribe so Te Kooti faced an obstacle before him of course. From the Urewera Mountains, Te Kooti eventually sent his warriors out to wage war into the Whakatane region in early March of 1869, which was at first a success, but as with the earlier success's Te Kooti enjoyed, his enemies eventually organized their military might to fight his warriors.

In early April of 1869 Te Kooti once again sent his warriors out to wage war against their Ngati Kahungunu and English enemies. The warriors of the Ngati Kahungunu were evidently out searching for Te Kooti and his followers in the Lake Waikaremoana region, but they were not tending to the business of keeping an lookout on their pa, which would bring devastating results to the pas Maori and English inhabitants. On April 10, 1869 Te Kooti's warriors fell upon the Ngati Kahungunu pa, Mohaka, killing 64 of the Maori and English inhabitants of the pa. However, Te Kooti's warriors were not finished with their war work for after taking their enemy's pa, they then left to find the Ngati Kahungunu warriors who they probably knew were searching for them. After departing

from the horrible scene at Mohaka, they eventually found Mohakas warriors and then ambushed them.

Outraged were the English and their loyal Maori allies, but to combat the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership, they knew that they had to invade deeper into the Urewera Mountains. It was not going to be an easy task to send their soldiers deep into the Urewera Mountains, but the English had no choice but to. After assembling their soldiers the English soldiers were then ordered to invade deeper into the Urewera Mountains, from three directions apparently. One group of English soldiers was instructed to invade the Urewera Mountains from the north, while two other groups of English soldiers were instructed to invade the Urewera Mountains from the west and the southwest. The English movements were known of by Te Kooti who then began the process of preparing his warriors for the anticipated military engagements against the invaders. However, the rugged terrain didn't get the best of the English soldiers and their loyal Maori allies, for other unfortunate circumstances (food shortages, and probably the top concern of military commanders during time of war next to that of casualties directly from fighting, diseases of course) prevented the English soldiers and their loyal Maori allies from accomplishing their goal of conquering the Urewera Mountains.

Te Kooti and his followers were probably somewhat relieved that their English enemy had momentarily withdrawn from the Urewera Mountains by late May of 1869. The only military engagement from late May to September of 1869, occurred when close to 200 of Te Kooti's followers found themselves confronted with an small contingent of English militia, who were at first under the impression that the Maori that they had confronted were friendly towards their cause, but they weren't of course. In the battle that followed Te Kooti's warriors killed some 9 of the English soldiers, who were part of the small group of English militia.

In the meantime, Te Kooti once again attempted to induce the King Movement to get involved on his side during his war against the mighty English Empire, but he had obviously deeply disturbed King Tawhiao by suggesting that he should sit on the highest pedestal of supreme power. To suggest that power is of greater importance during time of war over that of cooperation, is worse than foolish of course, yet Te Kooti was not the first leader to openly put #1 above every other determining factor during time of war.

Instead of actively cooperating together ego prevailed, and by late August of 1869 Te Kooti and around 800 of his followers reached Lake Taupo, where they eventually made their decision to construct an pa. Under surveillance by their

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

English and Maori enemies, the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership probably knew that the peace was not going to last an long time, and so they were definitely patrolling the Lake Taupo region constantly looking out for their enemies that they knew would eventually come to make war on them. Te Kooti definitely knew that his enemies were hot on his trail but he possibly didn't know that his English and Maori enemies, were coming in 6 different groups.

Te Kooti didn't sit back and wait for his enemies to initiate the battles which were coming, for he ordered a contingent of his warriors to attack an contingent of Kahungunu warriors who had established an temporary camp after an storm. For two days Te Kooti's warriors assaulted the Kahungunu camp but they were incapable of defeating the Kahungunu warriors. Realizing it would be futile to continue on with the battle, Te Kooti's warriors made their decision to retreat.

After the battle between Te Kooti's warriors and the Kahungunu warriors, another battle took place at Pouto between Te Kooti's warriors and the very loyal Arawa allies of the English, in which the King Movement had chosen to send one of their higher ranking leaders to determine if it would be feasible for them to aid Te Kooti's cause. However, the Maori warriors under Te Kooti's leadership did not fight the English in the battle at Pouto, but it was the Arawa, who definitely were very well armed by their English allies. Most likely Te Kooti's warriors were using the weapons that they took from the armory on the Chatham Islands, and that they had taking on the fields of battles they fought against their enemies after escaping. Evidently Rewi Maniapoto (he was interested in aiding Te Kooti's cause) choked after the Maori warriors under Te Kooti's command were defeated by the better armed Arawa warriors at Pouto. He became so unwilling to give his military aid to the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership, he actually departed from them to head back home.

After their defeat at Pouto, and the choked Rewi Maniapoto's departure from them, the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership decided to build another defensive fortification at Te Porere. By October 4, 1869 the English and their loyal Maori allies showed up at the new Maori defensive fortification at Te Porere. But what probably captured everyone's full attention during the same time was the volcanic eruption occurring at the nearby volcano, Ngauruhoe. After getting their preparations done and over with, the combined English and Maori force then commenced to attack the Maori fortification, and the English would soon find out just how loyal their Maori allies were. It was relatively easy for the English and their loyal Maori allies to get up to the Maori defensive fortification and then enter it. After entering the Maori defensive fortification the loyal Maori allies of the invading English, shamed their peoples pride by going

on an killing spree. It was easy for the English and their loyal Maori allies to defeat Te Kooti's warriors at Te Porere, for Te Kooti's warriors were obviously not very well armed. Evidently the English casualties during the Battle of Te Porere were only 8. We can understand why the English suffered few casualty's during the Battle of Te Porere, while Te Kooti's casualties were far greater, simply by centering attention on the weapons of war used by the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership.

Few Maori survived the combined English and Maori military force assaulting Te Porere, but those who managed to escape (that includes Te Kooti) immediately fled deeper into the territory of the King Movement. Since England was unwilling to actively pursue the fleeing Maori under Te Kooti's leadership straight into the King Movements territory (the English would probably have started another all out war against the King Movement if they continued to pursue the Maori under Te Kooti's leadership deeper into the King Movements territory), what the English did instead was request of their loyal Maori allies "to do their dirty work for England," which they were more than willing to shame their people.

Te Kooti was now even more desperately on the run to escape from his bitter enemies (by this time it was the Maori allies of the invading English who were pursuing Te Kooti and his followers), and on March 25, 1870 those Maori allies of the English who had agreed to do England's dirty work, found Te Kooti and his followers at Maraetahi. However, Te Kooti and 24 other Maori escaped. And then on May 15, 1872 Te Kooti accepted the inevitable (he bowed down to King Tawhiao's authority) by entering the domain of King Tawhiao then begging for asylum. King Tawhiao had obviously rightfully misinterpreted Te Kooti's first requests years earlier, which were for King Tawhiao to bow down to Te Kooti's authority, but King Tawhiao definitely was sympathetic towards Te Kooti's cause when the brave Maori leader bravely begged for his protection, because he protected the brave Maori leader who stood up to defend his peoples dignity against the mighty empire of England.

Te Kooti was bullied into fighting his enemies and is probably the one Maori leader over all other Maori leaders, who represents the Maori cause against the invading English hordes. He was not intimidated by the lack of modern day weapons of war to use against his English and Maori enemies, who had an endless supply of the fineness modern day weapons of war to use against his warriors. In the end, Te Kooti was victorious of course, and his victory over England ended the Maori-English wars.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Titokowaru's War

This conflict was initiated by the forked tongue of the English of course. Maori land was involved, and the English went on the real estate hunt after the 2nd Taranaki War concluded, and by 1867 the Maori of the Taranaki region were under the impression that the English had finished their Maori real estate hunting. However, it didn't take the Maori very long to learn otherwise. In 1868 the English were up to no good once again with Maori real estate, which took the form of the English negotiating with Maori leaders for even more precious Maori real estate. After learning of greater numbers of invading English settlers settling down to live upon their real estate, an Maori chief (Titokowaru of course) was forcefully induced to send several Maori warriors from the Ngati Ruanui Tribe, to defend their remaining land against the invading English hordes. And on June 9, 1868 they killed 3 English settlers and the last Maori-English War thus began. Titokowaru was not intimidated by the better armed and more numerous English soldiers, and although he had only 80 warriors under his command, he was determined to defend his subjects land against invaders.

Unfortunately, Titokowaru also had to deal with several Maori tribes who were fighting on England's side. At the Battle of Te Ngutu o Te Manu, the English were defeated by Titokowaru's obviously well armed warriors, for the English suffered some 50 casualties during the intense battle. On the other hand the number of Maori casualties were only 3. At the Battle of Moturoa, the English suffered another defeat against the Maori warriors under Titokowaru's leadership (they may have increased to some 200 warriors by this time), suffering even more casualties (English casualties during the intense battle of Moturoa was 60) than they had during the Battle of Te Ngutu o Te Manu.

After this victory Titokowaru's warriors grew to around 400, but nearly 2000 English soldiers and their Maori allies were assembled to attempt to take an pa known as Tauranga-Ika, which they had no problems doing, for upon their approach to the Maori pa Titokowaru's warriors abandoned their fortification, instead of fighting against their more numerous enemies. Only two other military engagements occurred during Titokowaru's War, which were won by Titokowaru's warriors, but after that, the last Maori-English War was over. England faced its greatest threat from the King Movement, and England responded to the might of the King Movement by sending 18,000 English soldiers to combat the King Movements warriors, and they successfully took their rich bountiful land, but the King Movement retreated away to lands which the English were prevented for the longest time, from entering so it was more a matter of time than anything else, in the war between England and the King Movement of the Maori of New Zealand.

SAMUEL POE

Samoa

By the early 18th century white contact had gradually commenced on Samoa on a rather more frequent level, but the whites would not increase that contact more until well into the 19th century. What the whites would eventually learn about the native Polynesian Samoan's of Samoa, was their will to fiercely defend their land against them. They were unlike Hawaii's Polynesians, but they were more like New Zealand's Maori people, and that is probably why they persisted on to independence, excepting American Samoa of course. Samoa covers approximately 1,093 sq mi and when including American Samoa, Samoa would be slightly larger of course. Samoa's population is 185,000. Samoa would not be forcefully brought under white control until 1899 when the Germans made Samoa a colony. German domination over Samoa would come to an abrupt end in 1914 when New Zealand forced the Germans out, then took control of Polynesian Samoa. On January 1, 1962 Samoa became independent once again. However, American Samoa is still under American rule.

Tonga

Another independent Polynesian country is Tonga. Tonga covers approximately 277 sq mi and has a population of 106,137. During the 19th century the Tongans endured civil unrest which may have occurred largely as a result of their white brethren. By 1845 the Tongan leader, Taufa'ahau Tupou, had united the Tongans into one kingdom. European visitors were impressed with how well the Christian Tongan Kingdom was, for they allowed the independent Polynesian Kingdom to freely exist up until May 18, 1900 when England brought the Tongan Kingdom under their control as an protectorate. On June 4, 1970 Tonga became an independent country once again.

Tuvalu

On October 1, 1978 the Polynesians of Tuvalu became independent once again. Their first permanent contacts with their white brethren commenced during the 18th century, and by 1877 the English brought Tuvalu under English jurisdiction. Their island country is a tiny one (10 sq mi) which will trouble the future Polynesians of Tuvalu which, of course, I am referring to the resources necessary for surviving. I believe that it is of the utmost importance for the Polynesians of Tuvalu to actively seek an alliance of economic origins with other independent Polynesian countries such as Samoa and Tonga and, although French Polynesia is under foreign rule, French Polynesia as well. At the present time the population of Tuvalu is 11,146. Unfortunately, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu are the only current independent Polynesian countries in existence.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

French Polynesia

France brought the Polynesians of what is now considered as French Polynesia, under their control back in the 19th century. At the present time the population of French Polynesia is 245,405. 83% of that total are Polynesians while 12% are white. The remainder of French Polynesia's population is mainly of east Asian origins. The land area of French Polynesia is approximately 1,609 sq mi, but the islands are scattered over 965,255 sq mi of the Pacific Ocean. Obviously the only reason why the Polynesians continue to outnumber the foreigners is the small size of the islands. Tahiti covers nearly 400 sq mi and happened to also be very mountainous. Unfortunately, other Polynesian islands such as Fiji and Hawaii were larger, and when the whites showed up with their black slaves, there was enough room in their greedy minds for outrageously white and black settlement to commence.

Other Polynesian islands currently under foreign rule include the Cook Islands (New Zealand), Niue (New Zealand), Pitcairn Islands (United Kingdom), Tokelau (France) and Wallis and Futuna (France). The Cook Islands cover approximately 91 sq mi and have an population of 18,027. There are 15 islands which make up the Cook Islands. Niue covers approximately 100 sq mi but has an population of only 2,134. The Pitcairn Islands cover 2 sq mi and has an population of only 48 who are mixed in race. Tokelau covers approximately 10 km and has an population of 1,392. Wallis and Futuna covers approximately 102 sq mi and has an population of 15,480. When these Polynesian Islands, which are currently under foreign rule, eventually become independent it will be extremely important for them to actively join with the independent Polynesian countries in existence now, to strengthen their limited resources of course.

Polynesian Fiji

Polynesians were Fiji's first human inhabitants, but historians also believe that the blacks (they are most likely descended from black slaves brought there by the whites after 1492) are native to Fiji as well. What is so compelling concerning Fiji's current daily affairs is the horrible race problems occurring. Unfortunately, over the past 20 years the Melanesians have come to dominate Fiji's government. Evidently the whites allowed for Indians from India to settle down and live in Fiji during the 19th century, but exactly just how many of those Indians are Polynesians in reality?

Anyway, during the 1980s those race problems arose because of the Indian dominance in Fiji's government which, unfortunately, led to two coups, which were most likely supported by the whites. After the successful coups it led to the

departure from the Fijian Islands of hordes of Indians (were some of them really the Polynesians?) to other countries seeking asylum. Polynesians are going to have to seriously look over this problem currently occurring in Fiji, to learn if an portion of those Indians fleeing from Fiji, are in fact the native Fijian Polynesians.

Fiji's population is 905,949 and is made up of what they describe as an native Fijian (54.3%), who are supposedly of mixed Melanesian and Polynesian descent or mix bloods. Indians (exactly how many of them are native Fijian Polynesian?) make up 38.1% of Fiji's population, but 30 years ago they were more numerous of course. The Rotuman people (they are Polynesians and inhabit Rotuma Island) make up 1.2% of Fiji's population. They are likely Fiji's (I'm referring to what is now all of Fiji) first human inhabitants. What is occurring in Fiji is not at all good for it is centered on race, and the whites will choose blacks over Asians. So to conclude on this very sensitive subject, we can blame the whites for Fiji's current racial problems.

In 1970 Fiji won independence, and during the 1970s Fiji was stable but the race problem eventually escalated. In the first 1987 military coup the culprit was centered on the Indian dominance within Fiji's government, while the second 1987 military coup resulted in the British Monarchy and Governor General, being replaced by more tolerable replacements. Then came the emigration of Fiji's Indians, which led to the Melanesians becoming the majority in Fiji. Fiji covers approximately 7,056 sq mi. The official language of Fiji is of Malayo-Polynesian origins, which does suggest that the Polynesians were in fact Fiji's first human inhabitants. As with what eventually developed in the Caribbean region after the invading whites showed up, they let loose their black slaves in Fiji, and that is exactly why Fiji's current predicament is in place. Fiji should be addressed by all Polynesians for they were Fiji's first human inhabitants.

Polynesian New Caledonia

Being about the same size (7,359 sq mi) as Fiji but slightly larger, New Caledonia is currently under French jurisdiction. Scholars have lied to the world about New Caledonia's eventual settlement. Again we have scholars openly suggesting that the Melanesians were the first human inhabitants of what is now New Caledonia but Polynesians were. The Atlanteans colonized New Caledonia long, long ago. The current racial makeup of New Caledonia is Melanesians representing 42.5%, while the whites makeup 37.1%. Unfortunately, the Polynesians only makeup 11.8%. Of course, the whites believe that the Polynesians who live throughout New Caledonia now, are recent arrivals but they are wrong of course. In 1492 only Polynesians lived in New Caledonia.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

As with what eventually developed in the Caribbean region after the invading whites showed up in New Caledonia, they let loose their black slaves and that is why the Melanesians dominate in New Caledonia now. New Caledonia's population is 230,789. The French are obviously attracted to New Caledonia and it's very likely that the white population on New Caledonia will continue to multiply over the coming years.

Polynesian Papua New Guinea

As with what eventually developed in the Caribbean region after the invading whites showed up, they let loose their black slaves throughout what is now the modern country of Papua New Guinea. Of course, the Atlanteans were first to live in what is now Papua New Guinea. Papua New Guinea covers approximately 178,260 sq mi and has a tiny Polynesian population which is located on two small islands.

The Polynesian Solomon Islands

As with what eventually developed in the Caribbean region after the invading whites showed up, they let loose their black slaves in The Solomon Islands, and that is why the Melanesians make up 94.5% of The Solomon Islands current population. Unfortunately, The Solomon Islands first human inhabitants, the Polynesians, now only make up 3% of the total population of The Solomon Islands, but that is greater than the Native American population of certain Caribbean Islands of course. The Solomon Islands cover approximately 11,157 sq mi and has a population of 478,000.

Polynesian Vanuatu

As with what eventually developed in the Caribbean region after the invading whites showed up, they let loose their black slaves in Vanuatu, and that is why the Melanesians are the majority there. Vanuatu covers approximately 5,700 sq mi and was first settled by the Atlanteans very, very long ago. We have every reason to discard the histories that the whites have written of concerning Melanesia, and how the current population throughout Melanesia came about. Polynesians need to address this extremely sensitive issue, for the Polynesians were the aborigines throughout what is considered Melanesia.

Polynesian Micronesia

Although rather similar to the whites description of Australasia and Melanesia, Micronesia is somewhat less challenging and probably so for the size

of Micronesia. Unlike Australasia and Melanesia which are huge, Micronesia is even smaller than Polynesia. The current population of Micronesia is apparently of Australoid and Polynesian descent, which does prove that the whites let loose their black slaves there as well. Of course, the Polynesians were the first human inhabitants of what is now Micronesia. Of the independent countries which are classified as Micronesian, they are The Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, The Marshall Islands, Nauru and Palau. There are two Micronesian islands (Guam and The Northern Mariana Islands) which are controlled by the United States.

Polynesian Hawaii

Hawaii was probably one of the first islands of the Pacific Ocean colonized by the Atlanteans. It was Captain Cook who was responsible for discovering Hawaii for England, but it was the United States which eventually brought the native Hawaiians under permanent foreign control. Unlike the Maori of New Zealand who defended their land against the invading whites, Hawaii's native Polynesian population were not willing to send their warriors out to fight wars against the invading whites. At the present time Hawaii's native population are completely surrounded by foreigners and have no land to call their own. It is widely believed that Hawaii's native population at the time of first contact with their white brethren, was in the hundreds of thousands. Cuba covers over 42,000 sq mi and European historians are adamant that the native population of Cuba at the time of their first contact with their white brethren, was only a measly 50,000. Hawaii covers only a little over 4000 sq mi so I believe that those European historians have got some serious calculating to go through once again.

Polynesian Easter Island

Probably the very first island (excepting probably the Galapagos Islands) in the vast Pacific Ocean colonized by the expanding Atlanteans, Easter Island was populated by a few thousand Polynesians when the first whites showed up in the year 1722. Some scholars actually believe that the Polynesians encountered a native population on Easter Island and exterminated them but they are wrong of course. The Polynesians continue to live on Easter Island. Although Easter Island covers only 45 sq mi that small land size allowed the Atlanteans to survive on to now.

Again Polynesians must address the very sensitive issue I have presented, for they were the first human inhabitants of Australasia, Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia. Of course, the blacks and whites will never accept my belief that Australasia, Melanesia and Micronesia were first settled by the expanding

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Atlanteans, yet what I have presented should be considered as being the truth by all Native Americans and, especially, the Polynesians. We must focus our attention on the remaining Polynesian populations throughout Australasia, and Melanesia especially, for if we discard assisting their welfare it will do the world no good. We know from instinct that the blacks and whites could care less so it is extremely important for especially the Polynesians to rethink their origins and stand up even more for what is especially dear to them. We have been stabbed in the back by the whites regarding Australasia and Melanesia, and what that represents should be very well understood by Native Americans and Polynesians.

If historians are correct that the Polynesians are related to the people of Indonesia, Malaysia, and other locations throughout southeast Asia through language, and if my theory is correct that the Polynesians are in fact Algonquians, that means the people of Indonesia, Malaysia, and parts of mainland Asia are partially related to the Algonquians from interbreeding with them. As mentioned already, the Polynesians suffered at the hands of the Europeans as well, but they have survived.

French Polynesia has a population of 266,339, but not all people are Polynesian but most are. Hawaii has a Polynesian population close to 200,000, but most are mixed with the blood of the Europeans and Asians, as well as the blacks. New Zealand has a native Polynesian population of 354,000, but they are mixed in race as well, but the blood of the Polynesians dominates of course. There are yet many Polynesian islands which are termed that of Polynesia, which are under foreign control. In the future the native Polynesians of those subjugated islands will obviously address the issue of independence from the foreign countries who subjugates their daily affairs. As for Australasia and Melanesia which were the larger land areas that the Polynesians inhabited, the Polynesians must look upon those vast islands their ancestors once only inhabited, as being part of what is termed Polynesia.

The Polynesian Chamic

Lands which the Chamic people inhabited were Cambodia and Vietnam, which are both located to the north of Malaysia. What is intriguing about, and could prove of an once thriving Atlantean civilization possibly existing in Cambodia and Vietnam, is the presence of the syllabic alphabet in that very region. Evidently, and this is an historic fact, the Chamic languages are considered as being part of the Malayo-Polynesian language family.

That alone suggests of an once thriving Atlantean civilization in Cambodia and Vietnam very, very long ago. Those ancient civilizations located in Cambodia

and Vietnam, which are considered by archaeologists and scholars, to have been the creation of non Atlantean peoples, may just have been the creation of the Atlanteans. Although non Atlanteans won't be impressed enough to attempt to discover of an Atlantean presence once existing in Cambodia and Vietnam, the Atlanteans on the other hand should themselves carefully investigate to learn of any kinds of possible links within those ancient civilized ruins located in Cambodia and Vietnam, to Atlantean ruins located elsewhere, particularly in North America.

Chinese influence in Vietnam (at first northern Vietnam only) has been especially vibrant throughout the ages according to historians, particularly in northern Vietnam. If the Atlanteans did colonize Vietnam they probably colonized all of Vietnam because Vietnam is situated in such a way, it afforded the Atlanteans the excellent opportunity to colonize all of Vietnam. Of course, the very same could be said for Thailand. After 221 B.C. the Chinese made their moves deeper into Vietnam, by initiating more of their own colonies. We can trace Chinese dominance in Vietnam to this time period (221 B.C.), which eventually led to the Chinese language also dominating the spoken word in Vietnam. For over 1000 years the Chinese ruled Vietnam successfully. And during that time period the Chinese likely sent large numbers of Chinese settlers to Vietnam to settle down to reproduce. However, the original inhabitants were prone from time to time to rise up against the Chinese invaders, and on one occasion two female Atlantean leaders (if the Atlanteans did colonize Vietnam) organized their subjects to specifically wage war on the Chinese invaders. That event occurred in 39 A.D. The Trung sisters successfully toppled Chinese rule, but their new kingdom would not survive the test of time, for the Chinese returned to "free their citizens from native rule." That event occurred 4 years later in 43 A.D. In 939 A.D. the Vietnamese successfully fought to free Vietnam of Chinese rule. However, by that time the Chinese had probably successfully turned most of Vietnam into an Chinese clone.

One ancient southern Vietnam Kingdom was that of the Champa. Probably long adhered to the south of Vietnam, and also central Vietnam, the Indonesian Champa's were very competent while at war against the expanding Chinese. They rose up against the invading Chinese on several occasions and withstood the Chinese onslaught to take away their liberty. For some 200 years (between 600 and 800) the Champa's capital was located near what is now Da Nang, but immense changes were occurring in Vietnam directly as a result of the expansion of the Chinese Empire, which would impact the lives of the citizens of the Champa Kingdom. China had invaded northern Vietnam successfully during the 2nd century B.C., and the native people they conquered in northern and central

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Vietnam, were subjugated by them of course. Later on, they would become known as the Annam. At the height of the Annamite Empire, it encompassed nearly all of what is today Vietnam. It was the Annamese who were responsible for driving the Champa from central Vietnam, further southward, in search of seclusion from their enemies. I may not be totally confident that the Atlanteans initiated at least one colony in Vietnam, yet the Atlanteans must investigate on their own, if our ancestors were aware of what is now the modern country of Vietnam, and actually sent settlers there to permanently live.

Cambodia would be the one country the Atlanteans colonized all of, if the Atlanteans colonized Cambodia and Vietnam. Cambodia's Funan Kingdom may have been of Atlantean origins, if the Atlanteans colonized Cambodia. As with Vietnams Champa Kingdom, the Funan Kingdom of Cambodia is reportedly to have been very similar to the cultural and customs which thrived in India. What encompasses what is now the region where Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam are located, were ancient civilizations which were greatly influenced by the Indian civilization, which was located just to their west.

However, China was closer but Chinese influence in that region where Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam is located, was evidently minimal before the Chinese invaded that region. We also must remember that the Bay of Bengal was an obstacle to the inhabitants of the Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam region, which made visiting India all the more difficult for them. That obviously represents an obvious mistake in the age of China's civilization. Instead of China's accepted date for their civilizations beginning, it likely occurred later.

Cambodia's Funan Kingdom was apparently of Mon-Khmer origins, and is widely accepted as being the first civilized kingdom in what is now the modern country of Cambodia. We must remember the Mon-Khmer people for we have been educated that they "committed a horrific crime against their own people," just 3 short decades ago. Evidently in ancient times the Funan Kingdom operated an port located at Oc Eo, which was on the Gulf of Thailand. What is very interesting about that fact is the distinct belief historians have of the Funan Kingdom using the Gulf of Thailand to frequently visit India. Look on any map with the Bay of Bengal, the Gulf of Thailand, Cambodia and India and you will know just why I find that rather interesting.

Vietnam and the United States invade Cambodia

We all know about the horrible Vietnam War, but what is extremely suspicious concerning that horrible Vietnam War, is what occurred in Cambodia. Historians believe that the North Vietnamese deliberately penetrated Cambodia to aid their cause against South Vietnam. So they believe that North Vietnam only

used Cambodia to avoid their bitter American and South Vietnamese enemies! We, however, can actually consider the March 1970 actions of Cambodian Prime Minister, Gen. Lon Nol, as being initiated to stop an North Vietnam invasion of Cambodia. In March of 1970 Gen. Lon Nol seized power after Sihanouk left Cambodia to conduct this and that, and probably for his own benefit, while his kingdom was under assault (North Vietnamese soldiers were intruding into Cambodia to avoid their enemies) by the neighboring kingdom of North Vietnam.

No normal kingdom will allow an neighboring kingdom the opportunity to use their domain as an battle refueling location! Gen. Lon Nol acted on instinct to protect his kingdom from invaders. There may have been some sort of conspiracy in place during that time, which may have been to prevent the spread of communism or the spread of capitalism, yet we should also consider the actions of Vietnam, to have been imperialism in origin. After the Cambodians rose up to defend their liberty, North Vietnam responded by sending larger contingents of their soldiers directly into Cambodia. North Vietnams actions were definitely imperialism in origins.

And after North Vietnam openly invaded Cambodia (this is the suspicious part), they were followed by South Vietnamese and American soldiers. American involvement in that fiasco referred to as the Vietnam War, is a joke to say the least. President Kennedy was likely murdered because he didn't want to do what his country wanted of him, which was to fight communism. If the United States had wanted to they could have easily defeated North Vietnam. North Vietnam would not attempt to spread communism to other neighboring kingdoms, without first bringing all of Vietnam under communist control! Why? North Vietnam hand their hands full fighting their South Vietnamese neighbors!

After North Vietnam invaded Cambodia they apparently found extremely willing communist Khmer Rouge allies. We have every reason to disbelieve that bit of historical information. Although it is an good likelihood that the same people would actually attempt to kill themselves off (all earthlings are currently trying to do just that now!), we must stop short, however, of actually believing that the Cambodians would actually attempt to exterminate themselves. Unfortunately, those historians believe that the communist Khmer Rouge were armed by communist Vietnam. Shortly before North Vietnam brought all of Vietnam under their control, the communist Khmer Rouge had captured Phnom Penh.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

The Cambodian Holocaust

What occurred after communist Vietnam conquered Cambodia in April of 1975, almost equals what the Jews and Egyptian Europeans endured during World War II. An genocide program was commenced which depopulated Cambodian cities of their Cambodian inhabitants. Those Cambodian inhabitants were forced into concentration camps to be enslaved and murdered. Anywhere from 2 to 3 million Cambodians were eventually slaughtered. They know where they can take their December 1978 Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia! Where did all the Cambodians go?

Atlanteans must take the time to seriously investigate the horrific events which occurred in Cambodia during the 1970s, because there is too much of those “suspicious historical records” concerning the horrific events which occurred in Cambodia during the decade of the 1970s, which just don’t fit together. Everyone else can accept Cambodia’s 1970s historical records (even the Cambodians) 100%, yet Atlanteans must instruct each other to avoid believing anything non Atlanteans suggest.

Polynesian Indonesia

To the south of China, Vietnam and Cambodia is the nation of Indonesia. Indonesia is a nation made up of over 13,500 islands, which includes Borneo, Java, Sumatra, and Irian Java, which is located on the same island as the nation of Papua New Guinea, which is home to a black people, who they believe are related to the Australian Aborigines. There are close to 6,000 Indonesian islands that are currently inhabited by the Indonesian people, who number over 232,000,000 people, making Indonesia one of the more populous countries in the world. As you already know the Indonesian language is related to the Polynesian languages, as well as to the languages of the Filipinos, and to the languages of Madagascar, and also to that of the island of Taiwan’s original inhabitants which, of course, would mean the Atlanteans did settle Taiwan thousands of years ago, during their great migration periods.

Since Indonesia is in fact located well out in the ocean, it is very probable that the Atlanteans did not allow the opportunity to colonize the beautiful Indonesian tropical islands, get away from them. The islands have been an active volcanic location for an incredibly long time, and the soil of the tropical islands, were and they still are, incredibly rich. In fact if they are largely volcanic they have to be some of the fineness soils in the world for agriculture operations. Historians believe civilization was brought to the Indonesians from India or China about two thousand years ago, but in reality historians could be very wrong about the date

civilization was born among the Indonesian people, especially the Indonesians who inhabited the coastal regions of the beautiful islands of Indonesia.

If the Atlanteans were not the first human inhabitants of Indonesia, could Indonesia have been the home of an Asian people who migrated to the islands, who were possibly related to the Chinese, or to the Vietnamese and Cambodians to the far north? It is not an easy question to answer, but it could be likely Asian immigrants from China and the immediate region surrounding China, were late arrivals who forced their way onto the beautiful Indonesian islands after the Atlanteans settled them. If that scenario is correct, they were unable to fully take control of the islands from the Atlanteans, probably as the result of an large Atlantean population that was strong enough to prevent a total collapse of the Atlantean customs, culture, and languages of course.

To be realistic there may have been a native black people already living there unrelated to the Algonquians, when and if, the Algonquians settled there, and I mention that because there is a black presence there now but, and this is only keeping with what the whites have done in the Americas, those blacks who share that land with the Indonesians were probably let loose there by the whites, after the whites forced their way in, after 1492. Then Indonesia may have known no human settlers until the Atlanteans showed up, which is probably closer to being the truth.

Indonesia is, unfortunately, home to volcano's that have the power to change the climate of our earth, and as well to bring death and destruction on an incredibly large scale. When the volcano Krakatau erupted in the year 1883, it injected into the earths atmosphere so much volcanic ash that it created beautifully colored sunsets for two years after the eruption, as well as ending the lives of 36,000 innocent humans. Sixty eight years before the Krakatau eruption occurred, another very violent volcanic eruption in Indonesia occurred, but in comparison when Mt. Tambora erupted in 1815, it was more powerful than the Krakatau eruption, and as well it brought more human deaths to the Indonesians, and in fact, nearly three times as many deaths as Krakataus 1883 eruption did.

From what I can tell about our earths climate history, especially the most ancient of human climatic records which are from the Story of Atlantis, I can't help but feel that we are sliding slowly into an ice age. If the Story of Atlantis was not tampered with we have a major problem now. If eastern Canada was tropical 11,500 years ago, what has gone wrong with our earths daily climatic patterns? Since we now know that volcano's can cool the earth down considerably as a result of injecting humongous amounts of ash into our earths atmosphere, we can actually pinpoint all the smoke that earthlings are injecting into our earths atmosphere, either it be from simple man made fires such as man

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

made fires to clear forests, or to heat homes, or to cook daily meals, as being responsible for changing our earths daily climatic patterns. Even just smoking cigarettes or cigars can effect our earths daily climatic patterns, if that's the truth.

I live in Great Falls, Montana which is quite windy during the winter months. They actually believe that the reason for Great Falls warmer periods during the winter months are directly related to those winds which are termed, Chinook winds. They believe that those winds blow in warmer air, but in reality those winds may clear the sky's just to the east of the Rocky Mountains, of much of the man made smoke, which could then, realistically, result in warmer temperatures. Oh, if that's true it could be an indicator of how the winters were in the Great Falls region long, long ago, which is dumbfounding. For an example, it is not unusual for Great Falls to experience temperatures well into the 60s during the coldest month of January, when those Chinook winds are in place. You may think that's not so big a deal, yet Great Falls has an elevation of over 3600 feet. Again that is dumbfounding.

Usually in those northerly locations where the number of hours per day of daylight are less than 9 hours, which occurs during the winter months, snow frequently falls and accumulates to the depth where it does not melt. Here in the Great Falls region we get tons of snow (Great Falls averages over 60 inches of snow per winter) each winter, but rarely does the snow stay on the ground for longer than 2 or 3 weeks. If Great Falls did not benefit from the Chinook winds every winter, the winter climate conditions here in Great Falls, would be almost identical (the nearly identical northerly locations) to the winter climate conditions of North Dakota and northern Minnesota. However, Great Falls is nearly 15 degrees warmer during January, than North Dakota and northern Minnesota.

Those Chinook winds blow from the southwest (they move towards the northeast) sending (many believe its practical and their correct) the cold air back to the north. When snow falls and accumulates where it doesn't melt until spring (warmer weather conditions) arrives, the sunlight hitting the snow covered earth below is reflected back up into space, and that prevents the snow covered earth from warming up, which is why those northerly locations where snow stays on the earth all winter, are so cold during the winter months. Along the eastern Rocky Mountain front here in Montana, however, it is an exception. We need to research this unique situation here in Montana, to determine in the future if man made pollution is responsible for the wide variations in temperatures existing along the eastern Rocky Mountain front, compared with that of those same northerly locations to the east.

We do have an unique situation here which could benefit those who want to conquer the hidden mysteries of the earths daily climatic patterns. For all we

know those Chinook winds are probably moving much of the man made pollution along the eastern Rocky Mountain front here in Montana, towards the northeast. Obviously the reason its warmer here than in North Dakota and Minnesota (their elevations are lower as well) in the winter months, has to be centered on less pollution. Since the Chinook winds do cleanse much of the polluted air here in Montana during the winter months, what develops is warmer (it is very cloudy here during the winter months as well) winter temperatures. If the winter days here were far more clear or partly cloudy, it would definitely be even warmer here during the winters.

Imagine if there was absolutely no man made smoke whatsoever in the Great Falls area during the winter months. Unfortunately, we can't eliminate man made smoke so there is no way of proving that the Great Falls region would heat up even more during the winter time. Another fact about the winter months in the Great Falls region, are the numerous cloudy days. About 2 out of every 3 winter days in the Great Falls region are cloudy, so if it wasn't so cloudy here during the winter months it would definitely be warmer. The highest maximum January temperature in Great Falls was a balmy 67, which is quite significant considering the elevation of the city. Augusta is even closer to the Rocky Mountains than Great Falls is, and has an elevation of 4050 feet, which is almost 500 feet higher than Great Falls.

What is unique concerning the winter months in Augusta, is the almost identical maximum and minimum winter temperatures it shares with Great Falls, which is close to 50 miles east of Augusta. I will use Great Falls 1893-1956 climate stats, which includes Black Eagles (Black Eagle lies on the north side of the Missouri river, while Great Falls lies to the south of the Missouri river and borders Black Eagles western city limits) monthly averages, because the elevation of Black Eagle is 3350 feet, as was probably Great Falls original location where the city's daily climate records were recorded, which is 800 feet lower than Augusta's elevation, to give an good picture of the point I'm trying to make. Augusta's daily climate records go back over 100 years.

Septembers, Octobers, Novembers and Decembers maximum daily high temperatures are almost identical for Augusta and Black Eagle or Great Falls 1893-1956 climate stats. They are respectively for Augusta and Great Falls: 70.5, 60.5, 45.5 and 37.5, and 70.8, 60.3, 45.5 and 36.9. It is actually slightly cooler in the Great Falls region during those four months, which is alarming As for January's, February's and March's monthly maximum high temperatures, they are respectively for Augusta and Great Falls: 34.1, 38.6 and 44.6, and 33.8, 35.7 and 44.3. Again the Great Falls region is slightly cooler than the Augusta region, especially during the month of February, which is alarming.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Even at the new Great Falls climate recording station which has an elevation that is over 3600 feet, the February's are still colder than Augusta's. It is alarming because Great Falls is 800 feet lower in elevation than Augusta is. It is suppose to get cooler by better than 1 degree with every 300 feet up in elevation, but that is not the case in the Augusta and Great Falls region. Augusta should be 3 degrees cooler than Great Falls but it isn't. West of Augusta are the Rocky Mountains, which have different winter conditions than the plains to their east. Instead of high winds or the Chinook winds, cities and towns in the mountains experience low winds during the winter months.

Anyone living in Augusta, Cascade, Great Falls and Sun River during the winter months, can escape from the high winds by just driving over the nearby mountains, to those mountain cities and towns. It may be extremely windy at Great Falls, but at the same time the winds in Lincoln or Helena might just be non existent. That is how the winter weather here is.

Another nearby small town about 10 miles due west of Great Falls is Sun River. Sun River has an elevation of 3560 feet, which is lower than Great Falls newer climate recording station by almost 100 feet. The maximum high temperatures during January's, February's and March's in Sun River are respectively: 33.9, 40.2 and 46.0. Its kind of difficult to accept the maximum February high in Sun River as actually topping out at over a balmy 40 degrees. Imagine if there was an location around Sun River which had an elevation at exactly sea level, and how much warmer it would be in the winter time. Instead of an balmy 40.2 it just may reach into the lower 50s. We could actually add on another 12 degrees or more to the winter maximum high temperatures, if there were locations in this region at exactly sea level. Then Septembers, Octobers, Novembers and Decembers maximum high temperatures in Sun River are: 71.2, 60.9, 45.1 and 37.2, which are slightly warmer than in Great Falls.

Another small town to the southwest of Great Falls by a good 30 or 40 miles is Cascade. Cascade has an elevation of 3390 feet, which is about the same as Great Falls old climate reporting station. Climate stats have been recorded at Cascade for over 95 years. Januarys, Februarys and March's average maximum temperatures in Cascade are respectively: 34.3, 39.2 and 46.2. Septembers, Octobers, Novembers and Decembers maximum high temperatures in Cascade are respectively: 72.1, 61.0, 46.7 and 38.0. To the northeast of Great Falls by a good 40 or so miles is the small town of Fort Benton. Fort Benton has an elevation of 2640 feet, which is almost 1000 feet lower in elevation than Great Falls. Septembers, Octobers, Novembers and Decembers maximum high temperatures in Fort Benton are respectively: 74.1, 63.0, 46.2 and 36.0. During

SAMUEL POE

Januarys, Februarys and March's the maximum high temperatures in Fort Benton are respectively: 31.2, 39.6 and 47.4.

Belt is 20 miles to the east of Great Falls, and close to 70 miles to the east of Augusta, and has an elevation that is even higher than that of Augusta. Belts elevation is 4220 feet. However, during Septembers, Octobers, Novembers, Decembers, January's, February's and March's in Belt, those maximum monthly high temperatures in Belt are respectively: 69.7, 58.3, 42.8, 35.9, 33.8, 38.5 and 44.7. February's in Belt are just as warm as Augusta's but warmer than the February's in Great Falls. What is important about those cities is their populations. Black Eagle, Great Falls and Malmstrom Air Force Base (Malmstrom borders Great Falls eastern city limits) has a population that exceeds 60,000, while the remaining cities have populations at around 1000 or less. You be the judge to determine if humans are interfering with mother earths daily climatic patterns! It clearly shows that more populated settlements can effect daily climate conditions, but it still needs further research, if it hasn't already been done.

Now for locations which have the same elevation. Key West and Key West NAS islands, which are part of the Florida Keys, as is Big Coppitt Key, which isn't too far from Key West, are those locations. Junes, July's, August's and Septembers in Big Coppitt Key, have maximum high temperatures of 86, 87, 87 and 87, while at Key West NAS they average 86.9, 88.5, 88.7 and 87.8, while at Key West they are 87.4, 88.9, 89.2 and 87.8. Although all three locations have the same elevation and are separated by no more than 10 miles, there is that clear difference existing. Of course, Key West is the most populous city (around 25,000 people live there and almost all of the island is developed) while Key West NAS and Big Coppitt Key have at the most, only a few thousand residents. Most likely the reason for the slightly different temperatures is related to just how many inhabitants reside on each of those small islands, as well as just how much human development has occurred. Januarys maximum highs and minimum lows at all three locations are respectively: Big Coppitt Key, 73.0 and 64.0, Key West NAS, 74.0 and 64.0, and Key West, 74.5 and 64.5.

Another extremely suggestive question concerning humans polluting our earths atmosphere is, are we shortening our own precious life span's when we pollute our earths atmosphere with our man made smoke? Before we discovered civilized life, we did not know how to create fire and during those times when we were so used to the ways of uncivilized life, our earths atmosphere was definitely free of man made smoke. In fact, I believe that not only did our earths sky's look different then, but we lived longer and most of

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

our earth was tropical, excepting our earths polar caps. Almost everyone knows of the great ages humans lived to in the bible, but too many disagree. If our ancestors lived for a thousand years or longer during those ancient times, we may just want to delve further into concerning humans polluting our earths atmosphere with man made smoke, to learn if it is effecting our daily health conditions.

Crocodilians, some fish and some reptiles can live for hundreds of years, and yet they spend considerable time submerged in water. Of course, those fish spend all their time in water for they can only breathe through water. That should tell everyone something is wrong! Why do some forms of animal life live far longer than others? If you happen to ignore the ages humans lived to in the bible, which I used to, you should not ignore that extremely bit of important information. We know that smoking is not good for our health, and since our earth is incapable of eliminating all of the man made smoke we inject, immediatly, it simply means it can only accumulate.

It has probably accumulated so vastly over the ages it has cooled our earth down considerably, and it has probably shortened not only our own life span's, but all other forms of animal life considerably as well. Since larger human cities obviously have far more pollution, it would be extremely wise for those who adamantly want to live a longer life, to find either an small village or maybe purchase an farm of some sort, far from the nearest very large human city, to live permanently. Who knows, maybe people who live in villages which have populations of at the most, only a couple of hundred people, and farmers and ranchers who live out in the middle of nowhere, live for far longer than we like to accept as being the truth.

Then you must preserve your good health by using preservatives such as drinking a cup of water with an teaspoon of salt brine solution every morning on an empty stomach, and wait at least a good 10 to 15 minutes before eating your first meal of the day. You will need to purchase rock salt and then fill an mason jar up with water, and then drop a few crystals of rock salt into the mason jar. Wait a good 24 hours or longer, to find out if those crystals of rock salt have dissolved. If they have dissolved repeat the process. After you realize the salt in the mason jar will not dissolve, that represents that the water has become saturated with salt and you then must stop until you drop more rock salt crystals into that mason jar, and the process repeats itself. Put one teaspoon of that salt brine solution into your cup of morning water every morning. There are probably other preservatives we can use such as honey. Even now they continue to find honey in good condition in Egyptian mummy's, which could actually be as old as 11,500 years.

Volcanic eruptions can obviously change the earth's climate, yet they also at the same time, benefit humans in particular ways. Indonesia will always have some very rich soils to grow crops which, of course, is the good side of the story but, of course, the reason for Indonesia's rich volcanic soil, the volcano's, are the bad side of story. And certainly the Atlanteans of Indonesia, if in fact the Atlanteans settled the islands, experienced the same catastrophes as the later Indonesians did. India was probably attracted to Indonesia's volcanic soils for historians speculate that Indians have played important roles in Indonesia's history for at least two thousand years. Most likely, however, India has been involved in Indonesia's history for far longer than only two thousand years. By the 16th century the whites were actively visiting the Indonesian region to trade with the native inhabitants. In the 17th century the Dutch were beginning to force their will over Indonesia, as well as eventually requesting of the Chinese, to send Chinese settlers to settle down and live in Indonesia, as they did also on Taiwan. It was also probably during that very same time that the whites let loose their black slaves as well.

For the next two centuries the Dutch eventually brought more of what is now Indonesia under Dutch control. By 1909 the Dutch had brought Indonesia under their control but it wouldn't last of course. The Chinese had become by 1909, very powerful entrepreneurs in Indonesia, which many native Indonesians did not approve of. Obviously the Dutch had created major obstacles for native Indonesians when they allowed foreigners other than of white Dutch descent, and Dutch descent as well, to settle down upon native Indonesian lands. Japan brought Indonesia under Japanese control during World War II, and they were not so well received by the native Indonesians, but they did promise to give them their independence, but there wasn't enough time, of course, for Japan to do that.

After World War II the Dutch would encounter an Indonesia that wanted them gone, but the Dutch were not so willing to abdicate their rule over Indonesia. On two separate occasions the Dutch attacked Indonesia to attempt to keep their Indonesian colony under their control. The first Dutch military actions took place during July of 1947. Then again during December of 1948, the Dutch attacked Indonesia to attempt to keep their Indonesian colony, but widespread protesting resulted and that protesting is what finally brought independence to the native Indonesians.

As for the island of New Guinea which Irian Jaya is part of, it was discovered by the Portuguese in 1511. Spain actually claimed New Guinea in 1546, and named the island New Guinea because they mistakenly thought that the natives resembled the blacks of western Africa. It may have been the Portuguese or

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Spanish who first let loose the blacks on New Guinea. They are not fooling anyone! Irian Jaya covers approximately 162,928 sq mi and has a population of 1,828,700. We definitely have a serious problem here for Indonesia has a population of more than 232,000,000, but only 1,828,000 live on Irian Jaya. Indonesia covers 782,663 sq mi and Irian Jaya alone makes up almost a quarter of Indonesia. The Dutch didn't relinquish control of Irian Jaya until 1962 to Indonesia. By 1969 the people of Irian Jaya voted to become part of Indonesia. I believe something is seriously wrong because Irian Jaya is almost as big as Borneo and Sumatra, yet its population is drastically fewer. Did the Dutch and the other white countries who have participated in New Guinea's history, do something that we haven't the slightest clue of, to New Guinea's original Asian inhabitants?

Anyway, Indonesians can trace much of their historical roots back to India, as also can Cambodia, Malaysia and the Philippines. However, those historical Indian roots are most definitely more ancient than we have been taught by historians. Those Indian roots most likely go back far longer than a measly two thousand years. And by probably the first century A.D. the Indian influence was on the decline but it would persist on for several more centuries, and that contact obviously involved sailing the ocean between Indonesia and India of course.

I know the average historian will always stick with the current accepted origins of the peoples of Indonesia, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, the Polynesians of the Pacific Oceans islands, and the Aborigines of Australia and, of course, they believe their ancestors came from the mainland of Asia either by walking, when during the ice age much of Indonesia and Australia were connected by land bridges, from the mainland of Asia, or by sailing during a time when conditions favored a good chance of sailing a very short distance to get to their destination. The Atlanteans, in my opinion, may or not have been the first human inhabitants of Indonesia, the Philippines, Papua New Guinea, and Australia, but I do believe they were very aware of the above mentioned locations, and they did in fact see to it that those locations came under the control of the Atlanteans, who very likely sent many of their settlers to live in those locations. I just don't know if those locations were already occupied by other people, and if there existed any civilizations in those locations then.

Polynesian Malaysia

To the north of Indonesia on the mainland of Asia, is the modern Asian country of Malaysia, which has a population that exceeds 22,000,000, and of that, the Chinese make up slightly more than 25% of the total population of

Malaysia. Malaysia covers nearly 127,000 sq mi. and has a tropical climate. Thailand borders Malaysia to the north, and both Cambodia and Vietnam which are located nearby, have small populations of people who speak languages related to the Malayo-Polynesian language family, which simply means at least some of the people presently living in Cambodia, Thailand and Vietnam, are of Polynesian descent.

Islam reached what is now Indonesia and Sumatra in the 12th century, and from there it eventually spread throughout Indonesia, and then Malaysia, as well as onto the Philippines. Islam is still the dominant religion of Malaysia, and continues to grow in Malaysia, but Islam is not the only religion of Malaysia. Christianity is also practiced there, as well as the religions that originated in India which, of course, are Buddhism and Hinduism. The first Europeans arrived in the sixteenth century, and from that time on the Europeans were a thorn in the foot of the Malaysian people, as well as the Indonesians and the Filipinos, and I might want to add, the rest of the non European peoples, simply because the Europeans in reality intruded into the affairs of nearly all non European peoples, yet that obviously is nothing new to world history. The Atlanteans, if my theory is correct, possibly settled in what is now Malaysia, and other Asian locations in the same region, as long as 11,500 years ago.

Its possible that there was an native people already living in Malaysia when the Atlanteans first arrived. But were those people an Asian people native to the southern areas of the mainland of Asia? Or could it be possible that an Asian people migrated there after the Atlanteans settled there? Good questions to battle! Malaysia is within close proximity to Cambodia and Vietnam, and its possible the Atlanteans settled in both Cambodia and Vietnam, and possibly even Thailand, but again its possible there occurred an Atlantean conquest of some kind over the native peoples of those regions, which resulted in the Atlanteans forcing them to speak Atlantean, and that could explain the language relationships of course. I am mentioning possible Atlantean colonies or conquests in Cambodia, Thailand and Vietnam, because the Chamin language that is native to Cambodia and Vietnam, is apparently related to the Indonesian and Malaysian languages.

Malaysia's history is not so well known of as a result of a lack of historical records. However, since Malaysia is in extreme close proximity to Indonesia (Indonesia's Borneo shares their island homeland with Malaysia's Sarawak and Sabah) we can single out India's influence once again. So Malaysia's civilized roots can be largely traced directly to India, but even before India's influences the Atlanteans probably were bringing their civilized customs, including their syllabic

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

writing system to what is now Cambodia, Indonesia and Malaysia, and probably Thailand as well. In 1511 the white Portuguese forced their way into Malaysia, and toppled the Malacca Kingdom (it originated on mainland Malaysia) whose roots went back to 1400. Evidently an refugee from probably Johor, founded the Malacca Kingdom, and the young kingdom soon expanded as a result of gaining more wealth. Portuguese rule was one which was in constant trouble with the native inhabitants of Malaysia, which the Dutch were aware of and acted on. In 1641 the Portuguese were driven from Malaysia by the expanding Dutch, and the Dutch would also experience trouble with the native inhabitants of Malaysia as well.

During the early 19th century England was finding the islands to the north of Australia, very attractive, including what is now all of Malaysia. By 1819 England had founded Singapore, which would later on become an independent Chinese country. Unfortunately, the whites were very willing to send Chinese settlers to what is now Malaysia. Evidently the whites felt that it was necessary to incorporate foreign workers and entrepreneurs in Malaysia. That action of the whites was deliberate and centered on injustice and was not necessary. They only needed to look to the native Malaysian's for what they required. Their act of injustice would create Singapore, of course, but even more disturbingly it led to the Chinese immigrants to eventually thinking that they had every right to claim Malaysian land. Malaysia's Borneo lands were under Muslim Brunei rule until an unfortunate 1841 incident occurred (the Sultan of Borneo awarded James Brooke a gift of land for aiding him, but the English stabbed them in the back) which would eventually bring Malaysia's Borneo land under England's control by 1888.

Of course, the English allowed foreign immigration which also included immigrants from India. However, it was the Chinese who were the more acceptable to England. By 1945 the Chinese made up 37% of Malaysia's population. The English didn't need foreign labor for they had all the labor they required among the native Malaysian's. They deliberately forced foreigners into Malaysia to deliberately inflict future injustice. During the independence movement the native Malaysian's were so concerned about the foreigners acquiring political power in Malaysia, that they balked at the idea of an Malayan Union. Evidently the Malayan Union was created to specifically allow foreigners to have the opportunity to become citizens. Instinct set in and the native Malaysian's acted for they knew that the foreigners would seize power (does Fiji ring a bell) if they had the opportunity to do so. England's Malayan Union was created to cause problems for the native Malaysian's and those problems continue. At the present time there are two Malaysia's with one being the native

Malaysian's, and the other being the foreign Chinese. Unfortunately, the injustice has caused the native Malaysian's problems which could escalate into open rebellion, which will be fought to make either Malaysia, native Malaysian, or Chinese. The native Malaysian's can thank England for the horrible injustice they currently endure as a nation.

If the Atlanteans did in fact settle in mainland Asia or Malaysia to be precise, the ancient civilizations located in that part of our earth, are indeed much older than what we believe the age of the ancient civilizations of those locations to be. Realistically, Atlantean civilization possibly took root in the Malaysia region coming directly from North America, then eventually over time the Atlantean civilization was adopted by the native peoples of the mainland of Asia who certainly, of course, put their own innovations into the much older Atlantean civilization. We have to seriously consider that many other locations in eastern Asia, which may have been possibly colonized by the Atlanteans, not just one location, was exactly how the native inhabitants of Asia became civilized unless, of course, there was an native Asian civilization in place when the Atlanteans first showed up. Yet for all we know, it may have only been one location which was colonized by the Atlanteans, and from that one location their civilization would spread throughout eastern Asia. And as for an older Asian civilization in existence long before that of the Atlanteans, I presently haven't any clue if there actually was, yet it may have been very likely.

The Polynesian Philippines

To the east of Malaysia, and to the northeast and north of Indonesia, are the Philippine Islands, a group of 7,100 large and small islands that covers an area of 115,830 sq. mi. Historians believe that the ancestors of the Filipinos originated on the mainland of Asia, and they are possibly right about not only some of the inhabitants of the Philippines, but also Malaysia, Indonesia, and as well Taiwan originating on the mainland of Asia. However, their estimated time period for their arrivals are probably far off. But I suspect that the Atlanteans were not shy of those locations, and in fact, they probably settled all those locations (the Philippines included) coming directly from North America of course.

Either the Atlanteans conquered the original inhabitants of those locations (they need to prove that there was an aboriginal people there first) or the Atlanteans themselves were over time, conquered by those possible original inhabitants of that location of Asia, who present day historians believe were first to live there. Unfortunately, we have been taught by the whites that blacks were those first human inhabitants of the Philippines. I have no choice but to exclude

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

the white historical records of the Philippines concerning black Filipinos, and again refer to the whites, be them Spanish or any other whites, let loose their black slaves throughout the Philippines after 1492. Again I will claim that they are not fooling anyone.

Historians believe that around 200 B.C. the Asians invaded the black controlled Philippines and eventually brought the islands under their control, which is a bunch of bull. Probably as long ago as 11,500 years but maybe even further back in time, some Atlantean navigator discovered the Philippines and then alerted the proper Atlantean leaders about the discovery of the new islands. Upon receiving the news of the discovery of the new islands, which were most likely uninhabited, those Atlantean leaders likely debated over the subject of sending their settlers to the Philippines, and possibly for considerable time. They obviously decided to organize expeditions to survey the Philippines first, to learn of good locations to eventually start colonies, as they had obviously done everywhere in the vast Pacific Ocean. Afterwards, they obviously commenced to send their settlers to the uninhabited Philippines to settle the islands.

Europeans were not at all shy of the Philippines, and the same fate suffered by so many other peoples, such as the Indonesians, Malaysians, the Polynesians, the black Africans and, of course, the native Indians of the Americas, also was suffered by the natives of the Philippines. Early on, the first white European world power, Spain, became a major problem for the people of the Philippines, and in fact, it was the Spanish that founded the present capital of the Philippines, Manila, in the year 1571. Spain had to deal with the empire of England first, then later on the United States of America, who undoubtedly only wished to see the Spanish sail off into the sunset, and be very good natured about it. But the Spanish decided that to stand up against the powerful Americans, was far better than to give in without a fight.

During the Spanish-American War that started in 1898, the Spanish were greatly humiliated by the more powerful Americans, who became a world power during the very humiliating war the Spanish most certainly only wished to forget. The Americans only suffered 389 battlefield deaths in that war that was fought from the Americas to the Philippines. Yet what good came from the war for the Americans, was the Americans eventual acquisition of the Philippines, from the losers of the Spanish-American War, the Spanish. The Americans eventually allowed the Philippines to become independent in the year 1934, and I do believe the main reason the Americans allowed the Philippines to become independent, was the very large population of the Philippines. If the Philippines did indeed have a much smaller population then, than I suppose the Americans probably would of reacted far differently than they did and, of course, the point

I am trying to make deals with sending large numbers of not only American settlers to the Philippines, but as well settlers from Europe to the Philippines also and, to continue on with insisting of the white acts of injustices, forcing large numbers of blacks to migrate there as well.

There was an civilization existing in the Philippines long before the whites discovered the Philippines, which was in contact with far off India, particularly in trade ventures. Evidently the Indians from India were visiting the Philippines frequently, which could mean that many Indians from India settled down in the Philippines to permanently live, as well as natives from the Philippines venturing all the way to India to settle down and live in India permanently as well to. By the 13th century the Indians had brought Islam to the Philippines from the Middle East. Before the whites discovered the Philippines in 1521, its likely that Islam was well established, but after the whites brought the Philippines under their control that would change of course.

In 1564 the Spanish had successfully established themselves in the Philippines, and for over 300 years the Spanish would rule the Philippines without much resistance coming from the natives of the Philippines. However, by the late 19th century Spain was enduring the decline of their once formidable empire, and as we know they were singled out by the Americans who wanted their presence in the Americas and elsewhere as well, to come to an abrupt end.

However, the Americans were initially not well received by the natives of the Philippines, for after gaining control of the Philippines problems would arise. On May 19, 1898 Filipino leader Emilio Aguinaldo, declared the Philippines to be independent, but the Americans eventually ignored it. When the Spanish signed the December 10, 1898 Treaty of Paris, they ceded the Philippines to the Americans for \$20 million. On December 21, 1898 the Americans proclaimed that the Philippines were now under American military rule. On February 4, 1899 fighting commenced in Manila between the Americans and native Filipinos, in which the Americans successfully drove off the rebel Filipinos.

Later on in 1899 the Filipinos resorted to guerilla warfare against the invading Americans. Fighting continued until 1902 when the Americans removed American military control with an civil American control over the Philippines. On July 4, 1946 the Republic of the Philippines was proclaimed. There are close to 85,000,000 people living in the Philippines presently, and that is far too many people for a country the size of the Philippines, but the Filipinos are currently in no great danger of any kind of an catastrophe devastating their great country. They do have to control their countries population growth so they can better provide for their citizens in the future, as the Chinese are currently doing now.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Although the Philippines did not go unconquered by the expanding white Europeans, I do believe their large population forced the Europeans to deal with them in a more favorable attitude centered on keeping the Philippines in Filipino hands, and as a result of that favorable attitude of the Europeans towards the Philippines, the Philippines are an successful member of the world community now. However, going back to the issue of foreigners migrating to the Philippines during white European control, we know that the whites did bring blacks to the Philippines, but they also probably allowed large numbers of Chinese people to settle down in the Philippines to live permanently as well. Today, the Filipino people are likely an mixture of the native Polynesians who first inhabited the Philippines, as well as black and Chinese, and even some white European as well.

Polynesian Taiwan

Just north of the Philippines is the island of Taiwan, which apparently was first occupied by an non Chinese people, thousands of years before the Chinese first made intrusions onto the island. Today, the population of the rather large island which covers an area of around 12,500 sq mi, is close to 22,000,000, and for an island that small with such an huge population, there is likely going to be severe consequences that the people of Taiwan are going to face some day in the future, unless they can somehow manage to overcome all the obstacles, which may effect them in the future as a result of overcrowding or over population.

It was during the seventeenth century when the Chinese from the mainland, commenced to immigrate to the rather large island, but even during the seventeenth century the Europeans were not at all shy of the island of Taiwan, and the Dutch actually ruled the small island from 1620 to 1622, before the mainland Chinese eventually gained control of the island. The original occupants of Taiwan, since they spoke a language related to the Malayo-Polynesian languages were, of course, possibly of Atlantean descent. But just who were those people and how did they get to the island?

We have to remember that from Madagascar to the Polynesian islands, to Malaysia and as well Indonesia, the Philippines, and probably Australia (since the languages of Australia's Aborigine people is part of that termed Austronesian language group), the inhabitants of all those locations all spoke a language that is part of the Malayo-Polynesian language family, and in fact, they actually believe that the original homeland of that Austronesian language family which the Malayo-Polynesian language family is considered to be part of, is Taiwan. The incredible distance that separates the entire territory of the Malayo-Polynesian language family or the Austronesian language family, is something that can't be ignored.

From Madagascar to Indonesia alone, it is nearly 4000 miles and, of course, the Indian Ocean separates Madagascar and Indonesia. There is only one written historical record that tells of an people, who long before the Europeans conquered the worlds oceans, were fully capable of navigating any ocean of our world and, of course, that is the Atlanteans from North America. Look on any map of the Pacific Ocean, and deliberately discover the great distant from Madagascar to Easter Island, and try and comprehend just how did all those islands come to be inhabited by people.

Of course, the Algonquians as long ago as 11,500 years to 15,000 years ago, were fully capable of navigating all the worlds oceans, and they are probably responsible for colonizing all those locations in the Pacific Ocean. Madagascar is not at all a great distance from the mainland of Africa, but were black people from the mainland of Africa the first inhabitants of Madagascar? Even though Africa is only a few short miles from Madagascar, I believe the Atlanteans inhabited Madagascar long before the first black people showed up on the huge island. Currently, those historians theorize that possibly two thousand years ago an Asian people from the mainland of Asia, were driven from their homeland to the islands of the Pacific Ocean, yet it's the incredible distance of that part of our earth, which obviously points to that other scenario. I mean, after all, Madagascar is nearly 4000 miles from Indonesia, and that alone is a distance far greater than the distance from North America to Africa and Europe is. So their theory to me is worth throwing in the trash, yet it may have been possible. I, myself, have to do far more research into the histories of the inhabitants of southern southeast Asia, to discover if there exist any historical records that mentions anything resembling a people who were fully capable of navigating the huge Pacific Ocean, as long ago as two thousand years.

From Madagascar to Easter Island, it is almost 15,000 miles, and to me it is unbelievable for any people of two thousand years ago to navigate, to and from, those locations, especially an supposedly uncivilized people, and the Europeans who were highly civilized, did not accomplish such a feat until the fifteenth century. So to me since there are historical records that date to 11,500 years ago, which mention that the Algonquians were fully able to navigate the Atlantic Ocean, it simply means that they could sail around the entire world then, in those ancient times.

Although Taiwan is predominantly Chinese, the islands first inhabitants continue to live on Taiwan, but they are, and have been, under Chinese domination for a very long time, and make up less than 10% of the total population of the overcrowded island. And sadly they will never regain control of their homeland and, of course, that is because of the Chinese people from the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

mainland of China who, at the present time, are far too powerful and numerous, for the small islands first inhabitants to by force, remove them from power to become free and independent once again. As for how long the first inhabitants of Taiwan have occupied the island of Taiwan for, that is at least to me simple to answer, and though 11,500 years should be accepted, in reality it may have been somewhat longer than that.

Taiwan's Aborigine's are classified as "Plains Aborigines and Mountain Aborigines," with the Mountain Aborigines being the dominant of the two groups. Of course, that can be attributed to Taiwan's mountains which likely saved Taiwan's original inhabitants from being absorbed by foreigners. Of the 13 currently recognized Taiwanese Aboriginal tribes only two are classified as being Plains Aborigines. Those two are the Kavalan and the Sakizaya. Before Taiwan recognized the indigenous Taiwanese tribes recognized presently, the Japanese (Japan ruled Taiwan from 1895-1945) officially recognized nine of Taiwan's Aboriginal tribes. Starting in 2001 Taiwan would give recognition to other indigenous Aboriginal Taiwanese tribes, when Taiwan officially recognized the Thao tribe. Then in 2002 and 2004 Taiwan officially recognized the Kavalan and Truku tribes. In January of 2007 Taiwan officially recognized the Sakizaya tribe. The remainder of the 13 officially recognized Aboriginal tribes of Taiwan are: the Ami, the Atayal, the Bunun, the Paiwan, the Puyuma, the Rukai, the Saisiyat, the Tao and the Tsou. Currently, these are the unrecognized Aboriginal Taiwanese tribes: the Babuza, the Basay, the Hoanya, the Ketagalan, the Luilang, the Pazeh/Kaxabu, the Popora, the Qauqaut, the Siraya, the Taokas and the Trobiawan.

Their history is one which allowed Taiwan's Aborigine's to remain independent from foreigners until the 17th century, when the Dutch gained control over the rather large island of Taiwan. Spain also interfered with Taiwan's Aborigine's. However, it was China which brought Taiwan under foreign rule permanently. It just may have been China that allowed Taiwan's Aborigine's to survive on. Taking into consideration, what the whites did on the smaller islands that the Polynesians inhabited (I'm excluding Indonesia and the Philippines) after discovering the islands of the Pacific Ocean, if the whites had continued to rule Taiwan it would have most likely led to the complete elimination of Taiwan's Aborigine's. So when China gained control over Taiwan it may have been an blessing in disguise. When Japan ruled Taiwan they actually officially recognized those Taiwanese Aboriginal tribes I have previously mentioned, so just knowing that suggests great importance.

Starting in 1624 the Dutch established a colony in southwestern Taiwan, while the Spanish established a colony in northern Taiwan in 1626. However,

the Spanish were eventually driven from Taiwan by the Dutch in 1642. The Dutch eventually requested of the native Aboriginal tribes of Taiwan, to actively trap for fur bearing animals, but what that act eventually created was Chinese traders and settlers openly visiting Taiwanese Aborigine villages, to trade and live as well. At first the Dutch were well pleased to have the Han Chinese in Taiwan also, but their approval wouldn't last after the Han Chinese gradually started to become more numerous. The Chinese would soon rebel against the Dutch and do so for control over Taiwan, and not simply because they weren't satisfied. In 1662 the Han Chinese had enough of the Dutch presence in Taiwan, and since they were now well established throughout Taiwan thanks to the Dutch, they assembled some 70,000 of their soldiers for an all out invasion of Taiwan, which was successful of course. The Dutch could have pursued a policy of eventually bringing Taiwan back under Dutch control, but after learning of the 70,000 Chinese soldiers who brought Taiwan under Han Chinese control, the Dutch would reluctantly accept that it would be too costly in both Dutch wealth and Dutch life, to bring Taiwan back under Dutch control.

During the Chinese rule they would take the Taiwanese Aboriginal lands from Taiwan's Aborigine's. All was not well between the invading Chinese and Taiwanese Aborigine's, for from time to time rebellions occurred, some of which were directly related to Aborigine lands. Evidently the Chinese reserved large areas of Aborigine land for Taiwan's Aborigine's, but the Chinese were prone to stab the Aborigine's in the back from time to time, which would eventually lead to the departure of some of Taiwan's Aborigine's from the plains of Taiwan, to Taiwan's more mountainous regions.

The Qing Empires presence on Taiwan officially ended on April 17, 1895 when they handed over Taiwan to the rising world power of Japan, after the Treaty of Shimonoseki was signed. Japan would get more powerful as the 20th century came. Evidently the Japanese were somewhat infuriated with one particular Taiwanese Aboriginal tribe (the Paiwan), who were apparently not so kind to an group of Japanese fishermen from Okinawa in 1871, after they accidentally shipwrecked along Taiwan's southern shores. After the Japanese fishermen were massacred by the Paiwan, the Japanese evidently were inspired by that unfortunate incident to look upon Taiwan's Aborigine's as being savages.

After gaining Taiwan the Japanese became infatuated with bringing civilized life to Taiwan's Aborigine's which, unfortunately, meant using violence occasionally to do just that. Japan was quite successful at bringing the plains Taiwanese Aborigine's to look the Japanese in the eyes. As were the plains Taiwanese Aborigine's capable of bringing the Japanese to look them in the eyes. As we know the Japanese officially recognized some of Taiwan's Aborigine's,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

which is nothing less than a miracle, for we know that all too often invaders have that immense will to eliminate the Aborigine's.

After their defeat in World War II, Japan was forced to hand over Taiwan to Chinese nationalists or the KMT. As with the Japanese invaders, the Chinese invaders (some 1.3 million mainland Chinese fled to Taiwan under Chiang Kai Shek's leadership) established a policy of forcing Taiwan's Aborigine's to become civilized or to accept Chinese customs. Since then the Taiwanese Aborigines have endured foreign rule uninterrupted. Their plight is very much the same as that of the plight of Native Americans, Polynesians, and the Roma people. Today, the Taiwanese Aboriginal population is over 450,000 or roughly about 2% of Taiwan's total population of 22,000,000. In 1623 Taiwan was Aborigine and thanks to the white Europeans it is no longer that way.

Polynesian Australia

Australia had to be colonized by the Atlanteans, after all it lies right smack in the middle of all the Pacific Oceans islands, which were colonized by the venturesome Atlanteans. I know at the present time from what I have learned about Australia's original inhabitants, the black Aborigines, that they are black in race, but I am not 100% certain that all Aborigine Tribes look black, because, I myself, like all other Americans, know at an early age young Aborigines look Asian, with wavy hair that resembles European and Asian hair, but as they mature into young adults, their hair gradually becomes identical to that of black people of Africa. Obviously there is something very mysterious about the Aborigines of Australia, but presently I do not know if there are some Aborigine Tribes, whose race, or appearance if you prefer, is more Asian compared to the average Aborigine Tribe. What I am presenting concerning Australia is the same I have presented for all other locations where the Polynesians were the first human inhabitants, which specifically deals with the whites bringing their black slaves to Australia then letting them loose, but only doing so after 1492.

Since we have been bombarded with the belief of the whites that the first Australians were black in race (again this subject is not worth writing of for Native Americans were definitely Australia's first human inhabitants) I must delve on this subject unfortunately. And another reason I must mention that is because I have no choice but to accept reality, Australian Aborigines who look black are the more numerous, if there are actually in existence now in Australia Asian looking Aborigines. So it obviously does appear as if black people were the first Australians but probably not.

I am not 100% certain if black people were the first inhabitants of Australia, for the Polynesians can't be ignored is another good reason to refuse to

acknowledge Australia as being first inhabited by blacks, especially Polynesian Madagascar, which can't be ignored, though they will insist on it. Europeans showed up on the shores of what we might want to consider the worlds largest island, but is instead considered to be a continent and rightfully so, after they had discovered the Americas. And apparently the English likely colonized Australia as a result of losing their American colonies but probably not. Greed played an far greater role.

I realize that since the Australian Aborigines are not pure in race, or to better put it, they are mixed in race, that that means there must of existed long before the arrival of the Europeans, an Asian people living in Australia, who certainly were not as numerous as the black Aborigines (if black people were Australia's first human inhabitants that is) and as a result of mixing with the black Aborigines, they have become extinct. Or the Algonquians were Australia's first human inhabitants, and blacks were in fact forced to Australia by their white brethren, to be slaves or let loose or both, and from mixing with them the Australian Algonquians have become extinct.

If my suspicions are on the right path, then that most certainly means the Algonquians were aware of the location of Australia. To be realistic it would be insane to actually think that the Atlanteans could of for some reason, bypassed the location of Australia by some freak accident. New Zealand is only a few hundred miles from the southeast coast of Australia, and since New Zealand was probably colonized by the Algonquians (their descendants on the islands of New Zealand are the Maori people), in my opinion that means it would have been impossible for the Atlantean navigators to have missed the continent of Australia. Then again we can't forget about Polynesian Madagascar! Of course, the Atlanteans knew of the location of Australia.

When the first Atlanteans arrived on the shores of Australia they may of encountered an Australian land void of any human inhabitants or black people, who possibly were very hostile. But what if Australia was uninhabited as I am almost certain it was? If the Atlanteans were the first inhabitants of Australia it means, of course, Australia was a virgin land waiting for the first human inhabitants. But since black Aborigines dominate presently, we can either reject or accept their assumption that Australia was first inhabited by blacks!

Undoubtedly, Australia was colonized by the Atlanteans, but unlike most other locations colonized by the Atlanteans, the Atlantean population possibly became extinct in Australia, or for all I know there may exist in Australia at the present time, tribes of Aborigines who show more Asian features than black. I will have to do far more research into the history and present living conditions of Australia's Aborigine population, to discover anything out of the normal that

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

currently I am not aware of, that may prove an early Asian presence in Australia. We have been given every reason to dispute their claims that not only was Australia first inhabited by blacks, but also Fiji, Papua New Guinea and those other islands in the Pacific Ocean which are presently black. Again Polynesians need to address this very sensitive subject. As difficult as an subject gets, Polynesians must claim that Polynesians were the first human inhabitants of Australia. What the whites did in the Caribbean Sea region can be used to illustrate to everyone of the point I am attempting to make.

Polynesian Mauritius

Evidently when the first whites showed up and then settled what is now the modern country of Mauritius (they were the Dutch), the islands were uninhabited. Of course, I do not believe that bit of historical information and for very good reasons. Mauritius obviously supported an Polynesian population when the whites discovered the islands which now make up the modern country of Mauritius. However, that Polynesian Mauritius population may have not been very large when the whites discovered the tropical islands. Today, the population of Mauritius is well over one million (1,200,206) and is mixed in race. Mauritius covers approximately 714 sq mi.

Polynesian Seychelles

As with Mauritius, the whites claim that the islands that make up what is now the modern country of Seychelles, were uninhabited but they are wrong of course. Today, the population of the modern country of Seychelles is nearly all of mixed white and black descent, but also include some Indians from India, and Chinese who immigrated there. What that obviously represents is the total extinction of the original Polynesian inhabitants of course. The total population of Seychelles is 80,098. Seychelles covers approximately 176 sq mi.

Polynesian Madagascar

Madagascar is only a short distance from the mainland of Africa, but black people were not the first inhabitants of that huge island! I do not believe European historians, or any other world historians in their belief that Asians from the mainland of southeast Asia colonized Madagascar, as well as Malaysia, Indonesia, and the other islands of the Pacific Ocean. From North America, I believe the Atlanteans obviously colonized not only Europe and Africa, but as well the Atlanteans possibly colonized Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Indonesia, the islands of the Pacific Ocean termed Polynesia, the Philippines, and even possibly India, Taiwan and, of course, Central and South America.

Madagascar did in fact have a black population when the huge island was discovered by the Europeans (that is if you believe them), but they were sharing that huge island with an Asian people, who apparently to European historians have inhabited the island for at least 2000 years. We must delve further into the sensitive question concerning the correct origins of Madagascar's black people! Although they believe that the blacks settled down in Madagascar before the onset of the white expansion in the late 15th century, most likely the blacks were brought to Madagascar by the expanding white Europeans, after they discovered the Americas or Atlantis.

Madagascar may have been one of the last locations colonized by the Algonquians, and I mention that because it is so close to southeast Africa. Madagascar is probably within five hundred miles of the mainland of Africa, and the most westerly of the islands of the Pacific Ocean, which were possibly colonized by the Atlanteans, who likely brought other peoples with them wherever they sailed to, including blacks if the black race was in existence 11,500 years ago, which they may have not been. Madagascar is so far from the homeland of the Malaysians and Indonesians, as well as the Polynesians, that it is hard to imagine any people before the Europeans conquered the worlds oceans, capable of colonizing those islands.

Atlantean navigators somehow were aware of Madagascar's location, which likely occurred as the result of some Atlantean navigator paying careful attention to the surrounding seas he was navigating. Most likely he spotted the tips of mountain peaks or maybe followed the trails of birds, for when navigators become aware of birds in the open seas, they know from instinct that land is not too far off. But was it through the Atlantic Ocean that the Atlanteans discovered Madagascar? Or was it through the Pacific Ocean?

It would not surprise me in the least if the Atlanteans if, after reaching the shores of Europe and north Africa, made a decision to sail southward down the coastline of west Africa, then continued sailing around the south tip of Africa, until reaching the Indian Ocean on the east coast of Africa, where the huge island of Madagascar is located a few hundred miles from the mainland of Africa. Obviously the Atlanteans knew where to look on the ocean for possible signs that land was within their reach, and that is probably how Madagascar was discovered by the Atlantean navigators. Madagascar is the fourth largest island in the world, and that alone is probably why the Atlanteans were able to discover the tropical island, which is well over 200,000 sq mi in size.

If, as I believe, Madagascar was uninhabited, then the first Atlantean navigators responsible for the important first discovery of the island, certainly did not waste time in bringing the important news of their discovery back to the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Atlanteans of North America, as well as Europe and Africa. Madagascar must of impressed the Atlanteans, but I wonder just how they got their settlers courage up to the point, where they would actually want to endanger their lives to settle the far off island. But who knows, the Atlanteans possibly took the time out to start a colony on the east coast of Africa, by way of the Red Sea, and from there organized groups of settlers to eventually settle that huge island.

At the present time Madagascar has a population which is over 16,000,000, but today the population is mixed, of course, and that is because of the native Atlanteans, blacks, and possibly an native people of eastern Asia (most likely the Chinese), who were brought along to Madagascar by the whites, as well as the late arrivals from Europe, and other locations also. As with all other locations that were settled by the Atlanteans, the Europeans forced their way onto the island, and during the 1890s Madagascar became a French colony (France actually commenced to populate Madagascar with blacks and Chinese in 1642), but the French were not going to dominate the worlds fourth largest island for eternity, as in the year of 1960, independence was eventually granted to the people of Madagascar. However, the whites have inflicted an deliberate injustice on the native Polynesians of Madagascar. There are two Madagascar's now with one being Polynesian, and the other being black. Of course, there are then the Chinese and whites as well. Very similar to the Indonesian and Malaysian injustices of course.

So both the Polynesians and blacks reached Madagascar in togetherness around 2000 years ago. They actually believe that the Indonesians were still voyaging to Madagascar in the 15th century. I wonder why! You must first conclude on your own if that is correct! Some 11,500 years ago the Atlanteans probably colonized Madagascar without the blacks, which they will never accept! During the years the whites were frequently visiting Madagascar, their slave trade business (the reason why Madagascar now has an large black population) was the talk of both the native Polynesians and invading whites. From time to time the visiting whites encountered civilized Polynesian kingdoms throughout Madagascar who were actively waging war against one another, and probably intimidating the whites. From what I can tell it appears that the whites had an extremely difficult time getting along with Madagascar's civilized Polynesian Kingdoms. Unlike other Polynesian islands (excepting Samoa and Tonga) the whites didn't do very well on Madagascar. Madagascar is an huge island and that probably hampered the whites in their attempts to totally subjugate all of Madagascar.

The Merina Kingdom and Monarchy of Madagascar

During the first three decades of the 19th century, the whites gradually started to make progress in Madagascar, especially in converting the native Polynesians to Christianity, which came about probably as the result of the Merina Kingdom, which was likely the most powerful Madagascar Kingdom then. To illustrate how the English conducted themselves then, they actually actively supplied the Polynesians with their weapons of war. That likely aided the Merina Kingdom in becoming very powerful. During the late 18th century the Merina were on the move throughout Polynesian Madagascar, and probably because of whites who were visiting Madagascar more and more frequently during those years. Conquest after conquest made the Merina Kingdom the most formidable in all of Madagascar, an fact the whites probably reluctantly accepted.

King Andrianampoinimerina

This Madagascar Polynesian King is probably responsible for making the Merina so formidable. His reign lasted to 1810. During the late 18th century he brought the Merina under his control, and then actively sought to wage war against other Madagascar Polynesian Kingdoms with a vigor. He did it quite successfully! By the time of his 1810 death the Merina King was yet thinking of conquering the rest of Madagascar, but it was not to be. His conquests over Madagascar are remarkable for the size of Madagascar is huge.

King Radama I

King Andrianampoinimerina's son, Radama I, inherited his fathers Madagascar Kingdom, which was by 1810 beginning to attract greater attention from the ever expanding English. After Radama I took the reigns of power, the forked tongue speaking English snuck up cozily to the Merina Kingdoms new king, and then began to speak in their forked tongue language. The English promised this and that, but what they wanted more than anything was for the slave trade business (the reason why there are so many blacks in Madagascar now) to come to an end, and to allow Christianity to freely exist throughout Madagascar (if you believe history, just about the main reason the whites visited Madagascar then). And to seriously get to the point, the English wanted him to allow the English to own this and that throughout all of Madagascar, which was the part which included the English forked tongue language of course. Get the message! Lies! He signed several treaty's with England but never gave in to what England truly wanted. By 1824 he had conquered all of Madagascar, which he found great pride in doing. King Radama I wasn't so easy apparently, because the English were incapable of getting what they wanted above everything else,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

which was all of Madagascar of course. After King Radama's I reign an even more difficult ruler emerged over the Merina Kingdom, who likely irritated the whites more than just a little. That Merina ruler was a woman.

Queen Ranavalona I

The Madagascar Polynesian Queen, Ranavalona I, was very different with the English after she ascended the throne of power in 1828. She was not the forgiving type and also the kind of leader who put the welfare of her subjects first. Her predecessors were at least willing to negotiate with the whites, but she was bothered by the whites, and probably for very good reasons.

She was probably alarmed by the white presence in Madagascar and eventually not only made Christianity illegal, she also ordered her subjects to stop nearly all trade ventures with the invading whites. Queen Ranavalona's I reign (1828-1861) was one in which the whites were prevented from making Madagascar white. She definitely deserves all the respect for during her reign her subjects were dealt an injustice by the whites, which materialized in the whites using propaganda to entice her subjects to actively disagree with her policies. She actually had to murder relatives to become the supreme leader over Madagascar. Queen Ranavalona I reinstated older non Christian religious leaders and aristocrats, which definitely helped her cause during her reign. She must have infuriated the English after the English received the news that Queen Ranavalona I refused to acknowledge the treaty's they had made with King Radama I.

After recovering from an near death illness in 1835, Queen Ranavalona I got wise to what was occurring in her kingdom. She singled out Christianity as being responsible for what was occurring, and then outlawed the religion which had brought the sneaky whites to her kingdom. She forced the English Christians out of Madagascar and then went and waged war on her subjects who had converted to Christianity. Over 150,000 native Polynesians of Madagascar died as a result of her rage over Christianity. That number hints at an huge Polynesian population in Madagascar during that time, which may have been in the millions. Late during her lengthy reign, the sneaky whites (the French) were conspiring with her son to change the course of Madagascar's history. Of course, the whites were speaking to Queen Ranavalona's I son in the forked tongue, by promising him this and that, but they were only thinking of themselves. If we are to believe the whites (non whites should remember that language), than Radama II, Queen Ranavalona's I son, signed an treaty with France on June 28, 1855 which gave the French the right to exploit all minerals, forests and available land all throughout Madagascar.

Queen Ranavalona I eventually learned of her sons plot to spoil the whites, and got immensely upset with the sneaky whites, and then ordered all whites to leave Madagascar. Her remaining time would not be long for the sneaky whites may have soon took action to have her reign come to an quick abrupt end. Supposedly, but possibly not true, Queen Ranavalona I died in 1861. Of course, her son assumed power and he did what the whites requested of him, which was allow foreigners to reside in Madagascar and Christianity to freely exist. However, when the intelligent Queen Ranavalona I reinstated the old aristocracy she allowed for the event which brought on her sons early death to occur. Her Prime Minister, Rainivoninahitriniony, found some time to order Radama II murdered, which occurred in 1863. King Radama's II very short reign lasted from 1861 to 1863.

Queen Rasoaherina

Many believe that Rainivoninahitriniony or his brother Rainilaiarivony, actually ruled Madagascar for the remainder of the Merina Monarchy. What they did do after murdering Radama II was allow his widow to assume the throne. Queen Rasoaherina reigned from 1863 to 1868. What occurred after Queen Ranavalona's I death, and then her sons death, are suspicious to say the least. However, we know from instinct that the whites were up to no good during that time, and it was probably the whites who were instigating this and that during those days. Christianity, the religion which brought the whites to all of the Atlanteans lands in order to convert them, eventually grew more popular after Queen Ranavalona's I death, and that definitely hints at something liberal occurring. Anyway, two more female Queens followed Queen Rasoaherina's reign with one being Queen Ranavalona II (1868-1883), and the other being Queen Ranavalona III (1883-1897). Both were appointed by Prime Ministers who may have been willing to be more open towards the whites. If we want to be precise about Madagascar losing their independence to the whites, it likely occurred when Queen Ranavalona I died. Her son was used by the whites to get what they wanted, which was Madagascar. However, we have to single out Queen Ranavalona's II reign in order to give an exact date for Polynesian Madagascar's end to independence. Of course, France intruded into Madagascar's affairs in 1883, and Queen Ranavalona III may have been an puppet of the French.

The Whites Invade Madagascar

In 1883 the French had enough of waiting to bring Madagascar under white domination, and deliberately planned an French military invasion of Madagascar,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

to bring the Merina Kingdom, which had been an obstacle to the whites for quite a long time, to its end. The conflict is historically referred to as The Franco-Hova War. Evidently “Hova” was suppose to represent the Merina aristocrats. After defeating the Merina Kingdom, France received from the native Polynesians of Madagascar, Antsiranana or Diego Suarez, as well as 560,000 gold francs to be paid to the heirs of the Frenchman who asked for the rights of France to exploit all of Madagascar’s minerals, forests and available land in 1855. After the conflict Great Britain saw eye to eye with their French kinfolk and agreed to renounce their claims to Madagascar. In 1895 the French again invaded Madagascar, then took the capital of Madagascar, Antananarivo, and did it by complete surprise evidently.

One year later in 1896, the French Parliament unanimously agreed to annex Madagascar, which brought the once mighty Merina Monarchy to an end. For 103 years the Merina Kingdom prevented the whites from conquering their beloved homeland. If there is one leader of the Merina Monarchy who must be glorified by future Madagascar Polynesians, it must be Queen Ranavalona I. It was her who stood up to the whites and prevented them from making Madagascar an predominantly white country like New Zealand. Unlike Hawaii, which wasn’t fully incorporated into an white country until late in the 19th century, Madagascar continues to support an large Polynesian population. Hawaii’s native Polynesians are an minority in their own country, while the Polynesians of Madagascar are numerous enough throughout Madagascar, it gives them power.

It was probably Madagascar’s mountainous terrain (the location where the Merina Kingdom originated at) that saved Madagascar’s Polynesians. Early on, probably in either the 16th or 17 century, the whites brought their black slaves to Madagascar and then let them loose. If there was an reason which brought the Merina Kingdom to dominate all of Madagascar, it was probably all the blacks and other foreigners living in Madagascar. They successfully brought Madagascar back under native Polynesian control obviously. And, of course, that occurred when Queen Ranavalona I assumed power over Madagascar.

The Betsileo

Before the whites and their black slaves lived in Madagascar, the Betsileo were accustomed to the life of independence. With the arrival of invaders, an new Madagascar eventually emerged, and probably directly from the humongous changes occurring all over Madagascar after the whites learned of the huge islands location. While on the warpath throughout Madagascar, Radama I

conquered the Betsileo then incorporated them into his expanding empire. Although the Betsileo are not as numerous as the Merina, their population is probably over two million now. As with their Merina kinfolk, the Betsileo people are located mainly in the central highlands of Madagascar, which most likely saved them from what the whites obviously wanted to happen to Madagascar's Polynesians. Along the coasts of Madagascar and inland for quite some distance, is where the Asians, blacks, whites and Madagascar Polynesians reside. Evidently Madagascar has 16 black African tribal groupings (that is likely as the result of the whites forcing large numbers of black Africans from the same tribe, to Madagascar, or they are in fact the descendents of the native Polynesians of Madagascar who lived along Madagascar's coastlines) some of whom are very numerous.

The native Polynesians of Madagascar can blame their white brethren for the deliberate injustice they inflicted on them which, of course, I am referring to the new Madagascar which has an race mixture. Of course, the whites deliberately inflicted that injustice so Madagascar's future would be one that will be problematic (Madagascar has experienced some internal problems since gaining independence in 1960) and the whites will favor the blacks of course. So there is more than one Madagascar now with one being the native Polynesians and the other being black. The whites probably allowed numerous (by numerous it may have been in the hundreds of thousands or even higher) Chinese and other Asian immigrants, to settle down in Madagascar as well. Madagascar covers approximately 226,658 sq mi and has an population of 15,506,472.

Japan

Apparently historians believe the first inhabitants of what is now the island nation of Japan, were an supposedly non Mongolian people who, today, currently still live on the large island nation. Of course, they are a minority in their own country now. European historians believe the Ainu to be related to Europeans, but from the little I have seen of the Ainu and the average Japanese person, I think the Japanese look more European. It is very easy to recognize a relationship that exist between the language of the Atlanteans, or the Algonquians if you prefer, and that of the Japanese people. But presently I have not done research on the Ainu language. If, as I suspect, the Ainu people are descended from the Atlanteans, I need to do more research into their language to discover if there may be a relationship with the Algonquian languages of North America.

If Japan was first occupied by the Ainu people than, of course, that means the Japanese are not native to Japan, and indeed their origins come from some location on the mainland of Asia. But just when did the ancestors of the Japanese

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

people first arrive on the islands, and come into contact with the islands first inhabitants? Again I have to mention the 11,500 years mentioned in the Atlantis story, to come to a date for the first Atlantean colonization of the Japanese islands, so the ancestors of the Japanese people had to of, in my opinion, arrived well before 9000 B.C., and possibly even earlier around the first or second millennium B.C. There had to be hostile contact between the two peoples, yet clearly the Japanese dominated eventually, that's if, the Japanese were late arrivals.

From the little I know about the Japanese language, and the absolute nothing I know of the Ainu language, I can't rightfully come to a decision on this subject to determine if the Japanese borrowed or adopted very heavily, words from their Ainu neighbors language, or vice versa, if the Ainu borrowed or adopted words from the language of the Japanese people. What I have to do obviously, is research on the Ainu language to discover if their language resembles the language of the Algonquians, more so than the language of the Japanese people does who, I realize, speak a language similar to that of Algonquians, and even more so than the Indo-European languages do. Language does influence me, and if the Ainu language does not in the least show a relationship to the language of the Algonquians, than I will have no choice but to consider the Ainu to be late arrivals to the islands of Japan, possibly coming from mainland Asia, and the Japanese people to be in fact the original inhabitants of the islands of Japan.

Japan, during the very early twentieth century, allowed their people to become westernized, and what followed afterwards, most certainly surprised and impressed the white Europeans. The world had been long dominated by the white Europeans since the sixteenth century, but the Japanese people stubbornly rose up to challenge white European domination, in the first half of the twentieth century, particularly beginning in the first decade of the twentieth century, in a war with Russia which, at the end of that conflict, the Japanese people were the victors.

From the end of the conflict between Japan and Russia, to the 1930s, the Japanese people become more westernized, and obviously the leaders of Japan felt that their nation was strong enough to afford to expand to not only benefit the Japanese people, but to also defend the other Asians in eastern Asia and the Pacific Ocean, from white expansionism. Central and eastern Asia, as well as Indonesia, the Philippines, Australia, and the many beautiful small islands of the huge Pacific Ocean, were targeted by Japan during the 1930s and, of course, during World War II. But the leaders of Japan were not unaware of the very powerful empire of England, and as well, particularly the United States, and they did realize that if they were going to expand into the mainland of Asia, and the other locations already mentioned just previously, that they had no choice but to

stand up to the empire of England, as well as the United States, which at that time was enjoying the opportunity of dominating the entire world, and they still do presently.

World War II was fought largely as a result of the territorial expansions of the Japanese people, and as well the Germans, but both nations of people made a mistake, which they realized later at the end of that horrible conflict. England and their huge empire, and as well the United States, particularly more so the United States, were not about to let another nation of people no matter what race they were, to have the opportunity to create their own empires and, of course, the reason being, the world was and it still is, dominated by the English speaking people. What the whites learned while at war against the mighty Japanese people during World War II, was the reality that the Japanese were difficult to dominate during war. Through almost 4 years of bitter war against Japan, the whites were incapable of sending their ground troops to Japan to attempt to conquer Japan. Out in the vast Pacific Ocean, for almost 4 years the whites battled the Japanese and made very little progress against mighty Japan.

After successfully detonating the first atomic bomb, the United States wasted little time in ordering atomic bombs to be dropped on Japanese cities, in order to hopefully bring the Japanese to surrender. Before dropping the atomic bombs, the whites had bombarded certain Japanese cities, but Japanese leaders would not accept defeat.

If the United States and England didn't have those atomic bombs to use against Japan, their war against Japan would have dragged on indefinitely, and in fact, if the United States and England had sent their ground troops to Japan, it would have been a miracle if they had managed to defeat Japan in a few years. After the Japanese surrendered to the whites, the white Americans established their military presence in Japan which represents total conquest. Since the American military presence is still in Japan that obviously represents the Japanese are not independent. Although the Japanese and the rest of the world may insist that Japan is an independent nation, that American military presence in Japan (any nation which has foreign troops within their domain are not free, including Cuba but Cuba is unique) does suggest otherwise.

In the United States during World War II, the Japanese Americans faced horrible racism that continues to shame the United States. Hundreds of thousands of Japanese Americans, were forced into specially constructed camps to separate them from the white Americans, who certainly feared the Japanese Americans. Recently, the Americans opened their eyes and ears, to the discontent the Japanese Americans felt about the mistreatment they received during World

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

War II, and compensated the Japanese American survivors of those camps, with cash settlements.

What I have noticed about the Ainu people of Japan, which I believe shows a relationship to the white race, is their great amount of body hair. But again I also realize that there are other people who share the same traits. In the western United States, there are certain Indian peoples, who surprisingly also share the same feature of excessive amounts of body hair, especially beards, but from what little I know about the Asian people of east Asia, I will admit that it is not at all unusual to see Asians with excessive facial hair.

For some reason the Europeans theorize that the Ainu people of Japan are indeed partially white in race, but I am not convinced at all about the fascination the Europeans have in regards to the Ainu people of Japan. Apparently some Europeans also feel the same way about the Polynesians who, to the whites, show some white features and, of course, we know that the Europeans also believe certain Indian peoples, and among them the Algonquians, to be partially white in race. The Ainu people of the islands of Japan, will never know freedom again, and the reason being, of course, the powerful and highly advanced civilized Japanese people, who for a non white people, are one of the most well off and powerful people on our earth. The Japanese people irritated the Americans terribly during the decades of the 1970s and the 1980s, and we are all intelligent enough to realize that the Americans were largely bothered by the Japanese ability to successfully conduct business, not only in the United States, but elsewhere as well. It's the price to pay if any particular country allows freedom to conduct business within their own country, to any foreign people.

Korea

I am not at all certain if the expanding Atlanteans established any colonies in what is now the modern countries of North Korea and South Korea. Before World War II there was only one Korea of course, which was free of the communist influence. However, as we know, changes occurred soon after World War II concluded. Many historians speculate that Korea's earliest known civilization was that of the Old Choson, which was located in northwestern Korea. They speculate that the Chinese conquered the Old Choson civilization in 108 B.C., then initiated their own colonies there. However, northwestern Korea is not our main objective concerning the Atlanteans possibly starting a colony in Korea. We must first concentrate on southern Korea where the Atlanteans would have definitely first focused their colonizing attention on, if they did in fact start colonies in Korea.

On Korea's southern coast an ancient civilization once flourished long ago, which was likely older than that of the Old Choson civilization of northern Korea. That southern Korean civilization is historically referred to as the Kaya. Evidently the Kaya were in frequent contact with Japan because the Japanese apparently dominated the Kaya Kingdom long ago. If Japan did in fact dominate the Kaya Kingdom, it likely means that the Japanese Atlanteans were responsible for initiating the Kaya Kingdom. Other Korean Kingdoms in the south of Korea, include the Paekche and the Silla, both of which, are speculated to have been by historians, initiated during the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D. Historians could be very wrong of course. Another northern Korean Kingdom to give attention to, is the Koguryo Kingdom, which historians believe was initiated during the 1st century B.C.

By 668 A.D. the Silla Kingdom had formed an alliance with the Chinese, then the two allied Kingdoms waged a successful war to unify Korea. What that obviously represents is large scale Chinese involvement in creating Korea's future. Chinese influence in Korea can be traced back to 108 B.C. when the Chinese first initiated conquests over Korea, and Chinese colonies as well. Although I am not 100% certain if the Atlanteans did initiate Atlantean colonies in Korea, the subject should be closely investigated by the Atlanteans, for the Atlanteans just may have initiated Atlantean colonies in Korea. Korea's 20th century history (Korea's ancient history as well) is very similar to Vietnam's history, if only because of the clear Chinese influence.

India

You may now be thinking now India, where to next but, of course, the Indians of the Americas got their name from the country we now call India but, of course, it was by an accident. Like Australia and Papua New Guinea, India evidently also is home to a black population. But were black people the first inhabitants of India? Or were the Asians the first to occupy India? Then again we must not forget that the whites probably brought their black slaves to India after 1492! Obviously at the present time the Asians are the dominant race in India, but are the blacks, or are the whites the next dominant race of India? Most historians believe the Aryans or whites, are one of the most important races of India presently, yet we know by the appearances of the Indian people that Asians are the most common race to be found in India, and though white looking Indians currently live in India, it's obviously difficult to notice them.

When the whites invaded India about 4000 years ago, they eventually by force, came to dominate India, and that is clearly visible in the current and ancient

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

languages of India (those Indian languages existing in India are probably descended from the Egyptian Europeans however), which hints at conquests of course. But what has happened to the white race of India? And what I mean by that is, it is rare to see Indians that look pure blooded white, although there are a few Indians who obviously show more than just a slight resemblance to the whites. But on the whole, it is far more than just common to see Asian looking Indians. Again another important bit of information that shouldn't be overlooked, deals with the Gypsy people or the Egyptian Europeans, who are likely native to eastern Europe, as being responsible for the many Indo-European languages currently spoken in India.

Its likely that well before the whites first invaded India, the Gypsies spread into India by coming directly from eastern Europe. In the Indus Valley thousands of years ago, there arose an Indian civilization that according to historians, ranks as one of the oldest civilizations created by man. That ancient Indian civilization in the Indus Valley may possibly be as old, or even older than 5000 years. And one of the more remarkable innovations of that ancient civilization was it sewer system which, according to historians, was one of the first sewer systems put to use by man. But was that sewer system in any way comparable to the Atlantean sewer system? We know the sewer system of the Atlanteans included hot and cold running water. What about their toilets and if they may have been inside the average home located in the Indus Valley, and also the average Atlantean home back in Atlantis? That answer has to be yes for Atlantis, but not all homes of course! As for India's indoor plumbing being comparable to the Atlanteans indoor plumbing, I have absolutely no idea, but I believe India's ancient civilization possessed only cold running water, and indoor toilets possibly only for the well off. Since the Atlanteans were blessed to enjoy the privileges of hot and cold running water, what does that tell us? It would take an incredibly long time after Atlantis was destroyed, for the next nation of humans to be blessed with indoor plumbing, which included hot running water, along with their cold running water, and in fact, 11,000 years or longer.

If India was indeed colonized by the Atlanteans, did the Atlanteans enter India from the west? Or did the Atlanteans enter by coming up from the south using the Arabian Sea? Or what about coming from the Indian Ocean? The Indus Valley is closer to the Arabian Sea so its likely the Atlanteans sailed in from locations such as Madagascar, or even possibly the Red Sea, or the Gulf, which is situated between Saudi Arabia and Iran. It would not surprise me if the Atlanteans put all three locations to work for them in their quest to travel wiser, and as well much faster. And there is nothing that supports anyone who may

theorize that the Atlanteans were not aware of those locations, because the Atlanteans were, undoubtedly, very aware of those locations!

From the Arabian Sea, the Atlanteans may have searched for good locations to start farming operations, and as well to build their homes. But who were the original Indians of India? Did black people greet the first Atlantean settlers? Or better yet, were those first Indians of India Asian as well? Again it's the black question! If there was a native population in existence already then in India, it's likely there may have been unrest between the two peoples, when and if, the Atlanteans first began to migrate to India. We know the Atlanteans were civilized, and so therefore they held an advantage over their foe, whom we must seriously consider to have been uncivilized. If we want to be reasonable concerning India's origins, we then must choose the Egyptian Europeans as first bringing civilization to what is now the modern country of India. Why? Language is definitely proof that eastern Europe's Roma people brought civilization to India!

Today, the population of India is over one billion, and that is not including the nearly 150,000,000 million Pakistanis living in Pakistan, which use to be part of India, and as well the nearly 150,000,000 people of Bangladesh, which is only slightly over 51,000 sq mi in size. Birth control must be enforced in all three locations, to ensure no catastrophes will bring starvation and death to the citizens of all three countries. Although I have no proof the Atlanteans migrated to India, I suspect that the Atlanteans were aware of India, and indeed they may have helped to civilize India.

Ethiopia

It is the language of Ethiopia, and the immediate surrounding regions, that tells a story of some event that occurred probably before written history that involved either the Atlanteans, or possibly the descendants of the Atlanteans of northern Africa, who may have been the Egyptian people. The Ethiopian language is considered to be part of the Hamitic-Semitic language family of the Middle East and northern Africa! But just why are the Semitic people and black people of northern Africa related by language?

Are black people of northern and central Africa, partially related to the Algonquians by race as I believe? That is not easy to answer! However, there are historical records that prove Native Americans migrated to northern Africa 11,500 years ago, and it's very likely that the Algonquians interbred with Africa's black people, and in the process both peoples adopted very heavily from one another's languages and customs. That could be the reason for the language relationship that exists between the Semitic people and black people of northern

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Africa! But what about some unknown conquest by the Atlanteans over the black people of northern Africa, which resulted in the Atlanteans forcing their defeated foes to speak their language? As well, what if the Atlanteans started a civilized colony in Ethiopia? Or better yet, were the Algonquians the first humans to live in all of Africa?

Ethiopia is located close to the Red Sea, but is separated from the Red Sea by Eritrea, Djibouti and Somalia. And since the Atlanteans were capable of navigating all the worlds oceans, its likely the Atlanteans paid visits to that region of Africa, possibly sailing to that region of northeast Africa, by way of Madagascar, or even India. Obviously since there is a relationship that exists between the Semitic people and black people of northern Africa, the possibility that the Atlanteans used Madagascar or India to make visits to the Ethiopian region, was likely. But did the Atlanteans colonize that region of northeast Africa? By the appearances of the black people of that region of Africa, I have to admit that on the whole, from what I am aware of concerning Ethiopia and its people, there is very little evidence I know of other than language, that tells us the Atlanteans colonized that region of Africa. Of course, that does not mean the Atlanteans did not colonize the Ethiopian region.

If the Ethiopia region was colonized by the Atlanteans, the native black population (if the black race existed during the first visits by the expanding Algonquians) may have been very numerous, and in fact, so numerous that they may of prevented the Atlanteans from permanently taking root in that part of Africa, and eventually multiplying to the point where their population actually exceeded the population of the native black population of the Ethiopian region. However, the black race had to be in existence then! If contact developed, was that contact of an hostile nature including outright warfare as the Story of Atlantis gives the hint? Or was it a peaceful contact?

Since the Story of Atlantis gives us the impression that the Algonquians were wicked (unfortunately, it is an far too common practice), its likely the Algonquians treated the native black population of the Ethiopian region very unfairly, but I really doubt it! Now what if Ethiopia was first inhabited by the Algonquians, who possibly were that regions first human inhabitants? Of the two suggestions to debate over we may just choose the Algonquians as being Ethiopia's first human inhabitants! Where are Ethiopia's Atlanteans, if Ethiopia was first inhabited by the Atlanteans?

Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti and Somalia, today, are for the most part, unstable poor countries, and face a bleak future. Famine has been a serious problem for the citizens of those countries over the past few decades, and the world has to enforce strict control of the distribution of food supplies, if and when, another

famine effects the lives of those innocent people, to assure that there will not be a catastrophe that all of mankind will end up regretting someday!

The Americas

Bermuda

Bermuda is located just over 500 miles to the east of North Carolina, and may have supported an Atlantean population when the whites discovered the Americas in 1492. However, Bermuda is so small (Bermuda covers only 20 sq mi) it does indicate that Bermuda may have been uninhabited in 1492 but I doubt it. One thing is certain, however, and that is the Atlanteans were definitely aware of Bermuda, and was likely colonized by the expanding Atlanteans very long ago.

The Atlantean Caribbean

The Bahamas

Of course, the Bahamas Islands are widely scattered throughout the Atlantic Ocean or the Caribbean Sea, and were most definitely colonized by Ojibway settlers at least 11,500 years ago, but probably even further back in time than that. It was Spain who first brought white and black settlers to the Bahamas Islands. Although historians put the blame for the extinction of the Atlantean population of the Bahamas on the Spanish, “it was the English who were responsible for eradicating the Atlantean settlers of the Bahamas Islands however.” When the whites conspired to locate and then invade Atlantis, or the Americas in 1492, they first did so in Spain under the direction of the Spanish monarchy, who placed Christopher Columbus in charge of locating Atlantis, which he successfully did of course. By 1647 the English had begun their process of colonizing the Bahamas Islands, and their eventual choice of settlers would be blacks of course.

After the whites discovered the Americas in 1492, they initiated the largest forced migration of humans in history, when they forced black Africans to relocate to the Americas, then to the islands of the Pacific Ocean, then to India. In 1647 the Bahamas were still occupied by the descendents of the Ojibways (the Lucayans), but with the Bahamas in English control the Lucayan presence on the Bahamas Islands would eventually come to an abrupt end. However, the blame can't be entirely put on England (the English will always blame other people of course) for we can single out the blacks as well to blame for the eradication of the Atlantean population on the Bahamas. At the present time there may be an tiny Native American population in the Bahamas, particularly on the island of Andros, which is the largest of the islands of the Bahamas. They may be descended from the Seminoles of Florida, who fled to escape from the invading

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

whites during either the 18th or the 19th centuries. The size of the Bahamas is 5,358 sq mi.

Cuba

Evidently the Atlantean people of the large island of Cuba did not suffer extinction for the Tainos population on Cuba is present but they are a minority of course, in their own domain. Cuba covers 42,800 sq mi and the population is presently predominantly mixed white and black, or mulatto. The Tainos population on Cuba is evidently less than 1% but I don't believe that statistic. In reality I believe that the Tainos population is greater than that of 1%, for they obviously include mix bloods who are probably of predominantly Native American blood, in their census statistics. Of all the islands of the Caribbean Sea colonized by the Ojibways, Cuba was definitely their favorite, for it was and still is, the largest island of the Caribbean Islands. They actually believe that Hawaii had a larger population when the first whites showed at those beautiful Pacific Ocean islands, than the larger island of Cuba did when Columbus showed up in, or after, 1492. To suggest that the Native American population of Cuba in 1492 was an measly 50,000 is ludicrous without a doubt.

The Dominican Republic

This country currently has an Tainos population which, however, is considered to be not significant. Whites make up 16% of the Dominican population, while blacks make up 11%, while nearly all of the remaining population is considered as being of multiracial of black, white and Native American origins. The Atlantean people were definitely smitten with the land of The Dominican Republic, and their population during its height was probably very significant. When the whites first showed up on Hispaniola, the Atlantean population was probably well into the hundreds of thousands, if not even much higher, but with the arrival of the invading whites, their population would dramatically decline afterwards, as a result of European diseases and forced slavery.

Eventually the white Spaniards, brought and let loose, black Africans all over Hispaniola, and that event can also be attributed to Hispaniola's dramatic Atlantean population decline, which occurred almost immediately after the arrival of the invading whites and blacks. And about the only reasons for the current Tainos population in The Dominican Republic, can possibly be attributed to the mountains located in the center of The Dominican Republic, and long Spanish rule. It was possibly those mountains which prevented the whites from completely eradicating the Native American presence in The Dominican Republic.

Those mountains obviously offered the Native Americans of The Dominican Republic, an opportunity to elude from the invading white Spaniards. Anyway, after the white Spaniards and blacks settled Hispaniola, they would eventually be overthrown by the French who would eventually be overthrown by the blacks. After the blacks brought Hispaniola under their control, the population residing in what is now The Dominican Republic, was compelled to seek independence from black Haitian control, which eventually occurred on February 27, 1844. The country of The Dominican Republic covers an area of some 18,810 sq mi, including those mountains which may have saved the Native American population on Hispaniola. At the present time I haven't the slightest clue to what the Native American population in The Dominican Republic is.

Florida

Southern Florida was colonized by the Atlanteans when they were busy colonizing those other Caribbean locations. They either colonized southern Florida by coming directly from Cuba or, which may be closer to being the truth, by first coming directly from their original homeland in eastern Canada. Their first contact with the whites may have took place when the Spaniard, Juan Ponce De Leon, visited Florida in 1521. Spain gradually colonized Florida, including the small island of Key West, which in 1763 had an sizeable Calusa and Spanish population. In 1763 England took control of Florida, which resulted in the Calusa and Spanish fleeing Key West, for nearby Cuba.

However, with the coming of the English Americans all of the Atlantean Nations of southern Florida, would eventually disappear. When the Seminoles (they were originally part of the Greek Confederacy) fled southward into southern Florida, to escape from the invading whites, they likely merged with the remaining Atlanteans who inhabited the coastal regions of central and southern Florida. Those Florida Atlanteans were likely the Calusa. Directly as a result of that union between the Seminoles and the Florida Atlanteans, the Florida Atlantean Nations have disappeared. The Atlantean population of Florida likely existed from central Florida, from the coastal regions, all the way down to throughout the Florida Keys. Even before the first whites showed up in Florida the Indians of southern Florida probably felt nausea about living in the Everglades.

Presently, the descendents of Florida's Atlantean people are currently in the Seminole people. The history of the Seminole people is a history which saw them retreating away from the invading whites, and involved several wars that they fought against the Americans. The Florida Everglades (that is where the last

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Seminoles and Florida Atlanteans fled to, to escape from the whites) were so unappealing to the Americans it actually saved all the Seminole people (most of the Seminoles were removed) of Florida, from being removed to Oklahoma. At the present time the descendents of Florida's Atlantean people occupy five Reservations in southern Florida, and their population is among Florida's Seminole population, but their nations and languages have disappeared as a result of being absorbed by the fleeing Greeks from Georgia. Their descendents are among Florida's over 36,000 Native Americans.

Haiti

Haiti is located in the western third of the large Caribbean Island of Hispaniola, and its history is almost identical to that of The Dominican Republic. However, there is a bit of a difference existing which is centered on that of racial origins. Haiti is almost entirely black African (95% of Haiti's population is black) with the remaining population being of predominantly mixed origins, being of black and Native American mixture of course. Evidently there is an tiny Tainos population in Haiti but their population is not known of. Black independence from France may have occurred too an extent as a result of black slaves fleeing from brutal white subjugation over them, into Haiti's mountainous regions, where they eventually organized their own settlements.

When the first successful slave rebellion in world history occurred on January 1, 1804 part of that successful slave rebellion's roots possibly went straight back to those independent black settlements in Haiti's mountainous regions. Those same mountainous regions in Haiti probably saved Haiti's Native American population, if Haiti currently has an Native American population. Haiti covers an area of some 10,714 sq mi. And if Haiti does in fact have an Native American population, the average Haitian obviously does not know much of their existence. Of course, the same can be said for Cuba, The Dominican Republic, Jamaica and other Caribbean locations.

Jamaica

As with some other locations (the Bahamas for example) which the English brought under their control, the Atlantean population on Jamaica was totally eliminated. Had the white Spaniards continued to hold on to the island of Jamaica, it is very likely that the Atlantean population on Jamaica would have survived on indefinitely. Of course, the English put the blame for the elimination of Jamaica's Atlantean population on the Spanish but I don't believe them. In 1655 the English under Admiral William Penn's leadership, brought the beautiful

SAMUEL POE

Caribbean Island of Jamaica under England's control. We can pinpoint the elimination of Jamaica's Atlantean population to the date the English gained control over Jamaica. Although I freely admit that England is responsible for eliminating Jamaica's Atlantean population, I will also put some of the blame on their black slaves for it is righteous.

Puerto Rico

This Caribbean Island probably has the best represented Native American population in the Caribbean. The Tainos are still found on Puerto Rico and its from Puerto Rico where the Tainos probably are best organized as an people. The reason for an Native American population currently on Puerto Rico, is probably Spain's long control over the beautiful Caribbean Island, which didn't end until the end of the 1898 Spanish-American War.

Those Caribbean Islands which the Spanish lost control of to other white European Nations, eventually saw either the total elimination of the Native American population, or its near extinction. Those Caribbean locations include the Bahamas, British West Indies (they are made up of Anguilla, the British Virgin Islands, Caicos Islands, Cayman Islands, the Leeward Islands and the Turks Islands). France's overseas departments of Guadeloupe and Martinique, are also included and both French controlled locations are predominantly black of course. Guadeloupe consists of two large islands which covers an area of approximately 687 sq mi., while Martinique is also an large island that covers approximately 436 sq mi. The United States Virgin Islands are also included.

The Lesser Antilles

These islands lie just to the east and south of Puerto Rico. Since they are significantly far enough away from mainland South America, it is reasonable to rightfully suggest that the Atlanteans colonized those islands at least 11,500 years ago. The larger Lesser Antilles Islands which have mountainous terrain (I'm referring to such islands as that of Dominica of course) likely have Native American populations. Although they have Native American populations, it is the blacks who are the more numerous of course. That fact can be attributed to the whites.

At the present time I haven't the slightest clue to what the exact population of the Native Americans of the islands of the Lesser Antilles is. Some of these Lesser Antilles Islands are independent country's while others are controlled by foreigners such as England, (England controls the British West Indies which include Anguilla which covers 60 sq mi, the British Virgin Islands which cover

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

59 sq mi, the Caicos and Turks Islands which cover 193 sq mi, the Cayman Islands which cover 102 sq mi, and Montserrat which covers 32 sq mi). France controls Guadeloupe which covers 687 sq mi and Martinique which covers 436 sq mi. The Netherlands control St. Eustatius, Saba and St. Maarten which has a total area of 309 sq mi but that includes Bonaire and Curacao, which may have been settled by the Atlanteans. And the United States controls the US Virgin Islands which cover an area of approximately 171 sq mi.

Antigua and Barbuda

These Caribbean Islands were eventually brought under English control. The islands cover an area of approximately 170 sq mi. It is the blacks who are the most numerous of course, which makes it an independent black country. Of course, the islands were settled by the Atlanteans long ago.

Barbados

Can we actually believe anything the English and all whites in general, have written down historically concerning Native Americans? In 1627 the English arrived on the uninhabited (the island was obviously colonized by Ojibway settlers) Caribbean island. Again we can put the blame on the elimination of Barbados's Atlantean population on England, and not on Portugal. The independent black Caribbean Island country of Barbados covers an area of approximately 166 sq mi, and was settled by the Atlanteans at least 11,500 years ago.

Dominica

This independent Caribbean Island country is rather large and mountainous to. Those mountains on Dominica probably saved the islands Carib Indians from extinction. They, along with the blacks, share the rather large Caribbean Island which covers approximately 290 sq mi. The island was settled by the Atlanteans long ago.

Grenada

This independent black Caribbean Island country was not first settled by whites until the French began their colonization program in the year 1650. Their choice of settlers were blacks of course. Grenada covers an area of approximately 131 sq mi. The Caribbean Island was obviously settled by Atlantean settlers very, very long ago.

SAMUEL POE

Saint Kitts and Nevis

This is another independent black country in the Americas which was originally inhabited by Native Americans. The total area of the Caribbean Islands is approximately 139 sq mi.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

England, France and Spain vied for control of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and with the 1783 Treaty of Versailles, France officially signed over Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to England. Of course, the blacks make up nearly all of Saint Vincent's and the Grenadine population, which makes it another independent black country in the Americas. And, of course, the Atlanteans settled these Caribbean Islands very long ago.

Santa Lucia

To the north of Saint Vincent and Barbados, is the independent black Caribbean Island country of Santa Lucia. Santa Lucia covers an area of approximately 236 sq mi. Both England and France battled for the Caribbean Island, but France ceded Santa Lucia to England at the 1814 Treaty of Paris. Of course, the Atlanteans settled Santa Lucia long ago. Blacks make up 90% of the population of Santa Lucia.

Mexico, Central America and South America

Of all locations on our earth that indeed had to be colonized by the Algonquians, both North and South America, were those locations. Mexico, although at a similar distance from the Atlanteans North American homeland, as Europe and Africa was, possibly was colonized by the Atlanteans, before or after the Atlanteans colonized Europe and Africa. But the eastern coastline of North America does eventually make its way to southern Mexico, and we must seriously take into consideration that the Atlanteans first conquered navigating the Atlantic Ocean, by sailing from their homeland, straight down to southern Mexico, before actually first discovering Africa and Europe.

Just north of Mexico City is an ancient Mexican Indian settlement named Teotihuacan. Historians believe the ancient settlement to be no more than 2000 years old, yet I sense something very unusual about that very ancient settlement, which strikingly looks similar to ancient Egypt's city where the pyramids are located or, Cairo. It is still absolutely stunning, and in fact, Teotihuacan is far more impressive than ancient Cairo. Was Teotihuacan actually first inhabited by the Atlanteans as long ago as 11,500 years? If I'm on the correct path it means

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Teotihuacan is indeed an Atlantean settlement that's possibly 11,500 years old. If the city is as old as 11,500 years, than it probably is older the Egyptian pyramids. What that represents is the nearly intact settlement of the Atlanteans for all the world to study. Teotihuacan was likely the first Atlantean settlement constructed in Mexico. And after the events which destroyed Atlantis ended, its likely at some point of time after contact between Mexico and Atlantis ceased, Teotihuacan was eventually abandoned by the Atlanteans who, I assume, would over time become the later Mayans, Toltecs, Aztecs and the other civilized Mexican Indians.

Southern Mexico and the rest of Central America, was the home of several highly advanced civilizations and, among them, the Mayans, Toltec's and, of course, the later civilization of the Aztecs, who were conquered by the invading Spanish (it was Spain's Mexican Indian allies who defeated the Aztecs for the Spanish) during the early sixteenth century.

Apparently the Mexican Indians were capable of making paper and, of course, writing, but, I for one, theorize that the invention of writing and paper as well, was of the creation of the Algonquians, who I believe are as well the inventors of the Roman alphabet used presently, with those changes included of course. The Atlanteans alphabet did not disappear, for it is still in use today by the Cree and Ojibway Indians of Canada but, of course, I know historians believe the Cree and Ojibway syllabic writing system was invented by a Christian priest during the nineteenth century. They are wrong! Did that priest make any changes to the already existing Atlantean alphabet? It may sound funny but it must be taken seriously simply because of suspicion alone!

What fascinates all of us about the Indian civilizations of Mexico and Central America, is the close similarities of the pyramids of Mexico and Central America, to the pyramids of the ancient land of Egypt. The pyramids of Egypt are larger, but the Mexican pyramids are just as impressive and pleasing to the human eyes. Obviously the Atlanteans were the people who first constructed pyramids, and it would not at all surprise me if the Atlanteans constructed pyramids in their North American homeland, which exceeded in size, the pyramids of Egypt. Since the civilization of the Atlanteans of North America, was totally destroyed by the deluge unleashed by mother nature some 11,500 years ago, we will never know if the Atlanteans constructed pyramids of their own, unless we get truly lucky and discover them intact. But to the west of the Atlanteans homeland and, of course, I am referring to the Midwestern United States, are supposedly pyramids made of simple earthen soil, called mounds.

In Cahokia, is one of the largest pyramids ever constructed by humans, but it is considered a mound by Europeans, because it is made of earthen soil. Did

the Europeans simply go about covering up an already existing man made pyramid at Cahokia, and all other pyramid locations of the eastern United States, that were made of brick or stone, with soil from the earth, to conceal from the human eye, what those pyramids are really made of? We will never know because the Americans will not tolerate such a venture to occur, and even possibly Native Americans, who may resent anyone molesting those ancient sites.

From Mexico or Central America, the Atlanteans did not have to travel a great distance until they reached the Pacific Ocean. And its likely the Atlanteans made their way to the west coast of South America, from Central Americas Pacific Ocean coastline. But it may have been possible for the Atlanteans to navigate the Atlantic Ocean from North America, all the way to the tip of South America, then gradually make their way up the South American western coastline as well. Its possible that the Atlanteans used Central Americas western coastline to make their way to the western coastline of South America, and as well into northern South America, where they eventually brought their civilization. The Indian civilizations of South America, were just as advanced as the Mexican civilizations, but not as impressive, and that is partly because of building material, and as well climate.

There are similarities that exist between the Indian civilizations of South America, and the Egyptian civilization most definitely. Everyone knows that the Egyptians mummified their dead, but in certain South American Indian civilizations the practice of mummifying the dead was also practiced, and that leads me to speculate the Atlanteans also practiced mummifying their dead, even though there is absolutely know evidence whatsoever to prove that the Atlanteans practiced mummifying their dead. I would not be surprised if the Atlanteans deliberately mummified their deceased, and their mummification techniques were just as well done as that of the Egyptians.

Off the coast of western South America, is an island that currently is known as Easter Island, but Easter Island is closer to South America than it is to Malaysia, which according to historians is the original homeland of the Polynesian people, who indeed were the first inhabitants of Easter Island. If, as I believe, the Algonquians did colonize South America, then most certainly they done the unthinkable, and actually gathered together their men to inspect the Pacific Ocean off the western coastline of South America, and in the process they possibly discovered Easter Island some 11,500 to 12,000 years ago, or even further back in time.

Once the Atlanteans discovered Easter Island, they obviously got their courage up to explore more of the huge Pacific Ocean. What an incredible event

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

that was! But where was the next Pacific Ocean island, or group of islands colonized by the Atlanteans? Was it Polynesia, Hawaii, New Zealand? We have not the slightest clue! But it is my belief the Atlanteans are the people responsible for first colonizing the islands of the huge Pacific Ocean, including Australia, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, and as well Papua New Guinea. Easter Islands close proximity to South America, and as well the Story of Atlantis, to me speak of an historical relationship shared.

The Legacy of the Atlanteans

Somehow the world was allowed to know of the existence of these incredibly advanced people, and the time of the height of their civilization and empire of 11,500 years ago. Exactly just how long the belief of many people, who believe that the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago, were more advanced than we of the present time are, has been circulating among them for, I presently have no knowledge of, but I suspect the decipherment of the Rosetta Stone discovered in Egypt two hundred or so years ago, may be the origins of some their beliefs about the ancient Atlanteans and their civilization. Or in other words, it may be because of the birth of archaeology, which came into existence largely as a result of ancient Egypt.

Before the discovery of the Rosetta Stone in Egypt, the English had started the industrial revolution in Europe, and its benefits to the human race continue to the present time. There are not very many inventions which are known to us at the present time, that were invented before the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, so if there are people who are uncertain about what this chapter is about, please keep in mind the decipherment of the Rosetta Stone, or to be precise, the decipherment of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic writing, is the subject of this chapter too some degree.

Napoleon Bonaparte was ordered to Egypt for an French military expedition, and while stationed in Egypt, one of his soldiers by chance discovered the Rosetta Stone, and that discovery led to great excitement among not only the French, but their bitter enemies, the English also. The English were so excited about the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, they actually stole the Rosetta Stone from their bitter French enemy.

The Europeans, and also the Egyptians themselves of that time, 1799, had no knowledge of how to read ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic writing, and since the Rosetta Stone had not only ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic writing on it, but also Greek writing, and Demotic writing also, the Europeans knew that whatever

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

was written on it, had to be the same in each written language. By 1821, a young Frenchman deciphered the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics, and soon afterwards the hieroglyphics on the monuments in Egypt, were read for the first time in nearly two thousand years (we have good reasons to not believe that, however, for it may have been longer than 2000 years), and if you have read the Story of Atlantis you certainly know what the Europeans wanted to find on those ancient monuments to read. Of course, the whites were excited about learning about Atlantis.

Could it be an coincidence that the modern world with all it's wonderful inventions, followed after the discovery and decipherment of the Rosetta Stone? It may sound goofy but it can't be ignored! The camera was invented by the Arabs nearly one thousand years ago, but over time it eventually made its way into the hands of the white Europeans, who put the camera to good use, especially for aiding European artists. The incredible invention of the camera, will have no equal in all of human history, and the reason being the camera is what we can claim to be a real time machine, that allows us to view either moveable or non moveable film, to revisit the distant past in all its realness. Within twenty years of deciphering the Egyptian hieroglyphics, the Europeans discovered the techniques for developing and preserving film, that could be used to photograph anything and everything.

Within seventy years of deciphering the Egyptian hieroglyphics, film technology advanced to the point where moveable photographs were invented. Today, we have access to our distant past preserved on film, and make no doubts about it the camera is a time machine in a major way but, of course, only as far as preserving images on film. Just how did the Arabs discover the camera? But even more importantly why did the Arabs fail to further advance the obvious potential qualities of the camera, which I suspect the Arabs held a tremendous fascination for, as obviously the Europeans in Europe did of course?

I am not trying to let the reader get the impression that I am claiming that the white Europeans only invented the modern camera, because of those Egyptian hieroglyphic writings they obviously read after deciphering the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics, during the early nineteenth century if, in fact, the reader is leaning in that direction. It was the Europeans who invented the modern camera, and I know from historical records that the Europeans long held a tremendous fascination for the camera.

In fact, the white Europeans had the techniques for preserving camera images before the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, and even before they finally conquered the unimaginal in the nineteenth century, but those techniques which existed

before the nineteenth century, were very poor and obviously nowhere good enough to claim it was what they expected it to be, but they continued to keep their dream alive, and as the entire world knows now at the present time, the white Europeans conquered producing realistic preserved film, of the images the camera hide within.

Electricity is another invention that we can't live without, and although we knew of electricity in the eighteenth century, we did not fully utilize that mysterious force until well into the nineteenth century. Were the Algonquians aware of electricity? It is not easy at all for us of the present time, to know of the answer to that question! If the Atlantean civilization had advanced to the point where they discovered the requirements to produce electric power, their discovery was eventually lost during the great flood that destroyed Atlantis, with the exception possibly of Egyptian written records of such an Atlantean discovery being preserved at some location in Egypt.

It is very simple to create your own electric power, simply by constructing an homemade battery that produces electric power. If the Atlanteans were able to sail all the worlds oceans 11,500 years ago, than the likelihood that the Atlantean civilization that existed 11,500 years ago, had progressed to such a sophisticated level, where they recognized and were able to produce electricity, is a very good one I believe, and I admit that only because of their navigation skills, which tell us they were very advanced. Their discovery of electricity, if they did recognize what electricity was and how to produce it, certainly did not advance to the stage where they could construct a gadget such as an electric fan and operate it successfully. But as for batteries to prove an idea that had to be proved, or just as a simple game for entertainment purposes, yes. I have seen on television certain shows about ancient civilizations in Europe and the Middle East, and some of the discoveries archaeologists have made digging up the long ago past.

Some archaeologists discovered what to them, looked like and may of operated like, an modern battery which may have been perfectly able at one time very long ago, to produce electric power. To prove that that ancient artifact may of been a battery able to produce electric power is very simple. All they need to do is reconstruct that ancient artifact using the exact same material, of course, and afterwards test the modern duplicate to determine if it does have the capability to produce electric power.

There is one certain inheritance that we all inherited from the Atlanteans, which all the world can't live without. Their civilization obviously was far more advanced than any other civilization of that time, if there were other civilizations

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

that coexisted with the Atlantean civilization, and there is a reason for that. Certain authors admit that the Atlanteans were the people who invented civilization, and over time spread their civilized way of life all around our earth.

Now none of us can openly claim that the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago, were the people who discovered civilization and its benefits to us all, because the Atlanteans were obviously not the only nation of people in existence 11,500 years ago. But their civilization does surround the entire world now, and I believe those authors are trying to tell us something which can only mean its about their technology. Their technology is what we have inherited, be it, however, we have made incredible advances which are obviously greatly superior now.

Now the real truth concerning exactly how advanced the Atlanteans were 11,500 years ago. The island mentioned in the Story of Atlantis which was in front of the straits of Gibraltar is, of course, North America, which is a good 3000 miles from the straits of Gibraltar. To sail 3000 miles during those ancient times is more than just remarkable. In fact we might consider it very hard to believe, yet I believe the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago, were so confident and experts at sailing, that they had no second thoughts about sailing all the earths oceans. That is what leads me to believe those certain authors who believe the Atlantean people civilized the earth, and were very advanced in other technology fields, are absolutely correct. As for those people who believe the Atlantean civilization was so advanced that they knew of the inventions of our modern time, such as electricity, the camera, and medicines, or even that the Atlanteans were more advanced technology than we of the present time are, that is another question that is easier to answer!

To me it is not true, that the Atlantean civilization advanced to a higher level than the American and British civilization that currently dominates our earth. It is possible that the Atlantean civilization may have been more advanced than the American and British civilization of the present time, and as a result of the great flood that destroyed Atlantis, their knowledge of their technology was lost, yet I wouldn't bet on it. The magnitude of that flood was so great that it destroyed all of Atlantis which, of course, was located in northeastern North America, and we know that catastrophes such as the catastrophe which destroyed Atlantis, kill a great many people, and the likelihood that Atlantean survivors, who were educated with the knowledge of that technology of their civilization, survived to keep that technology alive, would have indeed been very slim.

Egyptian hieroglyphics may of mentioned the existence of Atlantis, which I believe they do and I admit that because it is clearly mentioned in the Atlantis story, and their advanced civilization of 11,500 years ago and, if so, there may

be people able to read those Egyptian hieroglyphics alive, today, who know those Egyptian hieroglyphics not only mention the ancient Atlanteans, but they also know those hieroglyphics describe their civilization in greater detail, but they are unwilling for some reason, to come out in the open about this very sensitive subject.

Obviously there is no denying that the Egyptians knew of the Atlanteans and their civilization, because we learned about Atlantis from the Egyptian people, and also because the Egyptian people are descended from the Atlanteans. If the Egyptians recorded in great detail the civilization of the Atlanteans, and their many inventions and ideas, there are still there in Egypt on the monuments of that ancient land, unless the Europeans of 200 years ago destroyed that evidence to cover up historical information that the Europeans of two hundred years ago, did not want known.

That historical information possibly described certain Atlantean inventions or ideas, but more than likely that is not at all anywhere close to the truth. The historical information may of made mention of Atlantean conquests around the Mediterranean Sea, and other locations across the world, and also held historical information which mentioned the Egyptian people were descended from the Atlanteans, and also the most surprising of all, the Atlantean ability to sail all the oceans of the earth 11,500 years ago. Either way we try to decipher it, the white Europeans of two hundred years ago, possibly did not want known by the entire world, information that may point to the Atlanteans as the real discoverers of today's technology, which I believe is not the truth, and information that points to the Atlanteans ability to sail all the oceans of our earth 11,500 years ago which, of course, is the truth. And I realize white Europeans don't really care to let this be known of (they obviously don't like the subject), that certain people including possibly the white Europeans, were descended from the Atlanteans (human evolution of course). That information alone will upset white Europeans, who stubbornly believe all races are descended from the black bushmen people of Africa.

It is most likely that the white Europeans have destroyed, or are concealing from the world, historical information about the Atlanteans, which describes in great detail the origins of the Semitic people, including that of the ancient Egyptians (the first Egyptians), as well as certain other peoples, among them the white Europeans themselves. It is easy to understand why the white Europeans chose very long ago, to conduct themselves in that manner. I believe after the white Europeans discovered the Rosetta Stone, the white Europeans deliberately let it go to their heads, but only for one simple reason.

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

They knew those Egyptian hieroglyphics on the monuments throughout Egypt mentioned Atlantis, and though I may be wrong, I am slightly a bit suspicious that the modern world we know now (or only some of it), came into existence as a result of the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphic writing. And my suspicions are directly linked to those few people who believe the Atlanteans civilization was very advanced. They are strongly suggesting something important of course. Yet I am only suspicious, and in fact, I am more of an disbeliever than anything else! But we must not forget that they are truly attempting to tell everyone what appears as the truth about Atlantis.

White Europeans have been fascinated about the Egyptians and their ancient civilization, since the days of the Greeks and Romans, and even possibly well before the times of the Greeks and Romans. By the time of the rise of the first great European civilizations, the Egyptians were already very ancient, indeed so ancient that I do not believe the historical time table for the Egyptian civilization that presently is accepted by most as the correct historical dates for the Egyptian civilization. Why on earth do so many historians disbelieve the few historians and even archaeologists, who believe the Egyptian civilization is much older than is currently the accepted age of the Egyptian civilization? That question to most people is hard to answer but not for me. Atlantis is why the great majority of historians and archaeologists, do not and possibly will never accept, anyone's theory that the Egyptian civilization is at least 10,000 years old.

Long before that great flood that destroyed Atlantis, and even before the ice age that was the culprit of that flood, if there was truly an ice age then, there may of existed an much older Atlantean civilization that was far less advanced compared to the Atlantis we presently are aware of. We know the Atlantis we are aware of presently, was in existence at least 11,500 years ago, so there must of existed well before 11,500 years ago, or before the advanced Atlantean civilization known to us now, an earlier civilization which the Atlanteans inherited but did so with very remarkable results afterwards.

I realize that the Illini people who originally lived in the Illinois region of the United States, are likely the people mentioned in the Story of Atlantis, who settled the part of Atlantis which was located near the Atlantic Ocean, as well as Europe and Africa. Who knows they may have first settled that region of North America as long ago as 15,000 years ago or even further back in time than that measly 15,000 years ago. The Illini people did not all of sudden, construct their settlements then immediately advance their civilization to that of an highly advanced civilization, so realistically there is enough time at 11,500 years ago, for the likelihood for an additional few thousand years to be added on to the 11,500

years, we presently know the age of the Atlantean civilization to be. However, the first few thousand years of the Atlantean civilization were obviously nothing resembling the Atlantis so well known by us presently.

Cahokia, which is located near present day St. Louis in Missouri, is an ancient Native American settlement historians apparently believe is no more than 2000 years old. The Illini were living in the Cahokia region when the whites discovered the Americas, and that alone can be proof that the Illini are the builders of that ancient settlement and, if so, it is then likely that Cahokia is at least 11,500 years old, but in reality it is probably much older. Apparently the Ojibway have a belief that they originally lived westward, and strangely its likely the truth. From the Illinois region, the Illini likely migrated into the northeastern United States and eastern Canada, anywhere from 11,500 to 20,000 years ago, bringing their primitive civilized lifestyle with them, which would eventually evolve into the highly advanced Atlantean civilization, or Ojibway civilization we know existed at least 11,500 years ago.

Now as for the many Atlantean settlements left behind after the Atlanteans evacuated them. Their fate was obviously similar to that of the settlements of any civilized settlements destroyed by catastrophes, particularly floods. Evidence along eastern Canada's Atlantic coastline, as well as in the northeastern United States, tells of the existence of an ancient civilization in that region of North America. That alone tells us that there are more ancient civilized settlements in that same region waiting to be rediscovered.

Then there is the Atlantic Ocean as well, which lies off the coastline of North America, which must conceal within its waters even more Atlantean settlements, waiting to be rediscovered some day in the future. All of mankind can learn from the misfortunes of the Atlantean people (their fate can also be used to glorify their good fortune for they were innocent of course), that we can suffer incredible misfortunes, and survive to once again multiply and advance civilized life to an even greater degree of sophistication. It is not unusual for the leaders of a city that faces some threat that has the potential to bring death to all the inhabitants of that city, to warn their citizens about their predicament, so safe and careful evacuation plans can be made to ensure their survival. And since the Atlanteans were civilized they certainly prepared for evacuation, yet certainly not every Atlantean survived their unfortunate predicament.

Floods are very difficult to predict, especially floods of the magnitude that destroyed Atlantis, and are short lived also, so I am of the opinion that the great floods were not the reason the Atlanteans settled the Mediterranean region, if there are people who believe the Atlanteans were forced by the floods to seek

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

out new territory. What likely initiated the Atlanteans to explore the earth was adventure, but probably more so greed for wealth to be gained, which is nothing new. The flood that destroyed Atlantis lasted at the longest, only a few short years, and it totally wiped out Atlantis. There may have been more than a few survivors of that flood here in North America, but they certainly forgot their civilized way of life which, to put it bluntly, was very unfortunate indeed.

Presently, I do not see historians and archaeologists, sometime in the near future, openly admitting that the Semitic people are descended from the Algonquians. The accepted historical records would have to be changed for not only the Egyptians, but all other Semitic people also, as well as the Basque people and the Etruscans. The current history for the Semitic people goes back at least around 5000 years according to historians, which is indeed a long time. However, it is truly more ancient. And I reckon nearly all Semitic people will only accept that 5000 year period they have recorded Semitic history for.

Another form of evidence exist that has greater possibilities of telling all of mankind, who the Atlantean people, were and still are, at the present time. Within the past twenty years DNA tests have been developed which are now allowed in courtrooms, to either convict a criminal, or to acquit a criminal. All that needs to be done is to do DNA tests on people who currently live west of the straits of Gibraltar, to determine if anything out of the normal exist in those people, which could possibly prove that they are the Atlanteans and, of course, it has already been done. Of course, those people are already known of, and they have fascinated many a curious visitor for quite some time now.

Those people for the most part, have no clue as to what all the commotion over Atlantis is all about. Their memories of their civilization that may of existed as long ago as 15,000 years, have almost entirely disappeared. Algonquian Indians of North America are the Atlanteans, of course, and their flood story, especially that of the Ojibways, whose main character Nanaabozho, has a name that is so similar to the main character of the flood story of their Jewish descendents, who everyone knows as Noah, is nearly identical to that of the Jewish people. That DNA evidence, which tells of an relationship between the Algonquians and the people who live around the Mediterranean Sea, is certainly very convincing.

What happened to the Atlanteans is to me not a mystery, as I believe the Egyptians told us all in the Atlantis story, what we may expect to occur in our own time, or in our descendants time. Those destructions did occur, and they for certain will reoccur again some time again in the future, with devastating results for the human victims who will endure them. It all has to deal with mother nature. As for just how many destructions early humans went through and

survived, we have no clue, but we can get a somewhat clear picture by reading the Atlantis story. Some destructions had tremendous impacts which had the power to totally destroy a nation of people, as was the case with the Atlanteans, while others also had tremendous impacts, but in no way did those catastrophes bring total destruction to the human victims who endured them.

Ice ages, in reality, are far greater a force of destruction than floods, hurricanes, tornados and earthquakes but there is what we might want to call a bright spot that accompanies ice ages, for human civilizations, of course, if that is, ice ages truly come and go as they currently theorize. While floods, hurricanes, tornados and earthquakes can for the most part, occur suddenly, the same can't be said of ice ages. Although I sense ice ages may spread with terrifying speed they certainly do not reach their greatest extent until after several long centuries. And by speed, I mean at the most, only a few short decades for the earth to cool down dramatically enough to cover much of the earth with ice.

What stands out to me is that jet stream in our earths atmosphere, which controls to some extent, our earths daily climate conditions. If all of that jet stream (or jet streams) can move down southwards then stay permanently, it could mean ice ages can materialize with terrifying speed. After possibly a few centuries the growth of ice sheets or glaciers possibly slows down, that's if, ice ages do occur in the wicked manner they theorize they do. If an ice age actually was eminent, realistically there is enough time for any nation in its path, to organize its citizens to evacuate. However, where would they evacuate to, and would those people need to use war to evacuate? I don't think an ice age either by growth or meltdown, likely destroyed Atlantis, yet it can't be counted out. Again the jet streams will need to be carefully studied by humans in the future, for those jet streams can terribly effect human civilization. Who knows for certain, those jet streams may be responsible for those destructions of human civilization.

What followed after the decipherment of the Egyptians hieroglyphics is nothing less than a miracle. There is no way on earth anyone can rightfully claim that the inventions of our modern world are of Atlantean origin. England, after the New World was discovered, colonized North America, Australia, New Zealand, and certain other locations, and became incredibly wealthy as a result of colonizing those locations. All that wealth accumulated by the English, eventually led to great discoveries that are now part of our everyday lives. It was the wealth of the English that led to the industrial revolution, the invention of the telegraph, and telephone, camera, and electric power. Though there is the slight possibility we learned about certain Atlantean inventions, after deciphering the

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

Egyptians hieroglyphics, we will never know, however, the exact truth about such an scenario as the ancient Atlanteans being responsible for the technology of the current modern world we all live in.

What I recognize about the Atlanteans and their civilization, that stands out more than anything else, was the ability of the Atlanteans to navigate the worlds oceans, and I do mean the entire world. The Atlanteans may of not known of electric power, the camera, or the telegraph, but what the Atlanteans did know they utilized to the fullest extent. They certainly were great builders of ships, which were constructed for the purpose of navigating all the worlds oceans, and no one can deny that. As for their tools they used for everyday life, they certainly new of metals such as copper, bronze, and even possibly iron. The Atlanteans definitely knew how to make cement and concrete (they discovered mortar of course). The belief of archaeologists that the Egyptian pyramids were not constructed of cement or concrete, is a bunch of bull of course. Certainly we will accept that the Atlanteans knew exactly how to create clay bricks, and even far more importantly, how to create that mortar which they used along with clay bricks.

From the Atlantis story we know the Atlanteans, or at least some of them, had hot and cold running water. It may have been possible that all Atlanteans were fortunate enough to have the pleasure of indoor plumbing, but we know better! At the present time most of the worlds human population does not have indoor plumbing, and they know who they can put the blame on! The culprits reside in their own countries of course. Do we have any good reasons to believe the Atlanteans were any different than we ourselves are at the present time? The answer to that question is an absolute no! To be realistic the Atlanteans of 11,500 years ago, may of looked primitive to the later Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, but again there are reasons to believe otherwise, especially their indoor plumbing which included hot running water apparently. Who knows for certain, maybe the Greek and Roman civilization would have appeared to the Atlanteans as being inferior to their civilization.

The Atlanteans greatest gift to the world is their civilization, and that includes the ability to read and write, which many people consider the greatest innovation that humans have created. Today, the Egyptians hieroglyphics or the Sumerian writing system, are considered the worlds oldest writing systems or alphabets, but the Egyptians hieroglyphics are possibly descended from a much earlier writing system that originated in Atlantis. The Egyptians Phoenician kin, are responsible for the alphabet that currently dominates European civilization. The original Phoenician alphabet is far older than the 3000 years we believe their

alphabet to be, and even possibly closer to an Atlantean alphabet in comparison, than to the Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Apparently some people who are aware of Americas Stonehenge, believe ancient Phoenician writing is on some of the stones which were used to construct that ancient settlement. At the present time I have not had the chance to actually do research on Americas Stonehenge, and the supposed Phoenician writing on some of those stones there, yet if I actually get internet access again I will certainly search the internet for information about Americas Stonehenge, to discover anything unusual.

The Atlanteans did not vanish as a people (the whites will only accept that of course) that is more than clear to me, and it should be clear to everyone else also. Everyone who is aware of the Story of Atlantis knows the Atlanteans colonized northern Africa and southern Europe, so that knowledge alone tells us the descendants of the Atlanteans are still located in the Mediterranean region. However, its in the Middle East and India, where it is clearly more visible to everyone. Then there is North America and South America of course.

What exactly led to the Atlanteans conquering all the worlds oceans? The islands that may of existed during the ice age between Atlantis and the Mediterranean region, may have been the reason the Atlanteans became expert navigators, or at least I think so. Who knows, for all we know there could of existed during the Atlantean age, an island situated every 30 or 40 miles between Atlantis and the Mediterranean Sea. Even to primitive man a distance of 30 or 40 miles between islands, was an obstacle that could be conquered.

The Atlanteans obviously started out slowly but over time their fear of traveling the Atlantic Ocean diminished, to the point where the next step for those early Atlantean navigators, was to expand their explorations until they reached the Mediterranean Sea. Eventually their courage may of led them to explore further out into the Atlantic Ocean in all directions, not just to the Mediterranean region. If those early Atlantean navigators did just that, they certainly over time, eventually conquered the worlds other oceans, which is very unusual for such a feat to be accomplished so long ago.

It was not until 1492, when the white Europeans decided the Atlantic Ocean needed to be explored. We know from their history books that trade with India and the far east, was the reason why the Europeans made their decision to sail westward out on the Atlantic Ocean. You now have the Story of Atlantis to contemplate over as well! Read it and become enlightened! To be realistic the white Europeans knew that by going south down the west coast of Africa, it was possible to reach India and the far east, but I do believe the Europeans were,

*THE ALGONQUIAN CONQUEST
OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION OF 11,500 YEARS AGO*

undoubtedly, aware of the Atlantis story, and they may of thought that some of Atlantis may of survived the flood that destroyed Atlantis.

The thought of parts of Atlantis still out in the Atlantic Ocean, for safety reasons, of course, and courage to sail westward to try to get to India and the far east faster, pushed those early European navigators on. But who knows for certain, those white Europeans of the late fifteenth century, were possibly influenced to sail westward out on the Atlantic Ocean, only because they wanted to invade the Atlantis they obviously knew about. That I believe is much closer to the truth. Once they succeeded making it to Atlantis they eventually conquered the worlds other oceans easily.

We can debate over the question of “why didn’t the Greeks or Romans eventually send their sailors out into the Atlantic Ocean to explore it”? Fear of the unknown was one factor, another one was the Greeks and Romans were located at a great distance from the Atlantic Ocean, even though both the Greeks and Romans resided next to the Mediterranean Sea, which is connected to the Atlantic Ocean. They definitely knew about all the land which surrounded that huge Mediterranean Sea, but not the Atlantic Ocean of course. The Roman Empire reached out into the Atlantic Ocean (England of course), but they refused to sail out further than England and Ireland. If the Romans and Greeks had originated on the Atlantic coast of Europe, they may of acted very differently about the Atlantic Ocean.

The Atlanteans civilization was not the advanced civilization they want us to believe it was, but again I have to mention their navigation skills which, realistically, tells us a lot, and in fact, that’s all we need to know of exactly how advanced the Atlanteans civilization was. Their civilization for the most part, was no more advanced than that of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, minus their navigation skills of course. Their public buildings and housing, may of resembled to some degree, that of the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans. They were the first people to discover concrete and cement, as well as indoor plumbing. Again their indoor plumbing tells us once again that their civilization may have been very advanced. The Egyptian pyramids, and there are quite a few of them, may have been constructed with concrete. The average weight of those supposedly limestone blocks is in the tons.

If the Egyptians did know of concrete and cement, they may of learned about concrete and cement from the Atlanteans. I do not see the white Europeans making any great changes concerning their belief that the Egyptians did not know of concrete or cement. If the white Europeans do decide to change the historical records concerning Egyptian knowledge of concrete and cement, that leaves the

door open to the Atlanteans being also capable of using concrete and cement for construction of their public buildings, and their homes as well. To carry those limestone blocks which weighed in the tons, hundreds of feet up, for those ancient times, is unthinkable, but can't be ruled out. I believe that the Egyptians were intelligent enough to know how to grind that limestone, or any other stones, into a paste, to eventually make concrete.

Of all that has been written and said about the Atlantean people and their civilization, there are only a very few traces of information left to us about Atlantis. Other than the Atlantis story, which was first written down by the Egyptians, then followed by the Greeks, there are only two other places that I know of that may tell the world more about, who were and still are, the Atlanteans. Of course, the monuments of Egypt with their hieroglyphics, have to have important historical records concerning the Atlanteans and Atlantis.

We know how to read the Egyptians hieroglyphics so I know that if the Egyptian hieroglyphics did indeed make mention of the Atlanteans and Atlantis, as it is written in the Atlantis story, the white Europeans know of it, and they may never let the rest of the world in on their secret. The other place to search for more information about the Atlantean people, of course, is in the Atlantean people, who we know are the Algonquian Indians. There is no better way to prove a right or wrong than by using DNA. If an higher power wanted the Atlanteans to endure what they have endured, make no doubts about it, that same higher power also wants the rest of mankind to know who the Atlantean people are, for we now have DNA evidence which proves an relationship existing between the Native Americans, to the people who live around the Mediterranean Sea.

In North America, the Atlanteans continue to live life but, undoubtedly, the great majority of the Algonquians do not realize that they are the Atlanteans, and that's for a very good reason! White Europeans have gone to great lengths to avoid the Algonquian Indians, particularly their conduct with the few civilized settlements in New England and eastern Canada, where the ancient Atlantean civilization was located. Now it is for the most part, under the Atlantic Ocean just off the coast of New England and eastern Canada. But I have a hunch there are more ancient Atlantean settlements on the mainland in New England and eastern Canada (even just south of Hudson Bay), which will be discovered if we actually search for them! At the present time the Algonquians population is approaching 1,000,000, a far cry from the millions they certainly numbered 11,500 years ago, or even further back in time!