



On the Negro's Place in Nature

Author(s): James Hunt

Source: *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London*, 1864, Vol. 2 (1864), pp. xv-lvi

Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3025197>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London*

NOVEMBER 17TH, 1863.

Sir CHARLES NICHOLSON, Bart., V.P., in the Chair.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following new members were announced: Augustus S. Wilkins, Esq.; Alfred S. Rogers, Esq.; George Boulton, Esq.; George Nesbitt, Esq.; Spyridon Glaucopides, Esq.

Corresponding Members. Dr. Carl Vogt; Prof. George Pouchet.

Local Secretary, England. Dr. Farquharson.

Local Secretaries abroad. S. Stafford Allen, Esq.; D. Bogge.

The Secretary read a list of the presents received by the Society, for which thanks were voted to Hekekyan Bey, the Royal Institution of Cornwall, Dr. Beke, Sir W. Jardine, F.R.S., Dr. Cuthbert Collingwood, the Royal Geographical Society, and the Imperial Academy of Sciences of Vienna.

The following paper was read:—

*On the Negro's Place in Nature.** By JAMES HUNT, Esq., Ph. D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., F.A.S.L., President.

Dr. HUNT commenced by stating that facts relating to the physical, mental, and moral characters of the Negro have never been brought before a scientific audience in London, while in France, America, and Germany these subjects had been fully and freely discussed. There existed a considerable amount of literature on the subject, but it was unfortunately distinguished by an acrimonious tone. It was hoped to bring forward facts which would dispel some of the delusions which now existed respecting the character of the Negro race. A comparison was drawn between the anatomical differences existing between the Negro and the ape on the one hand, and between the European and the Negro on the other. It was stated that the Negro was generally of shorter stature than the European, but that the difference was greater in proportion than in form; that the bones were thicker and heavier; the trunk short and the arm long in proportion, reaching to the middle of the knee. The hips were represented as narrow; the thigh laterally compressed; the fingers of the hand long and flat, and the thumb long and very weak; the foot flat, and the heel both flat and long; the pelvis narrow, especially in the male; the teeth hard, and the molars usually very large. On all these points there appeared a nearer approach to the ape than was seen in the European. The brain of the Negro had been proved to be smaller than in the European, Mogul, Malay, American, Indian, and Esquimaux. The facial angle was generally between seventy and seventy-five degrees, and sometimes as low as sixty-five degrees. The frontal sutures closed much earlier in the Negro than in the European. The brain both of Negro and ape more resembled that of the European when the latter was in an infant state than when older; at puberty all development in the brain of the Negro ceased, and the form of the

* This paper has been published for the Society by Trübner and Co., pp. 60, price 1s. It will also appear in the volume of Memoirs which have been read before the Society, and which are now in the press. EDITOR.

skull became more ape-like as he increased in years, while the ape became more brutish as he got old—a circumstance which entirely accorded with the psychological fact that all increase of intelligence after the age of puberty was impossible. The hair of the Negro was represented as distinct in structure from that of the other races of man. The structure of the larynx and palate was also different to that of the European. It had yet to be established whether the offspring of the European and Negro were indefinitely prolific—many facts, together with the researches of Broca, leading to the conclusion that these mixtures were only temporarily prolific, and died out after the lapse of a few generations. The Negro had had the benefit of all the ancient civilisation, but there was not a single instance of any pure Negro being eminent in science, literature, or art; nearly all those who had become reputed for their talents could be proved to have had European blood in their veins. The circumstance of European features being found amongst Negroes, as has been frequently asserted, has been denied by M. Pruner Bey, who has examined many thousands. What civilisation they had was imitated, and they had never invented an alphabet, nor reasoned out a theological system. The Negroes in Africa were subject to the cruellest forms of superstition, and were the victims of the most frightful cruelty and torture. Domestic slaves were not generally sold except for some crime, and a large portion of the exported slaves were criminals. Numerous opinions were quoted to show the low mental character of the Negro. The following general deductions were made: First, That there is as good reason for classifying the Negro as a distinct species from the European as there is for making the ass a distinct species from the zebra; and if we take intelligence into consideration in classification, there is far greater difference between the Negro and Anglo-Saxon than between the gorilla and chimpanzee. 2nd. That the analogies are far more numerous between the Negro and apes than between the European and apes. 3rd. That the Negro is inferior, intellectually, to the European. 4th. That the Negro is more humanised when in his natural subordination to the European, than under any other circumstances. 5th. That the Negro can only be humanised and civilised by Europeans. 6th. That European civilisation is not suited to the requirements and character of the Negro.

Sir CHARLES NICHOLSON, Bart., V.P., said: We must have all listened with immense satisfaction to the very able, elaborate, and graphic paper read by our President. Reserving to myself the privilege of offering a few remarks before the conclusion of the debate, there is one point to which I would wish now to invite attention. It is a point not adverted to by my excellent friend the President, but it is of some importance as determining the fact as to the distinct character of the Negro and the Negroid races from the higher European or Aryan type. The question I would invite attention to is this: Whether the parasitic animals which belong to the Negro are distinct from those which belong to the European type? A very

distinguished friend of mine, Mr. William Sharpe M'Cleay, with whose name many here are familiar, resided for many years in the West Indies, having filled the office of Commissioner in Cuba. He had very decided opinions on this subject, and I may say that they are in entire accordance with those propounded to night by our President. It is, perhaps, known to many persons that Mr. M'Cleay is very distinguished as an entomologist, and I have heard him affirm with great confidence that the parasitic animals—the entozoa and those troublesome parasites that infest all animals—are distinguished in the Negro from those which infest Europeans. Probably some one will be able to give information on this point, because, no doubt, if it could be shown that the parasites that infest the body of the Negro are different from those which infest the European, it would go a long way towards establishing the specific difference which I think most persons present are prepared to admit between the European and the Negro.

Mr. S. E. BOUVÉRIE PUSEY said: I feel rather reluctant to address you after the excellent paper which has just been read, especially as there are many present who are much better qualified to do so than myself. I have, however, a few words to say on the subject. In very many examples, when the Negro has come in contact with European civilisation, he has been what he is in Cuba now, a slave for at least five or ten years, worked to death and then replaced by other slaves. In the Confederate States, where he has fallen into the hands of what I would call a noble people, he is unquestionably better treated; but till recently, owing perhaps to overcaution, any progress in knowledge has been much discouraged. However, the inhabitants of the Confederate States are many of them convinced that the Negro can be made a skilled artisan—an artisan of any kind. My authority is Mr. Pratt, of Carolina, a Louisianian delegate. It is true that they do not distinguish accurately between the Negro and the Mulatto; and it is remarkable how many examples of clever coloured men are Mulattoes. But it is not exclusively the case. I think we can point to one example of a pure black man, eminent both as a statesman and warrior—Toussaint l'Ouverture. When we consider how Toussaint played the French and the Spanish one against the other—when we consider his self-control and wise legislation—we cannot doubt that, though he was by no means the chivalrous hero represented by the Abolitionists, he was a man of splendid abilities. It is essential to know what tribe of Africans he belonged to. The slave says, "As stupid as a Congo nigger." Now, I am curious to know if he was a Congo Negro, or whether he was born of parents belonging to a higher tribe of Africans who accidentally got there. The superiority of the white man is admitted by the Negroes. The Mulattoes form the aristocracy, and the creed of the Negro is, that "a hundred black girls won't make one Mulatto yellow girl." I quite concur in the whole with what our President has stated, that the Negroes are a different species from the white man.

Dr. SEEMANN. I can only say that I agree in most of the principles that have been advanced tonight. I fully agree with Dr. Hunt in

VOL. II.—NO. IV.

c

considering the white man and the Negro distinct species. There is one thing that is very curious, that, while in the Negro children we always observe a very great sharpness up to a certain age, the most clever Europeans frequently turn out to be dunces up to a certain period. With regard to the colour of the Negroes, I think the darkest Negroes I ever saw were in Egypt, and they came from Nubia.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not consider the Nubians Negroes?

Dr. SEEMANN. No; but they came through Nubia. With regard to their not being prolific beyond a certain crossing, I am quite of that opinion. I made observations myself, and often inquired into the subject while staying at Panama and South America. I think the Negroes are very prolific up to the first or second cross, but after that the children are apt to die. I believe they are incapable of exercising any leading position in the world, and that they are best off when slaves or in an analogous position. I do not think that any amount of education will make them anything but what they are.

Mr. WINWOOD READE: I may be, perhaps, allowed to mention, that I spent fifteen months on the west coast of Africa, in equatorial, south western, and north-western Africa. I have, therefore, had opportunities of seeing a great many types of Negroes, though not perhaps of studying them very deeply. Western Africa is divided into highland and lowland, the latter running along by the sea coast. On the highlands are found the Africans; on the lowlands the Negroes. The typical Negroes inhabiting the sea-board have always been carried away by slavers or sold to them, and therefore those persons who have not visited the interior of Africa have always supposed that the Negroes truly represent the inhabitants of the continent, but that is not the case. They inhabit, comparatively speaking, a small area. It is a difficult subject, but I believe that the Negroes belong to the African races and are simply degraded. They possess among themselves traces of a civilisation that cannot be ascribed to the influence of Europeans. Dr. Hunt has said that several mechanical arts have been found among those Negroes that have been visited by Europeans. That is so; but on the other hand, though those arts are sometimes retained, the general effect of the importation of foreign articles is to destroy native industry. If you take cloth over there they do not make their own cloth any longer. The same with regard to their implements of iron, their weapons, and those sort of things. If you take over the iron they will simply forge the heads of the arrows, but they will not fetch down the native iron from the interior. And so with regard to everything else. I am, therefore, inclined to believe, that the Negroes are simply degraded Africans. With respect to the mental powers of the Negroes, nobody who has ever been in Africa will suppose for a moment that the Negroes approach the Europeans in any respect. If the Negroes are equal to the Europeans, the Africans are superior to the Europeans; for the Negroes are far inferior to the other Africans. The Negroes may be said to resemble schoolboys; it is impossible to make them work. They will not learn anything unless you make them. You must flog them occasionally. It is not necessary, of course, to treat

them badly, but corporeal punishment is absolutely necessary. With respect to the means of civilising the Negroes in Africa, nothing, I think, will ever be done by missionaries or by sending out people to Africa. The Mohammedans at present are civilising a great part of Africa by converting the inhabitants to their own religion, and by teaching them Arabic (for wherever the Mohammedans go the Koran goes with them), and by elevating their character in every possible way. For example; they forbid drunkenness, which is the great vice of the Negro, but which the laws of the Mohammedan religion forbids. With respect to the slave trade, it must certainly be abolished now, because there is no demand for the Negroes in America; in fact, they do not know what to do with the Negroes they have, and I fancy they would rather have them out of the country than in it. The only real demand for slaves is in Cuba, and Cuba doubtless will be ruined when the slave trade is abolished. We must not forget that it was owing to the slave trade that America and the West Indies attained to their prosperity. What would those countries have been without the assistance of the Negroes? We know what the West Indies are, and yet we did Africa no harm by their exportation. The most distinguished of our early navigators were slave traders, and a few hundred years ago a man was knighted for doing that for which he will now be hanged. If we were to consider the question from a philanthropic point of view only—that considers only the happiness of the Negro—I should say, certainly, “Don’t abolish the slave trade.” To take a Negro from Africa and carry him to America is the greatest benefit that can happen to him. It is like taking him out of hell and putting him in Paradise. With respect of the capabilities of the Negro for future improvement, I see no reason to despair of making something of him; but we must not try to feed the baby at the breast with strong meat. We must not suppose that the Negro is equal to ourselves, or else, what is the use of educating him? If the Negro is equal to us now, let him show it. Let us try to elevate his character and to educate him. Let us modify certain laws of slavery; for instance, we might imitate the Arabs. The Arabs of Africa allow any slave to redeem himself by paying a certain amount of money, and they give him a certain portion of time to work in, so that if he is really industrious he can always liberate himself. There is no reason why that should not be done in America. Perhaps that would be the best means of liberating slaves, because then only the industrious ones would be liberated, while the idle ones would remain in slavery, which is the proper place for them to be in.

MR. PUSEY: Are any of the tribes commonly known specimens of the African as opposed to the Negro? For instance, the Mandingoes or Foulahs.

MR. W. READE: They are Africans.

MR. PUSEY: The principle of allowing Negroes to redeem themselves has been carried out in Brazil with the best results.

DR. MURIE: I have listened to the paper with great interest; and I think we should look upon the subject in a twofold view. The authorities Dr. Hunt has given go so far as to prove that the African

c 2

does not possess the same mental and moral attainments as the white race. But there is another question that he entirely omits. Whatever may be the effect of the one race or the other possessing less or more brain, or physical development, the question arises, "Have the white race any right whatever to enslave their brother?" Even in Europe there are physical differences of race, and doubtless it is the same in Africa. You see in Africa tribes which differ materially from one another in colour and physical development. You have the west coast and you have the inner tribes; but I cannot see what the difference is between the African and the Negro. If the Africans are not of Negro blood, that involves a question of variety of race, which is rather a ticklish one to deal with. I think upon the whole that the authorities quoted by Dr. Hunt are quite sufficient. They are all authorities that have weight, because most of the persons in question have travelled in Africa, and have collected considerable anatomical and physiological data. We are much indebted to Dr. Hunt for having collected so many authorities on the subject. With reference to the different class of parasitical animals in the Negro, I can assure you that the fact mentioned by the chairman is quite established. A professor in the school of Mehemet Ali at Cairo, has made observations as to the entozoa of the Negroes that came under his inspection, and he states that the entozoa of the Africans are different from those of the European. But though that may be true, I do not see how we are to infer that they are distinct races because of that alone, for the species of parasite may depend partly on the climate.

MR. J. REDDIE: I rise rather to ask for information than to venture to criticise, either the admirable paper or the observations that have been made upon it. I think that the question as left by Dr. Hunt, has been somewhat altered by the observations of Mr. Reade as regards the very great difference between what he distinguished as the African and the Negro. I should like to know, if that difference is so very marked, whether he considers them as different species as well, because it rather complicates the question. He went so far as to say that if the Negro was equal to the European the African was superior to the European. Now, I suppose, no one will maintain that he is equal *de facto*, but only *in posse*—that he is of the same humanity and can be educated up to the European. I should like to hear that point explained. Before I sit down I would beg to make another observation as regards one part of Dr. Hunt's paper. It seems that the slaves that are sent to America and elsewhere are the very lowest of the population of Africa. They are that very inferior race that the proper African is so superior to, according to Mr. Reade. Well, in that case, I think that we have scarcely allowed the Negro a fair chance, because I should like to know what success we have had in educating our own refuse population? The events of the last few months, as regards ticket-of-leave men, to go no further back, show that it is a very difficult thing to alter the moral and intellectual developments of a human being. And unquestionably, if the race of Negroes that are in the Southern States of America are from the very lowest criminal population in Africa, I think it would be a very interesting subject for phil-

anthropists to know what effect the same treatment, pursued with regard to Europeans of a higher education, would have upon the better classes of Africans—those who are not, so to speak, hereditary thieves and everything that is bad. We know that even among our own criminal population there is supposed to be a sort of hereditariness, so to speak, and therefore we may have an easy explanation of the proverbial thievery of the Negro.

MR. READE: The "Africans" inhabit the interior of Africa, and are therefore not so commonly known to the traders, missionaries, and military men who visit the coast, as the "Negroes." The coast of Africa is formed of terraces which gradually mount from the sea. On the sea-board are found typical Negroes; on the first terrace an intermediate race. On the terrace beyond that is found the race which, as far as I have been able to discover, are something like the ancient Egyptians in their habits—more like them than the Arabs. Certainly the specimens of Africans which have been received in America are pretty much the same as if the inhabitants of Whitechapel had been sent out to any country as specimens of Englishmen. But those Negroes that have been sent to America have been judged of by philanthropists who have had no opportunity of judging of them in their own country, and they say that these Whitechapel Africans are the men who are equal to ourselves. I may observe that these delicate distinctions between the Africans and the Negroes have not yet been established. I believe I am almost the first to draw the attention of Anthropologists to them. I believe that what is called the typical Negro—the black-skinned, woolly-headed, Negro—is so distinguished on account of the moist and deleterious climate.

MR. PUSEY: Among the slaves imported to the West Indies, and in former times to the Southern States of America, the Mandingoes formed a principal feature, and Mr. Reade tells us that they are Africans as distinguished from Negroes. It would be a mistake to suppose that the slave trade has not prevailed in the Southern States of America for the last fifty years.

MR. READE: On what authority do you know that the Mandingoes were the Africans who were chiefly exported?

MR. PUSEY: They were the principal—one tribe among many. My authority is Long's *History of Jamaica*. Mr. Long was a slave owner in the time of the slave trade. Another authority is Bryan Edwards, one part of whose work is devoted to giving an account of the different tribes exported, and their different characteristics. I cannot remember all the different tribes, but the Mandingoes were one principal one, and the Kroomen were another.

MR. READE: The Mandingoes were Mohammedans, and as they were not allowed to sell slaves to foreigners, I should think Mr. Long must be mistaken.

MR. PUSEY: In Dr. Manton's and other writings, you will find mention not infrequently of Mohammedans among the slaves, and persons that could write Arabic.

MR. LEWIS FRASER: I have not been able to find those distinct races that Mr. Reade says are to be found so easily. I have

been some hundreds of miles in the interior on more occasions than one, and certainly the natives are Negroes right away through; but as you get into the interior they get mixed with the Mohammedans, and there you find that they are Mohammedans and not Negroes, though they may have black blood in them. There are distinct races and tribes, and you can know what tribe a man belongs to by his marks. As to those exported to the West Indies being the refuse of society, I must certainly differ from Mr. Reade there, for you can go and buy any body you please when you are in the country. Women sell their children, and I know one instance at least of a woman selling her child before it was born. Everytime she was with child she went and sold it. In fact, they will give their children away. The specimens that Captain Forbes brought to this country were given to him. They give a child away just as in this country you would make a lady a present of a pair of gloves. I might have had any quantity of them. And I may state that when girls are given, it is with a perfect understanding of the use to which they will be put, and not with the idea of their being brought to England. And as to their being black, it is a great rarity to see a black man. They are considered handsome when they are very black. It has been said that in North Africa they are generally black. I believe the other colours will not sell when they are brought north. They are all picked men. I am very glad to see that Dr. Hunt has brought this subject forward, for in nearly every point it represents what has been my feeling for years. I should like to have an interleaved copy of the paper that I might be able to make a few notes on some parts.

MR. CHARLESWORTH: There is one point in this paper about which I should like to make a suggestion. It relates to the physiological view of the subject. I refer to the sense in which the author uses the term "species." I have no doubt that the paper will attract attention both in this country and on the Continent; but so much attention has been directed to the views of naturalists in relation to the term "species," that it is important that Dr. Hunt should, in a note, or in some other form, indicate in what sense he uses it. Dr. Hunt told us that he considered the different types or modifications of humanity in the Negro race, as contrasted with the European, to be as entitled to specific distinctions as the different tribes of the equine race. That is, if you call the zebra and ass—and, perhaps, Dr. Hunt will add, the horse—if you call them different species of the genus *Equus*, you are also entitled to call the Negro and European different species. Now without meaning to call that in question, I would call the attention of this meeting to the fact, that in the popular and ordinary sense in which we use the term "species"—the sense, too, in which our highest authorities have used it up to the present day—we have considered these rather as varieties than as species, or races opposed to species—those animals, however, various in external character, which do readily intermingle and breed together, and in which the first two or three races are generally fruitful. Now the different species of the genus *Equus*, we know, are only fruitful during one or, at most, two generations, but, as it respects the Negro and European,

though there is a great deal of evidence to show that the intermingled races do ultimately die out, yet there can be no question whatever that they do breed together as readily as the native races among themselves. That is to say, that the Negro and European, when brought together under favourable circumstances, do as readily procreate as either of the races among themselves. I think that that is an important point to be considered in the definition which should accompany this paper as to the author's views of "species." One fact of great interest was brought forward by the chairman—perhaps I ought to call it an hypothesis. I mean that in reference to the parasitical animals. Now the real importance of that would, I think, altogether depend upon whether these distinct parasites accompany the Negro when moved from his native country to a different quarter of the globe. If we find in Negros' heads when in this country the same species of pediculi that we find in the Negros in Africa, and if that species is distinct from that which infests the heads of Englishmen, then the fact would doubtless be strong in favour of their being entitled to a specific distinction. These two points I believe to be of great importance, and well worthy the attention of this meeting.

The discussion was then formally adjourned till December 1st.

ORDINARY MEETING, DECEMBER 1ST, 1863.

R. S. CHARNOCK, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following new members were elected :—Dr. Berthold Seemann, F.L.S.; William Cort Wright, Esq.; A. T. Bledsoe, Esq., LL.D.; G. McHenry, Esq.; Frederick Lawrence, Esq.; John Edwin Mayall, Esq.

The SECRETARY read a list of the presents received by the Society, for which thanks were voted to the Society of Antiquaries, Dr. F. Royston Fairbank, and George McHenry, Esq.

MR. C. CARTER BLAKE: At the last meeting of the Society a paper was read by Dr. Hunt "On the Negro's Place in Nature," in which the author communicated the conclusions to which he had been led by his own researches, and by the study of those French, German, and American authors who have treated upon the subject. Certain conclusions were advanced by Dr. Hunt, on which, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will comment at some length. I will restrict my remarks chiefly to those topics to which I, as a student of the anatomical relations of the various relations of men among each other, and of the relations which the totality of the races of men bear to the inferior animals, have paid attention. I shall, I say, restrict my remarks chiefly to the anatomical part of the question, and to those physiological and psychological remarks which directly flow from the anatomical facts which must be admitted by the majority of comparative anatomists. I hope there will not be introduced

into this discussion any opinions of a political nature, which are foreign to those objects for which this society is founded, that of ascertaining the physical facts respecting the races of man—respecting man as a whole—apart from any conclusions which may be engrafted on the mistaken or possibly true interpretation of those facts. Dr. Hunt, in a most able paper, in which he gave due prominence to the memoir which M. Pruner Bey contributed to the Paris Society of Anthropology, gave us a most lucid and complete account of the physical facts relating to the Negro race. Nevertheless, there are a few other facts, and as these, in the main, support his conclusions, I will further direct attention to them. Professor Owen, whose duty it was to complete a catalogue of the osteological collection of the College of Surgeons in 1853, observed, that the great character in which the Negro skull differed from the skulls of the majority of those Europeans with which he was acquainted in his experience, is, that the plane which the supra-occipital bone formed with the plane of the foramen magnum formed a far more obtuse angle than in any of what he termed the leucous races of man. That is one fact to which our special attention should be directed. Now this fact, like all other facts which have relation to the constitution of the occipital segment of man, has a higher value than any which we may be disposed to place upon it in a mere teleological sense (merely, as we may perceive, it may have relation to our acceptance of the doctrine of final causes), that has a deep significance in a morphological value. And as that significance has been brought out in a book that has been laid before the scientific world of England, during the past six months, by one of our most eminent comparative anatomists, I will, on this occasion, for once adopt the conclusions of Professor Huxley, and point out the wonderful relations which the angle of the occipital foramen in man bears to a line drawn along the basiscranial axis. I shall point out to what a remarkable extent this angle differs in the various races of mankind. Professor Huxley, and other cranioscopists before him, among whom is Von Baer, have drawn a line from the anterior end of the sphenoid to the end of the basi-occipital; and they have drawn such line as a normal line, from which the axis of the cranium shall be measured. This line is a line comparable with a line drawn along the plane of the cranium, from the posterior edge of the basi-occipital to the lower end or edge of the supra-occipital bone, in point of fact, to the plane of the occipital foramen. And in the lowest individuals of the class mammalia, being such animals as the rat or hare, the angle which the plane of the occipital foramen forms to the plane of the basi-cranial axis is exceedingly acute, and so onward and upward it goes along a series of mammalia, whose direct ramifications I shall not attempt to trace before the Anthropological Society. When we come to the lower races of man—when we come to the Negro—we have a different angle of the plane of the occipital foramen with that of the basi-cranial axis; and such plane of the occipital foramen differs from that of the higher or white races in an appreciable degree. I have preferred to take this broad point of difference between the Negro and the higher and white races of mankind, because this is a point of difference which cannot

depend upon climate, civilisation, or upon any of those agents by which some people seek to regulate what they can conceive of the action of the laws which have operated in altering the races of mankind. Here is a broad, distinct, and marked difference between the dark races of mankind, of which, for the nonce, we may take the Negro as a type; and the white races of mankind. And here only I would be disposed to base a great distinction between the Negro and the White man. Then there are other differences, some of which have been pointed out by those anatomists in the Southern States of America—Dr. Nott for instance—which also have a great value, especially to the anatomist, inasmuch as they show, on the part of the anatomical configuration of the Negro, such a decided approach to the structure of the lower animals—in fact, to the apes—as comparative anatomists must adopt. All those who have had the pleasure of inspecting the skeleton of some of the anthropoid apes are aware of the slender shape of the iliac bones, or of the bones of the pelvis in those apes. And those who are inclined to accept what I deem to be scientific views as to the position of the Negro, will be also satisfied to learn that, upon the testimony of Dr. Nott, the average circumference of the pelvis of the Negro is so far off the average of the European, that it is usually from 26 to 28 inches, that of the White being from 30 to 36 inches. Another character which separates the Negro from the European is, that the scapula of the Negro is much sharper and broader than in the white races of mankind. If any of our members will take the trouble to examine a recent number of the “*Transactions of the Zoological Society*,” and will follow out the minute comparisons which Professor Owen has there made of the relation of the bones of the upper extremity in the white, the Australian, the gorilla, the chimpanzee, and the *oran-útan*, I think that such a comparison will be productive of most beneficial effect to the progress of anatomical science. Other facts have been stated by Dr. Nott, although not resting on an osteological basis. Thus he has ascertained that the muscles in the Negro have shorter bellies and longer tendons. The bulk of these researches have been confirmed by later inquirers into the myology of the Negro. Burmeister has told us that the ear of the Negro stands off to a greater distance from the head than that of the White race. That is another fact, in which the character of the inferior animals is indicated, though it may be distantly. M. Pruner Bey, in his *Memoirs* contributed to the Paris Society of Anthropology, has pointed out, I believe, a characteristic mark of the Negro dentition. Those persons who have thought to separate the human species from the inferior animals—and we at the present position of our science are not entitled to pronounce whether they have not acted on good ground—those persons have based their classificatory remarks on the dentition of the human species upon the fact that the alveoli (those sockets which contain the teeth in man) form a uniform semi-circular parabolic arch extending all round the upper jaw. They compare such structure with the admitted homologous structure of the gorilla and chimpanzee, in which the jaws, so to speak, are squared; in which the large sockets of the canine teeth have given to

the animal a most terrific expression, especially in the male, and they have proved that this is a broad and striking mark of distinction between man and the inferior animals. Nevertheless, the conscientious anthropologist will feel no regret when he learns, if he does not already know—and some of the members of this society who have read M. Pruner's memoir well know—that the alveoli in the Negro do not present the same round or parabolic curve as in the typical European, and that the curve of the Negro teeth is an ellipsis instead of a parabola. There are lower races of mankind than the Negro, as Dr. Hunt has pointed out; and to my knowledge there is an Australian skull in a public collection, in which the canines, both in the upper and lower jaw—both in the maxilla and the mandible—are so arranged as directly to square the jaws; and they depart from the common assumed type of human dentition to at least as great an extent as that which is presented by the young chimpanzee under four months of age. So far, then, with those anatomical facts which have occurred to my mind. With respect to the physiological facts I would feel most diffident in going over them. Some of our members have so ably expounded from their personal observations that which they deem to be the character of the Negro, and I place myself such full and entire credence in their observations, that I shall not attempt to repeat, on this occasion, what Mr. Winwood Reade and Mr. Fraser urged at the last meeting of the society. The fact that the Negro race under all circumstances has never been able to originate a civilisation of its own; the fact that it has never devised an alphabet or architecture of its own; that all the great civilisations of antiquity, of Egypt, Carthage, Rome, have passed unheeded, unregarded over it. These are facts, to which I attach the greatest possible value. With respect to the origin of the Negro race I will also pass over that. My friend, Mr. Charlesworth, alluded to some metaphysical distinctions as to the word species. He said that the Negro could not be deemed to be a distinct species from the White man, for that the Negro and the White produced a Mulatto, whose offspring was fertile. Now, in the first place, I deny the fertility of the offspring; and in the second place, I deny the validity of the argument. And, with respect to any definition of species, which may be attempted to be accepted by scientific men at this time—especially when our knowledge of species rests upon the vaguest of all possible bases, I will prefer to quote the words of my friend, Professor Owen, on the subject. Professor Owen has told us, that “Few naturalists now-a-days, in describing and proposing a name for what they call a new species, use the term in the same sense as zoologists of twenty or thirty years ago—namely, that of a new creation. The proposer of the new ‘species’ now merely means to state what he actually knows, namely, that the differences on which he founds the name ‘species’, are, so far as observed by him, constant, and not attributable to domestication, or any outward influence within his cognizance.” I think that, taking such a definition as that, the Negro is a markedly distinct species to that of the European. As regards the “creation” of the Negro, I will prefer not to offer any hypothetical explanation of the

genesis of the Negro race, for I believe that some of our members might give to us what is the native tradition of the Africans themselves respecting their origin; a tradition I can assure you of far higher value in a zoological sense than that which has been offered by one who has been termed the father of British ethnologists, the late Dr. Prichard. I will pass over the question of the genesis of the Negro race, therefore, as one to which, in the present state of anthropology, we cannot make any reference whatever. I will also pass over these generalisations, which various zoologists have placed before us, as to the relative scale of the Negro race among the various species of the genus *homo*. Among these classifications, those of Bory de St. Vincent and Desmoulins are the most philosophical; but I will not here discuss them, as I trust they will be placed at full length on the notes which will be attached to our president's paper. And I will also pass over those classifications of the Negro race which seem to me of fully as equal value as that which assigns to the Negro and the White, to Malay and Australian, to the man of Tierra del Fuego and to the Tartar of Siberia, the same value as of one species. The Comanche Indians of Texas have given us quite as philosophical a theory, if not more so—quite as philosophical, though it may be rather a more rough classification. They put, as might naturally be expected, the red man himself first, and the white man next. Be it remembered that this is a classification of the races of man. The horse they put third, the squaw fourth, and the Negro fifth (laughter). Such a classification is based upon equally philosophical grounds as that which assumes the unity of the human race. And as I do not wish to introduce any political or hypothetical matter into this discussion, I will rest all my argument upon the pure facts. I will say that the pure Negro race has never produced—throughout all the many thousands of years in which civilised life has been connected with the race—it has never produced a poet, a historian, a general, a lawgiver, an orator, a mathematician, a naturalist, a mechanist, a traveller, a priest, a painter, an architect, a musician, a linguist, a physician, a philosopher, nor, I fear, any clever thinking men under any circumstances whatever. There seems to be a kind of mental or moral blight over the Negro race which is utterly inexplicable upon our present interpretations of mental or of psychological laws. Now, then, we come to the moral character of the Negro. Mr. Fraser and Mr. Winwood Reade have so adequately described this, that I, who have no personal experience in the matter, would willingly pass it over. No doubt to most of the fellows of the society the narrative of Herodotus is perfectly familiar. He is describing a race which some of his commentators have declared to be the Negro, and which showed their utter abnegation of that which we consider to be moral law. He describes the promiscuous concubinage of the Negroes throughout the whole nation, and the convenient arrangement by which, every three months, the children of the Negroes were adjudged to those who most resembled them. Such was the testimony of the old classicist. Such alike is the testimony of modern travellers on the banks of the Gaboon or on the Gold Coast. Then,

to continue our narrative of the facts, I think there has been proved to be a natural antipathy between the two races—the white and the Negro—a natural antipathy, which also, to a certain extent, bears out the hypothesis of distinct species. The same law by which the different species of wild animals refrain from breeding together in a savage state, prevails to a great extent in the operation of the relations between the White man and the Negro. No white man in America, and no white man, I believe in England, would willingly give his own child in marriage to a Negro; and I think that such relations as that serve to shew us also a moral law working in the case. The white woman—least of all in the Southern States of America—will not willingly mate with the Negro, nor the pure Negro with the white woman; unless in cases where the political relationship between the various states of society has been overset by means of a violent revolution. So far for the pure Negroes. I would not willingly waste your time with speaking of the mulattoes, especially as our president did not allude to them in his paper. I will not, therefore, allude to the state of the mulattoes in Hayti; nor to the fact that mulatto civilisation, now that it is erected in Hayti, has produced one of the most degraded states of social condition under which it is possible that two races which, from their close relationship, we could not have supposed to be so decidedly antagonistic, could live together. We have witnessed in Hayti revolutions by turns. In the first we saw the mulattoes massacring all the Negroes they could catch, and in the second the converse law was adopted. Geffrard, a mulatto, is the present president of Hayti, and he has turned out Soulouqué, a Negro, who was also a barbarous and blood-loving potentate. But while speaking of these mulattoes and mixed breeds of Hayti, I would call special attention to the very vague notion which prevails, even among the masses of intelligent English society, as to the relations between the Mulattoes and the Negroes. I have often heard individuals, whom I know not to possess half or a quarter of Negro blood, pointed out as typical specimens of the African race, whatever that may be. I, as an Anthropologist, will not attempt to define that race, and I hope that in this discussion we shall exclude the Mulattoes entirely from our consideration. Roberts, the President of Liberia, was pointed out as a Negro, and he possesses one-eighth only of Negro blood. Nevertheless, the Negrophilists, as my friend Mr. Pusey calls them, have selected him as an example of what civilisation might produce if the Negro could be the subject of such civilisation. And so I will entirely pass over the Mulatto races. On the last occasion a few remarks were made by our Vice-President, Sir Charles Nicholson, respecting the distinction between the entozoa and epizoa of the various races, as deduced, that is to say, from the tape-worms and flukes, from the pediculi and other parasites which infest them. Now, after some examination of those authorities to which we attach a high value on that subject, especially to Quandt and Küchenmeister, I have such doubts on the subject, that I am fully inclined to recur to the opinions which I expressed at the first meeting of this Society, that our deductions on the subject

are not complete. I hope, however, that diligent and sound researches will be made by the Society. Then, again, if it were shown that the fluke, or tapeworm, or parasite of the Negro is distinct from those infesting the white man, such difference would not logically involve a difference of race. It might involve a difference of the geographic distributions of parasites. Thus, although the Russians on the eastern side of the Vistula, and the Europeans on the western side, belong to the same great subdivision of man, yet, strange to say, the parasites on either side of the Vistula, taking that river as the broad boundary, differ most markedly. This surely shows a geographic and not an anthropological division. Thus I have passed over those broad anatomical and physiological facts that occurred to me on reading and hearing Dr. Hunt's most valuable paper, a paper which, at no distant time, I trust will be freely circulated among the members of this Society. And since the duty has devolved upon me of opening the debate this evening, I would trust that the discussion will be strictly confined to the facts which anatomy and physiology have made patent before us—to facts which observation can ascertain; and that any moral, any ideal, any philanthropic, any supposititious, any extraditious notions may be rigorously excluded. I have no sympathy with those commentators upon any observations which Dr. Hunt or myself may have made, who have assigned to them a value apart from their anatomical or purely scientific nature. To such objectors I would say that the anatomist who is willing to declare the facts which research has placed before him, does not pay the slightest attention to any extrinsic considerations whatever. Men who are willing to declare the truth as it is manifested in the facts which science has placed before us—as it is manifested by the general laws which science has placed at our disposal—

Men of long enduring hopes,
And careless what the hour may bring,

will not be prepared to enter into any political discussions, but will be prepared to meet their adversaries in the Society upon the purely anatomical bearings of the question of the relations which the Negro bears to the white or other races of men.

MR. PUSEY. I quite agree with our Secretary in thinking that the fertility of mixed breeds has no bearing on species; and I nearly agree with our Secretary in thinking that the Negro race has never produced any very great men. There appears, however, one exception—Toussaint l'Ouverture. I don't know his history so well as I might, but I think that subsequent investigation will only confirm this statement. There can be no doubt he is a pure Negro, for by the French law all Mulattoes were free, and Toussaint was a slave.

The Rev. J. DINGLE* said: I wish to enter my earnest protest against the manner in which the author of the paper under discussion has handled his subject. In a scientific point of view I can conceive

* These remarks are printed from Mr. Dingle's notes.

nothing more faulty. We have been asked to look upon the Negro race as of a species distinct from the rest of mankind, but scarcely any attempt has been made to show that this is in accordance with any principle of subdivision that has hitherto been recognised among scientific men, nor has the author laid down any system of his own which would justify such an admission. Science is likely to be little helped by such arbitrary and hap hazard propositions as this, and we might have looked for more impartiality, and a deeper sense of responsibility, in propounding doctrines which aim to cut off a large part of the human family from the common rights of humanity, and have become stale in the service of avarice and tyranny, having been in use now for a century or more to justify the most outrageous oppression, and to palliate the most disgusting cruelty. I have been deeply grieved to witness the resuscitation of theories which have been so completely exploded, and which even the blacks themselves have long since learnt to treat with contempt. The lecturer promised to rely upon facts. How far he has redeemed that promise I leave every hearer of his paper to judge. A large part of it unquestionably consists of the mere unsupported opinions of other individuals, and these in positions from which, at all times, we have had abundant proofs of ignorance and prejudice; and as to his facts, by bringing forward only those on one side, the author has acted as special pleader, rather than as a faithful investigator of truth. I need not do more than advert to the question of scientific classification. It is well known that fertility among each other has been very generally recognised as the mark by which the members of the same species may be known. There are very strong *a priori* reasons in its favour, and Dr. Prichard has elaborately shown that it is the true mark, and that all the different races of mankind answer to it. I may leave the matter, therefore, upon his testimony, only expressing my surprise that as the statement, that God "has made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," rests, as a scientific principle, on such high authority, the lecturer should have spoken so slightly of the expression of it. The lecturer has mentioned some individual who gives it as the result of his observation that hybrids between the blacks and other races are not continuously prolific; Dr. Prichard, taking a broader and more philosophic grasp of his subject, gives a mass of statistics to prove the contrary, and even mentions a peculiar race of men in South America (the Cafusos) which has been established by a cross between the American and African races. I go on to the mention of some leading and important facts which directly contravene the lecturer's position as to the incapacity of the Negro for benefiting from his contact with Europeans. Allusion has been aptly made by Mr. Pusey to the case of Toussaint l'Ouverture; it is, however, by no means sufficient for us to advert only to his particular case. At the outbreak of the French revolution events took place in St. Domingo which were enough to subvert all the lecturer's positions as to the inferiority of the blacks. The development of energy and talent among them was as decided as it was in any other country in that remarkable era. Toussaint, Christophe,

and Dessalines were all thorough-bred Negroes—[Mr. CARTER BLAKE: Certainly neither Christophe nor Dessalines; probably not Toussaint l'Ouverture.]—and they were unquestionably great men—men who had raised themselves from the most debased position by their intellectual power. Rank and its responsibilities had, before the revolution, been conferred on them under the auspices of the French and Spaniards, and in the lofty eminence to which they afterwards attained, two of them showed themselves able to appreciate the highest influences of morality and religion. I do not say they obeyed those principles in their own persons. We all know more of morality than we practise, and our character, as moral and intellectual agents, does not rest upon our always obeying the principles of reason and morality, but upon our capacity for understanding them, and recognising their obligations. No one can read the code and proclamations of Henri Christophe without acknowledging that he was a sovereign who recognised the value of wise and good laws and principles of government. I do not go into the question as to whether these acts of state were actually framed by men of Negro blood, though there is testimony to the fact, and doubts have probably been raised without foundation. It is sufficient for our argument that they were the adopted measures of the Negro sovereign, who would not have accepted the accessories of civilisation if he had not recognised their value. We must remember, also, that the community over which he ruled was, to a great extent, a Negro community, and that many of his ministers were of that race. Whatever may be the ultimate result of this experiment in Negro independence, enough has already been done to show that the Negroes are not incapable of civilisation, and we know that the causes which operate against them, especially the unavoidable establishment of a military despotism, have tended to the ruin of the most civilised states. The kind of intercourse which the Negroes had with Europeans in Africa sufficiently account for the little benefit which, till lately, they had derived from their contact with European civilisation. We learn from Mungo Park what strong prejudices had been generally excited among the Negroes against the Whites by what they had seen of them. Never witnessing among them any acts of Divine worship, they supposed that they were destitute of religion, and, observing their insatiable eagerness to possess slaves, they thought that they were cannibals. Few men have had better opportunities than Park of being acquainted with the Negroes, and his statements are in direct contravention of the lecturer's representations. The latter would have us believe that they were utterly given over to lying and lust; Park shows us, by a touching anecdote, that they have the highest appreciation of truth, and that, so far from being given over to indiscriminate lust, they were remarkable for conjugal fidelity. In this latter respect what he says of the Moors is in strong contrast with his account of the Negroes. He tells us, too, that the Negroes were eager to secure the intellectual advancement of their children; he denies that they should be considered an idle race when due allowance is made for the climate in

which they live; he shows that care was taken for the general education of the people in certain important arts of life, especially weaving and agriculture, and that they had skilled artisans in the manufacture of iron and leather. Apart from the vices of their rulers, and the evils introduced by their contact with Europeans, they were, as barbarians, more than usually disposed to be a contented and happy people, needing only the illumination of a purer faith, and the protection of a powerful and beneficent government. That their vices have been more prominent than their virtues, may readily be admitted; it is no more than has been true of the barbarous aborigines of every country under the sun. Prichard assures us, that the aborigines of Europe were in a more degraded state than the Negroes now are, and that they emerged more slowly from their pristine barbarism than many of the native African nations have done; and with reference to the superior influence of Mohammedans over that of Europeans, to which Mr. Fraser has alluded, I may mention that Prichard agrees with Park in deploring the debasing tendency of that kind of intercourse which the Africans have had with Europeans, and the utter ignorance in which they had generally been left, not only of the teaching of Christianity, but even of the existence of any religion at all among the Europeans. Where the Negroes have fairly come in contact with civilisation, they have shown themselves capable of great improvement. Those whom we sometimes meet in our own streets are not savages. The slaves in the Southern States of America are acknowledged to have visibly advanced in civilisation, and their tendency to rise to the level of other men is sufficiently attested by the fact that the slave-holders, from jealousy of it, do, as a rule, prevent them when young from receiving any instruction. I state this upon the testimony of Mr. Russell, the correspondent of the *Times*, who putting in vain the most elementary questions in religion to some children of twelve or fourteen years of age, was told by the overseer that it was not thought advisable to instruct them in such matters. The idea that Negroes are quick as children, but grow more stupid when they arrive at adult age (an idea very difficult to verify) is, I am apt to think, a mistake arising, like many others on this subject, from inadequate knowledge of what is true of men in general. Something of the same kind would probably be found true of men of every race. The indications of talent among young people are common, while in after life very few raise themselves above the average of their fellows. Under all circumstances, the vivacity of children is unrepressed, but among barbarians, and especially among slaves, there are not the motives in riper years to urge a man forward in life. I am informed by a lady, who belonged to an old Jamaica family, and who spent eleven years of her life there in the times of slavery, that it was usual to give the slaves the chance of emancipating themselves, by allotting them ground in the interior of the country, and giving them the Saturday to cultivate it on their own account. In this way many obtained their freedom. She knew slaves who, from their superior attainments, were valued by their masters at ten times the price allowed by the government at the time of

emancipation as the average value of slaves. From her intercourse with them, she had received a favourable idea of their capacity, especially for the cultivation of mechanical arts, and she had met in society a Negro gentleman from Hayti whom she describes as a person of very polished manners. I was much pained by the slighting way in which the lecturer referred to the efforts of the philanthropists, as he called them, in behalf of the Africans, especially as it was accompanied by the entire suppression of facts which really had a most important bearing on his subject. He had undertaken to help us to form a judgment as to how far the Negro might possibly benefit by contact with European civilisation, and all he could tell us of the result of the efforts that have been made on their behalf on the West Coast of Africa (the only place where the experiment has been earnestly tried) was, that the Negroes there were a lying set, or some expression of that sort. This is about as fair a judgment as if a countryman, who had found it hard to avoid being robbed in London, were to report in the country that the Londoners were all rogues. If, sir, we are to be guided by facts, in this matter, the following ought to be of some weight with us. There has been an attempt made at Sierra Leone to form the slaves released from the slave ships into a Christian community upon the European model, and the result of this experiment of about half a century, upon the vilest refuse of Africa is, that there is a respectable Christian community there. A tract of country of about three hundred square miles has been laid out, as in England, in parishes, throughout which there are numerous devout congregations well instructed in the Christian faith, and remarkable for sober, orderly, and Christian conduct. In a population of nearly fifty thousand, there are in connection with one religious body upwards of seven thousand attendants on divine service, four thousand communicants, twelve ordained native clergymen, and fourteen native lay agents; more than one quarter of the whole population is at school, a larger proportion, perhaps, than in any other country in the world, and only about six thousand remain Pagans and Mohammedans, the rest being divided pretty equally between the Methodists and the Church. Dr. Livingstone, in a letter to Sir R. Murchison, expresses in the highest terms his admiration of the result of the experiment, and affirms that the Sabbath is as well observed as it is any where in Scotland. Moreover, the people collected at Sierra Leone have become desirous of making their countrymen in the interior partakers of the same benefits with themselves, and, in this way, a mission was undertaken to the Yoruba country, among other places, in 1845. The people were so well disposed to receive Christianity, that already there is a church with upwards of one thousand communicants, with five native clergymen, many other native agents, and a large number of scholars. I could bring abundant testimonies to the soundness of the work which has been thus done for Africa; and surely, sir, it is better to have been instrumental in forwarding this great practical result, than to have been striving to revive the absurd and exploded theories, under the shelter

of which a mass of crime has been perpetrated which has filled the world with disgust.

Mr. T. BENDYSHE, M.A.,* said: I should like to make a few remarks upon Dr. Hunt's able and interesting paper, with the conclusions of which I cannot altogether agree. And first, it does not seem to me so clearly made out, as it does to many, that the Negro differs in what is called species from the European. For example, the African crania in the Chatham Museum are in number 128, and Dr. Williamson in his remarks upon them, after dividing all the skulls into four classes, goes on to say: "The characters stated as marking the four classes of skulls, and the division into races, are those usually found; but there are no characters which are universally present in every race. For example, in the Negro race the Mandingoes' skulls are well formed and approach to the European, and show few of the Negro characters: on the other hand, the Kroomen display these characters in their exaggerated form." And again, "In general the superior maxillary bone of the Negro does not project, nor is the skull compressed laterally; this occurs only in the exaggerated specimens of the Negro race, and out of 128 African crania, these strongly marked peculiarities are only found in two instances." He asserts, also, that the situation of the foramen magnum, is the same in Negro as in European skulls, and that the lower jaw is in general neither thicker nor stronger, and the angle the same as in Europeans. There are seven skeletons also in the museum, one of a Negro, of which he says, "The bones of the pelvis, and those of the skeleton generally, do not differ in the slightest degree, with regard to form or texture, from the English or Greek." And "the points of the fingers in the Negro, Hottentot, as also in the two Greek and English male skeletons, reach as low as the middle of the femur." Some of the differences, therefore, which have been relied on as specific, do not seem constant enough to compel us to come to that conclusion. Some attention, too, must be paid to the statements made by qualified observers, that both the European and the Negro in the Southern States of America, show signs of an alteration in their physical type, and both in the direction of the Red Indian type, or as it is said, that of the Iroquois. Now, if both the European and the Negro are so much acted upon by the climate and other local causes, that there is some prospect of their eventually being distinguished as a race with many of the characteristic features of the Red Indian, it is but fair to assume that they must have a common specific basis from which to start. For if not, then we must admit that climate is so strong an influence, as to be able to destroy what were originally specific differences; in which case it cannot be positively asserted that two races occupying very different climates, as the European and the Negro, are not of the same origin, or at least species. M. Bouté, in a paper read at the meetings of the French Anthropological Society, has tried to throw ridicule on this statement, by saying that it is reported that the Negro is observed to get more like the European, and the Euro-

* These remarks are printed from Mr. Bendyshe's notes.

pean like the Red Indian, and this is quite incredible, for he asks how the European type, which has such a marvellous power over the Negro, is influenced by such an inferior type as the Red Man? But the answer is very easy. Both are influenced, not by the Red Man, but by the climatic action which has made the Red Man what he is; and as both approach the Red Man, they will, of course, more and more resemble each other, and this it is which has really taken place. Indeed, I am inclined to think these apparently contradictory statements are a confirmation of the assertion, because they are made by independent observers and can only be explained in the way I have suggested. I have also a question to ask our learned President, to which I do not expect to get a satisfactory answer; but which, I think, demands some attempt at explanation, before we can be called upon to admit this diversity of species between ourselves and a being we all agree to recognise as man. Let us suppose that somewhere in the interior of Africa the intermediate beings should be found, which, according to the Darwinian theory must once have existed, if they do not still, between the highest ape and the lowest kind of man we are at present acquainted with,—I should be glad to know how it would become an enterprising member of this Society to act under the influence of such a discovery. At present, however much we may differ theoretically, we know practically what to do. Mr. Reade shoots and presents us with the skin of a Gorilla—and will no doubt tell us shortly the particulars of his exploit. Dr. Hunt presents us with the skull of a Negro: our consciences are satisfied, and we don't ask how he became possessed of it. But when brought face to face with the intermediate creature, how should we act? How should we distinguish between the animal we ought to shoot with triumph, and whose skin should be sent home and stuffed, and the man whose skull and skeleton would be equally interesting: but the manner of whose decease we should not care to know. Are we prepared to lay down any practical rule by which we could easily distinguish between the most anthropoid ape and the most pithecoïd man we may one day be acquainted with? Is it the test of language? That I believe has been given up. Is it that of mind or instinct? That distinction is now thought to be equally untenable. I am only acquainted with one test myself, with one faculty which appears to exist in the very lowest specimens of humanity, and which is wanting, not only in the apes, but in all animals whatsoever,—I mean the faculty of representing, or at least being able to comprehend the representation of natural objects when drawn upon a plane surface; the art, in fact, of drawing. That no race of men have hitherto been found ignorant of some faculty of drawing, or at all events understanding drawings, is, I think, undoubted. The Veddahs, who are asserted by Sir E. Tennant to be destitute of language, by his account trade by means of drawings. The Esquimaux understand and can correct the outline of a coast. But I know of no animal who has ever been supposed capable of comprehending the meaning of any representation at all. But if this constitutes a specific difference, then the Negro cannot be shut out from ourselves. But however this may be, until the question I have

d 2

put, namely, where we should draw the line, be solved, I do not think we can be sure that we have yet hit upon the true specific differences between ourselves and other races of men. Such differences may exist; but we ought not to assert that they do, until we can demonstrate what they are. Nor can I agree with Dr. Hunt in his position, that the Negro ought to be subordinated to the European, or that he can only be humanised and civilised by the European. The Negro, he said, has had the benefit of all the ancient civilisations, and had derived no good from them, or no permanent improvement. As to the latter statement, I will consider it in two ways: first, as being correct, and secondly, as being asserted without sufficient proof, and in contradiction to recent investigations. Assuming, then, that the Negro came in contact with the ancient civilisations and derived no benefit from them, there can be no doubt that it was as a slave that he felt their influence, and it seems to me singular to argue that because previous civilisations treated the Negro as a slave without effect, therefore the present civilisation is entitled to treat him as a being subordinated to them by nature. I think it would be quite as fair to say that it was precisely because he only knew the European as a slaveholder that the Negro has derived no permanent benefit from him. But even admitting that the Negro may present a more favourable side of his character to those who observe him under the influence of European slavery, I cannot allow that to be a reason why he should necessarily be considered a fair subject for such an experiment. I do not mean to rest my argument upon any moral grounds. I am of opinion that true expediency and true morality must ultimately be the same; but as it is more easy to pronounce an opinion on what is expedient than on what is abstractedly and morally right, I shall confine myself to the former considerations alone. With respect, then, to the effects of slavery there are two parties to be considered: the master and his slave. And even if a slight improvement in his daily life may be traced in the Negro, that cannot counterbalance the deadly influence that the dominion over slaves has always had upon every variety of man. However superior the European may be to the Negro, he certainly is infinitely superior still to the domesticated animals. Yet I need not remind you that though man in the abstract may be said to exercise absolute dominion over the animal, yet as an individual it is found impossible to trust him with absolute power. Nor does ill-treatment of animals prevail among the lowest ranks alone. It is only recently that we have all been shocked by the terrible accounts of the practices carried on by men of a liberal profession and of high position in a neighbouring country. Indeed, the animal may be said scarcely now to be in the position of a slave; for his rights are matter of legislation, and though his life may be in the hands of his master, the law provides for him an immunity from torture, and regulates the amount of labour to be demanded from him. But there is another and a large class of beings who are in some respects as inferior to man as Negroes are to Europeans. I speak of women. Woman is shorter in stature and far inferior in strength. Her faculties are more precocious and decay

sooner, nor do they ever arrive at the same extension of development. From the age of twenty to forty, and in a normal state, she is in process of child-bearing; so that during the time when a man is perfecting his education and taking his place in the world, she is principally subject to functional disorder. It would be well for many women if they were allowed to possess no property beyond a sufficient subsistence; and there are many in this country who would rather be the third, or fourth, or fifth wife of a man of large fortune than never be married at all. Accordingly, for many ages the lot of woman has been slavery; and whilst a slave she made as little progress as the Negro, her fellow slave. Nor if might makes right can she complain. But do I then advocate the deprivation of women's rights, or of her property, or the institution of polygamy? I desire nothing of the kind: but not because I feel myself bound to admit any positive rights vested in woman against her superior, man; but simply because experience shows that, in proportion as man abdicates the rights which force gives him, so he improves himself. No one here will probably deny that where woman is most free man is most civilised; and if the slavery of woman has injured the nations who indulged in it, not less has the slavery of the Negro, or of his fellow man. For if the ancient civilisations cannot be shown to have benefited the Negro, it is not difficult to prove that the practice of slavery was highly prejudicial to every ancient civilisation. And whatever the future may have in store, there is as yet no recorded instance of a country destitute of peasantry, and living on the labour of slaves, who have been able to resist in the long run the persistent attacks of a nation of freemen. But whilst I cannot believe that slavery is always to be the lot of the Negro, I do not think we are without reasonable grounds for forming an opinion as to the probable agents and means of civilisation, or improvement of that race. It is not the Bacon or the Newton who are always the best exponents of their own discoveries. That task is better adapted to the middle-class of minds, who have the faculty of popularising and diffusing what, perhaps, they themselves imperfectly comprehend; and in ordinary education the more advanced pupils are frequently the best conductors of knowledge to the young beginners. So we ought not to be surprised to find that the Negro seems more likely to be slowly elevated in the scale by the insensible influence of those who approximate more nearly than the white European races to his own appearance and condition. That this is so I will presently demonstrate; but just now I will give some positive facts for coming to the same conclusion from another point of view. I never attempted to dispute that the Negro has a closer resemblance to the ape than the European; and hence, I should be inclined to suppose, that those races to whom familiarity with the ape is less unpleasant would be the most likely to understand and sympathise with, and therefore to exercise beneficial influence on the Negro. Now there can be little doubt that the dark races of Europe have been more inclined to make a playmate of the monkey than the white. To say that this is owing, partly to our climate, which, perhaps, does not permit the animal to exist so easily, is not a sufficient

answer, though it may be an additional reason. But it is generally the dark Italian, and not the Englishman, who teaches the monkey his tricks, and is as friendly with him as a dog. And if it be true, as there seems good reason to suppose, that the ape of Gibraltar is not indigenous but an importation, we have an additional proof that proximity of geographical area, combined with deeper colour, causes greater sympathy between man and his nearest resemblance; and, accordingly, we find that the Portuguese and the Spaniard have a much smaller disinclination to mix with the dark races than ourselves. Hence their influence must necessarily be much greater. And though in many of their settlements the Portuguese may have degenerated, yet probably had they not preceded us, and made us as it were intelligible, our success, if we have had any, in the Negro, might have been less than it is. I said, in another part of this paper, that I thought the assertion that all the ancient civilisations had produced no effect upon the Negro might be somewhat difficult to prove. The Egyptian civilisation, for example, has so long passed away, that we can only laboriously reconstruct some faint and probably fallacious idea of it. That we ourselves should have been, however, exactly what we are, if the banks of the Nile had never displayed that civilisation, is very doubtful. But it would be very difficult to point out in what consist its effects upon modern Europe. Now if this be so, if this civilisation is so ancient, that what was worth preserving has become our unconscious inheritance, we can scarcely expect to find its traces existing in the Negro. But because we cannot point them out is scarce a sufficient reason, any more than it is with ourselves, for saying that nothing was effected thereby. Vol. iv, p. 426, Dr. Barth says distinctly that the Negroes must have received in more ancient times several institutions from the Egyptians, with whom, says he "I have no doubt they maintained an intercourse by means of the energetic inhabitants of Augila from a relatively ancient period;" and he instances the great care which the Songhay bestowed upon their dead. "The attention thus bestowed upon the dead seems not to have been in consequence of the introduction of Islam, but appears rather to have been traditionally handed down from the remotest antiquity." The Egyptians, therefore, do not seem to have been so powerless over the Negro as has been asserted; and in modern times, again, the religion which Egypt professes, has undoubtedly brought with it in its progress to western Africa a very considerable amount of civilisation, of which the Negro has shown himself by no means incapable of taking advantage. It has abolished human sacrifices and many gross superstitions, and in all places established some kind of learning and a literature. "Mohammedanism alone in these countries," says Dr. Barth, "maintains any sort of government. It alone has succeeded in giving to distant regions a certain bond of unity, and in making the land more accessible to trade and intercourse." It is in my opinion only by following the channel which Islamism has made that any real benefit can be done to the Negro. Through Egypt, and by means of Egypt, the real influence of Europe must be brought to bear. The efforts of missionaries on the western coast have produced

literally no effect whatever. The tide of Mohammedanism is still sweeping on towards beyond the equator; but from this we ought to learn the lesson how to bring in time something better. And if we are but content to follow in the footsteps of the old and the modern populations of Egypt, we may yet be able to engraft upon the savages of central Africa, and upon the Negro in his own land, and unremoved from his own soil, all the advantages he is capable of receiving.

MR. WINWOOD READE: Such experience as I have had in Pagan and Mohammedan Africa leads me to endorse every sentiment that Mr. Bendyshe has expressed in his paper; and, in fact, I have put the very same ones into print in a work that will soon be published. With respect to intermediate tribes in Equatorial Africa, I have no doubt that the Negroes there are comparative strangers, considered in the geological ages of the world. Though I never saw them, I heard rumours of a race of people which seemed to answer what the Hottentots are among the Caffres, in Equatorial Africa; and I think it very possible that, when the caverns and mountains can be searched, intermediate tribes will be discovered between the gorilla and man. With respect to the Mohammedan known in Africa, I have devoted a great portion of my work to proving that Christians cannot civilise Negroes, and that the Mohammedans can, and are doing so. They are making thousands and thousands of converts, as Mr. Fraser, I have no doubt, can inform you, and such civilisation as the Negroes possess is owing entirely to Mohammedan influence. It is true that the Pagan Negroes have traces of civilisation among them, as Mr. Bendyshe supposes. For instance, in the Congo, where no Arabs have yet arrived, they have the practice of preparing mummies, as was done in Egypt, and also other traces of civilisation. With respect to Mr. Dingle's remarks, the Negroes of whom Mr. Park spoke so highly were Mohammedans.

MR. DINGLE: Certainly not.

MR. READE: They were, at least, the Mandingoes and Foulahs.

MR. DINGLE: Mungo Park makes a distinction between the Mohammedans and the Pagans, and speaks especially of Pagans asking education from the Mohammedans.

MR. READE: According to Mohammedan laws, Mohammedan priests would not instruct Negroes if they were Pagans.

MR. DINGLE: He states it as a fact. Of course, the tendency would be to make them Mohammedans, but, nevertheless, they would be children of Pagans. Of Parker, especially, the man he remained with so long, he spoke expressly of his schoolmaster.

MR. READE: I have no doubt they were children of Pagans; but, of course, they must have been Mohammedans to receive instructions from the Mohammedans.

MR. DINGLE: Children are not one thing or another.

MR. READE: I have seen fifty of these schools in Mohammedan Africa, and many children of Pagans that have been taken from their parents and educated by the Marabouts, or Mohammedan priests. They are taught to write and read Arabic, though certainly they are not taught the Koran, and to teach them the Koran is the chief object of

Mohammedan education. With respect to a custom which Mr. Dingle cited as a proof of high civilisation—

Mr. DINGLE: No; I never cited anything as a proof of high civilisation.

Mr. READE: The custom of a Negro refusing to marry a Negress if she is not a virgin I will explain. Virginitv in Africa, as in other countries, is considered a marketable commodity. When a man marries, a new goatskin, or piece of white cloth, is put on the marriage bed, and if the signs of virginitv cannot be produced, the husband receives back the money paid for his wife. That, I am afraid, we cannot look upon as a sign of high civilisation.

Mr. DINGLE: I did not say "high."

Mr. READE: Respecting the precocity of Negro children, on that there can be no doubt. Mrs. Walker, the wife of the Rev. William Walker, an American missionary, who was ten years in Africa teaching children, and had twelve years' experience in teaching in America, told me that the Negro children were more precocious than the American children, but had not such retentive memories, and that, generally speaking, they came to a state of *in statu quo* about sixteen, and after that slowly forgot all they had learnt.

Mr. DINGLE: I could give you plenty of such instances among our own countrymen.

Mr. READE: I am only speaking of Negroes. For myself, I have learnt something since I was sixteen. With respect to the civilisation of the Negroes of Sierra Leone, I have been there, and have had opportunities of seeing something of the native character. I got there on a Sunday, and had a Negro to carry my luggage to the house where I was going to stay. When I got there I offered him sixpence, which I understood was the proper sum to pay. He said that I must give him a shilling, double the price, because he was breaking the Sabbath. In the afternoon, walking about the town, I saw a Negro woman, with a very pretty child. I said, "That is a very pretty child; is it your daughter?" "Yes," she said, "that my proper daughter. That am very pretty child. Would you like to buy him?" I said, "What?" She said, "Give me plenty of rum and cloth, and I sell you my child." So I thought to myself, this is some woman just come from the interior of Africa, who has never received Christian instruction; but, when the church bell rang, she stopped and said, "You no hear church bell? Stop, I'll go to church; now, after church we palava." With respect to a great number of native preachers in Sierra Leone, the most eminent of them had been in a chain gang. The doctrines they expounded were curious; one specimen I will give you. The native preacher wished to explain to his congregation the origin of the white man. He said to them, "My bredren, you see a white man; he bad too much, he wicked too much. You wonder how God let such a man as that come into the world. Now, I tell you. A berry long time ago, Adam and Eve lived in one beautiful garden; plantens there sweet, potatoes, plum wine,—ah, ah, too much. They had two sons—one Cain, the udder Abel. Cain kill him brudder, Abel. So God He came out from de sky, and says, 'Cain!' Cain go and hide himself in de bush; so

God says, 'Cain, you tink I no see you, you bush nigger! Come here, Cain!' So Cain came out, and said, 'Yes, Massa; I here. What do Massa want?' God said, 'Where your brudder Abel?' Then Cain turned white all over. Him de first white man, bredren." With respect to the Negroes of Sierra Leone having the same rights and privileges as the white man: the Negro certainly is put upon the juries. In fact, there are more Negroes than white men on the juries, generally in the proportion of about nine or ten Negroes out of the twelve. The consequence is, that whenever a white man brings an action against a black man, the white man always loses, added to which there are instances on record to show that black jurymen are in the habit of getting drunk in the jury-box, and sometimes of insulting the judge, and getting committed. I will just give you one instance, to show the kind of *animus* that prevails between the white man and a black servant who insulted him. The white man said, "Get out of my yard;" the black man, "See you damned first." The white man took him by the shoulders, as we should do in England if we were insulted on our own premises, and kicked him out. The black man brought an action; the white man was fined £50. I have nothing to say against the Wesleyan missionaries in Sierra Leone; they are a very good kind of men. They do not always speak good English; but I believe them to be pious, hard-working people. They are liable to be deceived by the West African Negroes, who are the most consummate hypocrites and the greatest liars in the world. But I must say, in favour of the missionaries, that times are very much altered since Major Laing wrote, when he said, "There are three missionaries in Sierra Leone, one of whom is living with a Negro woman, another is in the habit of getting drunk in the streets; and the third has been tried for the murder of a little boy, whom he had flogged to death."

MR. PLINY MILES: It appears to me as though the arguments to-night have all been on one side; and, partly on that ground, and partly because the other side wants defending, I think I shall take the other side. The statements made in reference to the paper which was read at the former meeting, are, I have no doubt correct. I did not hear it, but it has been intimated to me that, according to the author of that paper, the Negro comes nearer to the Gorilla or Ape than the white man; in other words, he is nearer a brute than a human being. (*No, no.*) Something, at least, of that sort, was the impression produced upon the meeting. Now, I shall endeavour to make it appear that such positively is the case, and will begin *de novo*, to endeavour to prove it. I shall discuss the question physiologically, not omitting facts relating to philanthropy, politics, or religion. I have no doubt that you will agree with me when I call attention to the fact that when we visit the Zoological Gardens, or similar collections, and look at the different animals, of apes, baboons, and monkeys, we feel a great degree of repulsion in consequence of the certain amount of resemblance that they bear to the human race, and yet they are evidently beasts. Now, sir, is it not evident that if we look upon the ape as a beast and not a human being, if it were not created somewhat in the likeness of a human being, we should feel no more re-

pugnance towards it than we do towards a greyhound. It is evident to me that the Almighty, in creating him in the likeness of a human being, has done so in order that we might not think him to be one, and he has given him one of the worst places in the world to live in—the tropics. It must be evident that the Negro is an inferior race, for no one but an inferior race would live in the worst part of the world. There are other facts to show that the Negro approximates to animals. The best cavalry soldiers in the army of Africa in ancient times, were the Numidians—true Africans and Negroes. They actually rode bare back, and in consequence of the aid given by that force, Hannibal was able to conquer Rome. Now, I think it is readily conceivable that the Negro must be somewhat nearer the animal than the man, or he could not make such good use of an animal such as that, and ride without saddle or bridle; and I think that the inference we must draw from my first statement, that the Almighty has given the Negro a profound idea of religion and reverence, in order to repel us from them by showing us that they have a certain amount of resemblance to ourselves. In fact, the argument has proved too much. It proves that the Negro is something above an animal, that he has a high appreciation, not only for character, but for persons that are superior to himself. In the United States of America we get a striking proof that he is not only inferior to the white man, but deserves to be so. He is very humble and submissive. The white man shows the extraordinary talent of being a very great tyrant. We have seen a great many accounts of the white man being very abusive; and the Negro race, with one or two exceptions—such as the case of a white man who got shipwrecked on the coast of Africa, on which occasion the Negroes exhibited something of the same talent—shows a different disposition. The white man, therefore, must be a superior man, because he has exhibited that peculiar kind of ability that tyrannises over his fellows. Now, I shall consider that you will take for granted what I state to-night, without troubling me to bring up any skulls; I shall propound all my facts *ex cathedra*. I was going to give you an example of a Negro, whose name I very much regret to have forgotten; but those who travelled in the Southern States of America fourteen or fifteen years ago, must have heard of him. He was an eminent engineer who built all the covered bridges that crossed the streams in the States of Alabama and Georgia, and they are certainly finished specimens of workmanship. In fact, his master made so much of him, that he liked very well to forfeit all his earnings. Now I think that that fact proves that the Negro is incapable of any great degree of improvement. Another fact I remember with reference to the city of New Orleans. There are three distinct races there, and when negroes, whether free or bond, are taken from one of the municipalities—from the English to the French, or the French to the English—only knowing the language they have been brought up in, they actually pick up the other language in six weeks. Of course they do not talk it grammatically; but I think that, having that extraordinary facility of acquiring a language, they must be considered to be a degraded race. I have another argument which will

affect us as Englishmen, for I claim to be a good Englishman, though I happen to have been born on the other side of the Atlantic. You have all heard that, sometime ago, a distinguished general, named, I think, Julius Cæsar, once came to this country. You will not dispute it that they were real Britons who lived here, wherever Julius Cæsar crossed the Thames, whether he did so at Kew or at Hammersmith. Now, the ground I take is, that the Englishman, *per se*, must be an inferior race of being, and it can be proved most clearly. Julius Cæsar brought a pretty large army with him, and undoubtedly there were some females in it as well as males. The successors of that army lived in the island some 400 years. I know this as a matter of course, because, my own name being Miles, I must have descended from them, and as *miles* meant one of a cohort, you must consider me to be one of a thousand also. One would think that that cross would improve the race of Englishmen, and we are told by our secretary that we are bound in the discussion of the ethnological, physiological, and human characteristics of the Negro, to put on one side all the crosses or mulattoes. Well, grant that for the time being. Now I think it must be clear that the original English race must have been a remarkably poor one that required another cross in a period of four hundred or five hundred years, when the Picts and Scots came in, and another when the Saxons came in. Afterwards we had a wicked Frenchman, usually termed a Norman. He brought over some of the best blood in England. Well, this sort of business continued, the English continued to deteriorate, and new blood had to be brought over at various times; so that I think I have proved, not only that an Englishman is an inferior character *per se*, but that at the present day he is absolutely nowhere.

MR. BURKE: It appears to me that we might go on discussing this question till doomsday, arriving at no result, if we follow it out in the manner in which we have done this evening. I have not had the advantage of hearing Dr. Hunt's lecture, and consequently I can only speak in reference to some remarks made this evening. I cannot precisely agree with my friend Mr. Blake. I do not disagree with him so much in his statements as in the use he has made of them. When we are talking of anatomy and physiology and so on, there are two questions: first, as to the accuracy of the facts; and then a still more important one, as to the use made of those facts. As a general rule, I have little or nothing to object to the facts, but I have every thing to object to the inferences. It is one thing to bring a series of minute observations in reference to some particular part of the skull, to some bone, or something of that kind, and it is quite another thing to assume the importance of that difference. It is one thing to say that there is a difference of an inch in a certain bone, or in a certain angle, and it is another thing to say that that is of such extreme importance as to distinguish one animal from another. I believe that the only importance that can be attached to anatomy, is the fact that it is sometimes capable of being supported physiologically, I believe the only importance that is attached to a piece of mechanism, is that that mechanism is doomed to perform similar functions, and that unless

you have an idea of the use of the mechanism, you have no right to speak of its importance, or its non-importance. The anatomist who has taken pains to draw these minute distinctions and differences between certain bones and certain parts of the brain, and so on, is working upon materials of which he does not know the value. Anatomists do not profess to be able to tell you the value of any particular part of the brain, and yet they commit the egregious *non sequitur* of saying that this part is important, though they professedly do not know what its functions are at all. There is the absurdity. I do not say they are bad observers, but I say they are very bad reasoners. That is the complaint I have to make. It is the greatest absurdity to be talking of anatomy where you are not able to talk of physiology. It is a pure absurdity to be talking of the structure of the skull when you do not know the value of the brains that are in it. If I want to know the value of a piece of furniture, a musical instrument say, I like to hear it played. Do you think I guide myself simply by the look of the mahogany, or its peculiar shape? So, if I want to know the superiority between one portion of mankind and another, I must look at the man in action. You tell me that the Negro has inferior manifestations. Well, on that ground I can reason with you. But the anatomist is not worthy of the snap of the fingers on a question of that sort. He is a man who is working in a particular channel, but he does not stop to consider whether his means are adequate. Now, I say that the philosopher, if he wants to solve a question, will look all around it, and he will not be such a fool as to talk away on something that will give no result, when, perhaps, by directing his attention still further, he may see another mode of solving a difficulty. That is the fault of the anatomist. It is the old story, each man walks in his particular channel, whatever that may be; but the reasoner does not do it. He looks all around him, and thus he draws his inferences, while the anatomist keeps himself to his own province. This is all very well, but when he becomes a physiologist that is another affair. Physiology here is the observance of men in action—the observance of his intellect and character, and social relations,—that is the physiology of the brain. You do good a step further if you go with the phrenologist,—assuming that he is going right—and find out that particular functions are performed by particular parts of the brain. A variety of remarks have been made in regard to this question of superiority and inferiority, but they have all been exceedingly one-sided; they leave a whole universe of facts untouched, that are equally cognate to this question. Is there no superiority and inferiority except as between the poor Negro and the White man? Is not the Asiatic inferior to the European? I maintain that he is. Are not the inhabitants of the Indian Ocean inferior to the Hindoo? I maintain that they are. Is not the Chinese, in one phase of character, very much inferior to the Hindoo? Is not the inhabitant of Asia Minor, or of Syria, a higher type of race than the Hindoo? Are there not relative inferiorities and superiorities in the different races of Europe, and even in the different races of one country? We talk of antipathies of race: you say that a White man will not give his daughter to a

Negro; I beg leave to ask whether an English nobleman will offer his daughter to an English peasant. Of course there are sympathies and antipathies of race, and I say that there are such among ourselves. If you live in familiar intercourse with the Negro, you find that he is inferior to yourself. You may possibly be a very fine fellow, you may be one among the superiors of a superior race, no matter how you became so. What is the kind of superiority after all? Is it not parallel to that which constitutes you superior to the peasant who tills your garden.

Mr. G. McHENRY: No; it is not.

Mr. BURKE: I differ from you in opinion very widely.

Mr. G. McHENRY: And I do from you. I am afraid you are an abolitionist, sir.

Mr. BURKE: This gentleman is at liberty to have his own opinions, and, of course, he will allow me to have mine. I contend that the difference is one of degree only.

Mr. G. McHENRY: I pity you; you do not know better.

Mr. BURKE: I must call upon the Chairman to prevent these unseemly interruptions. The gentleman can speak after I have done. If I have a servant in my house, I find that that servant has a different order of feelings, and is a different kind of being, in some respects, to the members of my own family. Does it follow that I am to make a particular distinction of species, and cut off that poor creature from us simply because she is a grade lower than we are? I for one maintain that there are gradations. There are such things as ethnic realms. For instance, there is a hierarchy of ethnic realms, and the individuals of one realm are higher than the individuals of another. I say that there are gradations in the subdivisions of those realms; and I say further, that there are gradations in the subdivisions of every great nationality. But if I believe that the Negro is by descent of a different origin from the white, that would compel me to believe that one class of the community in a civilised country is of different origin from another. Arguments have been adduced to prove this broad distinction between the Negro and European, as if there were no other people that had distinctions among themselves. I do not for a moment hold that the Negro is equal to the White, no more than the peasant is equal to the gentleman. I do not mean to say, that out of the peasant may not spring a gentleman.

Mr. G. McHENRY: Out of a black man there cannot spring a white man.

Mr. BURKE: Too much stress has been laid on the conventional distinctions of the Negro. Negro Africa is a large ethnic centre, in which there are a great variety of types. We have become familiar with some of the very lowest of those types, and that has tinged the whole range of our intellectual notions with respect to the Negro. There are places in Africa where the difference between the Negro and the European is extremely slight, comparatively speaking, and there are other places where it is extremely great. As to the question of hybridity, it has been denied that a fertile offspring can proceed from the Negro and White man. Those gentlemen who have the

kindness to settle all that assure us that a fertile offspring will proceed from the intermarriage of any one particular type in our own country ; but, if it is meant to be said that you cannot, by any possibility, have a fertile offspring by marrying a Mulatto with a Mulatto, and so on, I can only say that those facts have not yet been laid before the world in a manner that will justify the conclusions that have been drawn from them. Many observers of facts are very poor reasoners ; they draw their deductions from limited areas, forgetting all creation around them, and are frequently satisfied with one explanation, when, perhaps, if they went a little further, they would be at no loss to find another. This is, perhaps, a little of the *argumentum ad hominem*. But I must say that too much is made of this anatomical *finesse*. There is a tendency to make anthropology to consist of little observations that prove nothing. I say that anthropology ought to be studied in its universality, and that laws are not to be laid down by any special men who have gone through a whole lifetime working in a certain groove, and have not, perhaps, ten ideas out of it. It is a question into which everything is to be taken into account, and, above all things, it is a question of physiology, and not of anatomy.

MR. L. OWEN PRICE : I have listened with great pleasure both to the paper and to the discussion, particularly as there has been less discrepancy of opinion as to facts than generally occurs in these discussions. It has been admitted that the osteological distinctions which have been pointed out do occur, but there has been great difference of opinion as to the mental capacities of the Negro. I think that, from the very unsatisfactory state in which the science of psychology at present is, there is a probability that we might arrive at a more definite conclusion if we paid a little more attention to those psychological laws which are now tolerably well ascertained. In no case do the advocates of the equality of the Negro give us their grounds for holding that opinion. Only one example was mentioned, and that was the example of Toussaint l'Ouverture. Now, I think that, if those psychological laws, which are well ascertained, were applied to different nations, it would be possible to construct a scale, showing how far each race differs from other races. For example, I think it would be possible, by applying the statistical method, to show what were the occupations of the white man. That might certainly be done in all the European countries ; and, from the researches of travellers we might see what are the occupations of black men. We might then apply to these observations the psychological laws of construction, contiguity, and similarity. We might also take the most eminent specimens of each race. We might take Toussaint as the highest specimen of the black race ; he is one not among thousands, but among many millions. We might compare him with those whites that have distinguished themselves in all branches of science, and think that Toussaint—if we take the most favourable accounts of him—displayed the same power of constructive association ; not a very great power of deducting similarities, and about the usual mind of what Mr. Bain calls adhesiveness ; which is, perhaps, nearly the same thing as memory, though not quite. Among the white men we

find innumerable instances where great powers of deducing similarities are displayed, where the powers of construction infinitely surpass those of any Negro man, and where the powers of contiguity, perhaps, are superior, but certainly equal. It has been said that the Negroes have a great power of acquiring languages, and that, according to Bain, is said to be an evidence of the working contiguity, which is, in short, the faculty of memory. Now, if Negroes acquire other languages with as much accuracy as they seem to acquire the English, I do not think it speaks very much for their genius. They seem to be utterly deficient in what is called the articulate ear. It has been said that the civilisations of Egypt and other civilisations have passed over the Negro without effect. The answer to that, I think, has been, that it was only as a slave that the Negro came into contact with civilised nations. Be it so; but slavery, till the Christian era, and for some time after, was almost universal. How is it that other nations, the bulk of which were slaves, have emerged from that state? When we see the son of a Negro slave displaying the genius of a Horace, we may then entertain the question of the equality of the Negro and the White man. It has also been said that woman is as inferior to man as the Negro is to the White man; I do not consider that this is at all a parallel case, for this reason: that the son of the white women may be the greatest of men, whereas we have no instance of the son of any Negro, either man or woman, being a great man at all. Much has been said about species, but I do not think we can arrive at any distinct conclusions as to whether the Negro belongs to the same species as the White man until we know distinctly what species is. The great argument, the proof that distinctions of species naturally exist, is that the offspring of certain so-called species are not prolific, or that the so-called species, when united, have not offspring at all. But it seems to me that there is no broad line of demarcation whatever; because some of the so-called species are, to to a certain extent prolific, where is the line to be drawn? If you say certain species have no offspring, we should know what we are talking about; as it is we cannot draw a line whatever. It seems to me you might as well argue that because the French population in France is now stationary, that that is a sign that the French people have ceased to be prolific. We might, therefore, conclude, that the union of the Franks and the Gauls was a union of two different species, and that the test of species is now beginning to show itself; and that, secondly, they are dying out according to the law that no hybrids can perpetuate themselves. It seems to me also, that, in this case, in which the fertility is said not to go beyond the first generation, or, perhaps, the second, you cannot have any proof whatever that that want of fertility results from the fact of their being different species; because there are an immense number of other cases which have to be eliminated; and because, in all probability, in all these cases only a very few individuals of either species have been tried. I think, therefore, that in the present state of science, we cannot lay down any law whatever about species. As I before suggested, something might be done by working upon the laws of association, the

principles of which, I think, date from the time of Aristotle, and have stood their ground very well until the present day. I think, also, that the science of craniology—if that is a separate science by itself—should walk side by side with zoology and with osteology, and, in fact, with physiology. Cerebral physiology is at the present in so uncertain a state that it is impossible to decide perfectly that the brain is the seat of the mind. It has been stated by Mr. Bain—and he has supported his statements by very ingenious arguments—that the brain is not the *sanctum sanctorum* in which all our thoughts are locked up, and from which new thoughts are evolved. He holds, on the contrary, that the whole of the nervous system, in fact the whole of the system altogether is what constitutes the human mind. Till that theory is disproved, it certainly is incumbent upon us, as an anthropological society, to ascertain how far there is a correlation between the skull, the brain, and other regions of the body; and to ascertain also, if possible, what that so-called temperament may be which enables one man, who appears any larger than another, to do frequently more while he lives, and to do it frequently better.

MR. HUGH J. C. BEAVAN, M.A.*: I listened with a great deal of interest to the very valuable paper read by my friend, Dr. Hunt, at our meeting, and I also carefully followed the discussion which ensued. Now I am always sorry to find one side of a question alone argued, for it tends neither to instruction nor real utility; but I am bound to say that I have not noticed that any arguments were brought forward tending to disprove the theories advanced by Dr. Hunt. The truth, or an approximation to it, can only be obtained by discussions *pro* and *con*.; and, although it seems that, in the present state of our knowledge, nothing very definite can be determined on the subject, I consider that Dr. Hunt's side of the question has been fairly proved, so far as we can go in our present ideas concerning Anthropology. The theory of two different races is one which caused some attention to be paid to it many years ago, and several well-known masters of ethnology have subscribed to it, with certain reservation, as Dr. Hunt told us. We must look upon it, however, as a purely scientific question, without any touch of sentiment. To say that a Negro is a man and a brother partakes largely of sentiment, and it may be all very well in its place; but we must forget such ideas in an anthropological debate. To a certain extent, the questions we have been discussing resolve themselves into a matter of feeling. I do not say but that they are, and must be considered in a scientific manner, but feeling, and even politics, will unconsciously force themselves upon our minds in speaking of such an important question. As Dr. Hunt said, those who uphold his theory will be charged with encouraging slavery. Perhaps it may be so—I would rather that took place than that we should resign our opinion for the mere sake of agreeing with the abolitionist party, or of appearing to be philanthropic. Scientific truth is to be upheld in spite of all sentiment or party feeling. It seemed to me

* It was Mr. Beavan's intention to have delivered these remarks; but, in consequence of the lateness of the hour, it was only possible to hand them to the reporter.

that, at the last and present meetings, two or three gentlemen spoke as if they thought Dr. Hunt and Mr. Reade wished to make out the Negroes to be worse than they really are; as if they had some curious, unaccountable, and mysterious desire to asperse the character of these ill-used individuals. Now that cannot possibly be the case, seeing we have reliable data concerning the Negro character with which to work, and those authorities can be referred to by all. Those who have experience in the matter state that the Negro character is sensual, tyrannical, sullen, indolent, etc. That their life is a *purely* sensual one, and that it is no use trying to obtain an insight into the mind of the Negro, because he has very little of it, and it is never worth the trouble. Whether character has much to do with races I leave to others to determine; at all events, if it has, we cannot quite consider the Negro to have the same intellect and moral nature as ourselves. I quite agree with our President as to the *horrors* of the slave trade, and, like him, protest against being thought to favour it. Discussing the faults of the natural Negro, however, is far from advocating slavery. But it is curious how our opinions alter. I happened to meet a day or two ago with a pamphlet, dated 1744, and entitled *The African Trade in Negroes, the Great Pillar and Support of the British Plantation Trade in America*. It purports to be written by a merchant to a member of the English ministry, but names are not mentioned. Among other things, the author says, "Are we not indebted to those valuable people, the Africans, for our sugars, tobaccos, rice, rum, and all other plantation produce? And the greater the number of Negroes imported into our colonies from Africa will not the exportation of British manufactures among the Africans be in proportion, they (the Negroes) being paid for in such commodities alone? and as Negro labour hitherto has, so that only can support our British Colonies, as it has done those of other nations. It is that also will keep them in a due subserviency to the interest of their mother country, for while our plantations depend only on planting by Negroes, and that of such produce as interferes only with the interests of our rivals, the French and Dutch (who at that time dealt largely in Negroes), not of their mother country, our colonies can never prove injurious to British manufactures, never become independent of these kingdoms, but remain a perpetual support to our European interest, by preserving to us a superiority of trade and naval power." Again, after observing that it had once been proposed to abolish the slave trade by Act of Parliament, our author continues: "But the consequences of such reflections are of so melancholy a nature to every man who has the least regard to the interest of his prince and his country, that we will drop these gloomy apprehensions of abolition, and rather please ourselves with the agreeable idea of seeing such a glorious spirit appear in a British parliament for the support of this most important commerce and navigation, as will transmit our African and plantation trades with security to latest posterity." These ideas are rather different to those propounded in the present day, and circumstances have slightly altered the "independence" of some of our colonies; but although not quite explanatory of our present subject, I think the

extract interesting, as giving the trader's idea on the subject. In the article "Negro," in the third edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, date 1797, which article, strangely enough, is not to be found in the last edition, we read: "Vices the most notorious seem to be the portion of this unhappy race,—idleness, treachery, revenge, cruelty, impudence, stealing, lying, profanity, debauchery, and intemperance are said to have extinguished the principles of natural law, and to have silenced the reproofs of conscience. They are strangers to every sentiment of compassion, and are an awful example of the corruption of man when left to himself." Concerning the island of Santo Domingo, where the great insurrection is now raging, showing the bloodthirstiness of the Negro in a rather powerful light, Mr. Evarist, a Wesleyan missionary, wrote in 1821: "Every door is shut against us, and we are deprived in every possible way of liberty to act according to the Gospel, our own conscience, or the light of truth. This life is a burden to me, on account of the fearful and horrible things that I see." In an official letter from the same place, date 1823, we also read: "The unsophisticated denizen of the African wilds (and we know what *he* is like) is ennobled by comparison with the wretched degradation of his Haytian brethren, not merely relapsing into barbarism, but sinking fast under an odious combination of the darkness, ferocity, vices, and superstitions of all colours and all nations, unredeemed by the virtues of any." (*Hampden On Clarkson's Letter*, 1824.) I have not made these observations with any view of defaming the character of the Negro; but Dr. Hunt's paper has led me to examine into the subject, and I have satisfied myself on the points which he wishes to prove. Nothing decided can, of course, be discovered on such a point. It will take much time and both long and patient inquiry to do that; but, as I have no doubt Dr. Hunt's paper will be discussed and opposed by many societies, both at home and abroad, I hope we shall be able to obtain reports of their meetings, and be able also ourselves to add, in some slight degree, to the study of Anthropology. I may also express a hope, that the discussions which may hereafter take place on important papers may be to the point, and not ramble over such a wide space of ground as philanthropy, Darwinian, and other theories, instead of answering or upholding the stated views expressed by the author of a paper.

Dr. HUNT. I will not detain you long, but I think that the time has now come when I had better reply to the remarks that have been made. And first I would say that I did not expect that the harmony we had at the last meeting was likely to continue to the end of the debate. The speakers then, without one exception, supported the views I advocated. To-night I have listened with very great interest, in the expectation that I should hear something on the other side of the question. I am sorry, however, that the discussion this evening has not been so much to the point as it was on the last occasion. Indeed, many of the speeches we have heard this evening have wandered very far from the paper which I read. Three of the principal speakers, indeed, do not appear to have heard a word of my paper, and apparently have not even read the conclusions to which I

have arrived; therefore we cannot wonder that they have made speeches that are entirely foreign to the object of my paper and even to its title. I will, however, go over a few remarks that were made at the last meeting. And, first, with regard to the entozoa and other parasites being distinct. As Mr. Blake has said, all our present knowledge is given in a volume, Waitz's *Anthropology*, published by the Society. All observers have noticed that they are distinct, but whether that amounts to a difference of species, is a question to which, in the present state of our information, no answer can be given. Mr. Pusey reminds us that the Negro, when in contact with the European, has generally been in a state of slavery. That of itself suggests the inquiry, whether the whole course of history, for the last five thousand years, has been one gigantic wrong, or whether there has not been more justice in history than we may imagine; whether, really, it is not natural that he should be in subjection to those who are born wiser. I most fully admit the fact that the Negroes have always been slaves when in connection with Europeans, and I cannot admit that history has been one series of wrongs. Mr. Pusey tells us that the Negro can be made a skilled artisan. I doubt this very much of the pure Congo Negro, from the thickness of the skin of the fingers, and the well-known fact that all the skilled intelligent artisans in America are Mulattoes. I will not touch upon that, however, as it will come into another discussion, when we will go into the question of Mulattoes, and when I shall be able to show that the cases produced by the Abbé Gregoire were Mulattoes. With regard to hybridity, I am sorry that those gentlemen who have spoken on the subject to-night were not here on the last occasion to hear Dr. Seemann's observations on the dying out of mixed races. Mr. Reade very properly directed our attention to the fact that Africa is not exclusively inhabited by Negroes. We know perfectly well that it is not so. If we go to the extreme south of Africa we get a perfectly distinct type of man, represented by the Hottentot. The Negro gradually improves till we get about ten degrees above the equator, until we get to the Foulahs and Mandingoes, which are perhaps the highest type of that race. It has been said, and not without truth, that the intellect of all the people below the tenth degree is as dark as their skin. Now, we do not know enough of Central Africa to say much about it. The Nubians, the Ethiopians in the north of Africa, are all distinct from the typical Negro. In East Africa there are some pure Negroes so much lower than those in the West, that they are refused by the slavers. Prichard made a very good generalisation when he said that the darker the colour, and the nearer the approach to the typical Negro of the West Coast, the more brutal and un-intellectual they are. That I believe is one of the best generalisations that Prichard ever made. It is in perfect accordance with what we might expect from their physical organisation, and is, I believe, entirely borne out by all the recent researches in ethnology. Then we have been told that the shape of the brain could be altered, but I have really not heard a single anatomical or physiological fact brought forward in the paper seriously criticised. We know of no facts to

support a theory that any agencies can alter the shape of the brain. I recently had a chance of seeing a native of Haussa. I was told I should find European features, and I went expecting to do so, but, on the contrary, I found that in all the great characters—the projection of the teeth, the colour of the hair, and though the proportions of the limbs were not so bad as in some other African tribes, yet in all these particulars there was the Negro race. We hear anatomy and physiology spoken of as if they were separate—as if they had not always been combined. Now I, for one, have not based my conclusions solely on anatomical grounds. I say that in America years of observation have shown us that, up to about twelve years of age, the Negro children are very intelligent, but that you can make no progress after the second generation; they then arrive at about the highest point you can ever bring them to. It seems to me a much more philosophic view to suppose that there is a certain amount of permanence of type in the various divisions of the human family, to accept the teaching of historical facts, and to believe that the various races which are found are not descended from one another. I shall not go into the principles of classification, because that comes into another question—how many races are there in Africa. I fully admit that there are a large number of races in Africa, but I take the Negro as represented by the Negro of the Congo. I don't consider the classification of African Negroes at all satisfactory. There is no doubt that a great many of those European-featured men that have been seen, have European, or rather Arabic, blood in their veins. With respect to one of Mr. Reade's remarks, I am thankful he was not up at Newcastle when I brought forward some simple facts in anatomy and physiology. I was then met with a considerable amount of hisses, I assure you; but when my friend said that the Negroes should be flogged occasionally, that corporal punishment was necessary, and that taking them out of Africa to America was like taking them from hell to paradise, I thought that if he had been at the British Association, I would not have answered for his life. (Laughter.) I must leave his opinions without any criticism, except that I think we shall not be much inclined to doubt their truth. Dr. Murie, who has travelled very largely in Africa, and is a very good observer, agrees with the opinions I have brought forward. He says, "Have we any right, however, to enslave our brother?" Now, of course, we do not say we have any right to enslave our brother; but the question still remains, "Is the Negro our brother?" I did not say that he was, and it is rather begging the question to assume that he is. The six deductions I brought forward are quite independent of one another. The proposition that the Negro is always happiest in subordination to the European, does not necessarily include slavery, as we understand it. Then Mr. Reddie made some remarks to the effect that the Negroes are supposed to be the refuse of the population. Mr. Reade, I believe, agrees with it; but I must say I do not. I believe that the Negroes represent a race, and not a class; and though there are many Negroes who pass from one tribe to another, yet slavery is an institution that belongs to Africa. Some races are selected for

one thing, and some for another; the Eboes, for, instance, are used for domestic slaves. Mr. Louis Fraser, who I am sorry has not spoken to-night, went several hundred miles up the Niger with the expedition, and seems to have received impressions with the most unbiassed mind—he quite agreed with what I said as to the European features being due to mixed blood. I agree with him, also, that black is a rare colour, and that it was not a character of consequence. There is a popular piece of poetry about “fleecey locks and black complexion.” No doubt skins do differ, especially in their odour; for I believe all abolitionists know too well to their cost the disgusting odour of the Negro, which prevents their associating with them. With respect to the definition of the word “species,” I must leave that to another occasion. I may explain that the present paper was written subsequent to one on classification, which I read at the British Association. Some of these matters, however, will be brought forward again. I have not said that the Negro was a distinct species; I have simply said that, if we are consistent, and carry out recognised principles of zoological classification, he ought to be. That, of course, brings up the whole question “What is species?” and that question is now *sub judice*. And now a few words as to the discussion that has taken place to night. I have nothing to remark as to the first two speeches. Mr. Dingle said that there was a great responsibility in cutting off a large portion of men from the benefits of civilisation. I am not aware that anything I have brought forward has done so. I do not admit the fact. He believes in the unlimited fertility of the intermixture of all races of man. I only hope he will examine the evidence that has been brought forward on that subject by the Secretary of our sister society. If he will examine the book of M. Broca, *Sur l'Hybridité Humaine*, and the work written by the celebrated anthropologist, Dr. Nott, I think he will see that Prichard's views on the subject are no longer held by men of science or by men whose opinions are of any value. Dr. Seemann, will, I think, give him data that will show him that he must not quote Prichard now on the subject. The difficulty of obtaining pure crania is immense. Dr. Nott wrote to Professor Wilson to say that he had the greatest difficulty in procuring him a really genuine Negro skull. Then I am told that I did not give an impartial and fair account of the Negro. I must ask you to judge when you read my paper whether I have done so or not. I have certainly gone over a large amount of evidence, and have been in personal communication with all the Negroes that I could meet. I can appeal to my friend Mr. Louis Fraser, to whom I sent a copy of my paper, and who, with Mr. Ashmall, went through it. They wrote to me, expressing their cordial agreement with every particular with a few exceptions, which they indicated in the margin. When therefore, I am told that I have not given an impartial account, I must ask you to bear in mind what has been said about it by men like Mr. Fraser the naturalist, who accompanied the Niger expedition, and Mr. Ashmall, a Liverpool merchant, who has resided

eighteen years on the continent, and who is so well able to pronounce an opinion on the subject. Mr. Dingle says that the Negro advances in civilisation in the Confederate States of America. I have admitted it. I have admitted that they have made more progress there than in any other part of the world. I admit that up to the second generation the Negro does improve, and I say that we have to thank the Confederate States for this improvement, which shows the enormous benefit they have received from being taken out of Africa. And with respect to my slight of philanthropists, really those who slight philanthropy are those who do not like to see the Negro in that position in which he is most benefited. I asserted that he was best off in his natural subordination, and that while I wished to improve him the abolitionists wished to keep him in Africa. And with regard to exploded views, really, I must put it to gentlemen who are anthropologists to say which are the exploded theories. I have no fear of the result. With respect to Mr. Bendyshe's interesting remarks, he has gone over a wide field, and he did not hear the whole of my paper. If he had, I think he would have reserved his excellent essay till another occasion. He also touched on the improvement observable in the race of America. But with regard to the Negroes approaching the Indian type that is entirely imagination, and utterly unsupported by facts. Then he asked how we should behave to any higher specimen of anthropoid ape which might be discovered, and I must confess that is a subject I have not thought of. I shall be prepared to do so when we discover such a specimen. He said he would not dispute that the Negro was nearer to the ape than the European. That is my proposition, and I am much obliged to him for his support. Then, as to the best way of civilising the Africans—that is a large question, and I hope we may have the advantage of discussing it a future day. Mr. Reade thinks there will be found an anthropoid species between the man and the ape in central Africa. I have nothing to reply to that, although it is a very interesting field of speculation. Mr. Pliny Miles made some remarks, but he had not heard my paper, and I don't know that it is any use to reply to him. He spoke of the Nubians as Negroes.

Mr. P. MILES: No; the Numidians.

Dr. HUNT: The Numidians were certainly not a Negro nation; and he also spoke of the United States of America; I suppose he meant to have said the Federal States. And then with regard to the name of the celebrated Negro engineer, which he forgot—unfortunately it is of very little use for scientific purposes if we forget these data. I think, also, that if Mr. Miles had heard the paper he would have thought it not beneath him to adopt towards it a tone of serious argument instead of flippant banter. With respect to anatomy not being supported by physiology, and the former not being worth a snap of the fingers in a question of this kind, I beg to say that I have not ignored physiology. Mr. Burke, however, did not hear the paper, and therefore necessarily has not understood that portion of it. With respect to antipathy of race I was sorry that my friend, Mr. Blake, brought that forward. I have no antipathy of

race, and I should not encourage it. Mr. Burke tells us that a nobleman will not give his daughter to any one lower in the social grade than herself; but I beg to remind that gentleman that a nobleman's daughter will sometimes run away with a groom—showing that there is no antipathy of race. And now, in conclusion, I will simply read you the propositions I made in my paper, and then you will see exactly what we have gained by what has taken place. The first proposition was this: "That there is as good reason for classifying the Negro as a distinct species from the European as there is for making the ass a distinct species from the zebra; and, if we take intelligence into consideration in classification, there was a far greater difference between the Negro and Anglo Saxon than between the gorilla and chimpanzee." No speaker has attempted to deny that proposition. Indeed, it relates more nearly to the question of classification than to the Negro. The second proposition was, "That the analogies are far more numerous between the Negro and apes than between the European and apes." I think that this has been universally admitted. I have not heard anything in answer to it; so that there are two propositions gained. Then we come to the third: "That the Negro is inferior intellectually to the European." That has, I think, been carried with scarcely a dissentient voice. The fourth proposition, "That the Negro is more humanised when in subordination to Europeans than under any other circumstances." Now I really was afraid that that would not be carried; at any rate, I thought it would lead to a great deal of discussion; but I have to thank my friend Mr. Dingle and others for their support of it.

Mr. DINGLE: They are free in Sierra Leone.

Dr. HUNT: I say that in Sierra Leone the pure Negro is very much inferior to what he is in the Confederate States of America. In Sierra Leone he will not work, and is not humanised.

Mr. P. MILES: Were we not charged to avoid that as a political subject?

Dr. HUNT: The gentleman has admitted all I want, and I am much obliged to him. The fifth proposition is "That the Negro race can only be humanised and civilised by Europeans." That has not been established, but as it does not matter whether the Negro is civilised by Europeans or from Asia, it is a proposition which I need not insist upon, although I had my reasons for putting it in the paper. The sixth is "that European civilisation is not suited to the requirements and character of the Negro." That I think particularly applicable to our English institutions, where we see the melancholy exhibition in our colonies on the West Coast. Trial by jury there is a perfect farce, and the sooner that and some other things are done away with the better. We have now completed this discussion. There is no doubt a great deal more to be said on everything that has been brought forward, and all I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that I have simply been anxious that the truth should be elicited. I have also to thank those gentlemen who so kindly came forward at the last meeting and supported my conclusions with the weight of their large experience, and the testimony of their travels.

Mr. BURKE: Allow me to put a question. What is your particular

ethnic reason for singling out the Negro as the subject of this particular discussion, rather than many other races which are some of them inferior and some superior to the Negro?

Dr. HUNT: I shall have much pleasure in answering that question. I stated in my paper that there were about six races below the Negro, and six above him, taking the capacity of the cranium in the Negro as the test. I selected the Negro, because I considered the race to be well defined—taking the Congo Negro as my type; and also because I knew of no subject so involved in mystery, and on which there exists such an enormous amount of misconception as about the African Negro. I thought, therefore, that if I could do away with some of this misconception, and also with some of the cant which has been introduced, not only into public assemblies, but also into scientific meetings, I should be doing a duty to science.

Mr. DINGLE: I submit that that word ought not to have been used.

Dr. HUNT: I should be sorry to say anything that would give offence, and, therefore, I withdraw the word "cant," and say that the prevailing erroneous idea respecting the Negro is due to ignorance or want of accurate information on the subject. I thank you for the kind attention with which you have listened to the paper, and I can only hope that my humble effort may be the means of doing some good, and putting the real character of the Negro in its proper light, which will be for his own benefit and for the benefit of society at large.

Mr. MILES: What particular scientific bearing on the question, has the opinion of the individual Dr. Hunt calls an abolitionist on the odour of the Negro's skin?

Mr. G. McHENRY: Before that question is answered, I want to say something for the historical information of the gentleman who puts it, and who, I believe, is a native of Massachusetts. Massachusetts has never passed a law abolishing the slave trade, and it is pure hypocrisy to mislead John Bull on the subject. Moreover, every Southern State has laws against the African slave trade, and there is not one Northern State that has passed such a law.

Dr. HUNT: I am sorry that Mr. McHenry, who is well qualified to speak on this subject, did not address us before, for he is well known and respected for the great attention he has paid to the subject of the Negro. I believe the remarks he has made are entirely in accordance with the facts of the case.

Mr. PLINY MILES: So far as regards myself they are wrong. I am not a native of Massachusetts, and I am not a Yankee.

The Chairman then declared the discussion ended, and the meeting then adjourned.