

Towards Home Rule

Part II

We are convinced that there is only one form of government, whatever it may be called, namely, where the ultimate control is in the hands of the people."—*A. J. Balfour.*

EDITED AND PARTLY WRITTEN

BY

Ramananda Chatterjee, M.A.,

Editor of "*The Prabasi*" and "*The Modern Review*."

SECOND EDITION

Revised.

Calcutta
Modern Review Office
1917

CALCUTTA :

Printed by A. C. Sarkar, at B. M. Press,
211, Cornwallis Street ;

Published by R. Chatterjee,
210-3-1, Cornwallis Street.

First Editon 1000, June, 1917.

Second Edition, 2,000, November, 1917

No. ~~Jan~~ P/19459
Date 13-01-11

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Evolution and Revolution in Science and Civic	
Life	1
Social and Political Evolution	5
The Problem of Race Equality ..	9
The Alleged Inferiority of the Coloured	
Races, I	23
The Alleged Inferiority of the Coloured	
Races, II	36
The Place of India in the Brotherhood of	
Nations	55
Home Rule Among Savages in the British	
Empire	65
Public Administration in Ancient India ...	70
Municipal Institutions in Ancient India ...	76
Ancient Village Government in Southern India ...	83
Race Superiority	87
Civic Elements in Indian Life	91
Our Unity in Diversity	95
A Japanese Paper on the Indian Struggle for	
Self-rule	97
Our Fitness for Home Rule	99
British Capitalists and Indian Home Rule ...	109
The Rationale of Autonomy	102
Home Rule and the Super-Brahmanas ...	114

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION IN SCIENCE AND CIVIC LIFE

The doctrine of Evolution is a very old one. It was known to the ancient philosophers of India and Greece and also to some of the poets of ancient Europe. But although it is an old doctrine, it has been clearly enunciated only since the middle of the nineteenth century. In its present form the doctrine is associated with the name of Darwin. It has been attempted to apply it equally to the physical, animal, vegetable, and even mineral worlds. Of every branch of science—mental, moral and physical, it has been considered to be a fundamental conception.

For over a quarter of a century, the doctrine as enunciated and elucidated by Darwin held its ground almost quite unchallenged—being accepted by the leading scientists of every country of the West. But since the last two decades or so, there have been some scientists who do not accept Darwinism in its entirety. Evolution according to Darwin may be defined to be continuous variation brought about by several circumstances. But there are now several scientists who hold that continuous variation does not satisfactorily account for all the phenomena of Evolution. Francis Galton, in his paper on "Discontinuity in Evolution," published in *Mind*, Vol. III, believes in spurts or sudden leaps being "competent to mould races without any help whatever from the process of selection, whether natural or sexual."

Again in the same paper, referring to discontinuous or what he calls transilient variation, he says :—

"A leap has taken place into a new position of stability. I am unable to conceive the possibility of Evolutionary progress except by transiliences, for, if they were mere divergences, each subsequent generation would tend to regress backward toward the typical centre, and the advance which has been made would be temporary and could not be maintained."

Another writer, Mr. William Bateson, believes that discontinuous variations are the all-important means of organic evolution.

It is not necessary to quote other scientific authors whose expressed views coincide with the above. Evolution in the Darwinian sense of the term would not satisfactorily explain the phenomena of geological formations. Thus, for instance, we may conceive as possible the formation of a mountain by the piling up of atoms of sand or earth being accomplished in the course of centuries or thousands—or may be, millions of centuries. The formation of a mountain by the above process is quite possible. But it may be definitely stated that as a matter of fact no mountain was ever formed by the above process. The above process may account for the formation of mounds or hillocks, but not of mountains. Mountains are brought into existence by the sudden or steady upward pressure of underground forces and not by a slow process of accumulations.

The Darwinian theory of Evolution would not also satisfactorily account for the progress of human society. To a certain extent social progress may be achieved by evolution. But it does not reach its highest development by that process. As underground pressure lifts a mountain to its eminence, so a society reaches its height by a process analogous to the play of underground forces or volcanic eruption. That process is revolution. Prince Kropotkin, the Russian exile and revolutionist, defines revolution to be "rapid evolution," for he says that—

"Revolutions—that is, periods of accelerated rapid evolution and rapid changes—are as much in the nature of human society as the slow evolution which incessantly goes on now among the civilised races of mankind. And each time that such a period of accelerated evolution and reconstruction on a grand scale begins, civil war is liable to break out on a small or large scale."

According to Edgar Quinet—

"Great revolutions are the prominent and enduring landmarks on the highway of the world, far raised above all surrounding

Memoirs of a Revolutionist, p. 290.

objects, pointing to the progress not of particular nations but of the human race."

But while attention has been paid to the study of the laws which govern evolution, no attempt has yet been made to study the circumstances which bring about revolutions.

When human society has evolved, that is, made progress to a certain extent, and when some ferment has been introduced into it, the further progress of society does not follow the line of "continuous variation," but of "discontinuous variation," that is, of sudden leaps. The ferment may be generated within or introduced from without. The ferment is of the shape of a high ideal, it may be religious, political, or social. The revolution takes place when there is no safety-valve for the escape of the gases generated by the action of the ferment. The proper name for the social safety-valve is *Liberty*. Prof. Sheldon Amos, in his treatise on the Science of Law, says that

"Liberty, in itself, is a negative term denoting absence of restraints; on its positive side it denotes the fullness of individual existence."

It is when liberty in any sphere of life is curtailed, or the safety-valve closed, that the occurrence of a revolution becomes possible. For, to quote the above-mentioned jurist, liberty

"implies rest, meditation, imagination, slow and steady culture of the faculties, combinations and associations for all sorts of purposes and especially that slowly formed belief in the certain power of carrying resolutions into action on which so much of human greatness depends."

From their very nature, revolutions have not been generally accomplished without violence, because they mean a resistance to existing circumstances, and they try to restore liberty. The French Revolution is often used as an illustration of a typical revolution, for it swept away every vestige of the old. Kingsley, speaking of the French Revolution, says:—

"But, side by side with the death, there was manifold fresh birth; side by side with the decay there was active growth; side

by side with them, fostered by them, though generally in strong opposition to them, whether conscious or unconscious."

Again, he says that the French Revolution proclaimed the doctrine that—

"In each man there is a God-given individuality, an independent soul, which no government or man has a right to crush, or can crush, in the long run."

But "discontinuous variation" in social or political progress does not necessarily mean revolution. It is a sudden leap "competent to mould races without any help whatever from the process of selection."

Sir Henry Howorth, K.C.I.E., in his address delivered as president at the Shrewsbury meeting of the Archæological Institute, July 24, 1894, and printed in *The Antiquary*, London, September, 1894, said :—

"We talk of a Stone age, of a Bronze age, and of an Iron age, and these are excellent terms when we apply them to some particular area, like Scandinavia, to which they were first applied ; but they are misleading when universally applied. Many savages are still living, or were quite recently, in the Stone Age, the Shell age or the Wooden age.....while alongside of them were living the emigrants from Europe, who were not only living in the Iron age, but had learned to harness steam to iron, and to multiply human labor tenfold. Not only so, but it is obvious in such cases that there may be a great jump in civilisation from a very low to a very high step on the ladder without the necessity, or the possibility even, of intermediate steps. A Bronze age or a Copper age is not at all likely to intervene between the hewers of rude stones or of polished stones in the Pacific and in many parts of America and their adoption of iron.....

Well, this is a very good illustration of what may be properly called 'discontinuous variation' in the evolution of civilization.

Great stress should be laid on "discontinuous variation" as a means of progress ; for in India, Anglo-Indians are never tired of telling the people of this country that they are not yet fitted to enjoy the representative or parliamentary form of Government, because they have not passed through all those stages of society which England and other countries of Europe have done. Taking it for granted that their statement of facts is accurate, it is necessary to remind them that Evolution does not necessarily

mean "continuous variations." It also means "discontinuous variations"—a fact which was not lost sight of even by Darwin himself.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL EVOLUTION

One often hears Anglo-Indians say that the people of India have not yet *evolved* sufficiently to be fit for representative government. Those who say so do not seem to fully understand what they mean by "Evolution". To quote an American author :—

"There have always been words in our language which, because they covered a great deal of ground, and because we knew very little about the ground they covered, have proved convenient labels behind which to mask ignorance. Not long ago everything that we did not understand about the influence of one mind upon another we called 'magnetism'; now that we know enough about magnetism to make this no longer possible, we call it 'telepathy'. So of old, whenever any man desired to denounce a custom or a law without being able to say why, he characterised it as, 'contrary to Nature'; to-day it is more the fashion to say that it is contrary to the principles of 'Evolution'; not because of a laudable desire to avoid the contradictions contained in the word 'nature', but rather because the word evolution sounds more modern and more wise." P. 13 of Kelly's *Government or Human Evolution*.

Further on the same writer says :—

".....Evolution has become unfortunately synonymous in the minds of many readers with that of development, and, alas ! evolution is often the diametrical opposite of development. Development includes the idea of improvement ; evolution includes both the idea of improvement and that of degeneration. Development includes the idea of progress from simple to complex function—from the single cell of the protozoon to the multitudinous cells of man. Evolution, on the contrary, includes the idea of degeneration from the large-winged birds that flew over vast sea spaces to the small-winged birds, which, perhaps because they inhabited islands so far out to sea that flight was dangerous, gradually lost their wings by disuse ; from the fish with eyes of our surface rivers to the fish without eyes of the caves of Kentucky.

"But evolution involves even more degeneration than this, for if the environment be sufficiently unfavorable, the degeneration proceeds to the point of destruction, as in the Arctic regions, where moss alone survives,..... And it is interesting to note how it is that evolution has erroneously come to be synonymous with development. Evolution is not unlike the famous duellist, who, being charged upon his death-bed to forgive his enemies, answered, "I have killed them all." But she is more hypocritical, for she holds up to our admiration her few successes and spreads her skirts before her many failures; and so, inasmuch as we have before our eyes only those forms of life which have graduated from Nature's uncanny school in an environment which has been propitious to advancement, we associate progress and development with evolution, forgetting that, in less propitious environments, the lifeless desert and the eternal snow tell a different story." *Kelly's Government or Human Evolution*, pp. 66-67.

EVOLUTION OF NATURE AND OF MAN.

That there is difference between the evolution of Nature and that of man has been very clearly pointed out by the above-mentioned writer :—

"The kingdom of Nature is governed by the law of evolution; the kingdom of man by the law of effort; and effort is best exercised through the faculty which man has developed of resisting certain tendencies in Nature, and creating an environment not only different from, but opposed to, that furnished by Nature alone." P. 120.

Again he writes :—

"The evolution of Nature involves the lapse of interminable years; that of man may, if wise enough, be shortened by effort." P. 348.

EVOLUTION, DARWINIAN AND MODERN.

In the paper on "Evolution and Revolution in Science and Politics" we have pointed out that the Darwinian idea of evolution is not the creed of the scientists of to-day. Thus to quote De Vries :—

"One of the greatest objections to the Darwinian theory of descent arises from the length of time it would require if all evolution was to be explained on the ground of slow and nearly invisible changes. This difficulty is at once met and fully surmounted by the hypothesis of periodical but sudden and quite noticeable steps. This assumption requires only a limited number of mutative periods, which might well occur within the time

allowed by physicists and geologists for the existence of animal and vegetable life on the earth."*

UNCONSCIOUS GROWTH AND VOLUNTARY CONSTRUCTION.

But human society is not so much the outcome of growth as of construction. So, to quote the American writer Kelly again :

"Growth is easy, construction is difficult. Growth belongs to Nature ; construction to Art. Growth is accomplished for us ; construction is accomplished only by ourselves. Construction is the gospel of effort ; growth is the gospel of *laissez faire*." *Ibid*, pp. 257-258.

If human society is the result of construction, so is human government.

"Human government is purposive, not merely instinctive. It is the result of intellectual effort, not that of mere habit ; and it is intellectual effort engaged in making its own environment and no longer the unconscious result of the environment furnished by Nature." P. 213.

In the state of Nature, if the environment be favorable, then there is progress, if unfavorable, then there is degeneration. But in the case of man,

".....it is by *resisting* the environment that man has attained those qualities of mind and heart which differentiate him from other animals, and not by yielding to it ; and man progresses on the principle of resistance and not on that of adaptation. Evolution produced the ape ; effort has produced man." P. 93.

It is not so much by evolution as by effort that social progress takes place. The same writer has pointed out that—

"Society is not an organism.

"It differs from an organism in the following essential particulars :

"The units of an organism have no individual existence ; they are parts essential to the whole and exist for the sake of the whole.

"The units of a society have an individual existence.

"How nearly a government can attain* perfection, depends

Species And Varieties, Their Origin by Adaptation, by Hugo De Vries, Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906, p. 20.

upon the individual character of those subject to it; and how nearly the individual character can attain perfection depends to a great extent upon the government to which it is subjected. These two factors cannot be treated apart: one is a function of the other."

And so even if it be taken for granted that we have not "evolved" sufficiently in the right direction to be fit for even a qualified form of self-government, our Government is to blame to a very great extent for such a state of things.

PROGRESS AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS.

There can be no progress unless the economic conditions of a society are bettered. The celebrated founder of continental socialism Karl Marx's proposition was

"that in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which it is built up, and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch."

Again, he wrote :—

"Social life at any one time is the result of an economic evolution."

Demolins, a French writer, maintains that the majority of different racial characteristics are the results of socio-economic changes, which are themselves referable to physico-economic causes.

Prof. Seligman also writes that

"The more civilized the society, the more ethical is its mode of life. But to become more civilized, to permit the moral ideals to percolate through continually lower strata of the population, we must have an economic basis to render it possible. With every improvement in the material condition of the great mass of the population there will be an opportunity for the unfolding of a higher moral life; but not until the economic conditions of society become far more ideal will the ethical development of the individual have a free field for limitless progress." Seligman's *Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 132.

"* * in the records of the past the moral uplift of humanity has been closely connected with its social and economic progress and that the ethical ideals of the community, which can alone bring about any lasting advance in civilization, have been

erected on and rendered possible by, the solid foundation of material prosperity." *Ibid*, pp. 133-134.

What progress or social evolution for the better is possible under the present depressed economic condition of the Indian people? Writes Seligman:

"If history teaches anything at all, it is that the economic changes transform society by slow and gradual steps."

The contention of our Anglo-Indian friends then that Indian society has not *evolved* to be fit for representative government has no legs to stand upon. It is absurd to prophesy that Indians will be fit for such a government after 500 years. If in nature evolution is accomplished by mutation, in human society progress takes place by "effort" and "revolution" in the sense of rapid development; for if it be true, as Prof. Seligman in his *Economic Interpretation of History* (p. 129) writes, that—

"all progress consists in the attempt to realize the unattainable,—the ideal, the morally perfect."

it can only be effected by effort and not by involuntary evolution. And as the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy cannot be expected to substantially help our effort at conscious development, we must be prepared to rely on our own unaided efforts, and prepared to withstand all open and secret attempts to obstruct our progress.

THE PROBLEM OF RACE EQUALITY

BY G. SPILLER.

Hon. Organizer of the Universal Races Congress.

"Backward" does not necessarily mean "inferior".—Ratzel.

It is generally conceded that we should be considerate to all races of men regardless of their capacities; but there is equal agreement, and rightly so, that we should be considerate to domesticated ani-

imals, for instance. Here, then, is our dilemma ; for the most considerate of men, if he is sane, will not treat his horse exactly as he treats his compatriot, e.g., he will not expect both of them to converse, to reflect, to fashion and to obey the laws. Accordingly, considerate actions have to be adapted to the nature of the being we have dealings with, and if some races of men should prove to be very decidedly inferior to other races in inherited capacity, it is evident that they would have to be treated apart to a very considerable degree, being excluded, perhaps, from all important functions in the community. This, of course, would not preclude our loving them tenderly and doing everything which conduced to their welfare.

Now, since it is hotly contended that "the negro is not a human being at all, but merely a different form of ox or ass, and is, therefore, only entitled to such kindness as a merciful man shows to all his cattle," and since this is as warmly contested by the negroes and other races concerned, it becomes a vital matter to grapple with the problem of race equality. Especially is this important because many races are actually being treated, or even mal-treated, as inferiors, without any strong presumption in favor of the alleged race-inferiority. If to this be added the all-too-ready tendency to regard other races than our own as "inferior races", and to force these into becoming our hewers of wood and drawers of water, it is manifest that there is urgent need for some light to be thrown on the subject.

Moreover, if the brotherhood of man is to become a reality, as poets and prophets have fondly dreamed, and if the great nations of the world, irrespective of race, are to create a World Tribunal and a World Parliament, it is indispensable that the leading varieties of mankind shall be proved substantially equals. A parliament composed of human beings very widely differing in capacity is a palpable absurdity only realisable in *Alice in Wonderland*. Firmin, seeing the bearing of this, wisely remarks,

"Les races, se reconnaissant egales, pourront se respecter et s'aimer" (*Oe l'Egalite des Races Humaines*, 1885, p. 659).

However, we need not include in our problem every tribe and race whatsoever, but only the vast aggregate of mankind, say, China, Japan, Turkey, Persia, India, Egypt, Siam, the Negro, the American Indian, the Philippino, the Malay, the Maori, and the fair-white and dark-white races. These constitute, perhaps, nine-tenths of the human race. If an insignificant people here and there, say the Veddahs or the Andamanese, the Hottentots or the Dyaks, should be shown to be unquestionably inferior, this would constitute no grave inter-racial problem. The rare exception would prove the rule, and the broad rule would make the reality of the rare exception doubtful.

A century ago the issue we are discussing might have been very difficult of approach. Our knowledge of other races was then a negligible quantity, and of most of the important races we had no compelling evidence of higher aptitudes. This is altered now. We know almost intimately the various great peoples, and fortunately there exists to-day a common standard by which we can measure them at least in one respect. This standard is supplied by the University. As a mere matter of theory it is conceivable that not one non-Caucasian should be capable of graduating at a University, and it is even possible to conceive that a number of peoples should not be able to force their way through the elementary school. The data, however, favour no such conclusion, for individuals of all the select races which we have mentioned above have graduated in modern Universities and in diverse subjects.* To appreciate this statement, especially in the light of

* Certain inquiries at European universities where Asiatic and African students are to be found, tend to show that there is no good reason for thinking that they possess less ability than European students.

disparaging remarks to the effect that the facial angle of certain races more nearly approaches that of apes than that of Caucasians, we must remember that not a solitary ape has yet been known to have reached the stage of being able to pass the entrance examination to an infant school or kindergarten. We must agree with Ratzel, who says, "There is only one species of man; the variations are numerous, but do not go deep."

An objector might argue that the academic member of an inferior race is a shining exception, a freak of nature, and that from his feat nothing can be deduced regarding the average capacity of his race. This theoretical objection can be disposed of in various ways. We might meet it with the irresistible contention that no member of any species departs far from the average, for else a lioness could give birth to a tiger. Or we might, what is more satisfactory, test the objection by the data to hand. For example, of the ten million Negroes in the United States, many are said to be lawyers as well as surgeons and physicians, several thousand have graduated in Universities,* hundreds of thousands ply trades or have acquired property, and a few, such as Dr. Booker Washington and Prof. DuBois, are recognised as men of distinction.† Nor is even this a fair statement of the case. The Negro population of the United States is despised, if not down-trodden, largely deprived of elementary education,

* See Prof. W. G. B. DuBois's searching volume, *The Colored Negro*.

† M. Firmin, a Haitian, a full-blooded Negro, I am informed, has written a highly learned and remarkably judicious and elegant work on the Equality of the Human Races. Another Haitian, of humble and pure descent, but who later became President of the Republic of Haiti, General Legitime, has composed a luminous and comprehensive introduction to philosophy. A West Indian of immaculate Negro descent, Dr. Th. Scholes, has issued two excellent treatises on the races question. The Hon. John Mensa Sarbah, a West African, has written with conspicuous ability on the Fanti National Constitution. Many other works of equal worth, composed by negroes, exist.

and lacking, therefore, generally wealth and the corresponding opportunities for culture. Manifestly, if we assumed that the Negro race ceased to be thus severely handicapped, the possible number of university graduates among them would materially increase.* There remains alone the academic argument that under equal conditions the white race might show a greater proportion of professors or graduates, but the figures are wanting to decide this. Suffice it that we cannot speak of exceptions where thousands of graduates are involved.

A final objection might be raised relating to the absence of great men among the Negroes of the United States. They have produced no Shakespeare, no Beethoven, no Plato. Which is perfectly true; but neither have the teeming millions of the white race of America produced one such towering giant through the centuries. Moreover, the time of the recognition of great men appears to be from about the age of fifty onwards, and altogether only a little over forty years have passed since slavery was abolished in the United States.

Needless to say, what is stated in the preceding paragraphs regarding the capacities of the Negro race—which, according to Sir Harry Johnston, embraces some 150,000,000 souls—holds with increased force of the great Oriental peoples, who can point to complex civilisations and to illustrious sons and daughters.†

We must now examine the contention that man is more than intellect, and that while the various races may be possibly equal on the whole as regards *intelligence*, they differ much in *enterprise*, *morals* and *beauty*.

It might be said that many of the so-called Negro graduates are not full blacks. Since, however, very many of them are, the argument remains unaffected. It should also be noted that "coloured" people are treated precisely as if they were full-blooded.

† "I consider that your propositions could be abundantly supported by instances taken from India," writes a Civil Servant who occupied for many years a responsible post in India.

Enterprise is a vague term to define. So far as the qualities of the warrior are in question, these appear to be universal. The Greeks, the Romans, and the Carthaginians were certainly bold and daring. The Egyptians, the Persians, and the Hebrews fought intrepidly. The Middle Ages found Christians, Turks, and Huns,—accomplished in the fine art of massacre. Gustav Adolf of Sweden, Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Wellington, splendidly led superb armies. Japan recently showed the world what matchless fighting stuff is to be found in the Far East. And so-called savage tribes—north, south, east and west—appear to be no whit behind in the matter of dauntless bravery.

War, however, is supposed to offer a powerful stimulus, and it is argued that where the stimulus is gentle, it finds some races responding and not others. Inveterate idleness is thus stated to distinguish most non-European races. The Hon. James S. Sherman, Vice-President of the United States, well grasps this nettle. "The [American] Indian," he says, "is naturally indolent, naturally slothful, naturally untidy; he works because he has to work, and *primarily he does not differ altogether from the white man in that respect*. Mr. Valentin, this morning, very vividly pictured what the Indians were. He said, as you remember, that some drink, some work and some did not, some saved their money, some provided for their families, and some went to jail. Still *I would like to know what single white community in this whole land of ours that description does not cover?*" (Report of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and other Dependent Peoples, October 20—22, 1909, pp. 80-81. —Italics are ours.) Vice-President Sherman gives here the happy despatch to a very common fallacy. Man requires an appropriate stimulus to spur him to action, whether it be of the warrior, the hunter, the shepherd, the peasant, the tradesman or the scholar, and West and East are at one in this res-

pect. The inhabitants of China and Japan are world-famed for their industriousness, and the populations of Turkey, Persia, and India are also busy bees in the mass. Similarly the Negro and the American Indian in the United States are falling into the habit of what is called work in the West, and primitive peoples generally are as active as the circumstances demand.

Fearlessness and industry may not form dividing lines between the races ; but what of such attributes as initiative, inventiveness, progress ? Historians inform us that in Dante's time the Western methods of agriculture were still those of the Ancient Romans, and they further show us that the red-haired Teutons about the beginning of our era, while possessing themselves a civilisation of a most rudimentary character, exhibited no desire to emulate the dark-white civilised Romans with whom they came into contact. Should we, then, be justified in concluding from such facts that the European races in general and the Teutonic race in particular are unprogressive races ? Or does this not suggest that complex social conditions determine whether a race shall be pushful, empire-building, inventive, progressive ? So far as modern warfare is concerned, Japan ranges now admittedly with great Western Powers, and in industry and in science this Eastern nation is also taking its place in the front rank. Yesterday, as it were, despotic rule was supposed to hall-mark the East, to-day representative government is clamoured for in the few Oriental countries where it does not exist already. This, too, merely repeats the story of Europe's recent emergence from an autocratic *regime*. Taking further into consideration the imposing ancient civilisations of Egypt and Babylon, Persia and Phœnicia, and more especially the magnificent civilisation of China which is responsible for innumerable inventions and discoveries of the highest order, and bearing in mind that every country in the East is at present re-modelling its civilisation on Western lines, it is

reasonable to suggest that, so far as the 'spirit of enterprise is concerned, the various races of mankind may be said to be, broadly speaking, on an equality.

We must now examine another momentous factor, *the moral factor*. A few decades ago, due partly to unavoidable ignorance and partly to racial and religious prejudice, it was thought that morality was a monopoly of the West. Bret Harte's Ah-Sin was the typical Chinese; cruelty and prevarication were alleged to be the special prerogative of the Mohammedan, the less developed types of men were head-hunters, cannibals, and shameless; and self-respect and respect for others were iridescent virtues only to be encountered in the Central Europe and the United States. Now, however, that we possess the beautiful Sacred Books of the East in translation, this view has lost almost every vestige of justification, for much in the Chinese, Hindu, Persian, Hebrew, and even Egyptian and Babylonian classics is of the profoundest ethical significance.

Coming to *moral practice*, travellers of unimpeachable repute have taught us that love of family and country, devotion to friends, succour of those in distress, are not virtues characteristic of any one particular race. Concerning the Chinese the distinguished English missionary and scholar, Dr. Legge, says in a Present-Day Tract—

Take the Chinese people as a whole...and there is much about them to like and even to admire. They are cheerful, temperate, industrious, and kindly, and in these respects they will bear a comparison, perhaps a favourable comparison, with the masses of our own population...I found those of them who had any position in society for the most part faithful to their engagements and true to their word. I thought of them better, both morally and socially, when I left them, than when I first went among them, more than 30 years before."

And such passages abound in modern works, not only in regard to the doyen of the nations but in regard to most non-European peoples.*

"Among the cleanest—physically and morally—men that

Lastly, that there is little to choose in regard to *physique*, a glance at any good modern collection of fair-sized ethnographical photographs will show. It was the old drawings, little more than naive caricatures, and later the photographs of hideous exceptions, which supplied us with those types of other races that suggest startling race distinctions. Michelet and others have dwelt on the beauty of Haitians, and Firmin, with apparent good reason, thinks that the classic type of beauty is closely bound up with a high state of civilisation, a remark which Schneider (*Die Naturvolker*, 1885) endorses. Privation and affluence, refinement and degradation, leave their traces on uncivilised and civilised alike.

We are, then, under the necessity of concluding that *an impartial investigator would be inclined to look upon the various important peoples of the world as, to all intents and purposes, essentially equals in intellect, enterprise, morality, and physique.*

Race prejudice forms a species belonging to a flourishing genus. Prejudices innumerable exist based on callousness, ignorance, misunderstanding, economic rivalry, and, above all, on the fact that our customs are dear to us, but appear ridiculous and perverse to all who do not sympathetically study them. Nation looks down on nation, class on class, religion on religion, sex on sex, and race on race. It is a melancholy spectacle which imaginative insight into the lives and conditions of others should remove.

Considering that the number of race characteristics is legion, it would be embarrassing to assert that they possess a deeper meaning. Every small tribe seems to be the happy possessor of a little army of special characteristics, and one ethnologist actually

I have known have been some African descent" (Prof. B. G. Wilder, *The Brain of the American Negro*, 1909). See also the chapter on the truthfulness of the Hindus in Max Müller's *What can India teach us?*

speaks of five hundred tribes to be found in a radius of as many miles in a certain locality. The American Indians are said to be related to the Tartars, whilst possessing very distinct common traits; and each of the at-present recognised great racial divisions is equally capable of subdivision, and equally merges by degrees into the others. Again, we hear of red-haired, yellow-haired, fair-haired, brown-haired, and black-haired peoples, and we read of frizzly hair, woolly hair, silken hair, as well as of a few tufts of hair on the head in some tribes, and trains of hair trailing on the ground in others. Peoples differ in average height from less than four feet to over six feet. Some of these have very small and others very large eyes, and length of limbs varies considerably. The bodies of some few tribes are richly covered with hair, while others are practically devoid of it. The variations in colour of skin, from pink to yellow, reddish-brown and black-brown, are very conspicuous, and the so-called Caucasian type alone embraces the fair Scandinavian, the dusky Italian, the dark Hindu, and the almost dark Fellah. Noses, lips, chins, cheek-bones, jaws, vary prodigiously, and no less facial angle, forehead, and shape of skull. Accordingly the observable physical differences between so-called distinct races must be regarded as incidental on pain of having to assume hundreds of separate origins for the human race. Ratzel truly says:—

"It may be safely asserted that the study of comparative ethnology in recent years has tended to diminish the weight of the traditionally accepted views of anthropologists as to racial distinctions, and that in any case they afford no support to the view which sees in the so-called lower races of mankind a transition stage from beast to man."^{*}

We commonly judge races nearly as much by their customs as by their physical appearance, almost as if the former fatally depended on the latter. Indeed, anthropologists and travellers often unquestioningly

* A comprehensive criticism of works that lay stress on the inequality of races is to be found in Jean Finot's *Race Prejudice* and in Friedrich Hertz's *Moderne Rassen-theorien*.

and unsuspectingly assume that the mental traits of races are innate and fixed, like the tendency to anger or to walking uprightly. Yet a Zulu, for instance, taken from his tribe where he appears to possess innumerable rooted and peculiar customs, very soon loses them nearly all. The American Negro Missionaries in Africa find that custom is deeper than physical appearance, since their fellow Negroes in Africa look upon them as Americans rather than as men of their own kith and kin. As one of the Honorary Vice-Presidents of the First Universal Races Congress, the first delegate to the second Hague Conference of one of the greatest Eastern Empires, convincingly expresses this in a letter to the Congress Executive:—

"Races show nothing but skin-deep differences of language, of religion, of manners and customs, which are nothing but accidental modalities attendant on their respective historical evolutions in the past—in no way sufficiently powerful to efface the sub-stratum common to all humanity, and in no way tending to hinder any co-operative effort in the fulfilment of the mission common to mankind in general."

Is it, then, to be inferred, we may be asked in astonishment, that we should encourage indiscriminate miscegenation, free intermarriage between white, black, and yellow races? The inference need not be drawn, since we may say that, just as in parts of Europe, for instance, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews live together amicably while yet intermarrying very rarely, so the equality of the human races might be universally acknowledged and yet intermarriage not take place. However, we ought to note that in the West the fairest whites freely intermarry with the darkest whites, and that is difficult to see why—theoretically at least—any limit should be drawn.

What has been said above regarding the ephemeral importance of racial distinctions embraces, so it appears to the present writer, the bedrock truth which must be ever borne in mind in this controversy. The trunk of the elephant, the neck of the giraffe, are something singular in the animal king-

dom. Man, too, possesses a unique quality which likewise sharply divides him from sentient beings generally. All other animals are almost altogether guided by individual or gregarious instincts and their wisdom, natural and acquired, almost completely dies with them. The bee's hive and the ant's nest represent wonderful structures, but these structures, wherever we meet them, are so strikingly alike that it is evident natural selection and not reason or tradition accounts for them. Only man as a race has a history, a history of speech and writing, a history of architecture and dress, a history of laws, and one of arts and crafts. The individual thought of thousands of brains has, to give a trivial instance, created the safety bicycles, and the collective thought of millions through the ages has built up our complex civilisation. And this thought is transmitted *socially*—through home and school education, through public institutions, or through the imposing accumulations, of science, art, and industry. Except for such social transmission the work of the past would have to be commenced, Sisyphus-like, all over again by each generation, and the stage of savagery and barbarism would be unending.

Man's social nature distinguishes him from his fellow animals *absolutely* in that no animal species, however gregarious, is in possession of traditional knowledge collected throughout the length and breadth of thousands of years, and fundamentally in that any attempt to turn an animal into a social being is doomed to fail miserably. To illustrate, the domesticated animals may readily be isolated at birth from their kind with no appreciable consequences to their development, while, on the other hand, a human being thus placed would probably grow up more brutish than a brute. Man's upright attitude, his comparative hairlessness, the place of his thumbs, the size and weight of his brain, are undoubtedly radical differentia in relation to other animals; but these in itself do not constitute him the premier species of the globe. The most hopelessly benighted

pigmy in the forests of Central Africa possesses these characteristics nearly in perfection. The social and historical element makes man the civilized being, and it alone accounts for the successive ages of stone, bronze, iron, steam, and electricity.

A theory such as is here propounded ought to remove innumerable preconceptions from thinking minds. It is a theory which in a very real sense makes all men kin. It discourages inconsiderate pride of race, of sex, of birth, of nation, of class, and of religion. It encourages education, co-operation, science, strenuousness combined with modesty, and equal rights and opportunities for all men and women. It puts at its true value the eminently plausible but almost certainly unscientific doctrine that mankind can solely or mainly be improved in the only manner that animals can—i.e., by careful selection or breeding. Above all, it paves the way for national and international concord and co-operation, and for a fair treatment of backward races, subject peoples, and small nations.

In conclusion, the writer of this paper cannot refrain from expressing a fervent hope that the deliberations of the First Universal Congress may result in a better understanding and a higher appreciation of the different peoples on the globe, and may lead to the enactment of beneficent laws as well as to the formation of a powerful public opinion which shall promote this loftiest of objects.

Conclusions.—The present writer has taken the liberty to put forward as his conclusions certain proposals implicit in the Questionnaire published by the Congress Executive. He has preserved the wording as far as possible :—

1. (a) It is not legitimate to argue from differences in physical characteristics to differences in mental characteristics. (b) The physical and mental characteristics observable in a particular race are not (1) permanent, (2) modifiable only through ages of environmental pressure; but (3) marked changes in popular education, in public sentiment, and in environment generally, may, apart from intermarriage, materially transform physical and especially mental characteristics in a generation or two.

2. (a) The status of a race at any particular moment of time offers no index to its innate or inherited capacities. (b) It is of great importance in this respect to recognize that civilizations are meteoric in nature, bursting out of obscurity only to plunge back into it.

3. (a) We ought to combat the irreconcilable contentions prevalent among all the more important races of mankind that their customs, their civilizations, and their race are superior to those of other races. (b) In explanation of existing differences we would refer to special needs arising from peculiar geographical and economic conditions and to related divergences in national history; and, in explanation of the attitude assumed, we would refer to intimacy with one's own customs leading psychologically to a love of them and unfamiliarity with others' customs tending to lead psychologically to dislike and contempt of these latter.

4. (a) Differences in economic, hygienic, moral, and educational standards play a vital part in estranging races which come in contact with each other. (b) These differences, like social differences generally, are in substance almost certainly due to passing social conditions and not to innate racial characteristics, and the aim should be, as in social differences, to remove these rather than to accentuate them by regarding them as fixed.

5. (a) The deepest cause of race misunderstandings is perhaps the tacit assumption that the present characteristics of a race are the expression of fixed and permanent racial characteristics. (b) If so, anthropologists, sociologists, and scientific thinkers as a class, could powerfully assist the movement for a juster appreciation of races by persistently pointing out in their lectures and in their works the fundamental fallacy involved in taking a static instead of a dynamic, a momentary instead of a historic, a local instead of a general, point of view of race characteristics. (c) And such dynamic teaching could be conveniently introduced into schools, more especially in the geography and history lessons; also into colleges for the training of teachers, diplomats, colonial administrators, and missionaries.

6. (a) The belief in racial superiority is largely due, as is suggested above, to unenlightened psychological repulsion and under-estimation of the dynamic or environmental factors; (b) there is no fair proof of some races being substantially superior to others in inborn capacity, and hence our moral standard need never be modified.

7. (A) (a) So far at least as intellectual and moral aptitudes are concerned, we ought to speak of civilizations where we now speak of races; (b) the stage or form of the civilization of a people has no connection with its special inborn physical characteristics; (c) and even its physical characteristics are to no small extent the direct result of the environment, physical and social, under which it is living at the moment. (B) To aid in clearing

up the conceptions of *race* and *civilization*, it would be of great value to define these.

8. (a) Each race might with advantage study the customs and civilizations of other races, even those it thinks the lowest ones, for the definite purpose of improving its own customs and civilization. (b) Unostentatious contact generally and respect for the customs of other races, provided these are not morally objectionable, should be recommended to all who come in passing or permanent contact with members of other races.

9. (a) It would be well to collect accounts of any experiments on a considerable scale, past or present, showing the successful uplifting of relatively backward races by the application of purely humane methods; (b) also any cases of colonisation or opening of a country achieved by the same methods; (c) and such methods might be applied universally in our dealings with other races.

10. The Congress might effectively (a) carry out its object of encouraging better relations between East and West by encouraging or carrying out, among others, the above proposals, and more particularly (b) by encouraging the formation of an association designed to promote inter-racial amity.

THE ALLEGED INFERIORITY OF THE COLOURED RACES—I.

There are three modes of accounting for the origin of the human race, adopted by three different schools of ethnology. Polygenesis considers each race as a distinct species, created in the place of its original home. Evolution represents the races as belonging to a common species, but as having sprung from separate stocks or centres of that species. Monogenesis derives the races not from a common species only, but from a single human pair. The theory of monogenesis is naturally distasteful to those white people in whom the prejudice against the coloured races is strong. Besides being the simplest, it seems, however to be the most probable theory regarding the origin of mankind, and no valid objection has yet been urged against it. The Evolutionist derives the complex human organism, with all the differ-

ces of form and colour, from a single pair of cells ; so on the ground of analogy, it should be admitted that the various races have developed from a single pair of human beings. It has been objected that the monogenist school have not succeeded in explaining how the sons of one father dwelling in close proximity, and whose descendants would be constantly intermarrying, came to have such distinct progenies. But at an early stage of multiplication the progeny of the common ancestor must have separated, and isolation, precipitated by linguistic diversity and encouraged by distance, would have checked the mixture of the groups and helped the preservation of race-traits. In support, however, of the separate origin of races, ethnologists of the first two schools adduce certain proofs, based upon physical peculiarities. They assert that between the fair and the dark races there are *radical* physical distinctions which indicate in the case of the dark races, mental and moral inferiority, and they also allege a tendency to sterility in the case of procreation between the dark and fair races. The reader of the following lines, if free from preconceived bias in favour of the white-skinned races, will have no difficulty in discovering the more or less mythical character of these proofs and allegations.

I shall begin by quoting a passage from Dr. Scholes' *Glimpses of the Ages*, a book on which I have mainly drawn, in which he first states a fact well-known to us, and then gives the reasoning by which it is sought to be justified by the colourless races. Dr. Scholes says :—

"After the colourless race had imposed its rule upon the coloured races, it sought by means of its languages, its literatures, religion, philosophy, science, and its laws to consolidate the power which it had established by force. But strange as the fact may appear, when the seeds of law, religion, literature, etc., so industriously sown by the fair race, began to yield the fruits of uniformity, proximity, concord between it and its clients—the fair race, filled with alarm, strives to destroy the harvest. Here, then, is found, not the enemy sowing with tares the field of the slumbering husbandman, but the husbandman, himself awake, and professing great wisdom, sowing with tares his own field.

Nor is 'the psychological condition which has driven this mother—if I may change the metaphor—to attempt the life of her own offspring due to the sudden seizure of puerperal insanity, but rather to the mature conviction of serene deliberation. Thus the fair race alleges that its feeling of antipathy towards the dark races, and its endeavour to prevent them rising beyond a low stage, are justifiable on historic and scientific grounds. Science, it avers, by demonstrating the presence of certain peculiarities—physical, mental and moral—as being common to all the coloured races, peculiarities accounting for the secondary rank, which, instead of a primary rank, they uniformly take in the march of the world's progress, not only proves the impracticability of those coloured races co-operating with the fair race, on terms of political and social equality, but proves also that such a co-operation, by exposing the fair race to deterioration, and thereby menacing the causes of order and of progress, would be destructive no less to the coloured races themselves than to the fair race."

The most prominent physical peculiarity to which 'science' points, lies of course, in the crime of colour. It is therefore necessary to examine the colour theory in some detail. Mankind is usually divided into three varieties according to the colour of the skin—the melanous, the leucous and the xanthous. The melanous comprises people with dark or black skins, black hair, and black eyes. The xanthous pertains to people with yellow or yellowish hair, bluish or grey eyes, and fair complexion. The leucous, relates to people who are abnormally white, such as the albinos. The albinos, as is well-known, are found in every race and clime. The xanthous complexion too appears in people of the melanous variety. Occasionally among Indians one meets with persons who would pass as fair in comparison with an Italian or Spaniard. The melanous variety of colour is also to be found in every xanthous race, as for instance, in the skin of the brunette of western Europe. Colour is the product of a substance called melanin, or black pigment; its chief seats are the skin, the hair of the head and the eye. Among all races, the three varieties of colour usually predominates.* Moreover, in the

The fair complexion of the shell-cutting Shankaris of Dacca, referred to by Sir H. Risely, was noticed as early as 1839 by Dr.

red or brown hair and the blue or grey eyes of the white races, if not in their skin, melanin is present. Thus the presence of the black pigment in their organism cannot be regarded as a peculiarity of the dark races nor can it be advanced as an argument in support of their alleged inferiority to the European races and against the theory that all the races, whatever their colour, have sprung from one stock of one and the same species.

It is a favourite doctrine with a certain class of ethnologists that the deposition of melanin in the skin is post-natal, due to climate influences operating through many generations. The mental endowment of a race is thus associated, not only with its colour, but also with its habitat. The historian Buckle is responsible for the popularity of this theory. The following considerations will, I trust, suffice to demonstrate the utter futility of this doctrine. (1) Melanin is only one of a group of colouring matters derived from the blood and there are at least six other such substances, which are deposited before birth. Being of the same nature as all the other members of this group of pigment, and like them, being derived from the blood, the logical conclusion would be that it too has been deposited before birth. (2) It is known that melanin is deposited in the eye and the hair of the head before birth; we should therefore conclude that the same is the case with its deposition in the skin. (3) If these cutaneous variations in different races be due to climate, then to what are the variations in the colour of the hair of the head and eyes, among peoples in Europe who have lived for ages in the same localities, due? (4) If colour be due to climate, how again do you account for the class of animals, for example, the bear, which has brown or black skin, but whose habitat is the Polar Circle? (5) The bronzing of the

Taylor who in his *Topography of Dacca* (Chapter VIII) speaks of them as follows:—

"Most of them are of a fairer complexion than natives in general, and in some of their families there are a few Albinos."

white artisan through exposure to the sun or of the white tourist in hot countries, which have been referred to as illustrations of the influence of climate on colour, does not affect the argument, for the bronzed complexion is not maintained after the employment is abandoned by the artisan or the tourist returns to his home, and in any case this acquired colour is never transmitted from generation to generation. (6) Finally, pigment granules have been found by actual investigation in the skin of Negro fetuses.

It is no doubt true that pigment tempers the solar heat, and that is the probable function of colour. The monogenists hold that each race, people, or tribe, according to its cutaneous equipment, chose the climate that best harmonised with its dermal idiosyncrasy, and in this way explain the migration of the races. Circumstances of a political or economic nature may have forced a coloured people like the Esquimaux now and then to migrate beyond the subtropical zones to which they were adapted by nature.

The second physical peculiarity on which ethnologists love to dwell is cranial variation. The study of skull-measurement has been raised to the dignity of a science, and is called craniology; the whole series of race-distinctions, based on the shape of the cranium, the colour of the skin, the projection of the face, and stature, being given the name of anthropometry. The division of races into Caucasian, Mongolian, etc., had the disadvantage of placing the Hindu, the Persian, and the Egyptian in the same category with the Teuton or the Latin races. Herein lay the value of craniology. For, in its name, one of the high priests of that 'science', Dr. Nott, is able to tell the world :—

"What reason is there to suppose that...the Hindu [has descended] from the same stock as the Teuton? The Hindu is almost as far removed in structure from the Teuton as is the Hottentot, and we might just as well classify the reindeer and gazelles together as the Teuton and Hindu....."

As a result of his anthropometric survey, Sir Herbert Risley * has divided the people of India into eight distinctive types. His investigations have led him to hold that the Dravidians were the aboriginal people of India, that the Indo-Aryan type, of which dolichocephally (long-head) is one of the chief characteristics, is confined to Rajputana, Kashmir and the Punjab, that the Mahratta Brahmins are Scytho-Dravidians, and the Bengal Brahmins Mongolo-Dravidians with probably 'a strain of Indo-Aryan blood.' Elsewhere, Sir Herbert alludes to the Adisur tradition which is said to be borne out to a substantial degree by the measurements of the Brahmin and Kayestha head-forms of Bengal, inasmuch as among them, 'notwithstanding the uncompromising breadth of the head,' the finer nose-forms predominate. Sir Herbert is, however, modest enough to admit that the conclusions which he had 'ventured to put forward are necessarily provisional, and will be of use mainly as a guide to research...'

One cannot help sympathising with the poor craniologist in the difficulties which beset his path. No sooner did Dr. Nott conclude from his investigations that the negroes had shorter heads than the Europeans, than he burst forth into the following triumphant pæan:—

"It is mind, and mind alone, which constitutes the proudest prerogative of man, whose excellence should be measured by his intelligence and virtue. The negro and other unintellectual types have been shown...to possess heads much smaller, by actual measurement in cubic inches, than the white races, and although a metaphysician may dispute about the causes which may have debased their intellects or precluded their expansion, it cannot be denied that the dark races are, in this particular, greatly inferior to the others of fairer complexion."

Sir Herbert's difficulty lay elsewhere. He could not deny the mental superiority of the Hindu Bengalis, whom he for that very reason, helped in reducing to a minority in each of the divided halves of Bengal. So he alludes to their intellectual eminence

with as little grace as possible, speaks of 'their remarkable aptitude for clerical pursuits,' and proceeds to derive what consolation he may by denying the intellectual Bengali and the pugnacious Marhatta racial affinity with the Imperial Briton through descent from a common Aryan stock.

Let us now examine the value of the science of craniology, as estimated by ethnologists who are themselves polygenists or evolutionists. Prof. Brinton says :—

"Ethnologists who are merely anatomists have made too much of this science.....and have given it a prominence it does not deserve.....Within the limits of the same people...the most different skulls are found and even the pure-blooded natives of some small islands in the Pacific Ocean present widely various forms."

Professor Keane, continuing his remarks with reference to the scientific value of cranial measurements, says :—

"The result has shown that craniology alone cannot be depended upon to supply sufficient, or even altogether trustworthy materials for distinguishing the main divisions of mankind. Its chief elements, such as dolichocephaly, brachicephaly, orthognathism, and prognathism * are not constant in any given group, and in many cases the most surprising diversity prevails, where some degree of uniformity might be expected."

According to Dr. Vogt, the measurements of Retzius and Broca revealed the dolichocephalic and the other two types of head in every race. Sir Herbert Risley, who must be counted among the *pundits* of anthropometry, has to admit that 'long, broad and medium heads are met with in varying degrees of preponderance among white, black and yellow races.' And yet, with curious inconsistency, he asserts, almost immediately after, that 'all authorities agree in regarding the form of the head as an extremely constant and persistent character, which resists the influence of climate and physical

I should explain the meaning of these pompous words coined by the Swedish naturalist Anders Retzius in 1842, for the benefit of the uninitiated. The first two refer to the size of the head, and mean 'long-head' 'short-head', the last two refer to the projection of the face, and mean 'conforming to the human standard', 'conforming to the standard of the brute'.

surroundings.' Further on, warming to his subject, Sir Herbert grows more positive: 'On the whole, therefore, the form of the head, specially when combined with other characters, is a good test of racial affinity.' But in the next sentence he makes the following important reservation which practically amounts to giving his case away. 'It may be added that neither the shape nor the size of the head seems to bear any direct relation to intellectual capacity. People with long [dolichocephalic] heads cannot be said to be cleverer or more advanced in culture than people with short [brachycephalic] heads.'

Were the measurements, upon which the conclusions of the anthropometrists are based, taken from a mass of skulls gathered from a wide area? Let us see. 'It must be admitted,' says Vogt, 'that Retzius' measurements were confined to a few skulls which he selected as typical, and that he estimated the cranial shape rather from the general impression of the aspect of the skulls than by exact measurements.' Dr. Marton, another craniologist, based his observations on the Teutonic group of races on the measurement of thirty Teutonic skulls. Topinard determined the nasal index of the Gallic race by measuring the noses of sixty-eight Parisians. Professor Aeby of Berne had less than six hundred skulls for the classification of all mankind. Sir Herbert Risley took the measurements of "nearly six thousand persons representing eighty-nine of the leading castes and tribes in Northern India, from the Bay of Bengal to the frontiers of Afghanistan;"* that is to say, he based his generalisations regarding the races of India on the examination of less than seventy heads for each tribal or caste group. Dr. Vogt based his observations on the head form of the Ethiopian on the examination of six skulls only! And quite in keeping with the above, he laid down the proposition that the brain of a Negro had a less number of convolutions than a white man's brain, thus indicating racial inferiority, from the observation of the cast of

* Tribes and Castes of Bengal (1819), by H. H. Risley, introd.

a Hottentot woman's brain. Dr. Scholes most truly observes :—

"The brain of a solitary Hottentot female, and not even the brain, but only the model of that brain, is made to supply the facts for a generalisation concerning the brain-structure and the brain-capacity of some 212 millions of the human race. Is a greater travesty of scientific research possible? And yet, of this particular department, the sample now furnished represents the quality of the facts habitually served up to the world by the wholesale and retail traffickers in the popular wares of Negro aspersion."

It is well to mention here that craniologists are not even agreed as to the broad results of their investigations. For among them, there are persons—such as Drs. Deniker and Tiedmann—according to whom both in size as well as in internal capacity, the skull of the Caucasian is not one whit larger than that of the coloured races.

Thus we find that the cranium is no guide to the origin of races ; that the crania examined are too few to establish any theory concerning the pre-dominance of a certain cranial type in each race ; that the three different types of crania are all three found in each race ; and that hence, on the ground of cranial peculiarity no justification exists for applying to one race the term 'superior' and to another race the term 'inferior' ; and that as far as cranial variation is concerned there is nothing against the probability of there being to the Caucasian, Mongolian and Negro races a common origin.

And yet, to what uses has this *psuedo-science* of craniology been put, will appear from the following extracts from two well-known newspapers, the *Referee* and the *Spectator*. One of the articles was based on the incident of the invitation of Booker Washington to dinner at the White House and the other was written in 1907 when the ethnological survey of India was about to be undertaken.

The Referee :—

"[The Negro] will have to redress the facial angle; and he will have to grow a more spacious cranium before he can come into brotherhood with the more advanced nations of mankind."

The Spectator writes :—

"In education in particular, and even in administration, we underrate the extreme variety of origin among the peoples of India.....and are apt to proceed as if they were all Aryans, that is, persons with receptive brains, instead of recognising that divisions of them, perhaps a fourth of the population, (are Australoids or aboriginal Mongols, whose brains need preparation before they can understand, much less assimilate, Western ideas.

Here is Dr. Scholes' vigorous criticism of the above :—

"No doubt, by those unacquainted with the ingredients—in the form of facts—of which these extracts are made up, they will have been imbibed, as other nostrums of the same class are being imbibed, as vintages of the choicest brand; thereby giving point to the maxim that "where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise."—"Redressing the facial angle," "growing a more spacious cranium," "longheads," "shortheads." How imposing they look! How erudite they sound! But of the inhabitants of Central and Northern Europe, what was the character of their "facial angle" at the time of the Roman Conquest? And when was it redressed? In those days were there only "shortheads"? If there were not, what has become of the "longheads"? Such, then, is the manner wherein these fallacies of ethnology, introduced thirty or forty year ago, are to-day being masqueraded in our current literature."

And now the reader will be prepared for the following passage, taken from the introduction to Dr. Scholes' book :—

"Christendom at the present time suffers from a plethora of lies.....truth is spoken only within the limitations prescribed by politics. Politics is the *summum genus* of the *species* civilised institutions—municipal administration, social life, education, law, commerce, religion, literature, science, philanthropy—all in practice, of course not in theory, end in, and are regulated by, political considerations. And as the 'interests' of politics frequently demand the total suppression, or the partial statement only of truth, these institutions are found accordingly harmonising truth with the exigencies of politics. Let me furnish a single example. Nearly fifty years ago certain ethnologists and anthropologists, upon the most ludicrously inadequate data, taught that, among the cofoured races, there were certain anatomical peculiarities present, which not only distinguished these races from the white race, but made them physically, morally and mentally the inferiors of the white race. For many years after its announcement this theory, in almost every quarter, found little or no credence. But when some thirty years ago the Euro-

American, desiring to retain in his own hands all political power, resolved to oust the Afro-American from politics, and later, when Englishmen followed more or less by others of the European colonising States, for the same reason as that which promoted the Euro-American, resolved, in like manner, to effectively bar the progress of their coloured fellow-subjects towards political enfranchisement, this theory was exhumed from the grave of its oblivion, was galvanised into life, and by religion, commerce, literature, and all the other institutions of civilisation, has since then been employed to hold in serfdom the larger section of mankind. It must be observed, that during the nearly fifty years that have intervened since these hypothetical, anatomical peculiarities were published, a great accumulation of facts—the result of increased anatomical knowledge, of better acquaintance with the environments and habits of primitive peoples, and most of all, the result of the progress of numerous coloured communities under western culture—has been available.

"These facts.....are overwhelming in their disproof of the reported anatomical peculiarities of the coloured races. Yet how have such facts been received? They have been modified, ignored, or repressed, in order that the discredited assertions made forty or fifty years ago may be brought into harmony with the dictates of politics, and that in consequence, the coloured races may, with some show of reason, be held in the semi-bondage of pupillage.....And with respect to science, whereas in other departments, including religion, science demands for its researches, independence, and for its findings, free speech, here where the "interests" of politics are involved, worse even than being muzzled, science prevaricates.

How deserved the above scathing observations are, will further appear from the fact that not only the head and the face, but even other parts of the Negro's organism have been found fault with. Vogt asserts that his belly is relaxed and pendulous, he rarely stands upright, his knees are usually bent and the legs frequently bandy and so on. The vocabulary of abuse was hardly sufficient to meet the requirements of this scientist's description of the negro anatomy.* Dr. Scholes with the experience gained from his prolonged residence in Africa, answers him thus :—

"With the solitary exception of Dr. Vogt, all the world knows

- Readers of 'In India' by the Late Mr. Steevens, the brilliant correspondent of the *London Daily Mail*, will recall certain similar utterances regarding the Bengalis, for which there was about equal justification, as he stood observing them pass before him on the Hugly Bridge at Calcutta.

that but for his magnificent physique, equalled by few, if any, but surpassed by none, the Ethiopian could never have successfully encountered, and profitably survived, the rigour and ravages of a remorseless and relentless servitude."

But among ethnologists themselves there are persons who are capable of taking a saner view, and two of them are quoted below.

Dr. Prichard says :—

"From a consideration of the facts which belong to this department of inquiry, and a comparison of different tribes with each other, an inference appeared to result that all diversities of anatomical structures that are known to characterise the different tribes of men are mere varieties, and do not amount to specific differences."

Blumenbach makes the following emphatic observation :—

"'God's image he too,' as Fuller says, 'although made out of ebony.' This has been doubted sometimes, and on the contrary it has been asserted that the negroes are specifically different in their bodily structure from other men, and must be placed considerably in the rear, from the condition of their obtuse mental capacities. Personal observation, combined with the accounts of trustworthy and unprejudiced witnesses, has, however, long since convinced me of the want of foundation in both these assertions.....I am acquainted with no single distinctive bodily character which is at once peculiar to the negro and which cannot be found to exist in many other and distant nations; none which is in the like way common to the negroes, and in which they do not again come in contact with other nations through imperceptible passages, just as every other variety of man runs into the neighbouring populations."

Another argument which remains to be examined is that mulattoes, who are the offspring of the African and the Teuton, intermarrying among themselves, tend to become sterile. Dr. Nott, the author of this proposition, however, admits that the offspring of the Latin and the African races are quite prolific.

Between the mulattoes of the slave states of the American Union and the blacks, constant intermarriages take place and hence the census statistics of the United States afford no data for studying the prolificacy of the mulattoes *among themselves*. But the social position of the mulatto in the West Indies

is one of comparative isolation from both white and black. Comparing the increase of population in Jamaica with that of England and Wales between the years 1834-1881, we find that whereas in England and Wales there has been an increase of 49 p.c., among the mulatto population of Jamaica, for the same period, the increase was 63 p.c. That is to say, during forty-seven years the prolificacy of mulattoes of Anglo-African descent in Jamaica among themselves was 14 p.c. more than that of the population of England and Wales during the same period. And thus the attempt by means of the assumed infertility among the offspring of Anglo-African parentage, to prove the difference of origin of the races, has also failed.

The last proposition which has been advanced against the theory of monogenesis may be illustrated by another newspaper quotation. The following is an extract from a leading article in the *London Daily News* of July 4th, 1902, on the centenary of Dumas:—

"To-day is the centenary of the birth of the most striking and graphic writer of prose fiction which the whole range of literature present—Alexander Dumas pere, who, July 4th, 1802, began a stormful life of brilliant genius and ungovernable propensities. His father was a Creole. And the son exhibited some but not all of the characteristics which usually result from the blending of the blood of the white man with that of the Negro. Often, if not generally, that result is a union of the worst qualities of both races, or descendants in whom the quicker intelligence of the white race seems only to animate and excite the lower propensities of the Negro..... The offspring of such unions often prove what are called 'sports,' and there is a chance of such being a genius, as Dumas undoubtedly was..... He lived his life furiously and recklessly, squandering his amazing gifts on husks of literature and the world. He was without principle and without self-respect."

I shall conclude the present paper with Dr. Scholes' criticism of this specious theory:

"Thus, seeing that Oliver Goldsmith, Robert Burns, and Lord Byron, like Dumas, were geniuses, and also, like him, suffered from laxity of morals, we must conclude that they too had Negro blood in their veins, which was accountable for their moral obliquity.

"But if these three men had not Negro blood in their veins and yet were geniuses and at the same time transgressors in morals,

then there is no ground for attributing Dumas' moral transgression to his mixed parentage. Again, if these three men had no mixed blood and yet were moral delinquents, then the *Daily News*, in attributing Dumas' irregularities to his African blood, is guilty of the logical fallacy of irrelevant conclusion. Such, then, is another of the proofs by which the statement, that the children of mixed unions inherit the bad qualities of both races, is supported.

"Besides, the propagators of this theory lay themselves under the obligation of accounting for the bad qualities of the criminal classes of Europe and America: for the criminal classes of the latter place, who are not mulattoes."

THE ALLEGED INFERIORITY OF THE COLOURED RACES—II.

In our first paper on this subject, we have tried to show, principally on the authority of Dr. Scholes, the entirely fallacious character of the reasonings, based on physical differences, by which the superiority of the colourless races over the coloured is sought to be proved. It will be our purpose in the present paper, relying mainly* on the same source, to attempt to show that just as science does not support the theory of physical superiority, so history refutes the theory of mental superiority of the colourless over the coloured races.

It was actually believed by some pious slave-owners in the Southern States of the American Union,

Mainly, but not, entirely. Other authorities consulted are—Ameer Ali's *History of the Saracens*; Draper's *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe and Conflict of Religion and Science*; Lecky's *History of European Morals*; Buckle's *History of Civilisation*, edited by J. W. Robertson; Bluntschli's *Theory of State*; Wilkinson's *History of the Ancient Egyptians*; Brennand's *Hindu Astronomy* (London 1836), a valuable book, now become rare.

that colour has no function except as a mark of inferiority, and especially as the sign of a curse upon the Ethiopian race, of which slavery is a corollary. Dr. Scholes meets the racial fanaticism by an argument which ought to appeal to Christians—

"If the black skin of the Ethiopian were the expression of the servitude to which the Deity in a curse had condemned him, then what curse was there that consigned to the rigours of Egyptian bondage, for four hundred years, the Hebrews—the chosen people of God? And if a divine curse, were the Hebrews the chosen people of God? And if a divine curse, were the Hebrews black?"

"Further, if in addition to the black skin, the mental and moral degradation of the Ethiopian be also symptoms of this curse, then of what curse were the moral and mental degradation of the European, in former ages, the symptoms? The Greeks had their slaves, who probably were all whites; the Romans had their slaves, who were more white than black....."

Not only is the capacity for intellectual progress denied to the coloured races, but it is also asserted that they are incapable of moral progress, for, on the authority of no less a scientist than Darwin, high moral attainment is the equivalent of high intellectual development. But Dr. Scholes shows by quotations from Mommsen and others that the century preceding the Christian Era, though one of very high intellectual attainment in Rome, was at the same time a period characterised by an insane display of wealth and a mad extravagance, an unrestrained sexual license, and slavery on an extensive scale. The intellectual progress made by western Europe in the eighteenth century does not therefore connote a corresponding moral progress.

In order that the assertions of the mental superiority of the colourless races may be sustained, it must be shown (1) either that the colourless race has always been progressive, or that, when unprogressive, its position mentally was higher than that in which the mental condition of the coloured races has invariably stood; (2) that the coloured races have been uniformly unprogressive, that the depth of their unprogressiveness has been always greater than that which the colourless race has ever reached, and that when brought in contact

with a progressive race they had never evinced any capacity to rise from their habitually low plane of existence.

The progress made by the Afro-Americans, the modern Egyptians and Indians, and the phenomenal success of Japan in assimilating all that is considered best in European civilisation are sufficient examples of the fact that the coloured races, when they come in contact with the civilised white races, can raise themselves in the scale of civilisation.

Dr. Scholes, in his *Glimpses of the Ages*, has abundantly proved, by lengthy extracts from ancient historians like Tacitus, Polybius, Plutarch and Cæsar, that the Germans, Gauls, Celts and Britons, the predecessors of the highly civilised races of modern Europe and America, were in a state of existence which was "in certain of its phases lower than that in which the most barbarous of modern savages are now found." Cæsar describes the native Briton as follows:—

"The inhabitants of Kent, which lies wholly on the sea-coast, are the most civilised of all the Britons, and differ but little in their manners from the Gauls. The greater part of those within the country never sow their lands, but live on flesh and milk, and go clad in skins. All the Britons in general paint themselves with woad, which gives a bluish cast to the skin and makes them look dreadful in battle. They are long-haired, and shave the rest of the body except the head and upper lip. Ten or twelve of them live together, having their wives in common, especially brothers or parents, and children among themselves, but the issue is always ascribed to him who first espoused the mother."

The Roman historians expatiate on the ignorance, treachery, superstition, unreliableness, unprogressiveness, and general low form of life of these early barbarians: and dwell upon the absence among them of all knowledge of the metals and of any art, and of permanent habitations; they speak of the extreme poverty and wretchedness prevailing among these people, of the practice of incest, polygamy, human sacrifice and domestic slavery, and of the indolence and ferocity of these predecessors of the modern Englishman, Frenchman and German. The degrada-

tion of womanhood had gone so far that the tillage of the soil was imposed on women. A Chinese poet of that age would have been entirely justified in singing—

Better fifty years of Cathay
Than a cycle of Europe.

During the present war the most heinous crimes, the most fiendish cruelty and the most degraded kind of bestiality have been attributed to the Germans. These, if true, would prove the colourless Teuton to be worse than any coloured savage; if false, they would prove the accusers of the Germans, also colourless, to be unsurpassed liars.

We will now pass briefly in review some of the ancient civilisations of the world which were of a non-European origin. To take the earliest* of them first. We all know about the ancient Egyptians, who possessed a civilisation of a very high order eighteen centuries before Christ. Their pyramids are inimitable; so also their stupendous bronze statues; they possessed the secrets of hardening or tempering bronze with which modern Europe is unacquainted; the secret of embalming dead bodies is a lost art. Their musical instruments, their jewellery, their gold and silver vases, their chairs, ottomans and fauteuils, and their manufactures of cotton, linen and paper, formed the models for the imitation of the most advanced nations of later times. They attained a mastery in the manufacture of glass which has not been successfully imitated by the modern nations. The sculptures of Thebes and Beni Hassan, the architecture of the temples and the tombs, are a marvel to this day. In the mathematical and the physical sciences, such as Geometry, Astronomy, Chemistry, Mechanics, they were the teachers of Greece. Their laws and priestly regulations were framed with great wisdom. Lest the reader thinks that the above remarks are exaggerated, I shall quote a few sentences from Wilkinson's standard work :—

In the opinion of European savants.

"Nor were they deficient in taste,—a taste, too, not acquired by imitating approved models, but claiming for itself the praise of originality, and universally allowed to have been the portent of much that was afterwards perfected, with such wonderful success, by the most highly gifted of nations, the Greeks." "..... the wonderful mechanical skill of the Egyptians; and we may question whether with the ingenuity and science of the present day our engineers are capable of raising weights with the same facility as that ancient people." "How far then do we find the Egyptians surpassing the Greeks, at this early period, in the science of music! Indeed, long before the lyre was known in Greece, the Egyptians had attained the highest degree of perfection in the form of their stringed instruments; on which no improvement was found necessary, even at a time when their skill was so great that Greek sages visited Egypt to study music, among the other sciences, for which it was renowned." "Many of their ornamental vases as well as those in common use present the most elegant forms, which would do honour to the skill of a Greek artist; the Egyptians displaying in these objects of private luxe, the taste of a highly refined people."

Winkelman is of opinion that the Egyptians

"Carried the art of glass-making to a higher degree of perfection than ourselves, though it may appear a paradox to those who have not seen their works in this material."

Regarding their social customs, Wilkinson says:—

"In some instances, we find men and women sitting together, both strangers as well as members of the same family; a privilege not conceded to females among the Greeks, except with their relations; and this not only argues a very great advancement in civilisation, but proves, like many other Egyptian customs, how far this people excelled the Greeks in habits of social life."

Well do Dr. Birch and Mr. S. Lane-Poole remark:

"The superior position of women in the social scale.....shows that the Egyptians reached a higher point of delicacy and refinement than either their Eastern or Western successors. Colossal in art, profound in philosophy and religion, and in possession of the knowledge of the arts and sciences, Egypt exhibits the astounding phenomenon of an elevated civilisation at a period when the other nations of the world were almost unknown."

Greece imparted her civilisation to Rome, and Rome to modern Europe. Whence did Greece derive her civilisation? To this Dr. Scholes replies, after citing ancient historians like Diodorus and Herodotus, and some modern writers on the subject, that Egypt was the educator of modern Europe through Greece, that "Egyptian civilisation is to modern

civilisation what oxygen is to the air we breathe, it is its basis," and that "the spring of European art, no less than of European science, is Egypt, and not Greece." Dr. Scholes observes that "among most of our modern historians the prevailing habit is either to deny, ignore, or to deprecate the fact that the Greeks were thus obligated to the Egyptians." Nevertheless, it is a fact that Cecrops and Danaus, the leaders of the Egyptians, settled respectively in Athens and Argos, and thus contributed the largest share to the upbuilding of Greek civilisation. Modern historians who find it impossible to ignore the indebtedness of ancient Greece to Egypt, have directed their energies to proving that the ancient Egyptians were not Ethiopians. They want to retain the Aryan kinship of the ancient Egyptians at all costs. We have seen in our previous paper how the anthropometrist Nott, in his anxiety to maintain the supremacy of the white over all other races, even though they be of the 'supreme Caucasian' type, said: "the Hindoo is almost as far removed in structure from the Teuton as is the Hottentot." But when he finds it to his purpose to prove the unity of the Indo-European race in view of the possible derivation of ancient Egyptians from the Hindus, he says: "All the Caucasian families belong to that vast chain of nations called Indo-European in consequence of their having a common tongue, the Sanscrit." This veracious historian, however, holds that the ancient Egyptians were Europeans and not Hindus, which is the view propounded by another eminent ethnologist, Heeren, while a third, Featherman, surmises that they were Syrians or Assyrians. There are others, however, who could not totally ignore the evidence of history, and these, including Volney, Prichard, and Rollins, were compelled to declare in favour of their Negro origin. Dr. Scholes, analysing the philological, physical and historical evidence with great care and impartiality, arrives at the same conclusion. We therefore see

that the Negroes are now "fallen from their high estate" and that at one time their ancestors civilised modern Europe.

Let us now turn to the ancient Mexicans and Peruvians. I shall take my facts from Draper's well-known history. In Mexico, the legislative power resided in the monarch, who was, however, subject to the laws of the realm. The judges held their office independently of, and were not liable to removal by him. The laws were reduced to writing, which, though only a system of hieroglyphics, served its purpose so well that the Spaniards were obliged to admit its validity in their law courts, marriage was regarded as an important social engagement, divorces were with difficulty granted. No distinction of caste was permitted. There was a well-organised postal service of couriers. The army was provided with hospitals, army surgeons and a medical staff. The higher classes were strictly unitarian. At the conquest, the Mexican calendar was better than the Spanish. There were sun-dials, and instruments for the solstices and equinoxes. The globular form of the earth and the obliquity of the ecliptic were known. Their agriculture was superior to that of Europe; there was nothing in the old world to compare with their menageries and botanical gardens. They practised with skill delicate mechanical arts like those of the jeweller and enameller. They were skilful weavers of cloth. They knew how to move immense masses of rock. Polygamy was confined to the wealthy. Mexicans gave Europe tobacco, snuff, chocolate, cochineal. They had theatrical and pantomimic performances. The King's palace was a wonderful work of art. Its harem was adorned with magnificent tapestries of featherwork; in its garden were fountains, cascades, baths, statues, alabasters, cedar groves, forests and a wilderness of flowers. In conspicuous retirement was a temple dedicated to the omnipotent invisible God. In this no sacrifices were offered, but only sweet-scented flowers and gums.

The Peruvian civilisation was developed independently of the Mexican, as the two nations were ignorant of each other. The state of Peruvian civilisation is at once demonstrated when it is said that the mountain-slopes had become a garden, immense terraces having been constructed where required for the purposes of agriculture, and irrigation on a grander scale than that of Egypt carried on by gigantic canals and aqueducts. Two great military roads were built, one on the plateau and the other on the shore. The former for nearly two thousand miles crossed sierras covered with snow, was thrown over ravines, or went through tunnels in the rocks. Our admiration for this splendid piece of engineering is enhanced when we remember that it was accomplished without iron and gun-powder. Of these roads, Humboldt says that they were among the most useful and most stupendous ever executed by the hand of man. In Cuzco was the imperial residence of the Inca. The king's palace at Yucay is described by the Spaniards as a fairy scene. The popular religion was Sun-worship, but the higher classes believed in the one invisible God. The popular faith had a ritual and splendid ceremonial. Polygamy, though permitted, was confined to the higher classes. The people were divided into groups, and over each group of ten thousands an Inca noble presided. Through this system a rigid centralisation was insured. An annual survey of the country, its farming and mineral products was made, and the inventory transmitted to the Government. A register of births and deaths was kept, and periodically a general census was taken. "In Peru a man could not improve his social state...he could become neither richer nor poorer; but it was the boast of the system that every one lived exempt, from social suffering—that all enjoyed competence." The army consisted of two hundred thousand men. Their year was divided into months and weeks. They had gnomons to indicate the solstices. Their

writing was inferior to that of Egypt, but they had a literature consisting of poetry, dramatic compositions and the like. In Spain there was nothing that could be compared with their great water-works. The aqueduct of Condesuya was nearly five hundred miles long. "Its engineers had overcome difficulties in a manner that might well strike modern times with admiration." They built edifices of porphyry, granite and brick.

Our knowledge of Mexican history would have been much ampler than it is, but for the fact that immense quantities of Mexican literature were consigned to the flames by the Spanish Archbishop of Mexico, just as Cardinal Ximenes burnt a vast number of Arabic manuscripts at Granada at about the same time. As Draper remarks :—

"The enormous crime of Spain in destroying this civilisation has never yet been appreciated in Europe. After an attentive consideration of the facts of the case, I agree in the conclusion of Carli, that at the time of the conquest the moral man in Peru was superior to the European, and, I will add, the intellectual man also. In Spain, or even in all Europe, was there to be found a political system carried out into the practical details of actual life, and expressed in great public works as its outward, visible and enduring sign, which could at all be compared with that of Peru?"

Of the civilisation of China, it is not necessary to speak much. The Chinese system of administration is well-known. The people are remarkably chaste and honest, they are physically strong and peacefully disposed. Ma Twan Lin's Catalogue of Chinese literature is a library in itself. Printing, gun-powder and the mariner's compass are Chinese inventions. Silk and porcelain have been introduced into Europe from China. In certain of the mechanical arts, in chemistry, metallurgy, architecture, agriculture, and horticulture, the Chinese display wonderful skill. Of their manufactures one authority speaks thus :—

"The principal manufactures of the Chinese are silk, cotton, linen and pottery, for which they are especially celebrated. The finest porcelain is made in the province of Kiang-se..... Their skill in handicrafts is astonishing. Their rich silks and satins,

light gauzes, beautiful embroidery, elaborate engraving on wood and stone, delicate filigree work in gold and silver, carvings on ivory, fine lacquered ware, antique vessels in bronze, and their brilliant colouring on the fans of pith paper, command our admiration."

Draper thus speaks of the Chinese civilisation :—

"What is it that gives to her wonderful longevity ?..... The organisation of the national intellect is the principle. A broad foundation is laid in universal education. It is intended that every Chinese shall know how to read and write. The special plan then adopted is that of competitive examinations. The way to public advancement is open to all. Merit, real or supposed, is the only passport to office. Its degree determines exclusively social rank. The Government is organised on mental qualifications..... The intention is to give a dominating control to intellect..... The Chinese have heard of our discordant opinions, of our intolerance to those who differ in ideas from us, of our worship of wealth, and the honour we pay to birth ; he has heard that we sometimes commit political power to men who are so little above the animals that they can neither read nor write ; that we hold military success in esteem, and regard the profession of arms as the only suitable occupation for a gentleman. It is so long since his ancestors thought and acted in that manner that he justifies himself in regarding us as having scarcely yet emerged from the barbarian stage A great community aiming to govern itself by intellect rather than by coercion, is a spectacle worthy of admiration." *...

Egypt, Mexico, Peru, China, India, these are the great ancient civilisations of the non-European world and all of them were indigenous and self-developed, none produced from exotic models. It is not necessary here to dwell on ancient Hindu civilisation. The world is indebted to the Hindus, among many other inventions, for the decimal notation, for algebra and trigonometry. I refer those who want to know more on this subject, to the bibliography given at the end of Professor Macdonell's *History of Sanskrit Literature*. I shall only content myself with one or two extracts from *Brennand's Hindu astronomy*, which will serve to show that European writers have not been fairer to the Hindus than to the Egyptians. Says he :—

"In some quarters an attempt has been made to minimise these faculties [those of close reasoning in the science of mathematics

* For a further exposition of the Chinese position, see *Letters from John Chinaman*.

and kindred subjects even in their most abstruse aspects] upon grounds which, in the opinion of the present writer, are not only inadequate, but which show in the critics themselves a want of appreciation of the true merits of Hindu astronomy."

Again,—

"A conviction formed many years ago that the Hindus have not received the credit due to their literature and mathematical sciences from Europeans and which has been strengthened by a renewal of my study of those materials, has led me also to a desire to put before the public their system of astronomy, &c."

Of the imitative type of civilisation, as opposed to the spontaneous, the Saracenic may be mentioned as the highest non-European example. Dr. Scholes says:—

"The Greeks, so to speak, have been the instructors as we have seen, of both the Romans and the Saracens. The Romans were of the same race as the Greeks, whilst the Saracens were Semitic. But although linked in the one case by the affinity of race, yet which of these two peoples, trained by the same master—the Greeks—has in mental calibre borne the closer resemblance to its teacher? Certainly it is the Saracens, who in poetry, philosophy, science and letters, revealed the Greek cast of intellect."

Mr. Ameer Ali's *Short History of the Saracens* is now a text book in Indian colleges, and only a brief notice of that wonderful people is therefore necessary to illustrate the above eulogistic observation.

At a time when a pall of dense ignorance and barbarism enveloped the white races of Europe, the Arabs alone held aloft the torch of learning. The history of the Abbasside dynasty of Bagdad, the Fatemite dynasty of Cairo and the Omureyade dynasty of Cordova,—all of which flourished between the 8th to the 13th century of the Christian Era—reads like a romance. Under Harun Al-Rachid and his successor, Al-Mamun, Bagdad attained the acme of civilisation. There all the known sciences were cultivated. Philosophy, *belles lettres*, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, algebra, chemistry, land-surveying, botany, geology, natural history, were cultivated with equal avidity. "When Europe was hardly more enlightened than Caffraria is now, the Saracens were cultivating and creating

science," says Draper. The empire of the Moors abounded in extensive libraries, and the books ranged over the whole course of the domain of intellect, romances and tales, history, jurisprudence, politics, philosophy, travels, biography, books of reference, encyclopædias. The philosophy of Averroes is akin to the Vedānta of the Hindus, "Rationalism acquired a predominance such as it has perhaps not gained even in modern times in European countries." "The vast literature," says Sedillot, "which existed during this period, the multifarious productions of genius, the precious inventions, all of which attest a marvellous activity of intellect, justify the opinion that *the Arabs were our masters in everything*. They furnished us on the one hand with inestimable materials for the history of the middle ages, with travels, with the happy idea of biographical dictionaries; on the other, an industry without equal, architecture magnificent in execution and thought, and important discoveries in art." The palace of Alhambra in Granada has been aptly called '*a fabric of the genii*.' Persons having a taste for learning flocked to the Moorish Universities of Spain from all parts of Europe. Gebert passed from the infidel university of Cordova to the papacy of Rome. The English monk Abelard found a refuge there. Nowhere was ornamental gardening better understood. To the Saracens we are indebted for many of our personal comforts. To quote again the words of Draper:—

"Scarcely had the Arabs firmly settled in Spain before they commenced a brilliant career. Adopting what had now become the established policy of the Commanders of the Faithful in Asia, the Khalifs of Cordova distinguished themselves as patrons of learning, and set an example of refinement strongly contrasting with the condition of the native European princes. Cordova, under their administration, at its highest point of prosperity, boasted of two hundred thousand houses, and more than a million of inhabitants. After sunset, a man might walk through it in a straight line for ten miles by the light of the public lamps. Seven hundred years after this time, there was not so much as one public lamp in London. Its streets were solidly paved. In Paris, centuries subsequently, whoever stepped over his threshold on a rainy day stepped up to his ankles in mud..... Those sovereigns might well look down with supercilious contempt on

the dwellings of the rulers of Germany, France and England, which were scarcely better than stables..... No nation has ever excelled the Spanish Arabs in the beauty and costliness of their pleasure gardens..... In the midst of all this luxury,.....the Spanish Khalifa, emulating the example of their Asiatic compeers, and in this strongly contrasting with the Popes of Rome, were not only the patrons, but the personal cultivators of all the branches of human learning..... The Mahomedan liberality was in striking contrast with the intolerance of Europe. Indeed, it may be doubted whether at this time any European nation is sufficiently advanced to follow their example..... How different was the state of all this from the state of things in Europe! The Christian peasant, fever-stricken or overtaken by an accident, hied to the nearest saint-shrine and expected a miracle; the Spanish Moor relied on the prescription or lancet of his physician, or the bandage and knife of his surgeon..... While Constantinople and Rome were asserting, in all its absurdity, the flatness of the earth, the Spanish Moors were teaching geography in their common schools from globes."

The general standard of European civilisation at the time will appear from the conduct of the crusaders, and the contrast they presented to the army of Saladin. "Even down to the meanest camp-follower," says Draper, "every one must have recognised the difference between what they had anticipated and what they had found. They had seen undaunted courage, chivalrous bearing, intellectual culture far higher than their own." Michaud says that in Asia, the first crusaders "committed crimes which make nature shudder," and that they "forgot Constantinople and Jerusalem in tumultuous scenes of debauchery," and "pillage, violation and murder were everywhere left on the traces of their passage." "If contemporary accounts are to be credited, all the vices of the infamous Babylon prevailed among the liberators of Sion." Of the eighth crusade he says, "Beneath the shadow of the standard of Christ the crusaders gave themselves up to all the excesses of debauchery; the contagion of the most odious vices pervaded all ranks." Similar is the testimony of Joinville and Gibbon. According to Von Sybel, Mills, and many other writers, cannibalism was openly practised among the lower ranks of the crusaders.

European historians have pursued a similar course

towards the Saracens as they have done towards the ancient Egyptians and Hindus. This is what Draper says in this connection :—

"I have to deplore the systematic manner in which the literature of Europe has contrived to put out of sight our scientific obligations to the Mahomedans. Surely they cannot be much longer hidden. Injustice founded on religious rancour and national conceit cannot be perpetuated for ever.....The Arab has left his intellectual impress on Europe, as, before long, Christendom shall have to confess ; he has indelibly written it on the heavens, as everyone may see who reads the names of the stars on a common celestial globe."

In another book, referring to the conspiracy of silence among European writers with regard to the contributions of the Saracens to the cause of civilisation, Draper says :—

"It has been their constant practice to hide what they could not depreciate, and depreciate what they could not hide."

But the indebtedness of modern Europe to the Moorish culture can no longer be concealed : through Spain and Constantinople, Saracenic culture has descended to modern Europe. "The pagan literature of antiquity," says Lecky, "and the Mahomedan schools of science, were the chief agencies in resuscitating the dormant energies of Christendom." *Ex oriente lux*.

The empire of the Moors was overthrown by Ferdinand and Isabella, and soon after Torquemada, with his horrible inquisition, established a reign of terror in Spain. In the eloquent language of Conde, himself a Spaniard,—

"An eternal gloom envelopes the countries which their presence had brightened and enriched. Nature has not changed ; she is as smiling as ever ; but the people and their religion have changed. Some mutilated monuments still dominate over the ruins which cover a desolate land ; but from the midst of these monuments, of these cold ruins, comes the cry of Truth, 'Honour and glory to the vanquished Arab, decay and misery for the conquering Spaniards.'"

Stanley Lane Poole says as follows on the loss inflicted by Christian fanaticism in Spain :—

"The misguided Spaniards knew not what they were doing..... They did not understand that they had killed their golden goose. For centuries Spain had been the centre of civilisation, the seat

of arts and sciences, of learning and every form of refined enlightenment. No other country in Europe had so far approached the cultivated dominion of the Moors.....The Moors were banished; for a while Christian Spain shone, like the moon, with a borrowed light; then came the eclipse, and in that darkness Spain has grovelled ever since."

A dip into the history of ancient Egypt, India, Mexico, Peru, China* and the Saracens, therefore shows, that the proposition in favour of the supposed innate superiority of the white races is absolutely baseless; the arguments advanced in support of the theory being characterised by Dr. Schöle as "a mangled medley of sophistries, prepared on the Procrustean plan, by mutilating facts, which are either lengthened or shortened in accordance with the requirements of the bed, 'Caucasian superiority'." We shall now offer a few observations on the favorite doctrines of Henry Thomas Buckle, the representative in England of a class of historians whose aim is to indentify all branches of human knowledge with modern white races; who, in his *History of Civilisation*—a book which at one time used to be widely read in this country—had the audacity to perpetrate the following sentence:

"In these four countries [Mexico, Peru, India, Egypt]...there existed an amount of knowledge despicable if tried by an European standard," &c.

* "Western surgery is just now credited with performing marvels—all of which are said to be the invention and product of Western brains. Those who are of this opinion would do well to read the paper read by Mr. James Cantile at the Caxton Hall the other day on 'China in its medical aspects.' Mr Cantile said with great truth that the Chinese, who were the most intellectual race on the face of the earth, developed the science of medicine about 2,000 years before Christ. Six hundred years before Christ an excellent study of the pulse was written. Then there was a surgeon who performed an abdominal operation, every detail of which anticipated Listerism. There was no regular, medical education, and the Chinese surgeons were trained by being apprenticed to other surgeons. It was remarkable to compare ancient Chinese surgery with modern Western surgery. for they would find that many of the methods of treatment which people in the West thought were of quite recent discovery, were invented and used in ordinary practice in the East 3,000 years ago."—*Amrita Bazar Patrika*, January, 1908.

According to Buckle, the chief factors in the evolution of civilisation are (1) soil (2) climate (3) food and (4) aspects of nature. The cause of the early development of civilisation in Egypt, India, Mexico and Peru is explained by him by the fact that in those countries a fertile soil yielded an abundant harvest and led to a rapid accumulation of wealth but owing to the same cause man became indolent and civilisation was arrested and gradually fell into decay. Similarly, the climate of Europe being cold, evoked the energy of man and led to his steady progress. Where the climate is extremely cold, however, as in Sweden and Norway, or where it is comparatively warm, as in Spain and Portugal, labour becomes fickle and unstable, whereas in the more temperate regions of Europe the people show a capacity for a steady and unflinching industry. A temperate climate is, therefore, the best for the growth of civilisation. In regard to the aspects of nature, Buckle holds that in Asia, Africa and America, high mountains and great rivers, earthquakes, hurricanes and pestilence, aroused the imagination of man and made him superstitious; in Italy, where according to Buckle, the same conditions prevail, the excess of imagination has developed the artistic talent; whereas in countries where the aspects of nature are neither terrible nor grand, nothing interfered with the peaceful development of the intellect.

As to the effect of food on civilisation, Buckle speaks as follows :—

"The diet of hot countries, by its cheapness, the ease with which it is procured, and the smallness of the amount required for the individual, increases population; while the diet of cold countries, for reasons the very opposite of those just given, restricts the growth of population. The result being, in the case of the labouring class in the tropics, poverty and submission, whereas in colder climates the democratic spirit has prevailed, manifesting itself in revolutions, insurrections, &c."

So far as India is concerned, the following extract from an article by the Rev. J. T. Sunderland in the *New England Magazine* for September 1900, will

sufficiently demonstrate the falsity of this specious theory :—

"The population of India is not so dense as in a number of States of Europe, which are prosperous, have no difficulty in supporting their people, and in which famines are never dreamt of. Nor is the birthrate high in India. It is less than in England, and much less than in Germany, and several other continental countries. Indeed it is 75 per 1000 less than the average birthrate of all Europe. India is not over-populated."

I shall now make an extract from Dr. Scholes which will, I trust, dispose of the other theories regarding soil, climate and aspects of nature, associated with the name of Buckle :—

"We are told that these civilisations [those of Mexico, Peru, India and Egypt] are the results primarily of fertile soil, coupled with the absence in those places of certain natural phenomena. But situated in the same latitudes equally favoured by soil, and by the absence of restrictive natural phenomena, are regions which, in their sum total, quadrate with those other regions that have produced civilisations. Yet these regions [e.g. Northern Australasia, the islands of the Pacific, and California] have remained uniformly barbarous. Therefore, is it logical to conclude that the civilisations of those more enlightened states are due to soil? If so then to what is the backwardness of the uncivilised regions due? For they are in the same latitudes as the civilised; they have the same fertility; and they also enjoy, like these civilised regions, immunity from oppressive aspects of nature. Secondly, we are told that the civilisation of Europe is chiefly the result of its temperate climate, and that its extreme cold in the North, and its severe heat in the South, have produced in the inhabitants of those parts fickleness and instability of character. But seeing that the same temperate climate as that of Europe failed to produce a civilisation among the North American Indians, seeing that civilisations (Roman and Grecian), as high as those in the more temperate parts of Europe, have likewise been produced in the South, seeing that those peoples were neither unstable nor fickle, and seeing also that in latitudes corresponding, on the American Continent, to the area of extreme cold and to the area of extreme heat in Europe, civilisations (Canadian and American) like those of the more temperate regions of Europe have been produced, and that the peoples are neither unstable nor fickle, is the theory sustained, that makes the temperate climate a chief cause of civilisation? Buckle, as we have seen, regards soil and climate as two of the chief causes of civilisation... Lastly, as for the aspects of nature influencing the imagination to an abnormal degree in hot countries, we have taken the Italians, who are said to have been so influenced; we have compared them to their sires, the ancient occupiers of the peninsula, and we have

seen that upon the ancients the phenomena of nature produced no such effect: hence, granting that the Italians are specially imaginative and superstitious, the assertion that the excessive growth of the imagination is due to climate is disproved, and since there is no better proof regarding the Spaniards and Portuguese, this same assertion with respect to them is likewise disproved. Again, taking India, whose superstition Buckle has cited in order to prove the predominating power of the imagination in tropical and subtropical peoples, we have compared a specimen of that superstition produced by its imagination with a specimen produced by the imagination of Europe, and I believe it will not be honestly denied, that a similarity, rather than a dissimilarity, exists between the specimens. Therefore, from all these facts, I conclude, that the proposition brought forward by Buckle that food, climate, soil, and the aspects of nature 'originated the most important consequences in regard to the general organisation of society,' or are the chief causes of civilisation, is not only not proved, but is, by the very arguments with which he supports that proposition, disproved."

Buckle himself has been compelled to admit that "of the two classes of laws which regulate the progress of mankind, the mental class is more important than the physical." This makes his reliance on physical phenomena alone all the more strange and remarkable. The German political philosopher Bluntschli says of Buckle that "like all Englishmen, he lays too much stress on economical conditions," Can statesmen remedy the evil effects of unfavourable physical conditions? he enquires, and replies, "They can, if they are seriously devoted to the work of advancing a healthy national life." The whole question, therefore, depends upon the personal equation of the ruling section of the community. Bluntschli agrees with Buckle in thinking that a moderately fertile soil is the best. But he is careful to add, "Doubtless history proves that these conditions do not necessarily lead to an equal distribution of wealth and a healthy national life, and there are many other more powerful factors involved." Again he says:—

"But we must not exaggerate the importance of natural phenomena. After all, less depends on them than on the moral and intellectual education of man by man. Even in hot countries reason may be educated and fancy curbed by a feeling for the beautiful; and superstition may grow rank and thought be choked under a temperate sky. Man is not the creature of natural

forces: he must face nature boldly and independently, making use of her when she is kind, and combating her when she is cruel."

Buckle would destroy the self-confidence of the non-European, Bluntschli would encourage it. Referring to Buckle's services his editor, Mr. Robertson, says that Buckle was a pioneer, but not the final and accurate codifier of sociological law. Mr. Robertson truly observes that—

"The early Mediterranean civilisation grew from Asiatic seed, and the northern civilisations from the Mediterranean. But for these transmissions of culture, there is no reason to suppose that northern Europe would have emerged from barbarism."

To rectify Buckle's exposition, therefore,

"We have to note that the higher European civilisation is derivative, first by way of mediterranean contacts with the civilisations of Egypt and Western Asia, then by way of Mediterranean contacts with northern barbarism."

So much for Buckle and his theories. He is one of a class of historians which, according to Dr. Scholes, "pursues truth, in order that securing from it a badge, or symbol, it may with the same decorate some conventional prejudice, or political crime." European historians have taught us much for which we are sincerely grateful, but let us abjure with all our might their detestable habit of "cooking" facts to feed their national vanity. Dr. Scholes has adopted "*Fiat justitia, ruat cælum*" as the motto of his book, and he has rendered a real service to the cause of truth and humanity by exposing in all its ugly nakedness, the infamous attempt of some English and American historians and pseudo-scientists to set up the false theory of white superiority as an immutable law—a theory which was propounded with the sole object of justifying political crime.

THE PLACE OF INDIA IN THE BROTHERHOOD OF NATIONS

BY THE REV. J. T. SUNDERLAND, M.A., D.D.

Surely there is no higher ideal than that of human brotherhood, and no nobler purpose for which any of us can work than to promote such an ideal. But we should bear in mind that human brotherhood has its basis in the soul. There can be no brotherhood where one nation looks down upon another nation, or one class of persons upon another class, with ignorant prejudice or with arrogance or contempt. There can be human brotherhood only where there is intelligence and sympathy.

When we approach India in connection with the thought of human brotherhood or the brotherhood of nations, we find ourselves confronted with several rather serious difficulties. The first of all is this—the fact that India is an Asiatic land and the Indian people an Asiatic people. Europe, you know, for many generations (and largely also America, because we are children of Europe and the inheritors of her prejudices) has looked down with contempt upon Asia and every thing Oriental. This is a strange condition of things, for Asia is what? She is the great mother continent. She is the mother of races, the mother of nations, the mother of languages, the mother of the arts and more than any other continent the mother of the world's higher life. Our own civilisation (that of Europe and America) sends its roots back in almost every particular, into Asia. Why then

should we look down upon Asia? All the great historic religions of the world come from Asia. Why should we have prejudice against the continent from which we get our Bible and our religious faith? And yet we do. Europe has treated Asia for generations with contempt and cruelty in more ways than I can stop to explain or intimate. This fact, then, that India is in Asia, is one of the obstacles in the way of getting our minds into a condition to appreciate India and to open a way for a real brotherhood between ourselves and the Indian people.

Another obstacle exists in the fact that India is what we call a "heathen" land. We have long been sending our missionaries to convert the Hindu, concerning whom we sing,

"The heathen in his blindness
Bows down to wood and stone."

Does not the word "heathen" as employed by us always have in it an element of the contemptuous? Is it not partly synonymous with savage or uncivilised? As Christians, are we not apt to regard ourselves as distinctly superior to the "heathen" not only in religion but in civilization? Indeed does not the very act of sending missionaries to a people seem to set up a claim to superiority on our part, which is not conducive to the spirit of brotherhood? If our missionaries were always broad-minded, possibly this would not be so. But missionaries are not always the broadest men. Indeed, missionary societies seem generally to feel the necessity of sending out men who are "theologically sound," which is apt to mean men who are narrow, who have little inclination to recognise the best that is in the religion and the civilization of the people among whom they labour. This we must always bear in mind when we read or hear accounts of India given by missionaries. If the missionaries were to come back from India reporting that they find there people equally intelligent with ourselves, as virtuous as ourselves, having as great purity in their homes

as we have in ours, and as upright in character as are the people of America, what would be the effect of their reports upon the home churches? At once the inquiry would be raised, Why send our missionaries? Why have missionary societies? Thus we see that the pressure upon missionaries is very strong not to report at home the better side of Indian thought and life, but to confine their reports to the lowest and worst side,—the result of which must, of course, be to give us anything but the true India.

* As a fact, too (and this should not be overlooked), few of the missionaries come in contact with or see the best of Indian life. The people whom they are able to reach with their Gospel are largely of the lowest, most ignorant, and most degraded classes. The intelligence of India, the literature and art and better religious thought of India and the civilization of the land in its higher forms, they know comparatively little about. Thus we see how unfortunate it is that the Western world is compelled to get its knowledge of India so largely through Christian missionaries, who, however good men they may be, must in the nature of the case give us more or less inadequate and biased reports. When the people of India are represented to us in such a way as to cause us to look down upon them, if not with pride and arrogance, at least with pity born of condescension, the conditions essential for a genuine feeling of human brotherhood between us and them are destroyed.

Another difficulty which meets us when we come to talk about India in connection with human brotherhood is this: India is a subject land,—a dependency of Great Britain; it is not an independent nation. Its people are held in subjection by the sword of an alien power; they are not permitted to shape their own political destinies, but are ruled wholly by foreign masters. This condition of subjection is not only humiliating in the highest degree but it is degrading. It is destructive of brotherhood. Of course there can be no political fraternity between