

# THE KEY TO CULTURE



NUMBER 11  
**LIFE AMONG THE MANY  
PEOPLES OF THE EARTH**

The Story of the Races of  
Mankind and Their  
Relationship

*(Key to Anthropology and  
Philology)*

JOSEPH McCABE

EDITED BY  
E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

PRE-HISTORIC SCIENCE

**KEY TO CULTURE NO. 11**  
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

# Life Among the Many Peoples of the Earth

The Story of the Races of Mankind  
and Their Relationship

(Key to Anthropology and Philology)

Joseph McCabe

**HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS**

**Girard, Kansas**

Copyright,  
**Haldeman-Julius Company**

**Printed in the United States of America**

## CONTENTS.

	Page
Chapter I. The Variety of the Human Race.....	5
(1) How the Races Were Distributed. (2) The Origin of Racial Characteristics. (3) Linking Up the Family.	
Chapter II. The Lowest Peoples on Earth.....	12
(1) Where We Find Them. (2) The Primitive Little Negroes. (3) How They Live.	
Chapter III. Australia and Polynesia.....	18
(1) The Australian Black. (2) The Melanesian. (3) The Tragedy of Polynesia.	
Chapter IV. The Races of Africa.....	25
(1) Fragments of Earliest Times. (2) The Negro Family. (3) White Africans.	
Chapter V. The Races of Asia.....	30
(1) Primitive Asiatics. (2) The Mongol Family. (3) The Babel of India. (4) The Semites.	
Chapter VI. European Origins.....	37
(1) Relics of Prehistoric Man. (2) The Mediterranean Race. (3) The Alpine Race. (4) The Aryans.	
Chapter VII. The Peoples of America.....	42
(1) Are There Pre-Indian Peoples? (2) The Eskimo. (3) The American Indians. (4) Strange Peoples of South America.	
Chapter VIII. The Evolution of Language.....	48
(1) Do Animals Speak? (2) The Origin of Speech. (3) The Evolution of the Alphabet.	
Chapter IX. Families of Languages.....	54
(1) The Indo-European Languages. (2) Was There One Primitive Speech?	

# LIFE AMONG THE MANY PEOPLES OF THE EARTH

## CHAPTER I.

### THE VARIETY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

**L**YING before me is a map of the earth and its inhabitants as they were imagined by the wisest people of antiquity, the Athenians. They thought that the inhabited world was a sphere stretching a few hundred miles in every direction round Greece, which was the hub of the universe. Outside Greece, and a few centers of decaying gentility like Egypt, there were only "barbarians"—which literally means people who could not talk properly—and beyond these, lying in a fringe of outer darkness, were semi-human monstrosities, begotten, some thought, of the action of the sun upon slime. The most-learned men of all ages until a few centuries ago had some such childlike conception of the human race. We are asked to admire because the Egyptians reproduced the racial characters of a few peoples. The fact is that their wisest priests knew no more about the meaning of the races they depicted than did the baboon at the prince's court.

Science therefore confronted a formidable task when it set out to unravel the tangle of races of peoples. The Greeks had put the entrance to Tartarus in a spot which, allowing for the crookedness of their maps, is somewhere in the Rhine valley—really a land of sunshine and sunny-natured folk. By the nineteenth century we had encircled the globe and had discovered types of men who had never before been imagined. Every child by that time knew that there were people two thousand miles further north than Germany.

So the great work proceeded very slowly until the truth of the evolution of man broke upon the mind. Few aspects of life were so brilliantly lit by it as the diversity of the human family. I have in the previous volume briefly told how there had been a procession of humanity through the ages, from the level of the ape to the level of the Greek; and that procession had thrown off contingents at each point of its history, and in their isolation from the main stream they had remained fossilized at one or other early stage of culture. We had only to bring these races or peoples from their remote homes and set them in order, and we had a living picture of the rise of man from lowest savagery. This was the work of anthropology, or the science of man as a race. The older words ethnology and ethnography, which meant one or other branch of this study, are not now much used.

But, alas, there has been, as usual, a revolution, and the first general service I can do for the reader is to tell the truth about this.

Young men still treasure the sociological works of Lewis Morgan and Lester Ward, if not the picturesque older works in which Herbert Spencer and Tylor and others traced the evolution of all human institutions by means of savage life. It is all wrong, the professors now say. The "evolutionary school" is discredited.

As I pass from volume to volume, and have to explain that we need not be entirely disturbed by professors telling us that they have demolished ether, or matter, or the nebular theory, or gravitation, or natural selection, and so on, to the great delight of our anti-scientific oracles, I feel disposed to start a movement for the defense of the general public against this academic itching for new things. I feel that some of the professors must have this new version of George Eliot's famous poem:

For me . . . .  
 To have given my name to a new kind of snail  
 Or a new variety of Pterosaur:  
 To have thrown new light on the diet of the whale  
 Or found some truth in the Minotaur:  
 To have proved the folly of Newton's laws  
 And the depth of the Eskimo:  
 To have coined a new name for the menopause  
 Or the Greek for melting snow . . . .  
 Shall be Immortality.

Seriously, we now have an "historical" school of anthropology belaboring the "evolutionary" school. Naturally, they all believe in evolution, but Jesuits seize the opportunity (see Fr. A. Muntsch's recent *Evolution and Culture*—there is quite a school of clerical anthropologists in Austria) to represent the matter in that light and show that (so they say) Spencer, Ward, etc., are wholly discredited. What it really means is, first, that Lewis Morgan and other early writers did use too much imagination. Our knowledge of facts was in their day too scanty. But one illustration will suffice to show how little of a revolution there has been. Muntsch (S. J.) particularly speaks of the old theory that marriage was evolved out of primitive promiscuity, and shows how it is now rejected. But I have written for twenty years that primitive man was monogamous (I gave the reasons in the last volume) and I could quote writers of forty years ago saying it.

The real difference between the two schools is that the new school lays more stress on the spread of culture (weapons, institutions, etc.) by diffusion from one people to another. No section of the human race may have gone through the complete evolution of institutions as it is traced by the older sociologists and anthropologists, because lower tribes were constantly learning from higher and thus, so to say, skipping many years of evolution. Each human institution—marriage, kingship, etc.—was evolved, according to all anthropologists except those of the Austrian clerical school. Muntsch forgets to tell his readers that there is this profound difference between what his Austrian colleagues say and what is held by the American anthropologists whom he quotes. However, though all

culture was gradually evolved, the race did not move up steadily from one stage to another. That is the difference between biological and social evolution. Organs cannot be borrowed from another species, but ideas or institutions can. We must study the history of development in each case separately.

It is a very good thing to have this emphasized and to make actual research on those lines; but it is a bad thing to suggest that no one ever thought of it before, and it leads to the usual temporary exaggerations. Let me give two illustrations. A few years ago I made a special study of the evolution of religion (*The Growth of Religion*, 1918) on the basis of the facts of savage life, and I submit that it is quite in harmony with every sound principle of the new school. On the other hand, some of the most brilliant British representatives of the new school say that it compels them to believe that Mexican and Mayan culture in America somehow got its ideas from ancient Egypt. I wonder whether any American "historical" anthropologist would venture to say that. I put the idea to the leader of the American expedition as we sat together amongst the great Mayan ruins at Chichen-Itza, and he, one of the highest authorities, pronounced it simply ludicrous and held by no expert. I visited all the chief sites in Mexico and Yucatan and I have a good knowledge of Egyptian remains; and I felt that this new way of explaining human affairs was simply eccentric.

### §1. HOW THE RACES WERE DISTRIBUTED.

Well, let us, as usual, take into account the sound elements of the new school, which are not inconsistent with the old unless you insist that one or the other is **exclusively** true—that is the common error—and see how evolution does light up for us the dark confusion of the human family. "Human race" is an unscientific but useful and inevitable expression. A race is a section of the human family marked off from other sections by conspicuous physical characteristics which we call "racial": black, yellow, and white race, for instance. A "people" is a large community or part of a race with common blood (or supposed, like the Jewish, to have it): a "tribe" is a narrower group under a common head within the people: and a "nation" is a political unity, often embracing peoples of very different blood.

We will concern ourselves first with the general distribution of the human family or the various races which make it up. We are told that we must no longer speak of black, yellow, and white races, because there are all sorts of shades between the three. We are supposed not to have known that before. However, Professor Kroeber tells us in his admirable work that the Caucasian (mainly European and its derivatives), Negroid, and Mongoloid races embrace 99 percent of the two billion members of the human family. Most of us do not need to know much about the one percent. Anyhow we will get a preliminary general understanding of our human family by confining ourselves to these three races, which we will still call the white, black and yellow races.

Broadly speaking, they spread, respectively, over Europe, Africa, and Asia, with an extension of the Mongoloid to America. This distribution forcibly suggests that there was a center of dispersal, and that this center was somewhere about the region where Asia, Africa, and Europe meet. I may say at once that the islands which contain a large population apart from these continents—the islands to the south and east of Asia, from Ceylon to Australia and the Pacific Islands—were, it is agreed, populated from southern Asia, and so the scheme fairly embraces the whole human race. Age by age waves of population rolled over the earth from the southern Asiatic region.

Now this is in complete accord with what I told in the last volume. Ingenious professors have been contending of late years that man was born in all sorts of places—Spain, South America, even Britain—but there is a general agreement that the cradle was in Asia. The American experts generally look to central Asia. Professor Elliott Smith in his just published book (*The Evolution of Man*), which has the weight of one of the highest European authorities, insists emphatically that there is no evidence whatever for the choice of central Asia, and he favors eastern Africa; as some other modern experts do.

Bear in mind that at the time of man's early evolution north-eastern Africa was connected by land with southern Asia, and, since we are not exactly dying to know which was the precise part of the map where man was evolved, we know enough. Somewhere in that region, possibly in south-central Asia, though the evidence is not very convincing, the ape and human branches diverged. But this very early phase does not concern us in the present volume, as certainly no living race of men represents our ancestors as they were during the twenty to forty million years of their appallingly slow early development. And, as we saw that during the Tertiary Era the region to the north of India was immensely disturbed by the final rise of the Himalayas, we look further south for the home, wherever the cradle may have been, of the human race.

Thus a reasonable consideration of the matter and all the evidence point to southwestern Asia as the great area from which the streams of humans poured—it might be better to say trickled—over the globe. From here prehistoric man passed to Europe. There, we saw, he met the check of an Ice Age. There was not the same ice sheet over Asia as over Europe and North America. Recent experts conclude that the climate of Asia was too dry to provide the masses of snow. So southwestern Asia remained the central region for man, and it is a pity there is not more exploration there. From there a wave of primitive people passed south and east, and we shall pick up the fragments of that wave in the next chapter. Later was the outpour which survives in the Australian and Melanesian blacks. Later again was the stream southward into Africa which gave it its black population and the stream eastward over Asia which gave the yellow race. The family remaining in the region of the Caucasus mountains or the Caspian Sea (some recent writers prefer Caspian to Caucasian race—as if it mattered) formed the white race.



## §2. THE ORIGIN OF RACIAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Broad ideas like this are only broadly true. We all realize that, and later, when we take each of these great races or continents in turn, we shall see the modifications that the experts suggest. This is, however, a generally true statement of the main lines of human dispersal, and the reader will find it simple and helpful. Geographical circumstances made this area of southwestern Asia what we might call the swarming center of the race; though we must not imagine these very primitive men trekking in organized masses or caravans. Europe was glaciated. Africa was desert-bound except for the comparatively narrow neck through which the ancestors of the blacks trickled. Asia generally had grim and unattractive conditions, and on the east was the ocean.

We used to tell how the section of the race which poured into Africa was baked black by the scorching sun, how the Asiatic race developed its yellow pigment and slanting eyes in the extremes of summer heat and winter cold on the elevated plains of Asia (and sent a branch into the somewhat different conditions of America), and how the section of the race which remained and at last poured over Europe was bleached white by the northern European winters. The reality is never so simple as we represent it in these broad ideas, and we must not be in the least surprised when professors fling showers of learned words at them. The new views are, however, very far from settled, and I will just give some idea what is happening and then tell what we do know about our confusion of peoples.

Pigment is by no means the only test of race. The shape of the skull is a most important criterion. Experts speak—in Greek, of course—of “long-headed” and “short-headed” races, though you will understand better what they mean if I say narrow-skulled and broad-skulled. It is now the general opinion that man was at first narrow-skulled and, as the brain grew, the skull shortened from back to front and broadened at the sides. But the human family has mingled so much all over the earth that skulls have got very considerably mixed. On present tests of race, as we shall see, the Jews, who are popularly regarded as of the purest blood, are hopelessly mixed up in their ancestry. I might add that, though these recent skull-measurers ignore the fact, some very distinguished anatomists maintain that a race changes its skull when it changes its environment, its elevation above sea-level. So we won't talk here about “dolichocephalic” and “brachycephalic.” I am saying these things only to explain the great confusion and unsettledness that you will find in recent works on anthropology.

Hair is another test. Professor Haddon thinks it “the most useful character in classifying the main groups of mankind.” But again our human family has got badly mixed up, and, while woolly hair is generally confined to black or “pale black” men, the other varieties—straight and wavy hair—are divided amongst all sorts of races. So is the nose, another test. In some Jewish communities only sixteen percent have got what is politely called “the Semitic

nose." In short, the more you multiply tests of race—there are now about ten—the greater the difficulty becomes of sorting out our mongrel family.

Fortunately our simple need, which is to understand the human family generally, does not require that we should enter into all the controversies of the science which is now trying to sort out the racial elements of all countries. Official papers given to me in Mexico told me that the population consisted of four million Indians and twelve million "Mexicans," but the expert who gave me the papers whispered that the real analysis was: twelve million Indians and four millions of mixed Spanish and Indian blood. In Yucatan, where I met what I thought must be pure Castilian blood, a scholar assured me that there was no such thing in the country. If that is true of a country which was isolated from the rest of the world for thousands of years, and had only one narrow source of population (Behring Strait), what is likely to have happened in all other countries? We will confine ourselves to certain general truths.

One further word must be said about racial characteristics, however. Black pigment under the skin, (and in the hair and eyes), yellow pigment, or no pigment (or very little) are the most interesting of racial distinctions. It seems clear that pigment protects the nerves from the sun's rays (probably the ultra-violet rays). A sea-voyage over sunny seas "tans" you. The light-haired, blue-eyed, fresh-skinned Scandinavian has lost his pigment: the more sun the better for him. The typical African black has developed a mass of it. The dusky Portuguese is between the two, as his latitude leads us to expect. Full development of it or complete bleaching takes very long periods of time, so we need not be surprised that the savage of Brazil, who has only been in the tropics a few thousand years, is not as black as the African, or that the Eskimo is not as white as the Norwegian. Recent experts claim that the shape of the nose (flat or otherwise) and the texture of the hair also are closely connected with climate. There is strong reason to think that man was at first very dark of skin, woolly haired, and flat-nosed, and, as he wandered into different climates, the various branches of the race diverged and developed their characteristics. But we will not go more closely into this, or we shall run up against the usual angry conflict about heredity and environment.

### §3. LINKING UP THE FAMILY.

On the broad lines which chiefly interest us, and in a good deal of detail which we shall find interesting, there is sufficient agreement for our purpose. Before evolution was discovered men of science had gone a long way toward linking up the more conspicuous sections of the human family. Setting apart a few peoples which are known to have come from Asia in historic times (Magyars, Finns, etc.), the peoples of Europe were seen to be clearly related to each other. Elementary words like "father" and "mother" at once show a connection between most of them. Philologists, following these clues, brought the Persians and Indians into the fam-

ily. Thus, including the white population north of Mexico in America, more than half the human race was brought into one great family, which (as we shall see) we are still permitted to call by the convenient name of "the Aryan family." The Persians and Hindus were a southern, and therefore less white, branch of the family, living harmoniously together, as one people, in Asia Minor some five thousand years ago.

But language is, of course, no test of race. Conquerors can impose their language, and lower peoples may adopt a higher language. Nearly a quarter of the race now speaks the tongue of what was in the days of the Roman Empire merely a joint tribe of a few tens of thousands of people—the Anglo-Saxons. So the Romans had imposed their tongue, modified, in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal; and the Teutonic languages had spread down to the Danube. Proper racial tests have shown that there are really three strata in the population of Europe: Nordic (Slav, German, etc.), Alpine (the race which, we saw in the last book, cut across central Europe from Asia in the New Stone Age), and Mediterranean. We recognize all these as branches of the Caucasian race, and add the original Persians and Hindus. We will work this out later.

In the same way most of the peoples of central-eastern Asia were collected in a great Mongoloid family, and most of the races of Africa in a Negroid family. Modern books on anthropology are rich in these words ending in 'oid. You have only to remember that it means "like" (Mongol-like, Negro-like, and so on). It is necessary thus to modify the words because the Asiatics are not all Mongols—and the American Indians are not—but belong to a common stock with the real Mongols. So the dark-skinned peoples of Africa, and those of Australia and other islands, are better described as a whole as Negro-like. We shall sort out the population of each continent in turn.

Whether or no all belong to one species is, as I said in an earlier volume, a matter of words. Most experts say yes; a few say no; others say that all men now form one species, but that there were different species in prehistoric times. If monkeys could talk, they would call themselves one species—the monkey. Men differ almost as much as monkeys do, but we see no reason for dividing ourselves into species. Mutual fertility has nothing to do with the matter. Zoologists divide species by their external characteristics, and they are often mutually fertile. The real question is not whether we are one species, since there are no such distinctions in nature, but whether science divides us into several species. And the answer is that only a few men of science, who think that, say, the Negro was separately developed from the animal world, make such a division.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE LOWEST PEOPLES ON EARTH.

**I**N SORTING out the populations of the globe on the ground of the general principles given in the last chapter I take into account chiefly a sketch of human distribution given at the close of his recent book (*The Races of Men*) by my learned friend Professor Haddon, who is one of the most sober of thinkers, and the equally learned, but much more elaborate and tantalizing work, on the lines of the new school of anthropology, of Professor Roland B. Dixon, *The Racial History of Man*. Points are taken from other recent works, especially Professor Kroeber's *Anthropology*, but my chief task is to extract the clearer and more settled material and use it to tell a simple straightforward story.

First, however, I give two chapters of which neither my friend Professor Haddon nor any other modern anthropologist would quite approve. I want to separate out, if possible, for special description the really lowest peoples now living on the earth. The interest of this must be clear to the reader. If savages are prehistoric men, still showing us earlier phases of the evolution of man's ideas and institutions, it is particularly interesting to ask what are the ideas and the life of the earliest of them. Now I quite agree with these modern anthropologists that this sort of thing has often been done badly. I have been particularly interested for years in attempting to trace along these lines the evolution of religious and moral ideas, of the position of woman, and of the power of thought generally, and I have complained constantly that other writers in doing this paid no strict attention to the cultural level of the tribes they quoted. Not only sociologists like Morgan and Bebel, but, I venture to say, even my learned friend Professor Westermarck (in his study of the evolution of moral ideas) and Sir J. G. Frazer (in his studies of the evolution of magic and religion), make this mistake. Few sociologists escape it.

Because, the new anthropologists say, you cannot do otherwise. They tell you that it is a myth to say that this savage corresponds to lower Paleolithic man, that savage to later Paleolithic man, and so on, because his mental or cultural development has been influenced over and over again by other races. He has not been allowed to grow up in the way that evolutionary schemes describe. He has not been isolated, but the human family has been migrating and mingling and altering other people's ideas all the time.

Very true, but there are two limits to this truth. The fact is that some actually surviving peoples, though they are now dying out, have such rudimentary ideas about everything that they have clearly not learned from others; and we shall see that their brains and physiques are equally primitive, and their situation is such that we

understand why they remained at a low level. We will in the present chapter take these extremely interesting fragments of early humanity. Naturally, you are not an ignorant person if you happen to know nothing about the wild Veddahs of Ceylon or the Semangs, yet there is a special reason for knowing about them. They show us the ideas of quite primitive man, the early steps in the evolution of moral, religious, political, and other forms. In the next place, one large family of humans certainly has been isolated from all others for tens of thousands of years. These are the Australians, and we will take them as the starting point of another inquiry in the next chapter. Then we can turn to the four continents and their races.

### §1. WHERE WE FIND THEM.

Fifteen years ago in my *Story of Evolution* I said: "The chief key to the later progress of mankind is the stimulating contact of the differing cultures of different races." If I were one of those scientific men who had the august authority, or the personal inclination, to draw up laws, I should say that the principal law of human progress is the Law of Contrasting Cultures. You will find that quite a useful little torch in studying the present as well as the past. Why was China until recently so "conservative" while Europe and America were so progressive? Why did Ireland, Russia, Spain and Southern Italy remain backward while the connected cluster of central nations in Europe moved on? And so forth. We shall see the value of this when we come to history.

Isolation is therefore the clue to lack of progress—not inferiority of race, or blood, or germ-plasm, or religion, or climate, etc.—and we look for our lowest peoples in isolated spots. Take your map. (Please get a simple map of the world—a five-cent outline map will do—if you want to follow the story of man with full interest and understanding.) We shall, of course, look for them in small islands, the tips of the continents, and "impenetrable" forests in the interior. Well, look at the map. I suggest the tip and the string of islands south of Asia, the southern tip of Australia (Tasmania), the tip and central forests of Africa, and the southern point (Tierra del Fuego) and central forests of South America.

In other words, we are going to glance at the life of certain small and very lowly peoples in Ceylon, the Andaman Islands, the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, the Philippine Islands, Tasmania, south and central Africa, and South America. But first I am going to rule out South America or postpone its lowest peoples until a later chapter. The Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego and some of the tribes of Brazil have always puzzled me. The Yahgans, especially, are so extraordinarily low in culture that one feels inclined to put them at once amongst our lowest living prehistoric men. Yet most of the American authorities will not admit any pre-Indian population. Professor Kroeber dates the first invasions about ten thousand years ago. So we put these savages aside for the moment and will try to understand them later.

The geographical position of the others is significant. We have seen that, as the authorities practically agree, southern or southwestern Asia was the central home of the race at least after the beginning of the Ice Age. We must remember that the climate would be altered far beyond the actual limits of ice and snow. If the arctic ice-sheet were to spread down again as far as St. Louis and New York, Palm Beach and Los Angeles would have the present climate of Alaska. This southwestern area of Asia would feel the change, and the early humans must have wandered south. The north part of the Indian Ocean was still dry land, of which the existing islands are fragments. Along it, along the southernmost fringe of Asia, and into Africa by way of Abyssinia, the primitive humans wandered. Then the land foundered and they were marooned on some of the islands. Let us see if this is what we find.

## §2. THE PRIMITIVE LITTLE NEGROES.

Professor Haddon, who agrees with me in looking to southwestern Asia for the cradle or the center of dispersal, suggests that the rise of the mountains probably split the area into a northern and southern region: that the northern section of this early human family provided the material of the white or western and the yellow or eastern race: and that the southern section of the family retained and further developed the Negroid features of early man. The apes, we must remember, have plenty of pigment under the skin, and there is a general agreement that the early humans, above the Java man level, were sturdy little men with very dark skins and black woolly hair. Haddon suggests that these men wandered along the southern land which is now the chain of islands from Ceylon to Borneo, and into Australia. No boats were then needed.

The remnants of this early human family, the most primitive which has any surviving representatives, are the peoples I have enumerated, and there is no serious dispute about this. The first patch of the early race is, or was until recent times, in Ceylon. Here, naturally, the isolation is feeble. Ceylon is a beautiful island, of rich fertility, and quite close to overcrowded India. The higher races from the mainland settled in it ages ago and to some extent mingled with the primitive inhabitants, the Veddahs. Even when there was no physical blend, most of the Veddahs borrowed ideas and practices from the higher tribes. But right into the nineteenth century some of the Veddahs, the wild or rock Veddahs, remained aloof, and, two German scientific men, the brothers Sarasin, carefully studied them during six years (1887-1893). Later writers are not so careful to discriminate between the really primitive culture of the Veddahs and the ideas which some of the Veddahs copied. They were on the average less than five feet high, had almost black skins and black hair, and their skulls were amongst the smallest known. There are now no quite pure Veddahs left.

The Andaman Islands, where we find the next group, form, as Professor Dixon says, a very isolated area and one well fitted for the survival of a primitive race. There was, however, always a

fair sea-traffic, and in modern times a considerable traffic; so there is now very little of the primitiveness of culture left, though, where the blood is pure, the physique is that of the primitive Negrito, or "little nigger." The average height is less than five feet, the skin nearly black, the hair black and frizzly. They were carefully studied forty years ago and their primitive ways put on record, as we shall see.

The next patches are more severely isolated. They are the wild Semang of the Malay Peninsula and the island of Sumatra. They are pygmy Negroes or Negritos like the preceding, isolated in the forests. What remains of the Aetas of the Philippine Islands is another patch of this primitive Negrito population, stubbornly keeping a good deal of their native characteristics, but disappearing gradually in the flood of higher tribes. Another patch was until half a century ago isolated and preserved in Tasmania. Most probably this branch of the primitive race at first overflowed Australia, but in time the Australian aboriginals, a much higher type, came along and pinned the Tasmanians in the south-eastern corner, which was then cut off by the sea. They, as Haddon says, "never advanced beyond an early stage of stone-age culture," and it was sufficiently put on record before they became extinct in the nineteenth century.

The next direction in which these early Negroid little men could easily migrate was Africa. Owing to the successive waves of higher and more powerful Negroes we should expect to find them sheltering in the central forests and at the extreme tip of the continent. In point of fact, the Dutch did find them in the extreme south when they settled at the Cape, and displaced them. They are the Bushmen, and are slightly higher than the others I have enumerated, but lower than the Australians. They are not the earliest population of Africa, but they are low enough to be considered here. In the central forests, however, we have, as is well known, tribes of black, woolly-haired pygmies, who, though they have borrowed the language and some of the ideas of the surrounding tribes, are surviving patches of our primitive race.

### §3. HOW THEY LIVE.

Every reader will see the great interest of thus sorting out the survivors of the earliest wave of human distribution, the men of "an early stage of stone-age culture." The physical type is so similar from the forests of the Philippines to the forests of Tasmania and of central Africa that there is no doubt about their being fragments of an early race; and their culture, wherever we can trace it free from borrowed elements (which the anthropologist can trace to their sources), shows us that this race was, apart from very early fossil remains, the lowest race known to us. Against our study of this race the modern anthropologist can raise no objection, because, apart from obviously borrowed ideas, which do not interest us, their native culture is too low and too consistent to represent anything but normal human development.

And it is a culture of such interest that I need hardly explain why I give a special chapter to these primitive and obscure little black fellows. They show us very clearly what man—what the whole race—was thinking and feeling, and how he lived, hundreds of thousands of years ago. In material life, of course, they differ in different environments, nor are all of them at the same stage of mental development. The pygmy of the African forest is described as very cunning and so good an imitator that he has borrowed freely from the surrounding tribes. The Tasmanian, on the other hand, as we should expect from his extreme isolation, was the poorest specimen of human intelligence. He had no abstract or general ideas. For him there were rocks and trees, but not a rock and a tree. He had no words to express general ideas. In fact their language was so elementary, and had to be helped so much by gesture and facial movement, that they could not talk to each other in the dark! They had no agriculture, domestic animals, weaving of any sort, chiefs, or fire-producing apparatus of their own; and, though Tasmania is often very cold in winter, they had only the crudest houses or break-winds.

It is, however, the social aspect of these primitive peoples that is most interesting. All of them are strictly monogamous. That fact and the life of the apes are evidence that earliest prehistoric man was monogamous. Even the Andaman Islanders, who have had occasion to learn much from higher tribes, are reported by the recognized authority on them to have been strictly monogamous and usually faithful, never having recourse to divorce and very rarely having domestic quarrels. That is the quite general character of this group of people. An Indian traveler tells how a chief of a northern tribe was taken to visit the Veddahs, and their strict monogamy was explained to him. "That," he said, disdainfully, "is how the monkeys live." I have said that speculative sociologists have been far too ready to assume that primitive man was promiscuous, and that monogamy was slowly evolved at a later date, but there is one sociologist, Professor L. Hobbhouse, who says: "Marriage is indissoluble among the Andamanese, some Papuans of New Guinea, at Watubela, at Lampong in Sumatra, among the Igorotes and Italonos of the Philippines, the Veddahs of Ceylon, and in the Romish Church." He ought to have included the Tasmanians, and we then have an emphatic statement that marriage is the earliest human institution, and polygamy, polyandry and promiscuity develop long afterwards. I need not add that there is no form or ceremony of marriage.

This traditional monogamy is part of the general tenor of life of these primitive peoples. I say "peoples" here because apart from the African bushmen, who are a little higher than the others and may be mixed in blood by a blend with the earliest Negroes, they have no tribes and no chiefs; no sort of rudimentary social or political organization. Yet they are the most social or sociable in practice of all peoples. They have no decalogue—that is to say, they have no idea whatever of moral law—but all these lowly peoples observe the decalogue better than any higher peoples or nations in




the world. They rarely quarrel or steal, and very rarely kill. They never kill children or aged people, as higher savages do, to economize the food supply, and they generously support widows and the destitute. Haddon, in his survey of the peoples of the world, reports this on every page, and he makes this general remark about them: "They do not recognize virtue, but they do not practice vice." They are never cannibals, never offer human sacrifices.

There is, perhaps, no more curious proof than this in their life that they have not been influenced by higher tribes, but do faithfully represent early prehistoric man, for the higher tribes are invariably fighters, rarely monogamous, and much more prone to theft and murder. Primitive man was not a "savage," just as his cousins, the higher apes, are not savage. We are too apt to think that man's animal ancestry implies an early birthright of ferocity. He came of a long line of vegetarians or insect-eaters, not carnivores, and the peacefulness of primitive man, until (as in Tasmania and South Africa) higher peoples came to take his country, is strictly consistent with his ape ancestry. My own opinion is that his "good" habits, or social habits, are due to a sort of unconscious natural selection and to his millions of years of life in simple family groups. It was at a later and higher mental stage that he perceived the value of his practices and set up some sort of "moral law." Let me add that the real "savagery," which developed later, was an inevitable consequence of the inevitable development of tribes. Men had now to fight for their tribes and their hunting grounds, and they learned ferocity, which at that level meant effectiveness.

In regard to religion, these lowly peoples were at a corresponding stage. They had no gods or cults or priests, and most of them are just on the border line of belief in spirits or even short of it. Their mental outfit was in proportion. Even the Bushman, who is not quite primitive, cannot count beyond three. To the others there are only two numerals, one and many. None of them have any idea of growing food. Some of them have adopted fire-making apparatus and the bow and arrow from higher tribes, but in their native culture they are at the level of man of the earliest Stone Age. They do not even make stone implements of the kind which we find in Europe before we find any bones of Neanderthal man. One must hesitate to compare them with any of the types of prehistoric man that we saw in the last book, because the northern races probably developed along a separate line, but we may in general regard these lowly peoples as survivors of a stage of human development of between half a million and a million years ago.

## CHAPTER III

## AUSTRALIA AND POLYNESIA.

NE of the chief reasons why I have sorted out for special description the really lowest peoples on earth is that the reader may be on his guard when he finds the conduct of early man illustrated by quoting the life of savages. The higher savages illustrate fifty different phases of the evolution of man, and their culture is so mixed by contact with each other that one has to quote them with caution. Sociologists are almost never anthropologists. Even the best of them are very apt to quote the Australian aboriginal as a pure type of "the lowest savage." In fact, they might now quote against me the statement of Professor Elliot Smith in his recent book that the Australians are "undoubtedly the most primitive race now living."

Professor Elliot Smith is one of the most brilliant of British men of science, yet in this he is unquestionably wrong, according to all the authorities on the Australians. He is primarily an anatomist, and I fancy that what is in his mind is the fact that the Tasmanians have died out and left the Australians the most primitive in that part of the world. It is enough for the moment to say that the Australian blacks have very different degrees of culture in different tribes—possibly there were earlier and later waves of invasion of the continent—but even the lowest tribes have the spear and boomerang, finely worked stone knives, very complex marriage customs, elaborate initiation and other ceremonies, strong tribal organization, advanced magic and belief in spirits, myths and legends, totems, etc. These are common to all the Australians, yet not a single one of them is found amongst the lower peoples we have reviewed. The Australians are therefore on a distinctly higher level and exhibit a later stage in the evolution of the human race.

But there is, as I said, a special reason why we should be interested in the Australians. Anthropologists of the new school resent the drawing of conclusions about human evolution from savage tribes because we do not know how much of their culture has been borrowed. In the case of the Australians we have a natural guarantee of purity. You may remember the peculiar interest which we found in Australia in volume No. 5, **How Life Developed From the Simple to the Complex**. Animals of the age of the great reptiles wandered into Australia because it was still connected by land with Africa and Asia. But before the carnivorous higher mammals were evolved the bridge broke down, the land was cut off, and so we find the primitive pouched animals and the egg-laying duckmole, as well as a generally primitive plant and insect life, preserved in Australia today.

This applies in great measure to man. At a very early date a branch of the developing race in southwestern Asia made its way into Australia. This was, of course, not a march of a vast body of men, such as we find in historical times (the Huns, etc.), but a steady and continuous drift of men of a certain type across the southern land. The more primitive Tasmanian was pushed south, into his final home, and the new dark-skinned race overran the continent. Whether they came by boat, or the land was still connected, we do not know. It is today less than a hundred miles from Cape York, in northern Queensland, to New Guinea. There is, however, so definite a division of the Australian type from the types on the islands to the north that one seems justified in saying that the Australians entered on foot, or over very shallow and narrow water—there is no evidence that they had boats—and then the land foundered and isolated them for long ages. We have therefore here again a patch of prehistoric humanity preserved for us.

### §1. THE AUSTRALIAN BLACK.

In the last volume I told how, when the skeleton of Neanderthal man is compared with that of the Australian, we see at a glance that the latter is far superior to the former. The skull of the Australian—a specimen grins at me from my bookcase as I write—is less animal, and the whole frame is straighter and more definitely human. It used to be said that if we wanted to picture to ourselves man of the early Old Stone Age, we had only to read about the Australian. But he is definitely higher than Neanderthal man, and just as definitely lower than Magdalenian man. I have seen the drawings on rocks made by the Australians, and I have in my possession a specimen of what was described to me as the best drawing ever done by a native. There is no comparison with the art of Cave Man.

We may assume, provisionally, that the early race which a quarter of a million years ago sent a branch from southern Asia into Europe—the Neanderthal race—sent at a later date a slightly higher branch into Australia. Australian remains do not enable us to give anything like a date, though a skull found at Talgai in Queensland shows a higher antiquity and a lower type than the Australian of today. Let us say that probably somewhere between fifty and a hundred thousand years ago the new men entered Australia, in successive waves, and, as there were different tribes with slightly different cultures, they have advanced to some degree beyond their ancestors. Since these early invaders had the tame dog—it is now the wild dog or “dingo” of Australia—one must hesitate to give them too great an antiquity.

How primitive they are can be gathered from the fact that they have proved entirely ineducable and are dying out. There are only twenty to thirty thousand of them left, and the humanitarian efforts of the Australian government only make them look more pathetic. In heavy rain I have seen them slouching along just like dogs, but clad in discarded European clothes. Professor Klaatsch, whose

book on prehistoric man is very largely taken up with the Australians, spent three years amongst them and rather idealizes them, but they cannot be civilized. Dr. Ramsay Smith, of Adelaide, one of the most sympathetic students of them, told me that after a year or two of patient training, in farm or garden, the black would at last say, "Must go bush," and he would go.

I have already said in what respects they are materially higher than the Tasmanians. They are very expert spear (wooden) and boomerang throwers, skillful trackers and hunters, and can count up to four. Their tribal organization, cultivation of totems, magical practices, involved marriage laws, and secret ceremonies, are much above the primitive level. But they have no idea of agriculture, pottery, clothing, houses (beyond screen or "breakwinds" made of branches), or religious cults. The best Australian authorities assured me that they have "no religion and no morality," and you read this in the standard works on them of Spencer and Gillen, but it is a question of words. They believe intensely in spirits and put some spirits higher than others. They have no idea that the male parent generates the child, and they think that a spirit has entered a woman. Similarly, it is true that they have no idea of moral right and wrong, but they have strict traditions of what a man ought or ought not to do.

They are, in a word, a stage in evolution above the lower peoples. They are by no means "savages," though there were naturally early conflicts with the whites. Parents are much attached to children, and the women are devoted to their dogs. I have heard in Australia many stories showing a sort of instinctive excellence of character. In one case a mounted policeman was bringing in a black murderer from the bush, and he was swept off his horse by a swollen river. The black was swimming beside him with his hands manacled—they swim like fish—and, instead of taking the opportunity to escape, he seized the policeman's belt in his teeth and saved his life. They let that black go.

## §2. THE MELANÉSIAN.

What confirms me in my opinion that Australia was severely isolated by water after the blacks entered is the fact, that after that date wave after wave of tribes flowed eastward from southern Asia yet none entered Australia. You see on the map, south of Asia, a long chain of islands running right out into the Pacific. These are fragments of the foundered land which has still a claim to be considered the cradle of the race. The first island of the chain, Sumatra, is still within sight of the southernmost tip of Asia, and, as I said, we find in it primitive peoples who can never have had boats. In the next island, Java, the Ape-Man lived until some half million to a million years ago.

Across this chain of islands stream after stream of men poured when the boat was invented. The distribution of the population is significant. In the nearer islands from Ceylon to the Philippines are fragments of the lowest races. Overlying these, reaching

out at least as far as Fiji, is a black race higher in intelligence and more savage than the Australians. In the nearer islands these have been overlaid again by Malays and other higher tribes, and in the more distant islands there begins the highest of the races in this part of the world, the Polynesian, which ranged as far as New Zealand, Hawaii, and Easter-Island: so far that some believe they came into touch with the Peruvian civilization.

That is the broad meaning of the extraordinarily mixed population of these islands, from the head-hunters of Borneo to the perfectly educable and intelligent Maoris of New Zealand and other South Sea Islanders. The reader may, if he cares, consult Professor Dixon's work for the recent attempts to disentangle this great confusion of races and cultures in Oceania. For most people it is enough to understand in a general way how during tens of thousands of years waves of successively higher populations set out in this direction from southern Asia.

It is well, however, to know that there are two quite distinct races in the Pacific Islands, as, unless this is realized, a great deal of injustice is done to the higher type of islander. These two types are the Melanesian (or "Black Islander") and the Polynesian, who is lighter and much more advanced. The former is found on modern tests to be, as we should expect, a much adulterated race with all sorts of borrowed ideas, but for our purpose we may still draw this broad distinction. The nearer islands to Asia, from New Guinea to the New Hebrides, are still mainly populated by the Melanesians. It is they who are at the moment fighting the whites in the Solomon Islands.

Some writers would take these Melanesians to be just a branch of the dark-skinned race that peopled Australia, but in culture and physique they are higher. As wave after wave of higher peoples has passed over them and mingled with them, it is now difficult to tell what their original condition was. Dr. Rivers has made an analysis (*The History of Melanesian Society*, 1914) of their life, and he shows that their head-hunting (which is connected with a cult of the skull and of spirits), betel-chewing, totemism, social organization, and other features are adopted. It is significant how the more savage features come from higher tribes, but I have explained that. The interests of the tribe on the one hand and the early development of belief in spirits (which leads to human sacrifices and cannibalism) on the other, make an end of the earlier reluctance to shed blood.

Experts conjecture—there is almost no evidence—that it was about the beginning of the European New Stone Age that these blacks, with boats, streamed over Melanesia. They have been learning for thousands of years and are, of course, changing more than ever in modern times. A few years ago, when I was in New Zealand, I was pressed to come out to Fiji to deliver lectures on evolution! The audience would not be Melanesian, but it is a piquant illustration of our age that one should now be invited to lecture, with stereopticon views, in a spot where two generations ago men ate each other and one had to guard a succulent wife very

jealously. I understand that the meat was not particularly palatable, and that even the victims often walked quite cheerfully to the feast. But it is useless to attempt here to get at the original complexion of these people. I use as a paper knife one of the handsomely carved wooden blades with which, some forty years ago, a Papuan made a paste of his betel nuts, but the art of the carving is probably due to the tuition of some later race. It need be said only, in general, that we can with fair confidence find in them a much higher native culture than there is in Australia.

### §3. THE TRAGEDY OF POLYNESIA.

It is this popular confusion of Melanesians and Polynesians in one common class of "South Sea Islanders" that has wrought most tragic mischief in the Pacific. A naval captain who was very familiar with Tonga told me how two British naval officers, holding the customary idea, saw two natives drawing on the sand. "Let's see what the guys are doing," they said, and they found the men working out one of Euclid's problems which they would themselves rather avoid. I had a letter of introduction to the young Princess of Tonga, who was staying at the hotel in Auckland, to which I was going, and was assured that I would find her quite a thinker, but she had left when I arrived. A few weeks later, however, I had many interesting discussions on evolution with a pure-blooded Maori who attended my lectures and was a fully qualified medical man.

The skull-test of these people shows that there is no such thing as a pure race in Oceania. One wonders if there is such a thing in any part of the globe. Even the Maoris of New Zealand are of very mixed blood. But these refinements of modern classification do not alter the fact that there are a lower and a very much higher race in the islands. From the later part of the Old Stone Age black peoples streamed over the islands, and it is clear that the later migrants, with better boats, reached even as far as the Hawaii group in the north and New Zealand in the south. In both places we find the higher race imposed upon a lower; and we know that it was only during the Middle Ages that the Maoris came from the Cook and Society Islands to New Zealand, which was already inhabited. We have plenty of experience in the life of lower peoples, and even in the colonial expansion of higher races, to tell us what would happen. The men of the lower race would fight and be exterminated, the women would largely contribute to the new population.

It has been held by many scholars that the Polynesians, who are often remarkably close to Europeans in face and physique, are simply an eastern branch of the stock which gave Europe its characteristic races. The examination of skulls, while bringing out the mixture of blood which we ought to expect, sufficiently confirms this. The Polynesians came from Asia, probably not long before the beginning of the Christian Era, and the fact that they missed Borneo and Australia seems to show that they started in their long canoes from the region of Indo-China.

A special problem of the Pacific which still agitates the experts is the presence in Easter Island of immense stone statues, while there is only a small and backward population on the islands, and it is separated by leagues of ocean from all other islands. I have seen a group of professors purple in the face at the end of a three hours' wrangle over the mystery. I agree with the theory of my friend, Dr. Macmillan Brown, Rector of the New Zealand University, that the island is the solitary survivor of a group which has been destroyed by volcanic disturbances, and that this particular island, probably the center of the group, was the burying place of the chiefs. Some think that these more distant Polynesians were in touch with Peru, but this art of Easter Island—we have one of the giant statues set up in London—is often described in exaggerated language and is inferior to the art of the Maoris. It is, at all events, of the Polynesian level, and not a relic of some mysterious civilization.

What I call the tragedy of the Pacific is that this promising branch of the higher race, arrested in its cultural development by isolation from the other branches, has been treated by its "superior" European conquerors with an unwisdom that amounts to brutality. This branch of our race was fortunate enough to find a home than which there is none more pleasant and beautiful on the earth; one in which a simple and natural life would yield the maximum of happiness, consistently with the higher mental culture which we could give and they are quite capable of assimilating.

Instead of completing the felicity of life in the Pacific Islands, civilization has fallen like a blight upon the entire group. The carnage has been appalling, and even the semi-Europeanized or Americanized survivors look to the candid eye merely like degenerates in comparison with what they once were. The enforcement of European standards of morals has, by compelling them to adopt unsuitable and grotesque clothing, decimated the islands by pneumonia and consumption. The reduction of the population of the Hawaii group alone has been appalling. In addition, the cupidity of governments has sapped their spirit, and the cupidity of traders has taken amongst them the scourge of syphilis and of the immoderate use of alcohol. There are, as I have said, cases in which inferior races are doomed to extinction when the higher races come along. They are ineducable and have no hope of entering the progressive human family of modern times. This certainly does not apply to the Polynesians, and we have never yet patiently investigated whether it applies to the Melanesians. I would add that I am finding no fault with the present governments of Australia and New Zealand in their attitude to the aboriginals.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE RACES OF AFRICA.

**T**HE "Dark Continent" is an expression which fairly reflects the dark confusion of mind of most of the Europeans and Americans who use it and is itself a sufficient justification of this volume. We shall endeavor here to sort out its different peoples and see them in proper perspective; and here especially we must take our science on broad lines. If this volume were in the literal sense a compendium of the results of modern research, I should have to tell you how the "Mongoloid type" (which has nothing to do with Mongolians) persists in the Canaries, the Palae-Alpine type is found in the pygmies of the central forests, the Mediterranean type is blended with the Proto-Negroid in Somaliland, and so on. No doubt this kind of research will help us eventually to piece together the story of the peopling of the earth by the waves which age by age rippled out from southwestern Asia.

But for our purpose these types of skull need not be studied. A moment's reflection on known facts will remind you at once that Africa is a complete gallery of human specimens, not a solid block of heavy-featured blacks. One has only to recall, in the first place, that Egypt is in Africa. The Egyptians are as genuine a race of Africa as the Germans or English are of Europe, and have, indeed, been thousands of years longer in Africa than we can prove the white race to have been in Europe. Their culture has in the course of time penetrated deep to the south and west over the African peoples. Here again, as in the case of Easter Island and central Asia, we talk of "mysterious" remains of vanished civilizations when an intelligent grasp of the peoples as a whole and their history removes the element of mystery.

The upper one-third of Africa is, in fact, essentially not a dark continent, and its Mediterranean shore has in the course of ages borne more than one civilization. But, quite apart from the white block which is extending from the south in modern times, the lower two-thirds of Africa is by no means the more or less uniform mass of low-grade peoples which most of us imagine; nor is the pure-blood "Negro" the same type of human being in all parts.

It is a geographical accident that America knows only one type of "African," and if you reflect for a moment, in the light of what I have already said, that those regions of West Africa from which the late medieval Europeans found it most convenient to steal slaves to do their labor are the regions farthest away from the gate of entry into Africa (the northeast corner), you will realize that one is not likely to find there the most progressive elements of the population. If you further reflect again in the light of the principles I have given,



that Africa has had the least chance of the three continents to share what progress the world made, since the great desert severely isolated it except in one corner, you will see that there may be some more scientific and more humane explanation of the mental level of the colored folk than divine curses or inferior germ-plasm.

### §1. FRAGMENTS OF EARLIEST TIMES.

Please take your map, and the simpler the map the better. I would recommend one of those small atlases which give simple geographical maps of the earth and of each continent with a corresponding "physical" map of each. You then see that a vast desert stretches continuously from what is now Morocco, on the Atlantic coast, to the Persian gulf. This is today interrupted at one point by the fertile valley of the Nile, but that valley is only a few tens of thousands of years old. I should, in fact, be disposed to say that the river completed its cutting of the present valley through the limestone which underlies the desert only some fifteen to twenty thousand years ago, when the Ice Age began to end, and the snows and ices of the southern mountains—for all high mountains on the earth were glaciated—melted and swelled the flood of the Nile.

On the other hand, while the desert ran continuously from the Atlantic to Arabia, except for the river and some meager strip of vegetation, in the early ages there was more land in the east connecting Africa with Asia than there now is. It is useless to speculate when this foundered, but the open gate into Africa must already have been comparatively narrow when the earliest wave of humanity spread. It had been broader during the Tertiary Era, and the monkeys and apes had wandered through it. It is, remember, still an open question if this region of Africa was not the cradle of the race. The remarkably advanced ape skull found at Taungs and the very low human skull found at Broken Hill, in Rhodesia, are held to favor this theory.

We have supposed rather that the cradle and early home of the race was northeast of this, and I told in the second chapter how one part of the early Negrito, or pygmy Negro, family spread into Africa and survives in the forests of the Congo basin. The Bushmen of the south, who are certainly higher in many respects than the pygmy peoples, are regarded as a blend of early Negroes and the still earlier Negritoes, and the Hottentots of the south have a still larger share of the blood of the higher race.

It is not at all the settled teaching of science that these small dark-skinned men were earlier than the taller black or dusky men of Australia and Melanesia, but I regard it as much the most probable view. The apes are short in stature, Java man was short, and even Neanderthal man was shorter than modern man; while the pygmy peoples are, as we saw, invariably much lower in culture than the taller peoples. Moreover, the situation of the pygmies in the central African forests and at the extreme tip of Africa (before the Dutch dislodged them) vividly suggests that they were driven in front of an advancing taller race.

The prehistoric skulls found at Boshop and Broken Hill are relics of the early population of taller Negroid men which next flowed or trickled into Africa from the northeast. We have no people of the present day which can be regarded as a surviving part of this early race. Even black Africa has been to a great extent a "melting pot" of races, as one higher people poured in after the other and coupled with women of the lower races. But we may plausibly suppose that the earliest tall race, which passed into Africa during the Old Stone Age, was akin to the Australians. Primitive man, let us remember, was a colored man: a dusky person with black and yellow pigment under his skin. The accident of the predominance of white-men in modern times—the volumes on history will explain why I speak of it as an accident—should not give us supercilious ideas about color or persuade us to listen to superficial theories about the innate superiority of the white-skinned man. Four thousand years ago, when civilization was already one or two thousand years old, white men were just a bunch of semi-savages on the outskirts of the civilized world. If there had been anthropologists in Crete, Egypt, and Babylonia, they would have pronounced the white race obviously inferior, and might have discoursed learnedly on the superior germ-plasm or glands of colored folk.

Hence it was a people already dark of skin that entered Africa from the northeast and spread over it, driving the shorter folk with inferior weapons before them. The Broken Hill skull fairly shows us the type: a human being far lower than the Australian aboriginal of today and lower even than Neanderthal man, as we find his remains in Europe. But there was obviously a race of these taller dark-skinned people living in what we have called the central region of the early race, and, as it was a relatively congested region, it made slow progress. We might suppose it sending representatives of its earliest phase into Australia and Africa, then of a later phase into Melanesia and Africa. But it is better not to think of definite migrations. Age after age waves of this dark-skinned people in the northeast region flowed into Africa, and in the tropical conditions the layer of black pigment—the Negro still has yellow pigment also—was increasingly developed. By the time of the New Stone Age in Europe the population of Africa was, as Professor Dixon says, overwhelmingly "Negroid round a core of pygmy Negritoes"; the core being pent up in the dense forests of the Congo and, on account of its shooting poisoned arrows from the trees, as unpleasant to disturb as a nest of hornets.

## §2. THE NEGRO FAMILY.

Thus the Negro family is very mixed, and our contemptuous expression of "nigger" lumps all sorts of people of different intelligence and culture in one group. I have eaten in a "Kaffir" restaurant in Durban—nothing human is alien from me when I travel—and have lunched in London with two full-blooded Africans who discussed with me modern problems more intelligently than many members of aristocratic clubs had done. One of the two had a

European degree in philosophy and had been evicted for heresy from a chair of philosophy in a Mohammedan college; the other had been trained as an engineer at a German university and was an ex-minister (or Secretary of State) of Liberia. Between the two extremes the Kaffirs and my friends, you have every graduation of intelligence.

Broadly speaking, we divide the Africans into three groups. There are the Hamitic peoples of the north who have been most exposed to the influence of the higher races—higher in actual culture—which, as we shall see, continued to pour into Africa from the northeast. They are now mostly under the lead of the Mohammedans, and when Mohammedanism is itself educated we shall see what it will make of them. Another group are the Bantu tribes, who moved down the east of Africa as far as Uganda and mingled in places with the Hamites. Bantu, the common bond, means only that they speak a related group of languages, and a language may be adopted by any people. The purer and therefore more backward group of the Sudanese Negroes—the blacks who poured into Africa via the Sudan—occupies the west coast, and it is thus, as I said, an accident of geography that America made the acquaintance only of Negroes from this region; though I may add that the educated black engineer friend to whom I have referred was a pure-blooded West Indian, and therefore originally of this stock.

There are interesting degrees even in this west-coast region as well as amongst the Bantu. In studying the evolution of religion I found remarkably different degrees of development. The peoples of the more western and more isolated Gold Coast are much more primitive than those of the adjoining Slave Coast, and these in turn are divided into an eastern and more backward group and a western and more advanced group. You have in Africa, in fact, not only in regard to religion, but all ideas and culture, every step in the evolution of man from early Paleolithic up to the civilization of Egypt. Naturally we cannot pick out a particular people and say that its culture is a normal stage of human development, because there has been so much borrowing and overlapping. We have now a very large and fairly intimate literature about the peoples of Africa, and it brings out the very great diversity of culture. There is no "African race," properly speaking. The variety is more conspicuous than the similarity when you look closer.

Does this mean that the blacks are educable and that there is at least the possibility of realizing the dream of a black civilization in Africa which many of them already cherish? Setting aside the race problem of America, which can be solved only by actual trial and educational experiment, it seems to be probable that the majority of the Africans will prove educable. It seems to be settled by experience that some sections of the race have so long been out of the path of progress that they can no longer walk in it. They have the same brain as ourselves, but from age-long habits of life the skull seems to close on it at puberty and prevent the expansion which a higher education requires. Speaking of races, however, this ineducability has not yet been proved of any race higher than the

Australian, and only the Bushmen Hottentots and pygmies of Africa are at that level. Culture does not indicate intelligence but education. African peoples of equal intelligence have all sorts of different degrees of culture. The obvious answer to the question at the beginning of this paragraph is: Try.

### §3. WHITE AFRICANS.

During the latter part of the Ice Age a stream of the race may have poured along the northern shore of Africa. We saw before that the Mediterranean consisted at the time merely of two large and separate lakes, and there was continuous land across the straits of Gibraltar, through Sicily and Italy, to Africa, and from what is now southern Greece to Syria and Egypt. We should not look for a large population here because the chain of the Atlas Mountains stretches between the desert and the sea, and the region would be cold. Still there were people rather of the European than the Negro type. A prehistoric skull found at Gibraltar seems to be a relic of these people, and it is suspected by some that the higher race which came into Europe in the latter part of the Old Stone Age came from north Africa.

It was, however, through the usual gate in the northeast that the first great invasion of non-Negroid peoples arrived. These are, of course, the ancestors of the Egyptians. It is thought that they came in two streams from the east, one settling in upper and one in lower Egypt. It was the time of the New Stone Age. The new men either brought agriculture with them from the Mesopotamian region, where we find the wild ancestors of so many of our domesticated plants and animals, or they soon adopted it. The Nile Valley was now formed, and tribe after tribe settled on the fertile soil. Out of that seething mass of peoples, we shall see, arose the civilization of Egypt. The tribes of the north and south were at first welded into separate kingdoms, then they fused and the long rule of the Pharaohs began.

The region from which the earliest Egyptians came is, however, anything but certain, and it seems to me that there is a good deal to be said for the view that the northern Egyptians were the southern extension of the Mediterranean race, the race which grew numerous, and advanced fairly quickly, round the eastern Mediterranean lake. How the land then foundered and the Cretan and Egyptian civilizations developed separately, we shall see later.

In any case, a branch of the lighter-skinned race which dwelt in the Caucasian or Caspian region spread along the north coast of Africa and survives, with considerable blending, in what are sometimes called the white Africans of the northwest: Berbers, Kabyles, Uled Nail, etc. Most of them are swarthy enough, but in the higher latitude one finds ladies of very light skin. I have always been tempted to see in them descendants of the Europeans who pressed south at the height of the Ice Age, but the experts regard them as having entered Africa by the east. Professor Dixon concludes that the men of the Mediterranean race appear first in Egypt about the

beginning of its historical period and were the master-men in creating its civilization. That we will consider in the volume on history, The truth is that the lighter-skinned population of northern Africa is now very much mixed. The time came when the Phoenicians landed there and founded the wonderful civilization of Carthage. Later the Romans civilized the entire strip of Algeria and Morocco. Then the Vandals poured over it from Spain, and in the early Middle Ages the Arabs swept over the whole region and furnished a population even to the desert.

In studying the peoples of Africa one is particularly impressed with the fallacy of judging peoples inferior or superior on the ground of their actual culture. The Egyptians in their time had extended their culture over Nubia and much further south. The Romans created a very fine civilization in Africa—St. Augustine, the ablest thinker of his time, was born there—yet the same people who under the Romans created beautiful marble towns and had an extensive school system are the “degenerate” Algerians of today: degenerate in culture, but the same in intelligence. The Arabs, blending with the Moors, created a civilization which was in some respects even finer, yet look at the Moroccans of today! Some of the least promising in appearance of the inhabitants of the Moroccan region which Spain finds it so hard to keep—the Rif—are the actual descendants of the Spanish “Moors,” (chiefly of Arab blood) who in their day represented the high-water mark of civilization.

## CHAPTER V

## THE RACES OF ASIA.

**N**OW that we have analyzed the population of Africa and seen how fallacious it is to call it simply the home of "the black race," we are prepared to find that it is equally improper to regard Asia as the home of the yellow race. The broad distribution of the three fundamental types of color is, of course, unmistakable, and it is easy to understand. The central early race was dusky, with black and yellow pigment. Africa, being the only tropical continent, has naturally seen a predominant development of the black pigment. In what precise way the intensification of the yellow pigment produced by the glands of the skin fits a race for the Asiatic environment we cannot so easily say, but the special conditions are, essentially, extremes of cold and heat on dry elevated plains: conditions materially different from those of the black. The white European of northern Europe and the steady increase of swarthinness as we go south show just as plainly, when we take historical migrations of peoples into account, an adaptation to environment. It is only the obstinate adherents of certain theories of heredity who dissent.

But the really yellow-skinned people of Asia are, at the most, only half the population. Even in China there is every variety of skin, running to quite the European type in some places, and the three hundred million people of India are notoriously not yellow men. Every fundamental variety of the human race is represented in Asia, and a patient study of the peoples and their situation shows the foolishness of the glib characterizations of the Asiatic which one often finds in writers who fancy themselves profound. This will be clearer when we come to tell the history of the Asiatic peoples, but the prehistory, which chiefly concerns us here, will be found helpful and instructive.

## §1. FRAGMENTS OF EARLIEST TIMES.

We have already glanced at the survivors of the quite earliest human distribution in Asia, and it confirms us in looking to the extreme south for the center of dispersal. We saw that patches of the lowly Negritoes are found in the islands all along the southern coast, from Ceylon to the Philippines, and in the Malay Peninsula. We may legitimately infer that these islands were part of the mainland of Asia when man spread over this region, for such primitive peoples can hardly have had boats. It is probable that they wandered all over the south of Asia, as earliest stone man did in Europe, and were in time penned in the extreme south by a higher race.

When we come to the next phase we get the conflict of views amongst the experts to which I have several times referred. Of four recent authorities, no two agree about the early division of the race into its fundamental varieties, yet each writes his book as if he were giving his reader the settled and accepted teachings of anthropology. I am here taking points on which their theories can be reconciled or blended, and will continue to try to tell a simple story.

In Asia generally there is no trace of a long and slow passing of the race through an Old Stone Age such as we find in Europe. The land has now been considerably searched, and, though Palæolithic remains have been found in China, they may be, and seem to be, not nearly so old as the corresponding culture in Europe. But we saw that the central swarming ground of the race was southern Asia. It is curious that this has not been more thoroughly explored, yet the successive waves of men to Australia and Oceania clearly started from one or other point in the south of Asia. Obviously, then, we trace successively higher peoples, of swarthy skin, spreading along that region, driving the pygmies south, and often setting out from there for the islands. They must have circled the entire continent and reached as far as Japan and Korea, for traces of early primitive populations are recovered there. Some of the more primitive tribes which are included in the empire of India are patches of these early populations.

Of later stages it is difficult to give the kind of clear and simple account we want here. The truth is that swarm after swarm of peoples developed in southern Asia and spread along the coast, and from their various blendings we get the different types of people (Burmese, Assamese, Malays, etc.) scattered over southern Asia today. It is clear also that in the course of time various peoples made the more difficult trek across the central part of the continent. The Chinese annals speak of red-headed, blue-eyed tribes living in central Asia in former times, and the Caucasian type can be traced today in China and other countries. I must refer any curious reader who wants further information to the pages of Professor Dixon, but he will find in the analysis of the people of each country little more than a technical description of the prevailing types of skulls. It will be enough for us if we get a broad understanding of the peoples of China and India.

## §2. THE MONGOL FAMILY.

A certain very pronounced physical type, with yellow skin, straight black or dark hair, high cheek bones, and more or less slanting eyes, is so persistent over northwestern Asia and in China and Indo-China that we naturally grouped all the peoples of the region in one great Mongol family. The meaning of this name is simply that the type is seen in its most pronounced form in a relatively small group called the Mongols. Until the Middle Ages these Mongols were an obscure group of the tribes of nomads who bred their herds on the borders of the Chinese Empire. Then their famous leader Genghis Khan created an empire which stretched in the

thirteenth' century from the Chinese coasts to the frontiers of Poland. Thus the Mongol became in the mind of Europe the typical Asiatic, and all peoples with the characteristic yellow skins, high cheek bones, and slanting eyes were included in a Mongol family.

It goes without saying that the modern anthropologist has split up this family into many racial elements, but there are still high authorities who decline to enter into all these refinements. Professor Elliot Smith, for instance, speaks of a primitive people living in western Asia one branch of which passed eastward onto the great grassy plains of central Asia, developed the yellow pigment just as the southern race developed black, and spread into the numerous Mongoloid families of northern and eastern Asia. The other half of the primitive race remained at the European frontier, its northern section gradually developing the characteristics of the Nordic or white race, while its southern section became the swarthy Mediterranean race.

That is a broad expression of the development which filled Asia with what we call its Mongoloid peoples, and it suffices for us. In the east, naturally, this Mongoloid race met and mingled with the already mixed peoples of the coast countries which I have described, pushed up the eastern coast, and in time, as we shall see, sent branches into Japan and Korea, and poured on into America. The Ainu or hairy folk of Japan represent the previous population, and the Mongoloid stock is blended with the Malay race from the south. Even in Thibet there is a considerable fusion of racial types.

In China itself there is a very broad distinction between the peoples of the northeast and those of the south and southwest. They form one nation, but not one people. But the conditions there are much the same as in Egypt and Mesopotamia. When the race had reached the stage of agriculture, the fertile valley of the Yang-Tse river became more desirable than the broad, dry, grassy plains on which animals had been reared, and a relative congestion of tribes followed. Here we have always the conditions of civilization, but we shall see in the historical section how civilization actually began there.

It is more useful to reflect that the physical peculiarities of the Mongoloid type are not necessarily associated with any peculiarities of character. The Chinaman of fiction, the being of melodramatic inscrutability and mysteriousness, is as purely artificial as the "conservative" Chinaman of sociologists. Educated Chinese have been, as we shall see, for more than two thousand years the least mystical and most practical of men. Even the supposed mysticism of their ancient sage Lao-Tse—his rival Kung-fu-tse, the idol of the educated Chinese, had no mysticism whatever—was not in the least the stuff which is put out under his name today; and his less realistic ideas were little esteemed.

As to the "conservatism" and "impenetrability," the geographical isolation of the Chinese from every people of equal or superior culture during most of their long history, explains why they remained at one level—a very high level. Then, when Europe burst



in upon their dignified aloofness in the nineteenth century, they were shocked by its blatant insolence and violence, yet they saw that there were elements in its culture that might be learned. The Chinese scholar does not understand us and does not, as a rule, open his mind to us, but I have met many types of Chinese who had become accustomed to us, from officials of the Chinese embassy to shopkeepers in east London, who freely reveal that their mentality and character are the same as ours.

The mass of the people are known abroad by a class that represents them only in the sense in which our sailors represent us in the ports of the world. I know no writer who has lived at least a decade in China who does not speak highly of the character of the people. But again the geographical isolation has had a most important effect. Mainly in consequence of it the Chinese language has remained at the most primitive stage—each character being a different word—and it took many years to learn to read. The Chinese had, therefore, a far more serious reason than Europeans had until recent decades to leave ninety-five percent of their five hundred million people totally uneducated. A few years ago an alphabet of the language was made for them, and they now learn to read in a few weeks. The consequence was seen at once. While Europeans held that the Chinese mind was totally different from the European, they have now to bribe the adventurous generals to prevent the most advanced political ideas of Europe from spreading. The transformation of Japan fifty years ago is an equally deadly blow at the myth of the Asiatic mind.

### §3. THE BABEL OF INDIA.

The name Hindu is just as vague as Mongol. It means literally any person who lives in Hind or India, and it covers an enormous variety of peoples, languages, and creeds: a fact which hardly surprises us when we reflect that on every hypothesis India is the nearest country to the early central home of the human race. The Veddahs of Ceylon are, as we saw, a relic of the first wave of population that spread over it. Then the succeeding races which developed in southern Asia sent contingents into India, and it takes the resources of the expert to sort out their various blendings. We do not need to follow his attempts.

A fact that stands out clearly, and is more important from our point of view, is that some time before 2000 B. C. a branch of the "Aryan" race entered India from the northwest, became the ruling caste, and led the country in the development of its historic civilization. This has been known for a century, since philologists discovered that the language of the old sacred writings was akin to the languages of Europe in their early forms. In recent years we have found a treaty which was entered into by one of the Hittite kings, in the third millennium before Christ, with some people of Asia Minor, the names of whose deities show that they were the common ancestors of the Hindus and Persians and were closely related to the ancestors of the Nordic Europeans. Some time after

that date this people divided into the ancestors of the Medes and Persians, who moved to the hills north of Mesopotamia, and the branch which trekked across Asia and entered by the mountain passes into India.

We shall see more of this in the volume on history, and it need be said here only that the invaders must have been a relatively small body and would, from our present point of view, merely contribute one more element to the great variety of races. One may compare what happened to the settling of the Normans in England. They were a small but dominating body, and the mass of the Anglo-Saxons became a sort of lower caste. India had seen so many invasions and conquests that its caste system became one of the most pronounced in the world. Even the Rajputs, however, who claim to be direct descendants of the Aryans, are proved to be of the most mixed blood. The Aryans settled on the central plains and mingled peacefully with the earlier population, and from every side other streams of alien races have continued to trickle into the seething mass.

It need hardly be said after this that to speak of a typically "Asiatic mind" in India is more unfortunate even than in the case of China. Acute observers like Rudyard Kipling, who is largely responsible for the legend that "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," had, naturally, very solid facts in support of their statements. The traditional ways of thinking in India and China were, when Europeans first came into contact with them, radically different from their own. Long isolation in an entirely different environment, and with religions which were to a great extent phallic, accounted for this. To infer that there was at the back of it a different type of mind, which would never be Europeanized, was a bit of amateur psychology on the part of poets and essayists. Modern psychology uses a very different language. In any case, the educated Hindu, who is as a rule as little mystical as the educated Chinese, is adopting European scientific and political ideas as if he were born to them. For the mass of the people there is the same formidable educational problem as in China, but even they are adopting western ideas at a rate which alarms their British rulers.

#### §4. THE SEMITES.

We have seen that the "Aryan" invasion of India was by no means the only thrust into Asia of the race or races which were developing in the region of the Caucasus and south of it. At the beginning of the Christian Era there was, however, a formidable push back from east to west across central Asia. The great Asiatic plains have at times seasons of deadly drought which cause immense displacements of peoples and have, as we shall see later, had a deep influence on the history of the world. It is enough to note here that this movement swept what we may call westerners out of Asia and gave its present population to the great area north of India and east of China.

There remains the area—now Turkey, Arabia and Persia—by which Asia connects with Africa and Europe in the south: one of the richest areas in historic memories in the world. A dozen great civilizations lived and died on that area before Europe emerged from barbarism, and, as each at one time or another became an empire, mingling scores of peoples and sometimes (as we know in the case of the Jews) bodily transplanting them, it would be impossible to sort out the racial elements today. Some of the greatest races of antiquity, such as the Sumerians who founded civilization in Mesopotamia, are, in fact, still an enigma.

We will leave these problems until we come to the historical section. On a broad view of human history or pre-history we realize that the region to the south of the Caspian Sea (now Persia), the Caucasus Mountains, and the Black Sea, has been the most heavily trodden on the whole earth. A glance at the map will show you that. From the days, probably more than a million years ago, when broods of ape-like men crawled over it to Europe, as far as Britain, to the time when the Turks swept over it to reach their present home, it has seen more pilgrims than any other part of the world. It must, as we have often seen, have been the retreat of many tribes during the Ice Age, and we will follow the simplified view that these developed into the Caucasian race, the upper section of which became the Nordic and the lower the Mediterranean race.


From this seething center came the stream which populated Egypt and civilized northeastern Africa: the stream which represented in Asia Minor the common ancestors of the Persians and Hindus (two more great civilizations): the stream which turned north (Nordics) when the Ice Age was over and contained the ancestors of the Greeks, Romans, Slavs and Germans; the stream which poured round the eastern Mediterranean and provided the Cretans (another great civilization), Etruscans, Carthaginians—the whole population of southern Europe before the "Aryans"; and the stream which poured south and provided the Syrians, Sumerians (let us say this provisionally) or Mesopotamians and Semites. It will be a wonderful chapter of the human story when all this can be traced in detail and a full and rich picture put before us.

As I said, one stream from this pool of peoples poured into Arabia. The land is mostly desert, and in this special type of environment a special type of human, the Semite, was evolved. From their harsh region the fertile Semites then began to pour in successive waves over the more fertile land to the north. How they mingled with the Sumerians and joined in the development of the civilization of Mesopotamia we shall see later. The earliest Hebrews were a branch of the race which may possibly, as its tradition says, have begun in a small group that settled at the very ancient city of Ur in Mesopotamia. But the same legends make it clear how from that time onward the Hebrews or Jews (as they became), mingled their blood with that of countless peoples, and modern racial tests show that they are now almost as mixed in blood or race as any other nation. People of narrow experience, for instance,

think that every Jew has a characteristic nose. Where research has been made in different communities of Jews it turns out that the proportion having the said type of nose may be seventy, sixty, thirty, or even only sixteen percent of the whole. Skull-tests tell the same story. It is a myth that the Jews are anything like a pure race.

## CHAPTER VI

## EUROPEAN ORIGINS.

 THE science of anthropology has not so definite an object, or so clearly defined a province as most of the other sciences. It is literally "the science of man," but a dozen other sciences are concerned with man, and someone has impatiently complained that his science of anthropology had merely "the leavings of other sciences." It is at all events still rather indefinite. To some it means the study of the evolution of the races and peoples of men, to others a study of human institutions as we find them in various stages amongst the lower peoples of the earth, and to others an analysis of the various living peoples into their racial elements, chiefly on the basis of types of skull and face.

I am leaving to the sociological part of my program the study of the evolution of such institutions as marriage, government, etc., and I do not regard the examination of skulls as falling within our program at all. We take broad conclusions of these experts and are here simply studying how the earth was peopled by successive waves of migrants. We are today hopelessly mixed in racial elements. My paternal grandparents were pure Irish; which might mean any mixture of Danish, Spanish or Anglo-Saxon blood with Celtic or Mediterranean. My maternal grandmother was "pure English" (that is to say, British-Saxon-Norman, etc.), and she seems to have married a Scotchman (another mixture). I am therefore not acutely interested in the type of skull of my children. In few places is there any approach to purity of race. The only point which is of interest for our broad educational aim is how the various continents and islands were peopled; what truth there is in the racial distinctions which people claim, and what nonsense there is in the racial superiorities in which people take pride.

## §1. RELICS OF PREHISTORIC MAN.

The first part of our study of Europe is contained in the last volume. Throughout the bulk of prehistoric time, counting from the time when man began to use tools and leave souvenirs of himself, Europe was the chief home of the race. We discover, as we saw, that a million years ago crude types of men wandered over western Europe, especially the detached part which is now England, and we have a great wealth of remains for the last three or four hundred thousand years. Many attempts have been made to find that man had just as long and interesting a story in other continents. There is even amongst many scientific men an amusing sort of national jealousy on the point. All these attempts have failed, however. Nowhere else do we find the slow and interesting succession

of the Eolithic and Paleolithic cultures, as we do in Europe; but I have already said that I believe it will be found, when it is sought, in the area from Asia Minor to Afghanistan, the swarming center of the race. The Paleolithic remains recently found in China are very scanty.

At all events some race of unknown type, but clearly far lower than the Neanderthal, wandered over Europe, and put a feeble trace of its lowly intelligence upon flints, a million or more years ago. The first spell of the Ice Age may have driven it back to the southeast, but we find two races again in western Europe between a quarter and half a million years ago: Piltdown and Mauer man. The Piltdown skull was, as I said, at first wrongly reconstructed, and there is not so much distance between these two races as used to be supposed. Those who insist that Piltdown man was "modern" in type will find it difficult to explain that there is no further trace of a "modern" type for the next three hundred thousand years. All the implements are like, or lower than, the Neanderthal type.

During all this time Europe, as the flint implements show, had a large population (for prehistoric times), and a score of skulls and skeletons of Neanderthal man give us its type. A race far lower than the Australian occupied the continent. Then several new races broke in. We find Negroid remains in the south of France, and see that there were visitors from north Africa; but this is not racially important. But we also find one or more races of slightly higher savage culture pouring over Europe, probably from the usual source in the southeast, and developing art in the caves of the last part of the Ice Age. Then, we found, a new and higher race again spreads and opens the new Stone Age, and these new men wander as far north as Scandinavia and as far west as Ireland. That is a summary of all but the last part of the pre-history of Europe.

## §2. THE MEDITERRANEAN RACE.

It is generally agreed that the men of the first part of the New Stone Age were of the Mediterranean race. One really understands it better by dropping all technicalities. What it means is, as we saw, that the inhabitants of Europe must have mainly retreated to the southeast, to the eastern end of the Mediterranean basin, during the long, last and most acute phase of the Ice Age. The population of that region became thicker than ever, and more progress was made. As the ice disappeared, streams of these men poured along southern Europe and took possession of it. This probably went on for thousands of years, and some of the later streams brought agriculture, which was developed in the region of Asia Minor.

This Mediterranean race gave Greece, Italy and Spain their first populations (after the Cave Men), and no doubt spread further north. It rose to a great height in the civilization of Crete, which sent colonies all round that part of the Mediterranean and seems to have inspired the pre-Roman or Etruscan civilization of Italy. We shall see more about this in history, but let me remind you of the great geological event which must have profoundly influenced

the situation: the formation of the present Mediterranean Sea. Great areas of land on which the Mediterranean men lived passed under water. It is suggested that the melting of the masses of ice raised the level of the Atlantic so much that it burst through at Gibraltar and made the Mediterranean Sea, as we know it. Geologists, at all events, can clearly prove that somewhere about or after the end of the Ice Age this great inrush of water, which may be the germ of man's early legend of a Deluge, took place. It seems to me to throw all the more light upon the pressing back of the Mediterranean people into Europe, Syria and Mesopotamia and Egypt, and the development of civilization in those regions. Crete is, of course, a fragment of the lost land, and we shall see later what a wonderful civilization it bore.

### §3. THE ALPINE RACE.

The tragedies of one age are often seen in the perspective of time to have been the agencies of progress. Even today the race at large is not the master of its fate which it ought to be, but is rather in the position of a stupid or refractory child, driven onward by the lash. The Ice Age had led to the necessary conditions for the birth of an elementary civilization. Possibly the flooding of the Mediterranean had helped in the process by adding to the congestion of peoples. The new race wiped out the old or Neanderthal and inaugurated barbarism; which, unless we propose to alter the meaning of accepted terms, is the stage of culture between savagery and civilization. In Crete this barbarism was passing into civilization about five thousand years ago.

Some time before that, apparently about the middle of the New Stone Age, another race broke into Europe from the east and fought its way across the continent as far as Britain. This is known as the Alpine race. Some scholars believe that a first wave of it came by the north shore of the Black Sea and the valley of the Danube and a second race came by sea to the southern coast. We will stick to the simple fact that this Alpine race pretty certainly came from Asia and quite certainly cut its way across Europe, pinning the Mediterranean folk as a whole in the southern countries.

The Alpine people are particularly remarkable as the builders of the great stone monuments, as we saw in the last volume. They seem to have been one of the many powerful races developed in the Caucasic region, or to the east of it, and to have spread eastwards to India and westwards to the British Isles. They were at one time known as the Celtic peoples, but that name has led to endless confusion and is now little used in science. It is true that the most western extension of this Alpine race—it is best represented north of the Alps—brought to the British Isles the Celtic language which survives in Wales, Scotland and Ireland, but the wonderful "Celtic temperament" which artists and literary men treasure in the Irish race is a myth. The Irish and Scots are mainly not Celts or Alpines but people of the Mediterranean race who adopted the Gaelic language. The Gauls who poured into France are regarded as real

Celts (Alpine), but such floods of northerners afterwards poured into the country that it is almost as fair to call the French Teutonic as to call them "Celtic" or "Latin." In Brittany, however, we have an overflow of the (largely Alpine or Celtic) Britons or Brythons who crossed the sea when the Anglo-Saxons came in.

#### §4. THE ARYAN RACE.

Europe had now got two out of the three races which form the material of the bulk of its present population. One mainly occupied the south and is still conspicuous there. The other mainly occupied the central regions. It remained for a third race to become the masters of the north and from the north to send constant streams downward toward the Mediterranean. This is appropriately called the Nordic race, but it was, as we saw, only a branch of a larger family which had originally included the ancestors of the Persians and Hindus. The classic name for the whole group is "the Aryan race."

I have used this phrase several times with reserve because most anthropologists now avoid it, and some, with the usual dogmatism, tell you that it is quite discredited. They propose the name Indo-Europeans—which ignores the Persian branch. But the latest and most authoritative European writer on the subject, Professor V. Gordon Childe, says that Indo-European is a "clumsy" expression and frankly entitles his book *The Aryans* (1926). Because the name was applied only by the Hindus and Persians to themselves is no reason why we should not apply it to their cousins. These little differences do not concern us much, but the reader may, unless I explain, be puzzled in turning to other literature.

As Professor H. H. Bender (*The Home of the Indo-Europeans*) reminds us, and we have already seen, it was the close similarity of words in the languages of all these peoples, in their old forms especially, which led to the inclusion of them in one group. I elsewhere gave an illustration from the word *daughter*. Professor Bender takes the words *honey* and *mead* (an ancient intoxicating drink made from honey). *Honey* is in Greek and Latin *mel*, in Gothic *milip*, in Anglo-Saxon *milisc* and *mil* (*mildew* is "honey-dew"), in the old Cornish language *mel*, in Irish *mil*, in Armenian *melr*, etc. *Mead* is much the same in Sanskrit (the ancient Hindu speech), Old Bulgar, Lithuanian, Lettish, Gothic, Old German, Old Icelandic, Dutch, Welsh, Old Irish, and Anglo-Saxon. These two words seem also to confirm the theory that the original home of the Aryans was eastern Europe (most probably Russia). Bees are confined to particular areas in Asia, but are found everywhere in eastern Europe. Professor Childe and other authorities are more disposed to see "the home of the Aryans" in north Germany.

As we can gather from the names which are common to the group, the ancestral Aryans were herdsmen on the great plains, and some of the experts conclude that the family held together until about 3000 B. C. Now we have seen that somewhere about that



time the Indo-Persian branch was already in Asia Minor, and they had certainly not come from the far north. Probably what happened was that there were three chief centers of population during the last phase of the Ice Age: one south of the Caucasus range which became the Mediterranean race, one east of the Caspian, which became the Alpine race, and one, the Aryans, north of the Caucasus.

Of the latter one branch passed down into Asia Minor while the main body, now that Europe was again a mass of forest and herbage, moved slowly northward. As it proceeded and multiplied, another large group of tribes turned south, made its way across and round the Macedonian hills, and settled as the ancestors of the Greeks. How these semi-barbaric early Greeks mingled with the existing inhabitants and destroyed the Cretan civilization we shall see in history.

The ancestral Greeks seem to have turned south between 2000 and 1500 B. C. The next migration was of the tribes representing the ancestors of the Romans, who reached Italy, mingled with and dominated its Mediterranean Celtic inhabitants, and formed the Latin race. Then the ancestral Slavs separated from the ancestors of the Germanic and Scandinavian peoples, the latter pushing up to the Baltic region and the Slavs remaining in Russia, whence streams of them poured back to the Balkans. Some of these again mingled with later Asiatic peoples, (to form the Bulgars), and others blended with the Roman colonists (of whom there can be little blood left), and proudly called themselves the Rumans ("Romans").

It is not supposed that these Nordic people were a pure race even before they scattered over Europe and mingled with all its various inhabitants. They seem to have included a blend of Mediterranean and the older Paleolithic stock. Once they began their historic wanderings they picked up new blood everywhere. Still it is interesting to have sorted out the three races which chiefly make up the population of Europe—the Finns, Turks, Gypsies, Magyars are later invaders from Asia—and to notice in certain regions the predominance of the tall-blue-eyed, fair-haired Nordic, the medium-height, gray-eyed brunette Alpine, or the shorter and darker skinned Mediterranean, with black eyes and black or very dark hair. The actual mixtures and migrations of peoples just before the history of each nation begins we will tell in the historical volumes.

## CHAPTER VII

## THE PEOPLES OF AMERICA.

**I**T is an open question whether purity of race, if there is such a thing, is a desirable quality or whether it does not lead to a lessening of vitality. Our science of embryology is still too imperfect to give convincing answers to such questions, but in view of the historical facts there is ground to believe that the blending of entirely different stocks is, if one of them be not a very backward race, advantageous. I sometimes wonder if the problem of races which are on the border line of educability will not, in the more highly organized state of the future, be solved by encouraging mixed breeding. One is at once assured that from end to end of America the half-breed is morally inferior, but there are quite obvious reasons in his environment—in the general attitude toward him, for instance—why he should be, and there is not the least reason in the physiology of mixed breeding why character should deteriorate. This, however, is a problem of the future. We are trying to understand the present.

But I open with this note in approaching the population of America for one reason which is obvious and another which will surprise most people. That racial streams have in modern America reached their maximum of fusion is known to all. Since the time when the Spaniards, Dutch, English, French and Portuguese landed, and brought millions of Africans to work for them, the fusion has gone on increasingly until in the United States of today we have an unprecedented mixture; and in support of my view about mixing races I may justly point to its high quality and efficiency.

But practically everybody is under the impression that until the Spaniards arrived one pure-blooded race, the American Indians or Amerinds, occupied the country from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego. What is an "Indian"? If you reflect, you realize at once that it means merely an inhabitant of America, because the lands across the Atlantic were simply known to the early Europeans as "the West Indies" and their people "Indians," just like the inhabitants of the East Indies or India. Still, there seemed to be a similarity of physical type everywhere.

Modern authorities insist that we can no more think of a pure race in America than in Asia. It is, in fact, amusing to read the very long apology which Professor Dixon prefixes to his analysis of the people of America. When you find him claiming that, on the modern racial tests, there are amongst the American Indians themselves Mediterranean, Caspian, Proto-Australoid and Proto-Negroid elements, to quote his learned expressions, you understand why he expects to arouse antagonism! Let us put it more simply. We saw that there was an extreme confusion of races in eastern Asia.

Streams from the west—different and successive peoples, including even blue-eyed Caucasians—poured as far as China and there they mingled with a population born of three or four distinct streams, besides constant trickles from the south. The tribes which entered America were, therefore, already very far from being racially pure when they set out from Asia.

### §1. ARE THERE PRE-INDIAN PEOPLE?

Professor Kroeber suggests that it was something like ten thousand years ago when the Asiatics began to come over. It is the figure I had suggested in an earlier volume, and it will do as a working supposition until there is clearer evidence. In the last volume I told how recent finds of remains in America are claimed by a few to be pre-Indian, and that even some who, as all the leading authorities do, regard them as early Indian, think that they put back the date of the Indian invasions.

There is here a serious difficulty which seems to be generally overlooked. The ice sheet may have melted a little earlier in America than in Europe, but when one recalls the climate of northern Alaska—all admit, of course, that the Indians came by that route—one wonders whether the nomad people of Asia would or could venture so far north until the region had become at least not colder than it now is. If twenty thousand years ago the soil of Illinois was buried under ice a mile thick, what would Alaska be like? Even if we suppose that the first migrants had boats and came over via the Aleutian Islands, this must have been either after the end of the Ice Age, for the ocean would be frozen solid and the continent an uninhabitable waste of ice and snow, or before the beginning of its last and greatest phase. If we suppose the latter, if we imagine man entering America a hundred thousand years ago, we separate these early migrants by tens of thousands of years from the later Indians.

We saw in the last volume that some recent finds in Oklahoma are said to show the presence of man in America more than three hundred thousand years ago, yet it is admitted that these bone implements have a resemblance to those of the early Indians. It is not for me to discuss these, but I may point out that, if the claims were admitted, then man in America was leagues in advance of what he was anywhere else in the world, yet fifty or more years of keen geological research has brought to light only these few disputed traces of him, while Europe abounds everywhere in remains. It does not seem at all likely. I think it probable that the migrations were seven or eight thousand years ago, before prehistoric man in Asia tamed the horse and before the Strait was as wide as it is now; for when the history of China opens all knowledge of America had disappeared.

### §2. THE ESKIMO.

It seems, therefore, advisable to follow the lead of the great majority of the experts in the United States and consider that the

peopling of America from Asia began some time after the close of the Ice Age. It is generally thought that the Eskimos are survivors of the earlier migrants. If this is the case, one may suppose that the land was still in the grip of intense cold, and the early invaders were already accustomed to arctic conditions.

Many years ago it was suggested that the Eskimos were the survivors or descendants of the Cave Men of Europe. They are, as everybody knows, not unskillful at drawing on bone, and they send quite elaborate messages by means of such drawings. This year again some of the French authorities on prehistoric man have returned to the theory. They claim that certain skulls of Cave Man have proved, at a recent careful comparison, to agree so closely with the skull of the Greenland Eskimo that the theory is more probable than ever. They suppose that the men of the Magdalenian race, pressed by the men of the New Stone Age, retreated north with the ice and live today in the Eskimo. This view is often represented as a quite discredited idea of half a century ago; but it now has distinguished advocates in Europe.

On the other hand, the affinities of the Eskimo to the American Indians are so striking that it seems better to regard them as migrants from Asia who were driven by pressure into the far north or came over at so early a date that they never knew any other than arctic conditions. There is the usual difficulty as regards their affinities with the Indians, that any people can borrow a language and culture, but the physical type also is, like the Indian type, strikingly Mongoloid. We may follow the prevailing opinion and regard them as an early contingent of the invaders from Asia.

In their isolation they have naturally remained at a low level of culture. America, like every other continent, illustrates what I have called the law or principle of human cultures. In the extreme north and extreme south, as in the dense forests of South America, you get the lowest culture. In the narrow central part, where the maximum clash of tribes obviously occurred, you get the civilization of the Mayans. It is a matter of geography, not of inferiority. Let me add that the Eskimos are by no means savages, and there is much of interest in their moral and religious ideas. One of the early explorers, who knew their tongue, tried to explain to them that there was a war amongst the superior white folk. He did not succeed in getting them to understand what a war is.

### §3. THE AMERICAN INDIANS.

American and Indian mean, as I have already said, the same thing: an inhabitant of what the later Middle Ages called the West Indies. America was at first thought to be an extension of Asia. The only point of drawing a distinction between the two is to mark off the descendants of European invaders from those of the Asiatic invaders. From the scientific point of view it has the disadvantage of leading people to think that one pure-blooded race occupied America until the first Spaniards arrived.

Some modern scholars would go rather to the opposite extreme and declare that there was, even before the sixteenth century, as great a diversity of peoples in America as in Europe. But it can hardly be held that there were in America three racial strains so strongly marked as the Mediterranean, Alpine and Nordic in Europe, and there was—at least we have found this probable—no earlier Paleolithic population for the invaders to mix with, as there was in Europe. Yet it is clear that the Indian peoples grew to be as distinct from each other as are the Germans, Dutch and English in Europe, and one might even say that to compare these separate Indian peoples of North America with certain peoples in the south is to discover an even greater diversity. In Mexico alone the Indians speak more than fifty different languages today.

A writer on Mexico has said: "Iberian (Mediterranean), Semite, Hamite, Goth and Vandal, Roman and Celt (Alpine), mingled their blood in that stream of brave and adventurous men who first set eyes on Yucatan in 1517." This was the "pure blood" of Castile, and the blood of the Aztecs and Mayans was little less mixed. One has only to imagine the Mongoloid peoples coming over in successive waves, probably centuries apart, or Mongoloid peoples from different parts of Asia passing over. The diversity of languages alone in America warns us to take the word "Indian" in a very large sense. In no other continent is there such a variety of languages spoken. Philologists have sorted out a hundred and fifty families or "stocks" of languages. Some of these are being found to be related to each other, but it seems likely that there are well over a hundred sets of languages as distinct from each other as the Aryan and Semitic.

Here it is neither possible nor advisable to enter into detail. In so far as the Indians illustrate the evolution of institutions, we shall see a little more about them when we come to sociology. The general view is enough here: the origin of the peoples and the reasons for the very great inequalities of their culture. As in regard to other peoples, it is not a question of innate inferiority and superiority. One might almost say that it is a question of geography pure and simple. The geography of America put the conditions of progress in the narrow neck across which all streams of population had to pass from north to south. There, just before the Christian Era, civilization first appeared. In a later volume on the history of America, we shall, of course, see all that the experts can tell us of the evolution of these Indian civilizations. It may, however, be advisable to state here in anticipation that the remarkable cliff dwellings of the Pueblo Indians are not, as is sometimes supposed, previous to the Mayan civilization, but much later. Their best period is now, as we shall see, said to be from about 500 to 1100 A. D.

#### §4. THE STRANGE PEOPLES OF SOUTH AMERICA.

Ten years ago in tracing the evolution of religious ideas by means of the stages which we find in the lower races, I leaned to the theory that there were quite early perhistoric men in America.

It is often said that the "Fuegians" are amongst the lowest peoples on earth. This leads to confusion, as there are three distinct peoples, at quite different stages of culture, in the island. Of these the Yahgans are the lowest, and in their culture they singularly resemble the lowly peoples I described in the second chapter. They are generally naked even on the wintry shores of Tierra del Fuego, and live in the most miserable conditions. They have no religion or belief in spirits, as we are assured by the early missionary Bridges, who spent twenty years amongst them, and no idea of moral law, no tribal organization or totems (both so marked amongst the Indians), and only feeble traces of magic.

It will be seen, therefore, that I am prejudiced in favor of, not against, the view that early prehistoric man reached America. Yet it troubled me always that in physique—I have excellent photographs of them—they have not the least resemblance to the Negrito peoples of our second chapter, but have every appearance of being degenerate Indians. This is, I believe, the opinion of all authorities in the United States, though in South America some of the professors even hold that their continent is actually the cradle of the race. We should quite expect that the earlier and more primitive tribes to come over from Asia would be either exterminated, absorbed, or driven to extreme regions. The situation is the same as in Asia and Africa. Hence the south Patagonian Indians are far lower than those found further north, and it is natural to find the lowest of all in the island at the tip: as we found the Tasmanians and the Veddahs. In the case of the Yahgans we must suppose that there has been, in their particularly hard conditions of life, actual degeneration. No other Indian people has the elementary culture which I described. Even the Eskimos have an elaborate religion.

It is equally natural that we should find the next lowest Indians after the Patagonian, in the forests of the Amazon region. These correspond in their situation to the pygmies of Africa. Some of them have tribes, chiefs, agriculture, villages, pottery, etc., though the experts assure us that they have borrowed a good deal. Others, however, such as the Botocudos of Brazil, have neither agriculture nor tribal organization, and are savages of a low order. If there has not been degeneration here also, some of the migrants from America must have been of a very low type.

Similarly in the islands off the coast. The Caribs have actually given their name to one of the most repulsive practices of primitive man, cannibalism. It was at first "Caribanism." Amongst the Caribs and some other Indian peoples we also find one of the most curious aberrations of lower peoples, the couvade. It means that when a baby was born the mother went about her work as usual, and the man took to bed and received the congratulations of his neighbors. Curiously enough, there was the same practice amongst the Basques of the Pyrenean district in Europe until the eighteenth century, and as they are a fragment of the early Neolithic population of Europe, one wonders how general it was. The finding of this singular custom in two parts of the world which certainly did


not borrow from each other, confirms the evolutionary theory: that the mind can work out the same practices and institutions in different and independent places.

How the northern Indians of South America passed upward to the level of civilization will be told in history. The geographical position gives you the general understanding, which suffices here. We need no mysterious communication with Egypt. America evolved its own civilization, and when the full story can be told in detail of that wonderful march from Alaska to Peru, and the many successive civilizations that sprang up along the route, it will be one of the most stirring chapters of the human epic.

Does it follow that all the Indians are educable? In the north, or north of Mexico, the problem is being settled otherwise. Of the 400,000 Indians of the United States and Canada, we are told that probably a third are "breeds." In Mexico and elsewhere certainly the vast majority are quite educable, and the famous missions of the Jesuits in Paraguay proved, however we may criticize them in some respects, the educability of much lower tribes. As to the lowest, the situation is the same as we have seen elsewhere. There are ineducable peoples, but a humane generation will patiently and scientifically try all its resources on them before it puts that stigma of despair on any particular people.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THE EVOLUTION OF LANGUAGE.

 ONE of the first fallacies perpetrated and detected in the classification of peoples was the idea that men are related to each other by race because they speak the same language. We have within historic, and even recent, times seen so many instances of a people adopting the language of a superior or a dominating race that we ought to be sufficiently on our guard against this fallacy. Yet it is extremely common in a literature which, precisely because it is not scientific, gives the majority of people their erroneous ideas about the character of races and their respective inferiorities and superiorities. We read about the hot blood of the Latin race, the Celtic temperament, the mercurial Frenchman, the mystic East, the lazy Spaniard, the peaceful Slav, and so on. In most cases it is not even true that the people whom we describe by an epithet have the general character which we give them, and in very few cases is there the blood or race which we suppose.

The Italian, for instance, is not more hot-blooded, but has simply lived longer than most European races under a lax government which failed to check the use of the knife; and though his speech is a debased Latin, there is little blood of the ancient Roman people left in the country. Italy has a Mediterranean population very largely mixed with Alpine, Gothic, Lombard, Greek, and even Asiatic blood. The Andalusian is not the merry and light-o'-love person he is depicted in fiction, and he has almost no Moorish blood in his veins. The Frenchman is not more impulsive than the Englishman or more sentimental than the German, and he is as logical as either; and his "race" is so mixed that we could not tell it in a word. The Irishman has not a Celtic temperament, though he has a Celtic language, and is not witty. There is, in fact, no Celtic temperament in the mystic and artistic sense, for, where the Celtic blood is most pronounced in Europe, the temperament is the opposite of what we commonly call Celtic. However, we have seen how very mixed in race all the best known peoples of the modern world are, and now we must see something about their languages.

## §1. DO ANIMALS SPEAK?

The ancient thinkers felt that they marked off men clearly from all other living things when they defined him as being endowed with reason and speech. Reason, we have found, is not the exclusive property of man. It is a question of degree. Modern psychologists have invented very ingenious tests by which we can tell whether the behavior of an animal which is, for instance, an



closed in a box with certain means of escaping or of getting food, is purely impulsive or shows initiative and intelligence. These repeated experiments have put it beyond question that dogs, monkeys and apes "reason" their way out of a situation; and if we take for comparison with them, not an educated American, but a member of one of the lowest peoples described in this book, we see that there is the same reason in all the higher mammals in different stages of evolution.

Whether animals have "speech" is still disputed amongst men of science, but the dispute is largely a matter of words. For speech in the ordinary sense of the word you need not only a larynx—and even the bird, as I said in an earlier volume, has not this, but a different modification of the windpipe—but the development of a certain area of the brain which controls the organs of speech. It is, we shall see, doubtful if early prehistoric man had this brain center developed.

That animals do convey information to each other, and in most cases by sound, is admitted. Ants communicate in some way by means of their antennae or "feelers," but sound, the cry, is the chief means of communication. In the simplest cases it is obvious that the sound is merely an instinctive expression of the animal's feeling, and it is therefore not a communication in the proper sense of the word. The croak of the frog, the chirrup of the cricket, the call of the bird, the neigh of the horse, the roar of the lion, and so on, may let a mate know something, but we must not suppose that the animal is "calling to his mate" in the objective sense in which a human being would. It expresses a feeling which it has at the moment, as the cat does when it purrs or the canary when it sings.

The question of speech is therefore confined to a few of the higher orders of animals. There seems now to be no doubt that social animals, even social birds like the crow, have definite warning sounds; not merely cries which express the alarm of the particular animal, but cries for the definite purpose of warning the group. The psychological analysis of this is very difficult, for we are always inclined to interpret it on the lines of our own experience. But even if we suppose that it is an instinctive cry which the others understand, just as the female understands the croak of the male frog, and therefore know that there is danger—not by reasoning, but by a simple association of impressions—it is a kind of speech. Special students have studied the sounds made by monkeys and apes, and have concluded that they, especially the latter, have a large number of special sounds which express definite emotions and are understood as such by the others. A French investigator lived in a cage amongst the apes of Africa for a long time to study their "language," as he decisively calls it.

## §2. THE ORIGIN OF SPEECH.

Recent writers on language admit all these facts, but generally object that they do not represent true speech, or are not properly equivalent to human speech. One authority objects that the animals

never make sentences out of their sounds, but this means only that their speech is of the lowest order. Others object that in no case has the sound a "meaning." For instance, the Veddah, one of the lowest of humans, calls a spirit a "yaka." This is not a natural or instinctive cry or grunt on his part, but a sound, meaningless in itself, which is understood by others because a meaning has been attached to it. It is impossible to prove that even the highest apes have significant sounds in this sense, and therefore we may conclude that, while animals certainly do communicate to each other by their sounds, they cannot in any case be shown to have speech in the form in which we find it amongst even the lowest of human peoples.

But we have already seen that thirty or forty million years of evolution lie between the level of the chimpanzee and the stage of human development represented by the lowest living humans. And as these lowest existing peoples all have language—though some have clearly borrowed or adopted it—even when they have no moral or religious ideas or social forms, they do not help us to understand its evolution. That it was evolved, of course, could be proved from these lowest languages, if anybody doubted it. Some of them have no common nouns, no means of expressing general or collective ideas. They have only a few hundred simple sounds for concrete mental images of objects. The language advances with the mind.

From the primitive level which we find in the Tasmanians, in fact, an interesting story of the actual evolution of language up to the elaborate structure of a modern language could be put together. The story is still often repeated in unscientific literature that a peasant has only three or four hundred words all his life. Modern writers on language question this and say that it is merely a loose estimate, not based on research. It has been proved on scientific inquiry that the vocabulary of an American boy of three contains between six and seven hundred words. Most people, it is said, get through life with three to four thousand words. People who read much have a vocabulary of 30,000 to 75,000 words, while our modern dictionary has about 400,000. The evolution of language in this sense—from a low level upward—can easily be traced. It advances with intelligence and culture. One Indian language in America has only 7,000 words. The highest, the Nahuatl, has 27,000. English (though a compound of three languages—British, Anglo-Saxon, and Norman) had probably not more than ten thousand words in the days of Chaucer, and it has now more than forty times as many.

But to get beyond the most primitive known languages and understand how speech in the strict sense, as a use of significant sounds, began, is difficult. We can only speculate. One source of words is clear. Take such words as boom, roar, splash, drip, swish, bang, etc.; and they are very numerous in primitive speech. The sound imitates the action it expresses. But this does not take us very far. The "bow-wow theory," as the attempt to make this the chief source of speech was called, very soon breaks down. Others

suggest that having a set of sounds (something like the chanties of sailors) to accompany the step on the march or the hands at work may have been a source of speech; but this puts the social life of man too early. Many words, no doubt, were at first, like our interjections (oh, ah, phew, etc.), instinctive sounds expressing hunger, thirst, pain, pleasure, greeting, etc., and this is, perhaps, the most helpful suggestion as to the origin of language. But the whole question is very difficult, and there is no general theory which could profitably be put here.

The truth is that it occurred before the race had reached the stage of our lowest savages, and doubtless it was an extremely slow and gradual development. I said in the last volume that the lower jaw of Neanderthal man shows that the tongue-muscle was little developed in comparison with ours. This does not exactly show that he had no speech, but is compatible with a rudimentary sort of language. Man was then beginning to be social, and social life would lead to a development of speech. Another way of testing prehistoric man in regard to speech is to examine the inside of the skull where it rests on the speech-area of the brain. The skull more or less reproduces the size of the evolutions or folds of the layer of gray matter. But the indications in prehistoric skulls are not very clear. Of two recent writers on language one, Professor Kroeber, says that early Paleolithic skulls indicate speech, while the other, Professor Vendryes, the most authoritative recent writer on language, says that the skull of Neanderthal man proves that he had no speech or only very rudimentary speech. This seems to be correct.

### §3. THE EVOLUTION OF THE ALPHABET.

It is much easier to trace the evolution of written than of spoken language, for it took place very much later. Man had had speech for certainly something more than a hundred thousand years before he got the idea of speaking at a distance, so to say, by writing messages. Amongst some of the lower peoples, it is true, various means were evolved of sending messages beyond the range of the voice. In certain parts of Africa the drum is used, and quite elaborate messages can be sent over a whole region by the drummers. In other cases—amongst some of the Indians, for instance—the hands and arms were used much as boy scouts or sailors may use them today when they have no signalling flags. Nearer to written speech are the “wampums” (elaborate patterns in bits of shell) of the Indians and the “quippos” (cords with colored strands and a great variety of significant knots) of the Peruvians.

But the real beginning of written language is the drawing of the object. Cave Men were, as we saw, great artists, but we nowhere find amongst the remains of their culture drawings of objects put together in a series to convey a message. In this respect the Eskimo, who can send quite lengthy messages by drawings on a bone, are far superior to Professor Osborn's race of genuises, the Cro-Magnon men. The idea is not exactly the same as a form of

mild "intellectual" entertainment which was once popular in rural districts—the rebus—but the drawing looks much the same. Every picture tells a story, literally.

We see this clearly enough if we begin at the other end, at our own written language. We use an alphabet, (Alpha and Beta), and it is substantially the same all over the world. The Germans still conservatively print in Gothic characters, but these are our familiar characters crabbed by the monk copyists of the Middle Ages. The Slavs differ in some letters, because they learned the alphabet from the Greeks. Most of us derive it from the Romans, who got it from the Greeks at an early date when the present Greek forms had not been fully developed. The Hebrews have quite different forms of the letters (used also in Yiddish, a mixture mainly of German and Hebrew), but these forms were mainly developed in the first ten centuries of the Christian Era, not before the Greek and Roman. Syriac, Arabic and Hindu characters are only different modifications of the same alphabet.

In short, the alphabet is the same everywhere with local variations. The Greeks, who gave it to Europe, said that they got it from Phoenicia, but they greatly modified and improved it. The Hebrews and other Palestinian peoples do not express the vowels by letters. Originally they wrote only the consonants, writing from right to left of the page and beginning at what we call the back of the book. The Greeks changed the method of writing and made vowels out of some of the signs used by the Phoenicians. Letters of the alphabet easily change from country to country. English people today do not know the alphabet of their fathers, for they pronounce the "ye" in the old phrase, still quoted at Christmas (in "ye Yule log," etc.,) as if it were y e. It is not "y," but the old Anglo-Saxon for th. "Ye" is simply "the."

Scholars have traced all these alphabets back to some Palestinian people of about 1000 B. C. Experts dispute whether it was the Hebrews (which does not seem likely now that we know the truth about their early history) or the Phoenicians or another people; and whether the letters were based upon the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Hittite, or the Cretan written characters. An ancient Greek historian, Diodorus, says plainly that the Cretans claimed to have taught it to the Phoenicians. As nobody knew until a quarter of a century ago that there had ever been a civilization in Crete, and perhaps because of the ancient Greek proverb "All Cretans are liars," this statement of Diodorus did not receive much attention. It is now highly probable, as we shall see in the historical section, that the Cretans did invent an alphabet, and as the "Philistines" of Palestine were Cretan refugees, the Phoenicians probably got it from them. Then the Greeks and all the rest of the world got it from the Phoenicians, the great navigators and merchants of about 1000 B. C.

But we have a step further to go. The letters of the alphabet were not arbitrary signs made up like those used in stenography. They were modifications of older characters. It has been suggested that they were first more or less arbitrary marks (of ownership,

etc.) on objects: like the marks on rare pottery or like your monogram. The far more probable opinion is that they are modifications of some of the picture-characters with which everybody is familiar in Egyptian and Mexican hieroglyphics. The "cuneiform" (wedge-shaped) characters of the Babylonians are, as we shall see in history, similar characters simplified by the practice of writing on clay, and the Chinese fall in the same category. All were originally just drawings of objects.

Now in the Hebrew alphabet, which is in its original form one of the oldest, about a dozen of the names of the letters are names of objects. Aleph (A) is an ox, Beth (B) is a house (as in Bethlehem, or Beth-Lechem, house of bread), and so on. The meaning of others may be lost, but we have evidence enough. The original A was, apparently, a drawing of an ox, B a drawing of a house, D of a door, I or J of a hand, N of a fish, R of the mouth, and so on.

On the other hand, Chinese or Egyptian picture writing—for the Chinese characters are conventionalized pictures, as is in the most ancient form clear enough—is not, as is commonly supposed, picture writing in the literal sense, like that of the Eskimo. Each character does not stand for the object of which it is or was a picture. The Chinese writing represents sounds, but syllables or monosyllabic words, not single letters, and there is a good deal of combination. Similarly with Egyptian. The little picture of an eye or a hawk does not mean an eye or a hawk. The characters soon came to stand for sounds, and so one character could have various meanings. If, for instance, "eye" and "I" were Egyptian, the same character, an eye, could represent both, as well as the same sound in combinations. In the end a character might represent only the first sound of the word, or a letter; just as we saw in the case of the Hebrew letters. Then from the large number of characters for B, or words beginning with B, one was eventually selected. The later Egyptians used, except for sacred purposes, a script in which the characters had lost nearly all resemblance to the original hieroglyphics. It was the discovery of an inscription in this "demotic" Egyptian and in Greek as well as in hieroglyphics which gave the key to the latter.

The key to the cuneiform script of the Babylonians and Assyrians was found in the same way. No such key has been found in the case of the Mexican hieroglyphics (in which only the numbers can be recognized) or the Cretan inscriptions. But in the Cretan remains, as we pass from the earliest to the later, we see clearly that the script developed as I have described in the case of Egypt, and even earlier than in Egypt. When, if ever, the clue to the language is found, we shall have an interesting light on one of the most remarkable of the old civilizations. In its beginnings, about five thousand years ago, it uses a sort of hieroglyphic. It illustrates the evolution of written language from picture writing. Long before 1500 B. C. the writing was a representation of sounds, and when the civilization was ruined by the early Greeks, part of the race took this to Palestine. A few centuries later the Phoenician alphabet was in use, and a few centuries later again the Greeks copied and improved it.

## CHAPTER IX

## FAMILIES OF LANGUAGES.

**T**HE kind of evolution which we can fairly trace in the case of written language has, of course, been sought in the case of spoken language, but the results are vague and speculative. The science of the nineteenth century approached the task with great confidence. When the ancient Persian and Hindu languages were brought into line with those of Europe, philologists set out to link together languages in all parts of the world. The Chinese language attracted attention by its peculiarities. Instead of having an alphabet of a score of letters which, in different combinations, could represent all the sounds or words in the language, each word had its own character. Many of the characters are compound or combined, but originally each was a word of one syllable and had no inflections. "Shin mo," for instance, is "holy mother"; Pe-King is the "city of books," and so on; while, instead of having our various ways of saying great, greater, greatest, greatly, etc., you had to give peculiar shades of expression to the one word "tah".

Philologists said that this was the original form of all speech: a string of monosyllabic sounds without inflections. The next stage was supposed to be found in Asiatic languages like the Turkish, in which the monosyllabic words are "stuck together," or the speech is called "agglutinative". The third stage was the one with which we are familiar: inflectional speech. But that all languages go through these stages is not now admitted. They are different types of languages, which we find in different parts of the world, not necessarily stages in the evolution of every language. Philologists have done a great deal of research in tracing the development of forms of speech, as one may read in the recent work of Professor J. Vendryes (*Language*, 1925), but it is much too technical to be considered here. We will conclude with a few illustrations of the evidence for the relationship of various groups of languages.

## §1. THE WEAR AND TEAR OF WORDS.

It is an historical truth well within our knowledge that different groups of the human family alter their languages in the course of time. One finds it far from easy to read Chaucer, the English poet of the fourteenth century, and one has to be a special student of the subject to read Caedmon, the poet of the seventh century. A very large number of the ancient words have died out and have been replaced by foreign words which were adopted. The Norman invasion brought many alternatives. What the common folk knew as calf or pig, for instance, was known only in its table appearance to the Norman masters and became "veal" or "pork," from the French

for calf and pig. Later came the Renaissance and the fashion of coining long words from the Latin, and with the tremendous expansion of culture, industry and commerce in modern times came the need to coin, chiefly with Latin and Greek elements, tens of thousands of new words.

All this is well known, and it is more interesting to reflect on the different evolution of the English language in America and England. One of the important sources of new words in a language is the use of "slang," and of the countries fairly known to me none is so inventive and expressive in its slang as America. The psychology of this habit would be well worth study and might throw light on the earlier evolution of language. A good deal of the slang which is constantly invented is, of course, merely foolish or fantastic, but there is often a vigor or expressiveness in the new word which forces the literary gentlemen to adopt it. I confess that I always read with great pleasure American fiction with slangy speakers. One result is that the literary American English is, in spite of our close modern communications between different countries, showing a distinct shade of difference from what I may call English literary English, and is in its best instances stronger, terser and more expressive.

Naturally this is a development for which you have to look, but it helps you to understand how, when Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, Flemings, Germans and English, went their separate ways two thousand years ago, in an age when there was no inter-communication, their originally common language slowly became six different languages. The way in which totally different dialects then grew up in different parts of the same country is a further illustration. But the ancestors of the Slavs, Romans and Greeks had departed from the common group ages before the Teutonic tribes split up, and we naturally find that their speeches have diverged still further from the original model.

In each case, moreover, the branch of the Aryan race settled in a country which already had a language of its own, and it naturally adopted words. The rude ancestors of the Romans found a civilization in Italy, the Etruscan, when they entered it, and they borrowed freely from it. In some cases such changes conceal the common source of languages. The words "father" and "mother," for instance, are still common to all the Teutonic languages and to Latin and Greek and the languages derived from them. You have merely slight local modifications. "Mother" is "mater" in Roman, "meter" in Greek, and in other languages of the group *mutter*, *moder*, *madre*, *mere*, and so on. But "son" and "daughter," which ought to be just as common, are not. The Latin differs entirely from the others. It has adapted a word from some other language and passed it on to French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. The same has happened to "brother" in Greek.

Then there are changes of custom or fashion which get fixed differently in different peoples. In English "sea" is the ocean and "mere" (in Windermere, etc.) an inland lake. In German it is the opposite. A "hound" is a special kind of dog in English and is sim-

ply a dog in German. Racial fusion gives alternative words (swine and pig, ox and cow, joy and mirth, and so on), and either or both may be kept. And in addition to this there is a very remarkable tendency for a group in one place to alter the pronunciation of a letter (p and b, t and d, and so on), and the word comes to be spelled differently. I noticed in Greece that "beer," which has become a popular drink in the cities, has to be spelled "mbira" or else it would be pronounced "veera." Philologists have traced a large number of these "phonetic laws," as they call them, and are thus able to trace common words in quite different dresses. Thus the English "foot" or German "fuss" is clearly the Latin "ped" and the Greek "pod."

At the same time, we have to be on our guard against mere coincidences, which are often very curious. Professor Kroeber points out that in Yuki, a language of the Californian Indians, "go" is "ko," and "come" is "kom," yet there cannot be the remotest connection between English and Yuki or any borrowing on either side. Professor Klaatsch, trying to bring the Australian aborigines closer to the ancestors of the Europeans, points out that they have the word "warra" for water, "manda" for hand, "bĭna" for ear (Latin "pinna"), "djepar" for liver (Greek "hepar"), and "kapata" for head (Latin "caput"). Assuming that he has reproduced the sounds quite accurately—the Australians, of course, had no written language—these cannot be more than curious coincidences.

## §2. WAS THERE ONE PRIMITIVE SPEECH?

The study of languages, philology or comparative philology, was in the early nineteenth century in advance of most of the other sciences. The Babel legend was recognized by scholars a couple of centuries ago to be no serious obstacle to this research. The general opinion had hitherto been that Hebrew was most probably the one original language of the race, but the beginning of Egyptian exploration showed an entirely different language preceding it by thousands of years. Meantime the occupation of India by the British set thoughtful men at work on the ancient language of its sacred books, Sanskrit, and it did not take long to perceive its original identity with the chief languages of Europe. Persian was next related to them, and the Aryan or Indo-European family of languages was definitely established. One-third of the race speak languages which derive from this stock, so that a great step had been taken in the unification of languages.

A second great stock or family of languages—that is to say, a group that so closely resemble each other that descent from a common primitive language can be inferred—is the Sinitic (Chinese, Burmese, Thibetan, etc.). Fully a quarter of the race speak languages of this stock. The languages of Japan and Korea are of a different stock, but a third great stock, which includes the languages of further hundreds of millions of people, is that of northern and western Asia. To this group belong the languages of the Turks, Hungarians and Finns, who have moved into Europe from nearer



Asia. These three families—Aryan, Sinitic and Ural-Altaic—embrace the far greater part of the human race.

The division which we have already made of the peoples of the earth coincides so well with that of families of languages that we need not repeat all the details. We have a Semitic group (ancient Babylonian, Assyrian, Phoenician, Carthaginian and Hebrew, with modern Arabic and Abyssinian), a Hamitic family (which includes that of ancient Egypt) and a Bantu family. What the Jews speak today is, of course, a blend of Hebrew, German, etc., printed in the old Hebrew characters, and so different from Hebrew that one needs to be a learned rabbi to read the Old Testament in the original. The Hindu languages, apart from those derived from Sanskrit, form another family, and the languages of the Malays and Polynesians another.

These groups which I have named account for the languages of ninety percent of the human race, and we need go no further. I have already spoken of the immense number of families of languages in America. If one asks whether there is any prospect of ever embracing all these languages in a general world-scheme, the answer must be that at present there is no such prospect, nor does it ever seem probable. A language may in a sense be compared to living flesh. Survey it over a sufficiently long period and it takes in new matter and gives off old elements very much as an organism does. Some of the groups have suffered this process so long in complete isolation from each other that no common features are left.

We must, in fact, not too readily suppose that there was ever a common language of the race. In view of what we have seen in the last volume and the earlier part of this about the evolution and distribution of the race, this seems to me improbable in the last degree. We do not, as we saw, know when speech was evolved. The fact that such lowly peoples as the Tasmanians and Veddahs had languages of their own seems to put the origin very far back in prehistory. On the other hand, one would hesitate to ascribe anything more than what one might call a grunt-language to man of the Mauer type, yet the race was scattered over the earth, from Britain to Java, hundreds of thousands of years earlier than Mauer man. It seems clear, that languages must have developed quite independently in many different parts of the earth.

How much longer civilization will tolerate its plurality of tongues is a new issue in philology. It is not very acute in America, but the waste in Europe and the encouragement of international antagonisms are lamentable. Unhappily the new model languages themselves begin to multiply, and in European congresses one sees their rival partisans fling most unfraternal Idist or Esperantist epithets at each other. However, I am concerned with the past and the present: the section of the human story which tells how the earth has been peopled by its different and stubborn races with their distinctive characters and languages,

### BOOKS TO READ

A. L. Kroeber, **Anthropology**, 1923, 523 pp. (The best and most readable all-round study).

Roland B. Dixon, **The Racial History of Man**, 1923, 583 pp., illustrated. (Learned and technical analysis of existing peoples).

A. C. Haddon, **The Races of Men**, 1924, 184 pp. (Good summary).

G. Elliot Smith, **The Evolution of Man**, 1927, 195 pp. (Mainly origin of man).

Robert H. Lowie, **Primitive Society**, 1921, 453 pp. (Study of institutions).

A. A. Goldenweiser, **Early Civilization**, 1921, 428 pp. (Study of institutions).

Ellsworth Huntington, **The Character of Races**, 1924, 393 pp. (Environment).

G. M. Heal, **The Yellow and Dark-Skinned Peoples of South Africa**, 1910, 397 pp.

H. Ling Roth, **The Aborigines of Tasmania**, 1899, 228 pp.

W. B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, **The Native Tribes of Central Australia**, 1899, 671 pp., and **The Northern Tribes of Central Australia**, 1904, 784 pp.

Harold H. Bender, **The Home of the Indo-Europeans**, 1922, 57 pp.

V. G. Childe, **The Aryans**, 1926, 221 pp.

J. Vendryes, **Language**, 1925, 378 pp. (Advanced).

## LITTLE BLUE BOOKS

## Of Related or Allied General Interest

- 13 Man and His Ancestors (Illustrated). Carroll Lane Fenton
- 42 Origin and History of the Human Race. G. Schwalbe
- 56 A Dictionary of American Slang. Clement Wood and Gloria Goddard
- 82 Common Faults in Writing English. Lloyd E. Smith
- 150 Lost Civilizations. Charles J. Finger
- 166 English As She Is Spoke. Mark Twain
- 189 Eugenics Explained. Havelock Ellis
- 192 A Book of Synonyms. Lloyd E. Smith
- 202 The Survival of the Fittest. H. M. Tichenor
- 327 The Ice Age. Charles J. Finger
- 465 Esperanto for Beginners. D. O. S. Lowell
- 469 The Egypt of Yesterday: Exploration and Excavation.  
Julius Moritzen
- 481 The Stone Age. Clement Wood
- 491 Psychology for Beginners. Hereward Carrington
- 513 Travels of Marco Polo. Charles J. Finger
- 561 African Jungle Tales. C. J. Bender
- 563 New Light on Prehistoric Cultures. Maynard Shipley
- 580 Polar Exploration and Adventure. Helen Putnam van Sicklen
- 602 Great Pyramid of Egypt; the Sphinx, and Ancient Magic  
(Illustrated). Hereward Carrington
- 605 Indians of the Pueblos. Flora Warren Seymour
- 627 A Short History of the Jews. Clement Wood
- 628 How the Old Testament Was Made. Clement Wood
- 637 Pocket German-English Dictionary. Vance Randolph
- 639 4,000 Most Essential English Words. A Basic Literacy Test
- 681 Spelling Self Taught. Lloyd E. Smith
- 682 Grammar Self Taught. Lloyd E. Smith
- 683 Punctuation Self Taught. Lloyd E. Smith
- 696 How to Pronounce 4,000 Proper Names. Lloyd E. Smith
- 697 4,000 Words Often Mispronounced. Lloyd E. Smith
- 708 The Romance of Words: An Introduction to Philology.  
Clement Wood
- 756 The Story of the Sioux Indians. Flora Warren Seymour
- 788 The American Negro and His Problems. Walter F. White
- 797 Twenty Years Among African Negroes (Illustrated). C. J.  
Bender
- 798 Moral and Spiritual Life Among African Negroes (Illus-  
trated). C. J. Bender
- 807 African Negro Folk Tales. Faith Maris
- 811 Genetics for Beginners (Illustrated). Carroll Lane Fenton
- 812 An Introduction to Heredity (Illustrated). Carroll Lane  
Fenton
- 821, How to Improve Your Vocabulary. Lloyd E. Smith

- 827 *Life Among the Apes and Monkeys* (Illustrated). Carroll  
Lane Fenton
- 862 *German Self Taught*. Vance Randolph
- 901 *Woman: The Eternal Primitive*. William J. Fielding
- 902 *A Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases in Frequent Use  
in English Contexts*. Lloyd E. Smith
- 985 *A Psycho-Analysis of America*. James Oppenheim
- 999 *Latin Self Taught*. Miriam Allen deFord
- 1008 *The Origin of Religion*. Joseph McCabe
- 1011 *Pocket French-English Dictionary*. Vance Randolph
- 1021 *Italian Self Taught*. Isaac Goldberg
- 1030 *The World's Great Religions*. Joseph McCabe
- 1061 *The Human Origin of Morals*. Joseph McCabe
- 1093 *Interesting and Amusing Puns*. George Milburn
- 1105 *Pocket Spanish-English Dictionary*. Gaylord Du Bois
- 1109 *Spanish Self Taught*. Gaylord Du Bois
- 1112 *A Psycho-Analysis of the Jews*. James Oppenheim
- 1137 *The Moorish Civilization in Spain*. Joseph McCabe
- 1207 *French Self Taught*. Gaylord Du Bois
- 1216 *Pocket Italian-English Dictionary*. Helene Paquin
- 1222 *Easy Readings in Spanish*. Gaylord Du Bois
- 1259 *A Dictionary of Geographical Names*. Leo Markun

HOW TO ORDER: Order by number instead of titles, and remit at the rate of 5c per book plus 1c per book for packing and carriage charges. Complete catalog free on request.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS,  
Girard, Kansas