



TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARIES

REFERENCE LIBRARY

The Unity of the Human Race.

A LECTURE

Delivered before the Members

OF THE

Belleville Young Men's Christian Association,

ON THE EVENING OF THE 19th MARCH, 1860;

AND NOW PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM McLAREN,

OF JOHN STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BELLEVILLE C. W.

1860.

Printed by E. Miles, "Chronicle" Office, Belleville.

The Unity of the Human Race.

A LECTURE

Delivered before the Members

OF THE

Belleville Young Men's Christian Association,

ON THE EVENING OF THE 19th MARCH, 1860;

AND NOW PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM McLAREN,

OF JOHN STREET PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BELLEVILLE C. W.

1860.

Printed by E. Miles, "Chronicle" Office, Belleville.

P R E F A C E .

THE following Lecture on the Unity of the Human Race, now submitted to the public, formed one of a course embracing a variety of topics of interest and importance, which was delivered during the past winter by various Ministers, under the auspices of the Belleville Young Men's Christian Association. A few days after its delivery, the author was waited upon by a deputation of the Association, who requested that they might be allowed to publish it in pamphlet form. Feeling that the Lecture might be useful to some who have not time to peruse more extended and thorough discussions of the subject, he did not feel himself at liberty to refuse their request. It is due to himself, however, to say that it was not prepared with any view to publication, and that it makes no pretension to an exhaustive discussion of the weighty theme which it handles. A subject branching out in so many directions would require a volume rather than a Lecture for its satisfactory treatment. All that could be attempted in one Lecture was to touch on some of the salient points in the argument, and to present a few of the more prominent and striking facts which cast light on the question of the specific Unity and common parentage of our race. It is hoped, however, that enough has been said to confirm the faith of some in vital truth, and to lead others who may desire fuller information to investigate for themselves.

In preparing for the press, a few verbal alterations have been made, but none of them are of great importance. For the most part the Lecture is presented *verbatim*, as delivered.

Belleville, 10th April, 1860.

THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

In calling attention to a theme which is probably comparatively new to many in this community, it is a sufficient apology to say, that from its important scientific, religious, and practical bearings, it is daily exciting increasing interest in the great centres of thought on both sides of the Atlantic, and that it has already, in many quarters, become the battle ground between Christianity and Infidelity. Until a recent period it has been the received belief, both of philosophers and of christians, that the whole human family, in all its varieties of color, and physical conformation, sprang originally from a common stock, which God created and placed in Eden.

This doctrine was first called in question by a book published A.D., 1655, by an obscure French writer, named Isaac Peyrere. Finding his equanimity disturbed by what plain christians are apt to regard as the manifest meaning of the latter half of the 5th chapter of Romans, he cast about for some means of disposing of the unpalatable doctrines therein contained. Finally, it would appear, he concluded that the easiest way was to maintain that there were men on the earth long before Adam, whose one sin, Paul tells us, brought condemnation and death upon all men.

This work, like one, in our own day, designed to show that man is only an improved or developed monkey, for a time "made a sensation." And, like "The Vestiges of Creation," after receiving from cotemporaries more attention than it deserved, it soon fell into merited oblivion. Voltaire, however, having dug its dogmas from the grave of ages, and dressed them up anew, sent them forth to the world as his own progeny. After demonstrating to his own satisfaction that the whole system

of Geology was an absurdity, and proving that all the shells to which the infant science was then drawing attention were those of fresh water Lakes and Rivers,—or shells once worn by snails, or lost from museums, or dropped from the hats of pilgrims on their way from the Holy Land, or, finally, that they were not shells at all, but something like them, cast off in some freak of nature,*—after thus accounting for all the fossiliferous deposits on the surface of our globe, (since ascertained to be ten or twenty miles in depth,) and destroying all the evidence which they were then supposed to yield of the Noahic Deluge, the witty Frenchman thought he might farther serve the cause of infidelity by demolishing the established doctrine of the unity of the Human Race.

The Bible having taught that the human family sprang from one stock, he proceeded, in his superior wisdom, to show that in this, as in a great many other things, it was quite behind the age. Such is the origin of the discussion in modern times. We owe it to the sage skeptic who sprinkled himself with *holy water*, during a thunder storm, and laughed at all religion as an imposture, when the storm was over.

From his day to the present, various opinions have been held by philosophers on the question at issue. The great majority of the most distinguished Naturalists, such as Linnæus, Buffon, Blumenbach, Cuvier, Humboldt, Owen, Bunsen, Prichard, and J. Muller, of Berlin, have maintained the organic unity of mankind. Recently, however, a number of writers on both sides of the Atlantic, of more or less note, have lent themselves to the support of the opposite theory. America, however, has been most productive of authors of this class. Among these we may mention Agassiz, Morton, VanAmringe, Nott, and Gliddon. The names of Agassiz and Morton stand deservedly high in the temple of science. Many of this class of writers, like Agassiz, profess great respect for the Bible, which they regard as referring solely to the Caucasian or historical races. Among the most zealous opponents of the unity of the human family are Dr. J. C. Nott and the late Mr. Gliddon, the joint authors of two large works on this theme. Their scientific standing is of a more doubtful character; but what they want in science, they make up by bold assertion, and by the determined

* Miller Test. Rocks, page 321.

perversion of facts to subserve the interests of a gross and undisguised infidelity.

But, while the great majority of the more respectable class of the impugners of the unity of mankind avoid the low ribaldry which too often disgraces the pages of the last named authors, and while they profess great respect for the Bible, they do not at all feel bound to believe the facts which it teaches. They belong, for the most part, to that class who treat the Word of God as an old man in his dotage. He was very useful in his day, and great regard should be shown him on account of his venerable years and past good services, while it would be very foolish for us to govern ourselves in all things, by the instructions of one in his second childhood. It would not be polite to contradict the old gentleman to his face; but, if what he says is peculiarly unpalatable, they will not hesitate to whisper in your ear that really the old man talks a great deal of nonsense.

They have, however, two royal roads to escape, apparently, from unseemly collisions with the Bible, while they set aside, if need be, its teachings.

In the first place they give us to understand that Scripture evidence is quite inadmissible as authority in reference to any question of science. They tell us that we must leave the Bible to Theologians and *Sectarians*, and pursue science in a scientific and philosophical manner. But, may we not ask, what is scientific investigation? Is it that which regards only some favorite source of information, and shuts its eyes to all others? Is it not rather that which looks for truth wherever it may be found? If so, the Bible may not be so summarily ostracised from a scientific inquiry into the origin of the human race, or any other theme on which it speaks. Human *interpretations* we may modify or reject, but the *facts* which it teaches we are bound to receive, or else we must prove that it is a witness unworthy of confidence. No man can proceed philosophically, in the investigation of this subject, without either accepting the facts established by scripture, or disproving the authority of the Word of God. It is not the demands of scientific investigation which requires that the Bible should here be ignored, but the exigencies of a theory which might be endangered were such an authority consulted.

Their second maxim is, that the Bible was never designed to teach any system of physical science, and that consequently

we have no more right to expect to find in it a system of Ethnology than a system of Astronomy, Geography or Geology. The *truth* of this maxim we cheerfully admit; but to its *applicability*, in the case before us, we must demur.

The grand ends which God contemplated in making a revelation to men are moral and religious. The Bible was not given to gratify an idle curiosity, or even to unveil the mysteries of science, but to reveal to us the way of life, and make us know the path of duty. We have no reason to look for any information, unless given in an incidental manner, which is not immediately subservient to these high ends. It may be admitted, therefore, that all scriptural allusions, to matters pertaining merely to any branch of physical science, may be couched in language accordant with the prevalent ideas of the age, however incorrect, scientifically, these ideas may be.

But can the Unity of the Human Race be classed among those questions which have no immediate moral or religious bearing, and on which, consequently, the Scriptures may without marring the purpose for which they were given, speak in language dictated by the erroneous ideas prevalent in the age when the revelation was made? We apprehend not. And, if we may judge from the tone which pervades the writings of such men as Nott and Gliddon, we are more than justified in the suspicion that the important moral and religious principles directly involved, in the independent origin of each race, have, at least on this side of the Atlantic, given a great impulse to the advocacy of that idea.

The whole question of sin and redemption is bound up with the Unity of the Human Race. For "as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—Rom., v. 18.

The bearing of this doctrine on the subject of slavery is equally vital. If the Bible was designed for none but the Caucasian race, or if it never recognizes negroes and other inferior races as men, it no more commands us to treat colored persons as brethren than it requires us to regard monkies as men. It is the universal brotherhood of man which makes human chattelism an abomination.

Silent in reference to the lawfulness of the mere relation of master and slave, the Bible requires that which is utterly fatal

to *human* bondage. It commands masters to give unto their servants that which is just and equal. It commands the marriage relation to be held inviolable, and the parental relation to be respected. It enjoins all men to search the scriptures, and worship God according to the light he has given them. It requires us, in fine, to do to others, as we would that they should do to us. Let these plain injunctions of the Word of God be obeyed, and before the lapse of fifty years, every shadow of "the peculiar institution" will, without bloodshed, or revolution, or Harper's Ferry forrays, have disappeared from the face of the earth. If slaves are *human*, the laws and treatment to which they are subjected must, wherever the light of the Bible shines, be regarded as *inhuman*. This has not escaped the attention of Southern writers, such as Nott and Gliddon, who, while they continually parade their scientific treatment of their theme, are ever on the alert to excite a feeling in favor of their sentiments by pandering to the pro-slavery mania at the South. For well they know that, if they can only prove that the negro does not belong to the same original stock as his master, but to some race which the Scriptures have never recognized as human, African slavery is placed forever beyond the reach of successful assault.

The principles which these writers advocate, not only vindicate all the atrocities of American slavery, but brand, as uncommanded and absurd, two-thirds of all the Missionary efforts of the Christian Church. These are put forth among Mongols, Malays, Negroes, and Indians—races to which the Bible never refers. They are consequently outside of the range of the great Commission; and it is scarcely less foolish to impart the religion of Europeans to these inferior races than it would be to aim at Christianizing *baboons*. That the advocates of this system are by no means insensible to the wide moral and religious bearings of their views, is evident from their sneers at Missions, and their flings at, what they are pleased to call, "a false philanthropy."

Here then is a question freighted with the most momentous moral and religious bearings—a question on which turns all our ideas of sin and redemption—upon which depends the treatment of one-half of the inhabitants of the globe, either as men or as inferior beings,—and upon which hangs the extent and meaning of the great Commission. To affirm that we are not to expect

any information from the Scriptures on such a subject, is to declare that they will not speak on that for which alone they were given,—that they will not express an opinion on that which lies at the foundation of all our hopes for eternity, and which underlies the most important moral, social, and religious duties which we owe to men upon earth.

The Unity of the Human Race is not a curious point of mere physical science, on which the inspired volume may be expected to speak in the loose and inaccurate language of the age in which it was written. It involves such momentous interests that we are bound by every principle of sound criticism and by every dictate of common sense to accept what the Scriptures teach in reference thereto, in the most strict and literal manner. And, with the truth of these teachings, the inspiration of the sacred volume must stand or fall.

In entering upon an investigation of the testimony of Scripture and science in reference to the Unity of the Human Race, we may remark—1. That “if the Unity of the Human Race is established by sufficient warrant of Divine Revelation, no facts, however seemingly inconsistent with that truth, should in the slightest degree shake or impair the faith of a sensible man in that Revelation. For he only applies here the principle on which he is compelled to act on every other subject; that is to hold, on sufficient authority, *apparently* inconsistent facts, knowing that the reconciliation exists, and may sometime be discovered, if such discovery be within the range of human powers.”—*Church Review*, No. xxxvi, page 530, 531. We should not enter on the study of this topic with the idea that every apparent difficulty endangers the whole fabric of Christianity. But we remark—2. That it seems impossible that science, by itself, can ever disprove the Unity of the Human Race. It can at best only cast a doubt upon it, by tracing up existing varieties to an early period—a doubt, however, which must yield to the smallest particle of evidence on the opposite side. In order to establish the plural origin of mankind, science would require to discover some record reaching back to the very beginning and registering man’s origin, or some witness who was present at the first, and who, from his own observation, affirms that God did not make of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth. But on what rocky tablet is the fact recorded that all men did not spring from

Adam? And where is the witness who was present "with his Maker when man was first ushered into being?" When writers therefore without attempting to produce such evidence, venture dogmatically to assert the plural origin of mankind, we may rest assured that they are not the votaries of science, but of "science falsely so called."

I.—Our first inquiry shall be—Does the Bible teach that all the varieties of the human family spring from a common stock? This has been denied by VanAmringe and Agassiz.—The former says that the Adamic race is simply that to which the Scriptures have reference, and which God has employed in his design of redeeming mercy. The latter maintains that the Bible professes "to give the history of the *white* races, with special reference to the history of the Jews;" and wonderful as it may appear to those who have read Jeremiah's interrogatory, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" he even affirms that "nowhere," in the sacred volume, "are the colored races, as such, even alluded to."

It is a strong presumption against these views that the christian world has in all ages regarded the Scriptures as teaching a very different doctrine. This presumption gathers overwhelming force when we consider that the belief in the Unity of the Human Race was directly opposed to all the ideas prevalent among the pagan nations, to whom the gospel was first preached, and at war with the pride and selfishness of the white races to whom the gospel has hitherto been chiefly confined.—Men are not usually so liberal that for the pleasure of giving away their money they would invent an interpretation of Scripture which lays on them the expense of evangelizing the world. It is not, in itself, such a pleasant thing for a man to leave all the endearments of home and kindred, and spend his days far away from the comforts of civilized society; nor is it such a delightful thing, *per se*, for a man to be made a breakfast for cannibals or a luncheon for jackals, that ministers should be strongly biased in favor of a perverse view of the teachings of the sacred word which laid on them the privations and trials of the Missionary life. And unless, therefore, the Scriptures plainly teach the Unity of the Human Race, it seems little less than a miracle that that doctrine should have obtained such universal currency in the christian world.

But let us open the Book and learn from its pages. No one,

certainly, reading, without prejudice, the introductory chapters of Genesis would imagine that, long before God said "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," there were many races of men already in existence, who had "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every thing that creepeth upon the earth." And if the earth was already peopled, surely a help-meet might, without a miracle, have been found for Adam. And the command, "Be faithful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it," does not certainly look as if the earth were already for the most part replenished with human beings.

The Scriptures farther expressly declare that Adam was the *first* man. "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven." (I. Cor., xiv. 45, 47.) They affirm, moreover, that until the creation of Adam there was not a man to till the ground.—The prophet Malachi bases his denunciations of the unfaithfulness of husbands towards their wives upon the fact that God in the beginning made only one woman for one man. "And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously with the wife of his youth."—(Ch. II., 15.)

The same doctrine is taught with equal plainness in the New Testament. Paul, in addressing the Athenians from Mars' Hill, at a time when the black races of Africa were well known, declared, in direct opposition to the notoriously prevalent sentiments of the Greeks, that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." And, what is not less important than any of these considerations is the fact that the Scriptures ascribe the introduction of sin and death to Adam. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."—Rom., v. 12. Death did, no doubt, reign over the lower animals prior to Adam; that, however, as far as we are aware, was not "death by sin."—Death, did not reign over beings capable of sinning until Adam, by his transgression, involved our race in ruin.

But now we see all races of men sin and die; and, in the

universal prevalence of sin we have everywhere visible the mark of common parentage. This appalling evidence of the organic unity of our race meets us in every part of the earth. Navigators in exploring the great Pacific; and travellers in crossing the burning sands of Africa, or in threading their way through the primeval forests of America, have discovered new races, speaking unknown dialects; they have found men of every shade of color, from the jetty negroes to the white indians of the Northwest coast of America, and of every variety of physical conformation, from the degraded New Hollander to the intelligent New Zealander; but no traveller or navigator has yet discovered a variety of the human race in whom unholy passions do not rage, and over whom death does not reign.—This is the Bible test of Unity.

II.—In entering upon the consideration of the testimony of science in reference to the Unity of the Human Race, we shall find that in order to its successful elucidation two questions demand attention, viz :

1. Whether all races of men are one species? and

2. Whether all the members of the species, admitting that there is but one, are descended from a common stock? These points do not necessarily involve each other. If all men have a common parentage, it is evident that they constitute only one species. But if all men are of one species, it is not so evident that they must have descended from a common stock. It certainly can be conceived as possible, that God might, at the first, have seen fit to create several pairs, instead of one, and to make them as like each other as the present generation is to that which preceded it. On that supposition, there would be a single species with a plural origin

Before entering, however, on the discussion of these topics, two things, admitted by all Naturalists of any note, must be premised, viz :

1. That within the limits of a single species there may spring up varieties, many of which, when formed, become permanent, at least while the tribe remains under the influences which produced them, and often long after. In works on the Natural History of Man, such as those of Lawrence, Prichard, Carpenter, and Cabell, will be found abundant evidence that permanent varieties may spring up from accidental congenital peculiarities, from the long continued operation of modifying

agencies, from the influence of climate and food, and probably also from other influences, the nature and character of which are not known. Sir C. Syell, as well as the writers above referred to, has pointed out striking instances of the hereditary transmission of "acquired instincts." We shall hereafter adduce a sufficient induction of facts to convince the most skeptical of the existence of this power of variation, and indeed to show that it may be regarded as one of the characteristics of species.

2. That this power of variation is not unlimited. Beyond certain limits the original type has a frigid and an inflexible permanence.

The beneficent ends secured by these laws are obvious.—The first enables the constitution of living things to adjust itself to the climate in which they live, and the circumstances where-with they are surrounded. Without this inherent power of adaptation, migrations must have been unknown, and plants and animals must have been entirely confined to their original localities. Apart from this provision of nature, it would have been impossible for man to have adapted himself to his ever varying circumstances, or to have domesticated the lower animals which accompany him in his wanderings, and on which his happiness so much depends. This power of variation might prepare us to expect, in a creature like man, living in every region of the earth, subsisting on all varieties of food, and subject to every conceivable external influence, even greater modifications of the primeval type than are to be found among the endless varieties of the Human Race. Might not the candid mind here pause and ask, may not this be the key which unlocks all the mysteries which surround the diversities of the Human Race? May not God, having made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, have done for man what he has done for the lower animals,—placed in him a *nisus formativus* or adaptative principle by which each offshoot of the parent stock could adjust itself to the bounds where he had before determined its habitation?

The second law which sets limits to this power of variation is not less important. Were the power of variation unlimited, the distinctive peculiarities of each species would be obliterated, and all the beneficent ends now served by the different orders of living creatures would be frustrated. The domestic animals would certainly "long since have been blended into some strange

nondescript monstrosity as wild as a sick man's dream." To avert this calamity, nature has, in the laws of hybridity, placed an impassible barrier in the way of the permanent intermixture of different species. It has long been regarded by Naturalists as an established fact, that while a hybrid individual may be produced by the intermixture of two species, a hybrid species cannot exist; for the hybrid is barren and cannot propagate its kind. Prichard mentions that Dr. Wagner, of Germany, has proved by the dissection of animals of mixed blood, that nature has interposed in the anatomical structure of hybrids, an absolute barrier to their permanent reproduction.*

The bearing of this fact upon the specific unity of mankind is obvious. It is well known that all the varieties of the *genus homo* intermix and produce a permanently fertile offspring. The mulattoes in the United States, although an unhealthy race, are rapidly increasing in numbers, and have exhibited some of the most remarkable instances of longevity recorded in modern times. The Cafusos, in Brazil, are a mixed race, formed by the intermarriage of Negroes and Indians. The Griquas, of South Africa, a mixed tribe, known to be descended from the early Dutch settlers on the one side, and from the aboriginal Hottentots on the other, are a vigorous and increasing race. It is also generally admitted that the Papuans are a mixed race. If, therefore, it is a truth that wherever we see animals producing a permanently fertile offspring, there we have evidence of their specific unity, however much they may differ in physical conformation or physiological habits, we need not be surprised at the efforts which have been made by the New American School of Ethnologists to overturn the received doctrine of hybridity. With them it is a question of life or death. Their success, however, has not been by any means commensurate with their zeal. The researches of M. Flourens, of Europe, and Dr. Bachman, of America, the two greatest authorities on the subject of hybridity, have, we think, completely overturned their reasonings and fully established the long accepted doctrine of hybridity. With the exception of a cool begging of the question in reference to specific diversity of the various races of men and dogs, &c., all that our New School of American Ethnologists have been able to do, is to adduce a few cases in which the species were nearly allied where the power of reproduction existed in the

* Natural History of Man, page 16.

hybrid. In these cases, however, it was so feeble that it did not extend beyond the second or third generations. The fact remains indisputable that, although the experiment has been tried over the wide field of the world for thousands of years, no authentic instance can be produced of a hybrid race, or of hybrids continuing permanently to propagate their kind.

And had these writers succeeded in proving that distinct species may permanently intermix, they would have established what is utterly subversive of the idea of species as defined by themselves. They hold that species owe their character and existence to the immediate power of God, and that they are permanent throughout all ages. "It is a law of nature," says Agassiz, "that animals as well as plants are preceded only by individuals of the same species, and *vice versa*, that none of them can produce a species different from themselves." This is the view of writers of the Nott and Gliddon type, who are so anxious to prove that the varieties of the human family are different species. They mean by this that they differed from the beginning, each having its own origin. But, if two species by intermixture can produce a third, differing from both, it is evident that this third species was not original,—that it did not owe its origin to the immediate power of God, and that it was not preceded by individuals of the same species. It is also manifest that were it possible for species to intermix, these writers are inconsistent in attributing permanence to species as a characteristic. For, upon their own principles, one species may at any time be merged into another, and thereby lost or confounded.

Not only, therefore, is the attempt to prove that different species may permanently intermix a failure, but its success would be utterly subversive of the fundamental principles on which the diverse origin of the human races is advocated.—Truly these writers have reason to say with Napoleon, "nothing is more terrible than a victory, but a defeat."

We are now prepared to inquire more minutely into the specific unity and common parentage of mankind. But here a formidable obstacle meets us, in the difficulty of securing a satisfactory definition of *species*. We follow that of De Candolle as, on the whole, the simplest and as, in reality, implying all that is of practical value in the more modern definitions of Dr. Morton and Prof. Dana.

De Candolle says, "We write under the designation of

species, all those individuals who mutually bear to each other so close a resemblance as to allow of our supposing that they may have proceeded originally from a single being, or a single pair."

Do all the varieties of mankind constitute, in this sense, one species?

The most satisfactory answer, of course, would be that drawn from authentic history. There is only one historic work which professes to go back to the origin of our race. That work affirms that "God hath made, of one blood, all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The other historic authorities, to which appeal is sometimes made, do not reach back to a sufficiently early date to settle the question at issue. It is not, however, without importance to observe, that within the historic period permanent varieties are known to have sprung up. Analogy would lead us to suppose that other varieties may have originated in the same way.

But passing from the historical argument, we observe, that on purely scientific grounds, we are led to believe in the specific unity of all the varieties of the human race,

1. From the identity of the immaterial principle on which, as Agassiz says, the constancy of the phenomena of species depends.* The variations which appear in the immaterial principle, in the various races of men, are differences in *degree*, not in *kind*. In all parts of the world, man has the same spiritual and intellectual nature. All have reason, memory, imagination, desires, affections, and will. All tribes have a moral nature, capable of making the distinction between right and wrong. They are all "capable of holiness and happiness, and of wickedness and misery." All men have, in some form, a belief in the being of a God, and a sense of accountability to invisible powers. We may add, also, that wherever the experiment has been fairly tried, human nature has, in all its varieties, owned the gospel as the power of God unto salvation. No doubt there are great differences in the degree of development, and in the mode in which these common properties of the human race are manifested; but the same intellectual nature is every where seen in man, whether he pursues the chase in the depths of the forest, and sings his war song with Tecumseh or Black Hawk, or traces the courses of the stars with Newton or

* Principles of Zoology, page 43.

La Place. In all parts of the world, and under all degrees of civilization, man exhibits the same religious nature. In the language of Professor Draper, could our "vision reach into the past, and recall the credulous Greek, worshipping before the exquisitely perfect statues of the deities of his country, beseeching them for sunshine or rain, and then turn to the savage Amaiman, who commences his fast by taking a vomit, and for want of a better goddess, adores a dried cow's tail, imploring it for all earthly goods,—again the same principle would emerge, only illustrated by the circumstance, that the savage is more thorough, more earnest in his work."*

We are led to believe in the specific unity of mankind

2. From the Physiology of the Human System, which is the same, essentially, in all the races of man. All races, when placed in similar circumstances, attain the same *average* age. All mixed races are found to be permanently fertile. In all tribes the period of gestation is the same. All have the same slow growth and decline. The earlier maturity of females in warm climates, which was, at one time, generally received on the authority of Haller, has been completely disproved by more recent and careful researches. "So wonderful a correspondence," says Dr. Cabell, Prof. Comp., Anat., and Physiology, &c., in the University of Virginia, "through so extensive a range of physiological susceptibilities and powers, covering, as it does, the whole physical nature of man, proves, conclusively, the specific unity of his varied types, while a comparison of even the lowest types of man with the highest anthropoid apes establishes, beyond all question, a marked difference of specific nature." Professor J. Muller, of Berlin, the first, perhaps, of living physiologists, has said:—"From a physiological point of view, we may speak of varieties of men, no longer of races.—Man is a species, created once, and divided into none of its varieties by specific distinctions. In fact, the common origin of the Negro and the Greek, admits not of rational doubt."† We observe—

3. That the external structure of the human frame bespeaks the specific unity of all the varieties of mankind. "In the structure of his body, and in the physical organization which distinguishes him from every other species of animals, man is the

* Human Physiology, page 570.

† Quoted by Cabell on Unity of Mankind, page 138.

same being in Labrador and South Wales, on the Caucasian mountains, and on the burning sands of Africa." No difference has yet been discovered in the number of the teeth and bones, in the number and arrangement of the muscles, and of the organs of digestion, circulation, secretion, and respiration. Van Amringe, in his zeal to disprove the organic unity of mankind, enumerates twenty points of difference between the skeleton of the Negro and that of the white races,—but he has not shown that a single bone is to be found in the one which is absent from the other; and in those slight variations of form and size &c. which he mentions, he has failed to point out one peculiarity which is not found, occasionally, within the limits of the white race. To found distinction of species on peculiarities which spring up occasionally within the known limits of another race, is to set every principle of common sense at defiance; for nothing can be more evident than that the same causes which produce these varieties occasionally in one race, by acting universally in another, might cause them to appear uniformly. We shall hereafter see that other varieties of colour, hair, and physical conformation, are none of them of specific value. With the testimony of Prof. Richard Owen, who is acknowledged to be the most philosophical comparative anatomist of the age, we may conclude this part of our discussion:—"The Unity of the human species is demonstrated by the constancy of those osteological and dental characters to which attention is more particularly directed in the investigation of the corresponding characters of the higher quadrumana. Man is the sole species of his genus,—the sole representative of his order." The conclusion of the whole matter is that be he Indian, Negro, Malay, or Caucasian,—be he civilized or be he savage,—be he white or be he black, "a man's a man for a' that."

We can only mention without illustration some of the grounds on which scientific men generally believe in the common parentage of our race.

In addition to the explicit testimony of the Word of God, which expressly declares that all men sprang from one man and one woman, they regard all varieties of men as springing from a common stock,

1. Because when all men may have sprung from one pair, as appears from their being only one species, it is unphilosophical to suppose many creative miracles to account for that of

which one is a sufficient explanation.

2. Because it is now generally admitted among the highest scientific authorities, that unity of species implies a common descent. The labours of Prof. Ed. Forbes have gone far to settle this point. Sir Ch. Lyell has also done much to establish this belief.

3. The linguistic affinities, discovered by philologists among all tongues, clearly indicate that they are only branches of a common stock. On this subject immense research has been expended, and the conclusion to which all the first class philologists have been led is, that all languages are related to each other. Dr. Max Muller, Wm. Humboldt, Grimm, Latham, Gallatin, and Bunsen, are all at one here. These writers for the most part belong to a school which, in the words of Bunsen, "demands the strictest proof that these affinities are neither accidental nor merely ideal, but essential: that they are not the work of extraneous intrusion, but indigenous, as running through the whole original texture of the languages, compared according to a traceable rule of analogy." The result of all these profound researches has been to lead almost every one who has a right to speak on this subject to the conclusion that all languages have a common origin.

4. Because the testimony of tradition, in all parts of the world, points to the central regions of Asia as the birthplace of man. The African tribes point to the north or the north-east as the quarter from which they came. That Europe was peopled from the East is a matter almost of authentic history. The American tribes for the most part point to the north-west as the direction from which their ancestors came. A few tribes in the southern extremity of the continent point to the East, but none pretend that they sprang from the soil. The universal tradition of a Deluge which destroyed the whole human family except a few persons saved on a raft, ship, canoe, or mountain, by whom the earth was re-peopled, points to the same conclusion, and confirms what Scripture and science teach as to the common parentage of our race.

III. It remains for us now to remove some of the difficulties, arising from the extent and permanence of the varieties which distinguish the types of mankind, which lie in the way of admitting the organic unity of all the varieties of our race. "It is alleged that these varieties are so broad, so permanent,

and so ancient, that we are forced to the conclusion that the different races had different origins." Here then are three objections to the Unity of mankind which demand attention.

To the first, we reply—

(1.) That the distinctions between the different races are not so broad and marked as has been pretended. In fact, the various types of mankind "are connected with each other by intermediate gradations so close as to render it impossible to establish a definite boundary line between the collections of individuals which are assembled around them."

At one period it was maintained by eminent anatomists, that in the skin of the negro there is a separate layer called the *mucous membrane*, on which the dark coloring matter, which gives to the skin of that race its sable hue, is spread like a coat of plaster, and which is entirely wanting in the white races. This, in the eyes of competent judges, would have formed such an important variation as almost to mark the negro as a distinct species. Doubt was thrown on this opinion by the well known fact, that white persons have, from undiscovered causes, become black, either temporarily or permanently, and that black persons have, in like manner, turned white. Such changes could scarcely occur, if they implied the disappearance or formation of a layer of skin over the entire body. The microscope, however, has now done for this theory what Lord Ross's telescope did for the nebular hypothesis of astronomers—annihilated it. It has shown that the *rete mucosum* of anatomists is no separate layer at all, but a part of the outer skin, or *epidermis*; that it consists of a system of cells, and that it is found equally in the white and dark races. In the latter, however, there is a deposit of colouring matter in the cells. This great organic difference in the races, therefore, has vanished into thin air. Attempts have frequently been made to establish the specific diversity of the Negro race, by a reference to the peculiarities of their hair. It has been affirmed that it is not true hair at all, but wool,—that it is flat, while the hair of the white races is oval, and that of some of the Indian tribes cylindrical or round. But the careful investigations of the most reliable practical microscopists, such as Drs. Carpenter and Goadby, have clearly demonstrated that the covering of the negro's head is true hair, and not wool; they have also shown that the form of "the shaft of the hair varies not only in different individuals of the same

race, but also in different hairs of the same individual, being sometimes cylindrical, sometimes oval, and sometimes (though more rarely) eccentrically elliptical, or nearly flat."—Cabell, p. 135.

When we examine the colour of the races, which is the most obvious, though not the most important point of difference, we discover almost every conceivable variety of hue. There is nowhere any wide chasm to step across, such as we might fix upon as the boundary line of a new race. One shade melts almost imperceptibly into another, the more sable specimens of the fair races equalling the lighter samples of the more inky tribes. In Africa, there are endless shades of colour; in the North, the inhabitants are embrowned; in Central and Western Africa they are generally a jetty black. The Hottentots in the South are of a much lighter complexion. The Bushman is a yellowish red. In the East there are also various shades of colour, some of them conjoined with high organization almost as white as the natives of Europe. In fact, the pure negro is an exception even in Africa.

In Asia, the same wide sweep of varieties is observable.—From the pure Caucasian to the black fisherman of India,—from the swarthy Mongols to the jetty negroes of the Papuan group, every intermediate shade may be found.

In America, while the ground work may be regarded as of a coppery hue, there are not wanting tribes white, greenish-black, and chocolate coloured.

In Europe, as might be expected from the extent of the territory, there is not the same amount of variation in colour. It is, however, worthy of observation, that the difference between the South of Europe and the North of Africa is not greater than between the South of England and the South of France.

In like manner, the study of the shape and capacity of the skull, and of the structure of the human frame, reveals no broad definite lines of demarcation where we can say, Here one race ends and another begins. Dr. Morton, of Philadelphia, who spent much time in examining the *crania* of the various races, found that the *average* capacity of the skull of the white races was greatest, and that of the Hottentot and Australian the smallest; yet the largest Negro skull was very much larger than the smallest European, and even possessed two cubic inches more capacity than the largest Anglo-American."—(See Cabell, page

131.) And it must also be remarked that those races which seem most widely separated by structural peculiarities, are so connected by intermediate links, that we pass imperceptibly from the one to the other. So true is this, that scarcely two leading Ethnologists can be found who are agreed either as to the number of the great types of mankind, or as to the extent of territory which is occupied by each. Jacquinot says there are *three* races. Bouy de St. Vincent says there are fifteen species. Morton considers that there are 22 families. Pickering says there is no choice between one and eleven races. And Luke Burke last, but not least, maintains that there are 63 distinct varieties! he might just as well have added a cipher, and written 630; his data would have equally sustained him. For there are certainly no two men on the face of the earth exactly alike. Do we need anything more than these figures to tell how impalpable are the gradations by which we pass from one variety to another, and to demonstrate the worthlessness of the argument which is drawn from these varieties for the original diversity of the existing types of mankind?

In reply to this objection we observe—

(2.) That the varieties which appear among mankind are not greater than those which are known to have sprung up within the limits of a single species of the lower animals. It is difficult to make the observations which are necessary to establish this fact. From the length of time required to effect such changes, and the slowness of their progress, those who observe their commencement are not likely to see their termination; and those who witness their completion, not having seen their inception, have no idea of their extent. In this way, doubtless, many variations may spring up unnoticed. Happily for science, one experiment, on a sufficiently extended scale, has been made. When the Spaniards and Portuguese came to America, they found none of the domestic animals which were used in Europe. These were accordingly imported. After a time, many of them strayed into the forests, and have there continued multiplying for ages. The result has been the disappearance of all trace of domesticity, and the generation of new and peculiar characteristics, in accordance with their changed circumstances.

The descendants of the hogs introduced by the Spaniards bear a marked resemblance to the wild boar of the old world. The hog of the high mountains of the Paramos closely resembles

the wild boar of France. Instead of wearing, like his forefathers, a bristly coat, he has donned a garment of thick fur, which is often crisp, and occasionally he has an underdress of wool. He has also changed his former white or spotted appearance for a uniform black, except in some of the warm regions, where he is red. His snout has become elongated, and his forehead vaulted, so that in the shape of his skull he differs more widely from the race from which he sprang, than does the negro's *cranium* from that of the Caucasian. A variety on the "Island of Cubagna has a monstrous elongation of the toes to half a span."

In one part of South America, a variety of the Ox called "*pelones*," has been produced, which has a very rare and fine fur. In another quarter, there is a race found with a skin entirely naked. In Colombia, where, owing to the size of the farms &c., the milking of cows was laid aside, they give milk only during the period of suckling the calf. South of the Rio Plata there has sprung up a variety of cattle called the Niata breed, which has now almost displaced every other variety in a vast territory. Darwin, in his "Voyage of a Naturalist," says of them, "They appear externally to hold nearly the same relation to other cattle which bulldogs hold to other dogs; their forehead is very short and broad, with the nasal end turned up, and the upper lip drawn back; their lower jaws project outward; when walking, they carry their heads low on a short neck, and their hinder legs are rather longer, compared with the front legs, than usual. Their bare teeth, their short heads and upturned nostrils, give them the most ludicrous, self-confident air of defiance imaginable."

Dr. Bachman also mentions that "the cattle in Opelousas in western Louisiana, have without change of stock within the last thirty years, produced a variety of immense size, with a peculiar form and enormous horns, like the cattle of Abyssinia." We are also informed that this variety has become a permanent race, and that all other breeds have disappeared from the marshy meadows of Opelousas.

Returning to South America, the wild dog of the Pampas never barks like his progenitors, but howls like a wolf.

"The wild cat," we are told, "has lost the musical accomplishments of her civilized sisterhood, and gives none of those delectable concerts of caterwauling that so often make night

hideous, and call down from irritable listeners curses, if not something heavier, on the whole feline race."

The wild horse puts on a long shaggy fur, of a uniform chestnut color. The sheep of the central Cordilleras, when left unshorn, throws its wool off in tufts, and underneath these appears a coat of short, shining hair, and the wool never returns. The goat has lost her large teats, and produces from two to three kids annually.

Changes equally marked have been effected among the domestic fowl. A variety has been originated, called "rumpless fowls," which want from one to six of the caudal vertabræ.

Did time permit, we might easily cite equally convincing instances from the old world, of varieties having sprung up among the lower animals,—varieties in physical conformation, in color, and in mental or instinctive habits, as great as any which are found among the races of Man.

In farther reply to the objection drawn from the marked nature of the varieties which appear among mankind, we observe

(3.) That there is evidence of the existence of certain forces which, either by acting for a lengthened period, or by, what is perhaps more probable, acting with greater power in the earlier history of our race than at present, may have produced all the varieties which are observed in the human family.

There is known to be a race of black Jews in India, who retain, at least, to a considerable extent, their Jewish features. Many of their brethren in America, and elsewhere, probably from pride of color, maintain that their black co-religionists are converted Hindoos. But, in support of this opinion, they adduce no proof.

"Bishop Heber declares that three centuries' residence in India, has made the Portuguese nearly as black as the Caffres."

A tribe of Berbers, long isolated in the oasis of Wadreag in the great African Desert, have lost their light complexion, and Caucasian features, and have assumed the color, features, and hair of the Negro races. That this change was not effected by intermixture with other tribes, their history proves; and indeed their pride of blood is a sufficient guarantee.

Dr. Carpenter states, as the result of the researches of Prichard, Latham, and others, that "the Magyar race, in

Hungary, which is not now inferior in mental or physical characters to any in Europe, is proved by historical and philological evidence to have been a branch of the great Northern Asiatic stock, which was expelled about ten centuries since from the country it then inhabited, (bordering on the Uralian Mountains,) and in its turn expelled Sclavonian nations from the fertile parts of Hungary, which it has occupied ever since.—Having thus changed their abode, in the most rigorous climate of the old continent,—a wilderness, in which the Ostiaks and Samoiedes pursue the chase only during the mildest season—for one in the South of Europe, amid fertile plains abounding with rich harvests, the Magyars gradually laid aside the rude and savage habits which they are recorded to have brought with them, and adopted a more settled mode of life. In the course of a thousand years, their type of cranial conformation has been changed from the pyramidal (or Mongol) to the elliptical (or Caucasian); and they have become a handsome people, with fine stature, and regular European features, with just enough of the Tartar cast of countenance, in some instances, to recall their origin to mind.” The same change appears in the Turks, in Europe, who are also of Mongol extraction.

I may, however, refer to illustrations which are more within the range of our own observation.

It is well known that there are, in the British Isles, three branches of the old Celtic stock: the native Irish, the Highland Scotch, and the Welch. They all speak closely allied dialects of the same language; and history carries us back to a time when they were all one people, and when a Scot meant an Irishman. It is this ancient union of these races in one, which makes it a subject of dispute whether the celebrated Schoolman, *Johannis Scotus Eregina*, belongs to Ireland or to Ayrshire, and whether St. Patrick was born on the banks of the Clyde or in the Emerald Isle, and whether he was a Presbyterian Pastor of the Culdee type, or a Romish Bishop. But, although these three nations were originally one, what man of ordinary observation can fail to distinguish them now? They differ in looks, they differ in language, they differ in natural disposition and temper, and even in the sound of their voice. No one would confound an aboriginal Connaughtman with a Highlander, or either of them with a Welchman. If, therefore, such marked and decided varieties have sprung up among the branches of

the British Celtic stock, when living within a few hundred miles of each other, and almost in the same climate, how much more wide and indelible might these diversities have been, had one sept been planted in Central Africa, another in America, and a third on the shores of the Caspian ?

But to come still nearer home: it is said by competent judges, that a marked difference is already observable between the French Canadians and the parent stock in France.

In the United States, also, a marked variety has already sprung up. The peculiarities of this variety are so well known, that the painter at once lays hold of them, and the original is, without difficulty, recognized. No painter, unless he wished to be laughed at, would draw a John Bull and a New Englander with the same features.

It appears to us that the facts and considerations which have been adduced, are sufficient to destroy the force of the objection to the Unity of mankind, drawn from the marked character of the varieties in the human family, and to throw all the probability on the other side of the scale.

2. The *second* objection drawn from the permanence of the varieties of the human race, as proved by history and ancient monuments, we must say, appears to us very futile. The permanence claimed is only what we would expect from the working of nature among the lower animals. These, we have already seen, exhibit varieties which are always permanent as long as the animals in question are subject to the influences which produced them; and often long after they have been removed to other localities these peculiarities remain, or only very slowly give place to other variations. It is easier to do anything than to undo it. "You may make dough into bread, but you cannot convert bread into dough." Nature is not wont to move backwards. It would, therefore, be by no means surprising, that varieties once formed should become permanent.

That races do not readily move backwards, and assume their original types, by no means proves that they may not move onward and assume new variations. The monuments of Egypt are constantly cited by writers of the Nott and Gliddon stamp as proving the permanence of varieties, dating back well nigh to the Deluge. It is freely acknowledged that they clearly indicate that many of the types of Mankind which are found in the present day were then in existence. But they do not

prove, and in the nature of things they cannot, that the descendants of those persons who figure on these ancient monuments, removed to other localities, exhibit the same appearance at the present day. There has been no genealogical table kept to show who are their posterity. For aught that our friends, Messrs. Nott and Gliddon, can show to the contrary, they may themselves be lineal descendants of some of the Negroes who flourish on these ancient monuments to which they pay such filial attention.

These monuments, supposing them to be reliable, prove the early existence of many of the present varieties of man. But they cast as little light on the origin of these varieties, as they do on the present appearance of the descendants of the Caucasians, Berbers, or Negroes whom they exhibit. These varieties may each have originated in a separate creation. They may have sprung up by virtue of some general law. Or they may have originated with some great miracle, similar to, or identical with that by which, it is commonly supposed, language was confounded at Babel, and the testimony of these monuments would remain unchanged.

It is not a little remarkable, however, that writers who are so ready, as some to whom we have referred, to charge the Bible with gross errors, should place such implicit confidence in these monuments, which have only been deciphered within these few years, and which are yet so imperfectly understood, that learned men are disagreed, to the extent of more than a thousand years, as to the date at which they commence. It is also worthy of remark, that the earliest delineation of the Negro countenance, on these monuments, is, according to Mr. Gliddon, himself, more than 1,200 years after Menes, with whose reign they commence.

3. The *third* objection drawn from the *antiquity* of the varieties of the human race, is, if possible, less worthy of attention than that which preceded it. Profane history does not trace these varieties back to their origin, and therefore it cannot cast any light on the question.

The argument which certain writers urge against the unity of the human race, from the antiquity of present varieties, is substantially this: As far back as we can trace the history of mankind, we observe the same varieties as exist in the present day. History, they tell us, contains no evidence of the origin-

ation of new types, or of a race losing its distinguishing characteristics and assuming a new type ; therefore, present varieties must have originated in separate creations. These premises might be granted, which they are not, but we do not see how the conclusion flows from them. The argument is only a slight modification of that by which Hume proposed to disprove the creation of the world, viz., that we have no experience of world-building, while we have experience of false testimony among men. These gentlemen include the experience of former generations, as far as recorded by written and monumental history ; and because that does not prove that the present varieties sprang from one stock, they reject the testimony of the Word of God, and we may add, also, the indications of science. With similar logic, the King of Siam steadfastly refused to believe in the existence of ice ; inasmuch as it was contrary to his experience, and all the experience of mankind, as ascertained by him from history and tradition, that water should become so solid that a man could walk upon it.

The most perfect parallel, however, is the argument by which a native of the Emerald Isle, charged with stealing a shovel, proposed to demonstrate his innocence. When one witness had sworn that he saw Pat steal the shovel : " May it plaze yer honor," replied the Hibernian, " I can bring forty men to swear that they did not see me steal it." In the case before us, one witness, Faithful and True, declares that he saw, and made all men spring from one pair. What of that ? reply Messrs. Nott and Gliddon, we can produce forty Egyptian monuments which do not say so.

From the cursory view which we have been able to present of the subject of our Lecture, we trust enough has been advanced to show that the doctrine of the organic Unity of Mankind, preached by Paul to the *litterati* of Athens, is in little danger of being overturned by the assaults of those writers whose chief aim seems to be to *diabolize* science, by bringing it into conflict with the Word of God.

We have seen that, by every test of species which can be drawn from the external structure of the human frame, from the physiology of our system, from the intellectual and spiritual nature of man, and from the free and permanent intermixture of the races, science requires us to admit the specific unity of all the varieties of the human family. We have also seen that

the common parentage of our race is, according to the most reliable scientific authorities, implied in the specific Unity of its varieties. We have had assurance that the common parentage of our race is established by the researches of modern Comparative Philologists, who have proved that all languages are branches of a common stock. We have been led to the same conclusion by the universal tradition, which points to Central Asia as the birthplace of man, and speaks of a Deluge as wide-spread as the human family.

We have, moreover, seen that the distinctions between the races are not so broad and marked as has been pretended, but that we pass insensibly from one gradation to another, so that Ethnologists find it impossible to agree among themselves as to the number of distinct types. We have seen that as wide diversities as appear among men can be proved to have sprung up within the limits of a single species of the lower animals. That permanent varieties of the human race have originated within the historic period, has also been proved. The futility of the objections drawn from the permanence and antiquity of the varieties of mankind, has also been made apparent.

Are we not now entitled to claim it as the verdict at once, of Science and of Revelation, "That God hath made, of one blood, all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth?"

We confess that it is with no feeling of indifference that we have reached this conclusion. He has not the heart of a true man who is not glad to see science divorced from, what Humboldt well calls, "the cheerless doctrine of superior and inferior races." He is not a true well-wisher of his race who does not rejoice to see that tyranny and human chattelism find as little countenance from Science as from the Word of God. But to the Christian, the doctrine of the Unity of Mankind, linked as it is with all his profoundest views of sin and redemption, has a peculiar power and beauty. His most important duties and his brightest hopes are associated with it. When he looks out on the world and all its families, and marks the universal reign of sin and death, which gives him such appalling evidence of the Unity of Mankind, he sees his work and his duty. This brotherhood he must seek to rescue from sin and death. To his dying kindred he must carry those glad tidings of great joy which are for all people. To them he must proclaim their

common interest in the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. Divided, as they are, by language, custom, pride, malice, and prejudice, he must seek to gather them around the second great centre of Unity, where there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus.

This truth assures him, also, that it is not in vain that he labors for the conversion of the world to Christ, and longs for the time when "every kindred, every tribe on this terrestrial ball, shall bring forth the royal diadem and crown him Lord of all."

And when he looks forward to that better world, where he shall rest from his labors, his eye beams with joyous hope that he shall meet the whole brotherhood of ransomed sinners, saved by grace, out of all nations. And never does that bright country seem more lovely than when he sees it by faith, as John saw it, in rapturous vision: "And after this I beheld, and lo a great multitude, which no man could number, of *all nations*, and *kindreds*, and *people*, and *tongues*, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

E R R A T A .

Page 7,	for	unpalateable	read	unpalatable.
" "	"	inadmissable	"	inadmissible.
" 12,	"	faithful	"	fruitful.
" 13,	"	indians	"	Indians.
" 14,	"	Sir C. Syell	"	Sir C. Lyell.
" "	"	securad	"	secured.
" 15,	"	mixid	"	mixed.
" 16,	"	write	"	unite.

