

***LOUIS
FIGUIER***



***THE HUMAN
RACE***

**LOUIS
FIGUIER**



**THE HUMAN
RACE**

Louis Figuiier

The Human Race

EAN 8596547050025

DigiCat, 2022

Contact: DigiCat@okpublishing.info



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

THE WHITE RACE.

CHAPTER I. EUROPEAN BRANCH.

CHAPTER II. ARAMEAN BRANCH.

THE YELLOW RACE.

CHAPTER I. HYPERBOREAN BRANCH.

CHAPTER II. MONGOLIAN BRANCH.

CHAPTER III. SINAIC BRANCH.

THE BROWN RACE.

CHAPTER I. HINDOO BRANCH.

CHAPTER II. ETHIOPIAN BRANCH.

CHAPTER III. MALAY BRANCH.

THE RED RACE.

CHAPTER I. SOUTHERN BRANCH.

CHAPTER II. NORTHERN BRANCH.

THE BLACK RACE.

CHAPTER I. WESTERN BRANCH.

CHAPTER II. EASTERN BRANCH.

INDEX.

INTRODUCTION.

[Table of Contents](#)

CHAPTER I.

[Table of Contents](#)

Definition of Man—How he differs from other Animals—Origin of Man—In what parts of the Earth did he first appear?—Unity of Mankind, evidence in support—What is understood by species in Natural History—Man forms but one species, with its varieties or kinds—Classification of the Human Race.

What is man? A profound thinker, Cardinal de Bonald, has said: “Man is an intelligence assisted by organs.” We would fain adopt this definition, which brings into relief the true attribute of man, intelligence, were it not defective in drawing no sufficient distinction between man and the brute. It is a fact that animals are intelligent and that their intelligence is assisted by organs. But their intelligence is infinitely inferior to that of man. It does not extend beyond the necessities of attack and defence, the power of seeking food, and a small number of affections or passions, whose very limited scope merely extends to material wants. With man, on the other hand, intelligence is of a high order, although its range is limited, and it is often arrested, powerless and mute, before the problems itself proposes. In bodily formation, man is an animal, he lives in a material envelope, of which the structure is that of the Mammalia; but he far surpasses the animal in the extent of his intellectual faculties. The definition of man must therefore

establish this relation which animals bear to ourselves, and indicate, if possible, the degree which separates them. For this reason we shall define man: *an organized, intelligent being, endowed with the faculty of abstraction.*

To give beyond this a perfectly satisfactory definition of man is impossible: first, because, a definition, being but the expression of a theory, which rarely commands universal assent, is liable to be rejected with the theory itself; and secondly, because a perfectly accurate definition supposes an absolute knowledge of the subject, of which absolute knowledge our understanding is incapable. It has been well said that a correct definition can be furnished by none but divine power. Nothing is more true than this, and were we able to give of our own species a definition rigorously correct, we should indeed possess absolute knowledge.

The trouble we have to define aright the being about to form the subject of our investigation is but a forecast of the difficulties we shall meet when we endeavour to reason upon and to classify man. He who ventures to fathom the problems of human nature, physical, intellectual or moral, is arrested at every step. Each moment he must confess his powerlessness to solve the questions which arise, and at times is forced to content himself with merely suggesting them. This can be explained. Man is the last link of visible creation; with him closes the series of living beings which we are permitted to contemplate. Beyond him there extends, in a world hidden from our view, a train of beings of a new order, endowed with faculties superior and inaccessible to our comprehension, mysterious phalanxes, whose place of abode even is unknown to us, and who, after

us, form the next step in the infinite progression of living creatures by whom the universe is peopled. Situate, as he is, on the confines of this unknown world, on the very threshold of this domain, which his eye, if not his thoughts may not penetrate, man shares to some extent the attributes belonging to those beings who follow him in the economy of nature. Doubtless, it is this which makes it so difficult for us to comprehend the actual essence of man, his destiny, his origin and his end.

These reflections have been called for in order to supply an explanation of the frequent admissions of helplessness which we shall be obliged to make in this cursory Introduction, when we investigate the origin of man, the period of his first appearance on the globe, the unity or division of our species, the classification of the human race, &c. If to many of these questions we reply with doubt and uncertainty, the reader must not lay the blame at the feet of science, but must search for the cause in the impenetrable laws of nature.

And first, whence comes man? Wherefore does he exist? To this we can make no reply, the problem is beyond the reach of human thought. But we may at least enquire, since this question has been largely debated by the learned, whether man was at once constituted such as he is, or whether he originally existed in some other animal form, which has been modified in its anatomical structure by time and circumstances. In other words, is it true, as has been pretended by various of our contemporaries, that man is the result of the organic improvement of a particular race of

apes, which race forms a link between the apes with which we are familiar and the first man?

We have already treated and discussed this question more fully in the volume which preceded this. We have shown, in "Primitive Man," that man is not derived, by a process of organic transformation, from any animal, and that he includes the ape not more than the whale among his ancestry; but that he is the product of a special creation.

Nevertheless, whether its creation be special or the result of modification, the human species has not always existed. There is, then, a first cause for its production. What is this? Here is again a problem which surpasses our understanding. Let us say, my readers, that the creation of the human species was an act of God, that man is one of the children of the great arbiter of the universe, and we shall have given to this question the only response which can content at once our feelings and our reason.

But let us summon questions more accessible to our comprehension, with which the mind is more at ease, and upon which science can exercise its functions. To what period should we refer the first appearance of man upon the globe? In "Primitive Man" we have answered this question as far as it can be. We have considered the opinion of some writers who carry the first appearance of man as far back as the tertiary period. Rejecting this date on account of the insufficiency of the evidence produced, we, in common with most naturalists, have admitted, that man appeared for the first time upon our globe at the commencement of the quaternary period, that is to say, before the geological phenomenon of the deluge and previous to the glacial

period which preceded this great terrestrial cataclysm. To fix the birth of man in the tertiary period would be to travel out of facts now within the ken of science, and to substitute for observation, conjecture and hypothesis.

By saying that man appeared for the first time upon the globe at the commencement of the quaternary period, we establish the fact, which is agreeable to the cosmogony of Moses, that man was formed after the other animals, and that by his advent he crowned the edifice of animal creation.

At the quaternary period almost all the animals of our time had already seen the light, and a certain number of animal species existed, which were shortly to disappear. When man was created, the mammoth, the great bear, the cave tiger, and the cervus megaceros, animals more bulky, more robust and more agile than the corresponding species of our time, filled the forests and peopled the plains. The first men were therefore contemporary with the woolly elephant, the cave bear and tiger; they had to contend with these savage phalanxes, as formidable in their number as their strength. Nevertheless, in obedience to the laws of nature, these animals were to disappear from the globe and give place to smaller or different species, whilst man, persisting in the opposite direction, increased and multiplied, as the Scripture has said, and gradually spread into all inhabitable countries, taking possession of his empire which daily increased with the progress of his intelligence.

In "Primitive Man" we have given the history of the first steps of humanity.

We have traced the origin and progress of civilization, from the moment when man was cast, feeble, wretched and naked, in the midst of a hostile and savage brute population, to the day when his power, resting upon a firm basis, changed little by little the face of the inhabited earth.

We shall not refer to this at greater length, since in "Primitive Man" we have treated it fully, and in unison with the actual discoveries of science. But there is a very different problem to the solution of which we shall apply ourselves in the following pages. Did man see the light at any one spot of the earth, and at that alone, and is it possible to indicate the region which was, so to say, the cradle of humanity? Or, are we to believe that, in the first instance, man appeared in several places at the same time? That he was created and has always remained in the very localities he now inhabits? That the Negro was born in the burning regions of Central Africa, the Laplander or the Mongolian in the cold regions to which he is now confined?



1.—MEN AND WOMEN OF ANATOLIA.

To this question a satisfactory reply can be given by reference to facts furnished by natural history. But in seeking a triumph for our opinion we shall have to combat the arguments of a hostile doctrine. As we said in the early part of this Introduction, we must ever be prepared to encounter difficulties, to dissipate uncertainties, and to vie with other theories in each point of the history of humanity which we may seek to fathom.

There is a school of philosophers who assert that man was manifold in his creation, that each type of humanity originated in the region to which it is now attached, and that it was not emigration followed by the action of climate, circumstances, and customs which gave birth to the different races of man.

This opinion has been upheld in a work by M. Georges Pouchet, son of the well-known naturalist of Rouen. But, one has only to read his essay upon *la pluralité des races humaines*, to be convinced that the author, like others of his school, as ardent in demolition as powerless in construction, having chosen to act the easy part of a critic, exhibits unprecedented weakness when called upon to supply a system in the place of that he contradicts.

If there existed several centres of human creation, they should be indicated, and it should be shown that the men who dwell there now-a-days have never been connected with other populations. M. Georges Pouchet preserves prudent silence upon this question; he avoids defining the locus of any one of these supposed multiple creations. Such a faulty argument speaks volumes for the doctrine.

We, on our part, think that man had on the globe one centre of creation, that, fixed in the first instance in a particular region, he has radiated in every direction from that point, and by his wanderings coupled with the rapid multiplication of his descendants, he has ultimately peopled all the inhabitable regions of the earth.

In order to demonstrate the truth of this proposition, we will examine what takes place in connection with other organized beings, that is to say, with animals and plants, and then apply this class of facts to man: this is observation and induction, the only logical process to which we can here resort.



2.—SAMOIEDES OF THE NORTH CAPE.

And what do botanical and zoological geography teach? They show us that plants and animals have each their native locality, from which they but seldom depart, and that it would be impossible to cite any plant or animal which lives indifferently in all countries of the globe, without having been transported thither by human industry. The earth is, so to speak, divided into a certain number of zones, which have their particular vegetable and animal life. These are so many natural provinces, all of small extent, which

represent veritable centres of creation. The cedar, peculiar to the mountains of Lebanon, existed in this region alone before it was transported to other climates; and the coffee-plant had grown only in Arabia, before it was acclimatized in South America. We could quote the names of many vegetables whose natural abode is very sharply defined, but these instances are sufficient to exemplify the general rule of which we treat.

We need hardly say that animals, like plants, are attached to various localities which they rarely quit with impunity, since they have not the faculty of acclimatizing themselves at will. The elephant lives only in India and in certain parts of Africa; the hippopotamus and giraffe in other countries of the same continent; monkeys exist in very few portions of the globe, and if we consider their different species, we shall find that the place of abode of each species is very limited. For instance, of the larger apes, the orang-outang is found only in Borneo and Sumatra, and the gorilla in a small corner of Western Africa. Had man originated in all those places where now his different races are found, he would stand alone as an exception among organized beings.

Reasoning then by induction, that is, applying to man all that we observe to obtain generally among beings living on the surface of the globe, we come to the conclusion that the human species, in common with every vegetable or animal species, had but one centre of creation.

Can we now extend our investigation and determine the particular spot of the earth whence man first came? It is probable that man first saw the day on the plains of Central

Asia, and that it was from this point that by degrees he spread over the whole earth. We shall proceed to state the facts which support this opinion.

Around the central tableland of Asia, are found the three organic and fundamental types of man, that is to say, the white, the yellow, and the black. The black type has been somewhat scattered, although it is still found in the south of Japan, in the Malay Peninsula, in the Andaman Isles, and in the Philippines, at Formosa. The yellow type forms a large portion of the actual population of Asia, and it is well-known whence came those white hordes that invaded Europe at times prehistoric and in more recent ages; those conquerors belonged to the Aryan or Persian race, and they came from Central Asia. We shall see later on, that the different languages of the globe resolve themselves into three fundamental forms: *monosyllabic* languages, in which each word contains but one syllable; *agglutinative* languages, in which the words are connected; and *inflected* languages, which are the same as those spoken in Europe. Now, those three general forms of language are, at the present day, to be met with around the central tableland of Asia. The monosyllabic language is spoken throughout China and in the different states connected with that empire. The agglutinative languages are spoken to the north of this plain, and extend as far as Europe. And, lastly, inflected languages are found in all that portion of Asia which is occupied by the white race.

Around the central tableland of Asia, we thus find not only the three fundamental types of the human species, but the three types of human speech. Does not this, therefore,

afford ground for presumption, if not actual proof, that man first appeared in this very region which Scripture assigns as the birthplace of the human race?

It is from this central tableland of Asia, radiating so to say, around this point of origin, that Man has progressively occupied every part of the earth.

Migration commenced at a very early period, the facility with which our species becomes habituated to every climate and accommodates itself to variations of temperature, taken in connection with the nomadic character which distinguished primitive populations, explains to us the displacement of the earlier inhabitants of the earth. Soon, means of navigation, although rude, were added to the power of travelling by land, and man passed from the continent to distant islands, and thus peopled the archipelagos as well as the mainland. By means of transport, effected in canoes formed from the trunks of trees barely hollowed out, the archipelagos of the Indian Ocean, and finally Australia, were gradually peopled.

The American continent formed no exception to this law of the invasion of the globe by the emigration of human phalanxes. It is a matter of no great difficulty to pass from Asia to America, across Behring's Straits, which are almost always covered with ice, thus permitting of almost a dry passage from one continent to the other. Thus it is that the inhabitants of Northern Asia have found their way into the north of the New World.

This communication of one terrestrial hemisphere with the other is less surprising when we consider what modern historical works have shown, namely, that already about the

tenth century, which would be nearly 400 years before Christopher Columbus, navigators from the coast of Norway had penetrated to the other hemisphere. The inhabitants of Mexico and Chili possess most authentic historical archives, which prove that a most advanced civilization flourished there at an early period. Gigantic monuments which still remain, bear witness to the great antiquity of the civilization of the Incas (Peru) and of the Aztecs (Mexico). It is reasonable to suppose that the inhabitants of America, who thus advanced at a rapid pace in the path of civilization, descended from the hordes of Northern Asia which reached the New World by traversing the ice of Behring's Straits.

To explain, therefore, the presence of man upon all parts of the continent, and in the islands, it is not necessary to insist upon the existence of several centres, where our species was created. If popular traditions went to show that all the regions now inhabited have always been occupied by the same people, and that those who are found there have constantly lived in the same places, there might be reason to admit the hypothesis of multiple creations of the human race; but, on the contrary, traditions for the most part teach us that each country has been peopled progressively by means of conquest or emigration. Tradition shows that the nomadic state of existence has universally preceded fixed settlements. It is, therefore, probable that the first men were constantly on the move. A flood of barbarians, coming from central Asia, overflowed the Roman Empire, and the Vandals penetrated even into Africa. Modern migrations have been conducted on a still vaster scale, for at the present day we find America almost wholly occupied by

Europeans; English, Spanish and other people of the Latin race fill the vast American hemisphere, and the primitive populations of the New World have almost entirely disappeared, annihilated by the iron yoke of the conqueror.

The continent of Asia was peopled little by little by branches of the Aryan race, who came down from the plains of Central Asia, directing their course towards India. As to Africa: that continent received its contingent of population through the Isthmus of Suez, the valley of the Nile, and the coasts of Arabia, by the aid of navigation.

There is therefore nothing to show that humanity had several distinct nuclei. It is clear that man started from one point alone, and that through his power of adapting himself to the most different climates, he has, little by little, covered the whole face of the inhabitable earth.

The Bible proclaimed, long before the studies of modern anthropologists made it known, this principle of the unity of the human species. In like manner as the Bible opposed its monotheistic cosmogony to the different cosmogonies of oriental or pagan antiquity, in like manner it opposes to the erroneous dogmas of the religions and philosophies of antiquity, this doctrine sublime and simple in itself, that man, the last child of creation, rules it as its appointed head and by his moral power. Holy Writ, indeed, says to us: "God has created the whole human race of one flesh."[\[1\]](#)

[\[1\]](#) St. Paul at the Areopagus of Athens. Acts of the Apostles, chap. xvii. v. 26.

There is another problem. Did the white, the yellow, and the black man exist from the first moment of the appearance of our species upon the globe, or have we to explain the formation of these three fundamental races by

the action of climate, by any special form of nourishment, the result of local resources; in other words, by the action of the soil, if we may use the expression of a conscientious author, M. Trémaux?[2]

[2] Origine et transformation de l'homme et des autres êtres. 1 vol. in 18. Paris, 1865.

Innumerable dissertations have been written with a view of explaining the origin of these three races, and of connecting them with the climate or the soil. But it must be admitted that the problem is hardly capable of solution. The influence which a warm climate exercises upon the colour of the skin is a well known fact, and it is a matter of common observation that the white European, if transported into the heart of Africa, or carried to the coast of Guinea, transmits to his descendants the brown colour which the skin of the Negro possesses, and that in their turn the offspring of Negroes, who have been brought into northern countries, become as they descend, paler and paler and end by being white. But the colour of the skin is not the only characteristic of a race; the Negro differs from the white, less by the colour of his skin, than by the structure of the face and cranium, as also by the proportion of his members to one another. Is it not, moreover, a fact that the hottest countries are inhabited by people with white skins? Such for instance are the Touaricks of the African Sahara, and the Fellahs of Egypt. On the other hand, men with black faces are found in countries enjoying a mean temperature, as for instance, the inhabitants of California on the coast of the Pacific Ocean.

Let us conclude that science is unable to explain to us the difference which exists between the different types of the human species, that neither the temperature nor the action of the soil furnish an explanation of this fact, and that we must limit ourselves to noting it, without further comment, in spite of the mania which prompts the savants of our day in a desire to explain everything.

We have now another question to consider. Should these white, yellow, or black men, to whom we must add, as we shall see later on, those who are brown and red, all of whom differ one from another in the colour of their skin, in height, in their physiognomy, and in their outward appearance, be grouped into different species, or are we to regard them merely as varieties of species—that is to say, *races*? To fully understand this question and to form a judgment of what will result from it, we must ascertain what is understood in natural history by the word *species*, and by the word *race* or *variety of species*. We will therefore commence by explaining the meaning of species in zoology.

The hare and the rabbit, the horse and the ass, the dog and the wolf, the stag and the reindeer, &c., are not likely to be taken one for another. Yet how greatly do dogs differ among themselves in size, in colour, and in their proportions. What a difference there is between the mastiff and the Pyrenean dog! The same observation applies to horses. How different we find in size and outward appearance the large Normandy horse, the London dray horse, or the omnibus horse of Paris, and the small Corsican or Shetland horses which we can carry in our arms! And yet no one is mistaken in them: whether he differ in size, or in

the colour of his hair, we always recognise a horse, and never mistake him for an ass; in the mastiff as well as in the bulldog, we shall always recognise a dog. However greatly a rabbit may vary in size and colour, it will never be taken for a hare. The Breton cow, slight and frail, is nevertheless as much a cow in the eyes of a farmer, and the rest of the world, as a full-sized Durham. The same reflection applies with equal force to birds. The turkey which exists in the wild state in America, certainly differs very much from the black or white turkey acclimatized in Europe; but there is no mistake that both of them are turkeys, and nothing else.

The vegetable kingdom will furnish us with similar facts. Take, for instance, the cotton plant on its native soil in America, and you will find that it differs from the cotton plant cultivated in Africa and Asia. The coffee plant of the South American plantations is not similar to the same shrub which exists in Arabia, whence it came in the first instance. Wheat varies with latitude to a most extraordinary extent, &c. The cotton plant, however, is always the cotton plant, whatever be the soil upon which it grows; the coffee plant and wheat are always the same vegetables, and one is not liable to be deceived in them. The action of climate and soil upon vegetables, these same causes taken in connection with nutrition upon animals, and finally the mixture which has taken place between different individuals, explain all these differences, which affect the external appearance, but not the type itself.

We mean by *species*, when applied either to animals or vegetables, the fundamental type, and by *variety* or *race* the different beings which result from the influence of

climate, of nutriment, and of mixture with individuals of the same species. The *species dog* gives birth to the *varieties* or *races* known under the names of bull-dog, spaniel, mastiff, &c. The *species horse* gives birth to the *races* or *varieties* known under the names of the Arabian, English, Normandy, Corsican, &c. The *species turkey* produces the varieties known as the wild turkey, the black and the white turkey. In the vegetable kingdom, the *cotton plant species* produces the American and the Indian cotton; the *bramble* produces the innumerable varieties which are known to us as rose-trees.

But, the reader will say, how are we to distinguish race from species, and does there exist any practical means of deciding whether the animal under consideration belongs to a species or a race? We reply that such a means does exist, which enables us to speak with certainty in every case. It is of importance that this should be made known in order that every one may test it for himself.

Take the two animals in question, unite them, and if that connexion of the sexes results in the production of another individual, capable of reproduction, this will indicate race or variety. If, however, the union of the two individuals is unproductive, or the offspring is itself barren, this will indicate two individuals of different species.

In spite of observations and experiments made in the course of many thousand years, reproduction has never been procured by mixture of a rabbit with a hare, a wolf with a dog, a sheep with a goat. It is true that hybrids are obtained between the horse and she-ass, and between the ass and the mare, but it is well known that the individuals

produced by this mixture, namely, the quadrupeds termed *mules*, are barren animals, incapable of reproduction with one another.

This rule is not confined to the animal kingdom, but it obtains also among vegetables. You can obtain artificial production from a pear tree by applying, with suitable precautions, the pollen of the flowers of one pear tree to the stamens of those of another. Fruit will be formed, and the seed which that produces will in its turn be productive. But if you attempt to perform the same operation between a pear tree and an apple tree, you will obtain no result whatever. This, again, is the practical method which enables botanists to distinguish varieties from species. The test of artificial fecundation between one plant and another, which it is desired to distinguish as regards their species, serves to solve the difficulties which are met in attempting to determine the position of a plant in botanical classification.

The word *species* therefore is not a fictitious term, a conventional expression invented by the learned to designate the classifications of living beings. A species is a group arranged by Nature herself. Fruitfulness or barrenness in the products of the mixture are the characteristics which Nature attaches to variety or to species; those groups therefore appear to us as though they had a substantial foundation in the laws which govern living beings, and we do but render in speech what we observe in Nature.

When, moreover, we reflect, we easily understand that if Nature had not instituted species the most complete disorder would have reigned throughout living creation. By intermixture the animal kingdom would have been overrun

by *mongrels* who would have confused every type, thus permitting of no discernment in this crowd of incoherent products. The whole animal kingdom would have been given over to inextricable confusion. In like manner, if plants had been capable of infinite variety through the mixture of different species, brought about by the industry of man, or by the effect of the wind bearing through the air the fertilizing pollen, there would be nought but trouble and disorder among the vegetable population of the globe.

Species therefore has a necessary, providential, and fixed existence. Impossibility of union is the distinctive qualification which nature assigns to this group of living beings. Reproduction is possible only between members of the same species, and the differences produced in their offspring by the soil, nutriment and surrounding circumstances, determine what we call race, or variety.

The principle which we have just enunciated, will in its application to man enable us to decide whether the individuals that people the globe, belong to different species of men, or simply to *races* or *varieties*; in other words, whether the human species is unique, and whether the different human types known to us, the white, black, yellow, brown and red-man, belong or not to *races* of the human species.

The reply to this question will doubtless have been anticipated. If we apply the rule stated above, all men that inhabit the globe belong to one and the same species, since it is a fact that men and women, whatever be their colour, can marry, and their offspring is always reproductive. The Negro and white female by their union produce mulattoes;

mulattoes and mulattresses are reproductive, as are also their descendants—marriages between members of the red or brown races are fruitful, and, what is more, the fecundity of the descendants of mongrels is superior to that of men and women of the same colour.

Unless, therefore, we regard men as a solitary exception among all living beings, unless we withdraw them from the operation of the universal laws of nature, we must come to the conclusion that they do but form a certain number of races of one and the same species, and all descend from one primitive unique species.

Men are brothers in blood: this principle of universal fraternity imposed by nature, may be placed side by side with the corresponding maxim suggested by the moral sense.

Those who deny the unity of the human species, *polygenists*, or supporters of the plurality of human kind, base their arguments in favour of there being more than one species, upon the assertion that the distinction between the Negro and the white man is too great to permit of their possibly being classed together. But, between the lap-dog and the mastiff, the wild and tame rabbit, the spaniel and the greyhound, or the Shetland and Russian horse, there is a much greater difference than exists between the Negro and the white man. We are unable to state exactly, or to explain with any degree of accuracy, how it is that man, as he was first created, has given birth to races so widely different as the white, black, yellow, brown, and red which people the earth at the present day. We can but furnish a general explanation of what we see in the widely varying conditions

of existence, and in the opposite character of the media through which man, for ages past, has dragged his existence, frequently with much difficulty and uncertainty. If the dog, the horse, the rabbit, and the turkey, through the agency of human industry applied to them during a period of scarcely two thousand years, have given birth to so many varieties, how much more would man, whose appearance upon the globe is of such antiquity that we cannot assign to it even approximatively a date—man, whose fate it has been to pass through so many different climates, such various physical and social positions, expect to see his own type become modified and transformed? We should, with more reason, feel surprised at finding that the differences between one variety and another are not much wider than they appear to be.

In order to avoid this argument, there remains to the supporters of the plurality of human kind no alternative but to regard man as an exception in nature; to assert that he has laws peculiar to himself, and that the principles which pervade the life of plants and animals can in no way apply to him. But man, who is an organized and living being, and is furnished with a body that differs but little from that of any mammiferous animal, is, so far as concerns his organization, subject to the universal laws of nature, and that of intermixture among the rest. It is therefore impossible to admit the question of exception raised by those who deny the unity of the human species.

The principle that the human species is one, and what follows as a natural conclusion, namely, that all men who inhabit the earth are but races or varieties of this one

species, will, therefore, appear to the reader to be satisfactorily established.

These different races which originate in one species, the primitive type having been modified by the operation of climate, food, soil, intermixture and local customs, differ, it must be admitted, to a marvellous extent, in their outward appearance, colour and physiognomy. The differences are so great, the extremes so marked and the transitions so gradual, that it is well-nigh impossible to distribute the human species into really natural groups from a scientific point of view, that is to say, groups founded upon organic characteristics. The classification of the human races has always been the stumbling block of anthropology, and up to the present time the difficulty remains almost undiminished.

A cursory examination of the various classifications which have been brought forward by the most important of those who have essayed the task will make this truth apparent to all.

Buffon, in his chapter upon *man*; a work which we can always read again with admiration and advantage, contents himself with bringing forward the three fundamental types of the human species which have been known from the first under the names of the white, black and yellow race. But these three types in themselves do not exemplify every human physiognomy. The ancient inhabitants of America, commonly known as the *Red-Skins*, are entirely overlooked in this classification, and the distinction between the Negro and the white man cannot always be easily pointed out, for in Africa the Abyssinians, the Egyptians, and many others, in

America the Californians, and in Asia the Hindoos, Malays and Javanese are neither white nor black.

Blumenbach, the most profound anthropologist of the last century, and author of the first actual treatise upon the natural history of man, distinguished in his Latin work, *De Homine*, five races of men, the Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, Malay and American. Another anthropologist, Prochaska, adopted the divisions pointed out by Blumenbach, but united under the name of the *white race*, Blumenbach's Caucasian and Mongolian groups, and added the *Hindoo race*.

The eloquent naturalist Lacépède, in his *Histoire naturelle de l'Homme*, added to the races admitted by Blumenbach the *hyperborean race*, comprising the inhabitants of the northern portion of the globe in either continent.

Cuvier fell back upon Buffon's division, admitting only the white, black and yellow races, from which he simply derived the *Malay* and *American* races.

A naturalist of renown, Virey, author of *l'Histoire naturelle du Genre humain*, *l'Histoire naturelle de la Femme*, and of many other clever productions upon natural history and particularly anthropology, gave much attention to the classification of the human races. But he was not favourable to the unity of our species, being led to entertain the opinion that the human species was twofold. This was the starting point of an erroneous deviation in the ideas of naturalists who wrote after Virey. We find Bory de Saint Vincent admitting as many as fifteen species of men, and another naturalist, Desmoulins, doubtless influenced by a

feeling of emulation, distinguished sixteen human species, which, moreover, were not the same as those admitted by Bory de Saint Vincent.

This course of classification might have been followed to a much greater extent, for the differences among men are so great, that if strict rule is not adhered to, it is impossible to fix any limit to species. Unless therefore the principle of unity has been fully conceded at starting, the investigation may result in the admission of a truly indefinite quantity.

This is the principle which pervades the writings of the most learned of all the anthropologists of our age, Dr. Pritchard, author of a *Natural History of Man*, which in the original text formed ten volumes, but of which the French language possesses but a very incomplete translation.

Dr. Pritchard holds that all people of the earth belong to the same species; he is a partisan of the unity of the human species, but is not satisfied with any of the classifications already proposed, and which were founded upon organic characteristics. He, in fact, entirely alters the aspect of the ordinary classifications which are to be met with in natural history. He commences by pointing out three families, which, he asserts, were in history the first human occupants of the earth: namely the *Aryan*, *Semitic*, and *Egyptian*. Having described these three families, Pritchard passes to the people who, as he says, radiated in various directions from the regions inhabited by them, and proceeded to occupy the entire globe.

This mode of classification, as we have pointed out, leaves the beaten track trodden by other natural historians. For this reason it has not found favour among modern

anthropologists, and this disfavour has reacted upon the work itself, which, notwithstanding, is the most complete and exact of all that we possess upon man. Although it has been adopted by no other author, Pritchard's classification of the human race appears to us to be the most sound in principle.

M. de Quatrefages, in his course of anthropology at the Museum of Natural History, Paris, makes a classification of the human race based upon the three types, white, yellow and black; but he appends to each of these three groups, under the head of *mixed races attached to each stem*, a number of races more or less considerable and arbitrary which were excluded from the three chief divisions.

The classification of M. de Quatrefages will be found in his *Rapport sur les progrès de l'Anthropologie*, published in 1867.^[3] It is extremely learned and well worked out, but a classification which entirely passes by the simple mode of reasoning we shall adopt in the following pages.

^[3] In 4^o forming part of the *Rapports sur les progrès des Sciences et des Lettres en France*, published under the auspices of the Minister of Public Instruction.

The classification of the human race which we propose to follow, modifying it where in our opinion it may appear to be necessary, is due to a Belgian naturalist, M. d'Omalius d'Halloy. It acknowledges five races of men: the white, black, yellow, brown and red.

This classification is based upon the colour of the skin, a characteristic very secondary in importance to that of organization, but which yet furnishes a convenient framework for an exact and methodical enumeration of the inhabitants of the globe, permitting a clear consideration of