

MUTUAL AID AMONG SAVAGES.

THE immense part played by mutual aid and mutual support in the evolution of the animal world has been briefly analysed in two preceding papers.¹ We have now to cast a broad glance upon the part played by the same agencies in the evolution of mankind. We saw how few are the animal species which live an isolated life, and how numberless are those which live in societies, either for mutual defence, or for hunting and storing up food, or for rearing their offspring, or simply for enjoying life in common. We also saw that, though a good deal of warfare goes on between different classes of animals, or different species, or even different tribes of the same species, peace and mutual support are the rule within the tribe, or the species; and that those species which best know how to combine, and to avoid competition, have the best chances of survival and of a further progressive development. They prosper, while the unsociable species decay.

It is evident that it would be quite contrary to all that we know of nature if men were an exception to so general a rule: if a creature so defenceless as man was at his beginnings should have found his protection and his way to progress, not in mutual support, like other animals, but in a reckless competition for personal advantages, with no regard to the interests of the species. To a mind accustomed to the idea of unity in nature, such a proposition appears utterly indefensible. And yet, improbable and unphilosophical as it is, it has never found a lack of supporters. There always were writers who took a pessimistic view of mankind. They knew it, more or less superficially, through their own limited experience; they knew of history what the annalists, always watchful of wars, cruelty and oppression, told of it, and little more besides; and they concluded that mankind is nothing but a loose aggregation of beings, always ready to fight with each other, and only prevented from so doing by the intervention of some authority.

Hobbes took that position in the last century; and while some of his contemporaries endeavoured to prove that at no epoch of its existence—not even in its most primitive condition—mankind lived

¹ *Nineteenth Century*, September and November, 1890.

in a state of perpetual warfare; that men lived in 'the state of nature,' and that want of knowledge of the natural bad inclinations of man, brought back to him of its early historical life, he maintained, that the so-called 'state of nature' was nothing but a caprice between individuals, accidentally huddled together by the caprice of their bestial existence. True, there has been some progress since Hobbes's time, and that progress stands upon a firmer ground than the speculations of Hobbes. Hobbesian philosophy has plenty of admirers, but since of late quite a school of writers who, taking up the terminology rather than of his leading ideas, have come in favour of Hobbes's views upon primitive man, and in giving them a scientific appearance. Mr. Spencer, in the lead of that school, and in a recent work, has represented primitive men as a sort of tigers or lions, fighting out the struggle for existence, and living a life of 'continual free fight'; and 'beyond the limited and temporary relations of the Hobbesian war of each against all was the natural

It has been remarked more than once that Hobbes and the eighteenth-century philosophers imagined that mankind began its life in the state of small families, something like the 'limited and temporary relations of the bigger carnivores, while in reality it is not so. Such was *not* the case. Of course, we have no knowledge of the modes of life of the first man-like beings, but we are settled even as to the time of their first appearance. We are inclined at present to see their traces in the lower tertiary miocene deposits. But we have the indirect evidence of us to throw some light even upon that remote period. A careful investigation into the social institutions of man has been carried on during the last thirty years, and has shown among the present institutions of primitive man still older institutions which have long disappeared, and which less left unmistakable traces of their previous existence. Science devoted to the embryology of human institutions has developed in the hands of Lubbock, Edw. B. Tylor, Huxley, Huxley, Bachofen, Maine, Post, Kovalevsky, and others, and that science has established beyond any doubt that man began its life in the shape of small isolated families. In a primitive form of organisation, the family is the starting-point of human evolution. As far as we can go in the history of mankind, we find men living in societies—in the state of the highest mammals; and an extremely small

² *Nineteenth Century*, February 1888.

in a state of perpetual warfare; that men have been sociable even in 'the state of nature,' and that want of knowledge, rather than the natural bad inclinations of man, brought humanity to all the horrors of its early historical life, he maintained, on the contrary, that the so-called 'state of nature' was nothing but a permanent fight between individuals, accidentally huddled together by the mere caprice of their bestial existence. True, that science has made some progress since Hobbes's time, and that we have safer ground to stand upon than the speculations of Hobbes or Rousseau. But the Hobbesian philosophy has plenty of admirers still; and we have had of late quite a school of writers who, taking possession of Darwin's terminology rather than of his leading ideas, made of it an argument in favour of Hobbes's views upon primitive man, and even succeeded in giving them a scientific appearance. Mr. Huxley, as is known, took the lead of that school, and in a recent paper he represented primitive men as a sort of tigers or lions, deprived of all ethical conceptions, fighting out the struggle for existence to its bitter end, and living a life of 'continual free fight'; to quote his own words—'beyond the limited and temporary relations of the family, the Hobbesian war of each against all was the normal state of existence.'²

It has been remarked more than once that the chief error of Hobbes and the eighteenth-century philosophers altogether was to imagine that mankind began its life in the shape of small straggling families, something like the 'limited and temporary' families of the bigger carnivores, while in reality it is now positively known that such was *not* the case. Of course, we have no direct evidence as to the modes of life of the first man-like beings. We are not yet settled even as to the time of their first appearance, geologists being inclined at present to see their traces in the pliocene, or even the miocene, deposits. But we have the indirect method which permits us to throw some light even upon that remote antiquity. A most careful investigation into the social institutions of the lowest races has been carried on during the last thirty years, and it has revealed among the present institutions of primitive folk some traces of still older institutions which have long disappeared, but nevertheless left unmistakable traces of their previous existence. A whole science devoted to the embryology of human institutions has thus developed in the hands of Lubbock, Edwin Tylor, Morgan, Maclennan, Bachofen, Maine, Post, Kovalevsky, and many others. And that science has established beyond any doubt that mankind did *not* begin its life in the shape of small isolated families. Far from being a primitive form of organisation, the family is a very late product of human evolution. As far as we can go in the palæo-ethnology of mankind, we find men living in societies—in tribes similar to those of the highest mammals; and an extremely slow and long evolution

² *Nineteenth Century*, February 1888, p. 165.

was required to bring these societies to the gentile, or clan organisation, which, in its turn, had to undergo another, also very long evolution, before the first germs of family, polygamous or monogamous, could appear. Societies, bands, or tribes—not families—were thus the primitive form of organisation of mankind and its earliest ancestors. That is what ethnology has come to after its painstaking researches. And in so doing it simply came to what might have been foreseen by the zoologist. None of the higher mammals, save a few carnivores and a few undoubtedly decaying species of apes (orang-outangs and gorillas), live in small families, isolatedly straggling in the woods. All others live in societies. And Darwin so well understood that isolatedly living apes never could have developed into man-like beings, that he was inclined to consider man as descended from some comparatively weak *but social species*, like the chimpanzee, rather than from some stronger but unsociable species, like the gorilla.³ Zoology and palæo-ethnology are thus agreed in considering that the band, not the family, was the earliest form of social life. The first human societies simply were a further development of those societies which constitute the very essence of life of the higher animals.⁴

If we now go over to positive evidence, we see that the earliest traces of man, dating from the glacial or the early post-glacial period, afford unmistakable proofs of man having lived even then in societies. Isolated finds of stone implements, even from the old stone age, are very rare; on the contrary, wherever one flint implement is discovered others are sure to be found, in most cases in very large quantities. At a time when men were dwelling in caves, or under occasionally protruding rocks, in company with mammals now extinct, and hardly succeeded in making the roughest description of flint hatchets, they already knew the advantages of life in societies. In the valleys of the tributaries of the Dordogne, the surface of the rocks is in some places entirely covered with caves which were inhabited by palæolithic men.⁵ Sometimes the cave-dwellings are superposed in stories, and they certainly recall much more the nesting colonies of swallows than the dens of carnivores. As to the flint implements discovered in those caves, to use Lubbock's words,

³ *The Descent of Man*, end of ch. ii. pp. 63 and 64 of the second edition.

⁴ Anthropologists who fully endorse the above views as regards man nevertheless intimate, sometimes, that the apes live in polygamous families, under the leadership of 'a strong and jealous male.' I do not know how far that assertion is based upon conclusive observation. But the passage from Brehm's *Life of Animals*, which is sometimes referred to, can hardly be taken as very conclusive. It occurs in his general description of monkeys; but his more detailed descriptions of separate species either contradict it or do not confirm it. Even as regards the cercopithecus, Brehm is affirmative in saying that they 'nearly always live in bands, and very seldom in families' (French edition, p. 59). As to other species, the very numbers of their bands, always containing many males, renders the 'polygamous family' more than doubtful. Further observation is evidently wanted.

⁵ Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, fifth edition, 1890.

'one may say without exaggeration that the same is true of other palæolithic stations. Investigations that the inhabitants of the south of France partook of tribal meals. So that men lived in societies, and had even at that extremely remote epoch.

The same is still better proved as regards the stone age. Traces of neolithic man have been found in such quantities, so that we can reconstitute his life to a certain extent. When the ice-cap (which must have covered regions as far south as middle France, middle Russia, and covered Canada as well as a great part of the United States) began to melt away, the surface was covered, first, with swamps and marshes, and afterwards with less lakes.⁶ Lakes filled all depressions, and the waters dug out those permanent channels which, in the present epoch, became our rivers. And wherever we look in Asia, or America, the shores of the littoral period, whose proper name would be the period of the traces of neolithic man. They are so numerous that we wonder at the relative density of population. 'stations' of neolithic man closely follow each other, which now mark the shores of the old lakes. In such stations stone implements appear in such quantities, it is possible as to the length of time during which they were used by rather numerous tribes. Whole works of stone, testifying of the numbers of workers who used them, have been discovered by the archæologists.

Traces of a more advanced period, also, are found. The use of some pottery, are found in the shell-lake period, appear, as is well known, in the shape of hollow vessels, thick, from 100 to 200 feet wide, and 1,000 feet long. They are so common along some parts of the coast, that at the time they were considered as natural growths. 'nothing but what has been in some way or other the work of man,' and they are so densely stuffed with the products of industry that, during a two days' stay at Millstone, we found no less than 191 pieces of stone-implement pottery.⁷ The very size and extension of the works for generations and generations the coasts of

⁶ That extension of the ice-cap is admitted by most geologists, especially studied the glacial age. The Russian Geologist, who holds this view as regards Russia, and most German geologists in Germany. The glaciation of most of the central plateau of Europe is recognised by the French geologists, when they pay attention to the deposits altogether.

⁷ *Prehistoric Times*, pp. 232 and 242.

'one may say without exaggeration that they are numberless.' The same is true of other palæolithic stations. It also appears from Lartet's investigations that the inhabitants of the Aurignac region in the south of France partook of tribal meals at the burial of their dead. So that men lived in societies, and had germs of a tribal worship, even at that extremely remote epoch.

The same is still better proved as regards the later part of the stone age. Traces of neolithic man have been found in numberless quantities, so that we can reconstitute his manner of life to a great extent. When the ice-cap (which must have spread from the Polar regions as far south as middle France, middle Germany, and middle Russia, and covered Canada as well as a good deal of what is now the United States) began to melt away, the surfaces freed from ice were covered, first, with swamps and marshes, and later on with numberless lakes.⁶ Lakes filled all depressions of the valleys before their waters dug out those permanent channels which, during a subsequent epoch, became our rivers. And wherever we explore, in Europe, Asia, or America, the shores of the literally numberless lakes of that period, whose proper name would be the Lacustrine period, we find traces of neolithic man. They are so numerous that we can only wonder at the relative density of population at that time. The 'stations' of neolithic man closely follow each other on the terraces which now mark the shores of the old lakes. And at each of those stations stone implements appear in such numbers, that no doubt is possible as to the length of time during which they were inhabited by rather numerous tribes. Whole workshops of flint implements, testifying of the numbers of workers who used to come together, have been discovered by the archæologists.

Traces of a more advanced period, already characterised by the use of some pottery, are found in the shell-heaps of Denmark. They appear, as is well known, in the shape of heaps from five to ten feet thick, from 100 to 200 feet wide, and 1,000 feet or more in length, and they are so common along some parts of the sea-coast that for a long time they were considered as natural growths. And yet they 'contain *nothing* but what has been in some way or other subservient to the use of man,' and they are so densely stuffed with products of human industry that, during a two days' stay at Milgaard, Lubbock dug out no less than 191 pieces of stone-implements and four fragments of pottery.⁷ The very size and extension of the shell-heaps prove that for generations and generations the coasts of Denmark were inhabited

⁶ That extension of the ice-cap is admitted by most of the geologists who have specially studied the glacial age. The Russian Geological Survey already has taken this view as regards Russia, and most German specialists maintain it as regards Germany. The glaciation of most of the central plateau of France will not fail to be recognised by the French geologists, when they pay more attention to the glacial deposits altogether.

⁷ *Prehistoric Times*, pp. 232 and 242.

by hundreds of small tribes which certainly lived as peacefully together as the Fuegian tribes, which also accumulate like shell-heaps, are living in our own times.

As to the lake dwellings of Switzerland, which represent a still further advance in civilisation, they yield still better evidence of life and work in societies. It is known that even during the stone age the shores of the Swiss lakes were dotted with a succession of villages, each of which consisted of several huts, and was built upon a platform supported by numberless pillars in the lake. No less than twenty-four, mostly stone age villages, were discovered along the shores of Lake Lemán, thirty-two in the Lake of Constance, forty-six in the Lake of Neuchâtel, and so on; and each of them testifies to the immense amount of labour which was spent in common by the tribe, not by the family. It has even been asserted that the life of the lake-dwellers must have been remarkably free of warfare. And so it probably was, especially if we refer to the life of those primitive folk who live until the present time in similar villages built upon pillars on the sea coasts.

It is thus seen, even from the above rapid hints, that our knowledge of primitive man is not so scanty after all, and that, so far as it goes, it is rather opposed than favourable to the Hobbesian speculations. Moreover, it may be supplemented, to a great extent, by the direct observation of such primitive tribes as now stand on the same level of civilisation as the inhabitants of Europe stood in prehistoric times.⁸

⁸ It is known that some scientists are inclined to see in the lower races—degenerated specimens of mankind who formerly knew a higher civilisation. To the general arguments already opposed to the degeneration theory by Lubbock and Edwin Tylor let me add the following. Save a few tribes clustering in the less accessible highlands, the 'savages' represent a girdle which encircles the more or less civilised nations, and they occupy the extremities of our continents, most of which have retained still, or recently were bearing, an early post-glacial character. Such are the Eskimos and their congeners in Greenland, Arctic America, and Northern Siberia; and, in the Southern hemisphere, the Australians, the Papuas, the Fuegians, and, partly, the Bushmen; while within the civilised area, like primitive folk are only found in the Himalayas, the highlands of Australasia, and the plateaus of Brazil. Now it must be borne in mind that the glacial age did not come to an end at once over the whole surface of the earth. It still continues in Greenland. Therefore, at a time when the littoral regions of the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, or the Gulf of Mexico already enjoyed a warmer climate, and became the seats of higher civilisations, immense territories in middle Europe, Siberia, and Northern America, as well as in Patagonia, Southern Africa, and Southern Australasia, remained in early post-glacial conditions which rendered them inaccessible to the civilised nations of the torrid and sub-torrid zones. They were at that time what the terrible *urmans* of North-West Siberia are now, and their population, inaccessible to and untouched by civilisation, retained the characters of early post-glacial man. Later on, when desiccation rendered these territories more suitable for agriculture, they were peopled with more civilised immigrants; and while part of their previous inhabitants were assimilated by the new settlers, another part migrated further, and settled where we find them. The territories they inhabit now are still, or recently were, sub-glacial, as to their physical features; their arts and implements are those of the neolithic

The first thing which strikes primitive folk is the complexity of relations under which they are living in a family, in the sense we attribute to it. But they are by no means loose in their coming in a disorderly manner to momentary caprices. All of them are which has been described by Morgan as 'gentile,' or clan organisation.⁹

To tell the matter as briefly as possible, mankind has passed at its beginning from a state described as that of 'communal marriage' to that of husbands and wives in common, and of consanguinity. But it is also certain that the intercourse were imposed at a very early stage soon prohibited between the sons of one man and daughters, and aunts. Later on it was prohibited between the sons of one man and daughters of the same mother, and so on, until it failed to follow. The idea of a group of presumed descendants from one stock (as in one group) was evolved, and marriage was prohibited. It still remained 'communal' until it had to be taken from another class, and was divided into numerous, and subdivided into several classes, and divided into classes (usually four), and so on, until between certain well-defined classes of people now among the Kamilaroi-speaking people its first germs appeared amidst the people who was captured in war from some other people, and have belonged to the whole gens, and the capturer, under certain obligations, to be taken by him to a separate household, and to form a gens a separate family, the appearance of which is a quite new phase of civilisation.

age; and, notwithstanding their racial differences, their modes of life and social institutions cannot but consider them as fragments of the now civilised area.

⁹ Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society, or Researches into the Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*, in *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society*, vol. xvii. When Morgan first described it, it was all but general extension, maintaining the basis of the consecutive steps of human evolution. But the most careful researches prosecuted since, and ancient law, have proved that all races of mankind have passed through the same stages of development among various savages. See the works of Morgan, Kovalevsky, Lippert, and so on.

The first thing which strikes us as soon as we begin studying primitive folk is the complexity of the organisation of marriage relations under which they are living. With most of them the family, in the sense we attribute to it, is hardly found in its germs. But they are by no means loose aggregations of men and women coming in a disorderly manner together in conformity with their momentary caprices. All of them are under a certain organisation, which has been described by Morgan in its general aspects as the 'gentile,' or clan organisation.⁹

To tell the matter as briefly as possible, there is little doubt that mankind has passed at its beginnings through a stage which may be described as that of 'communal marriage'; that is, the whole tribe had husbands and wives in common with but little regard to consanguinity. But it is also certain that some restrictions to that free intercourse were imposed at a very early period. Inter-marriage was soon prohibited between the sons of one mother and her sisters, granddaughters, and aunts. Later on it was prohibited between the sons and daughters of the same mother, and further limitations did not fail to follow. The idea of a *gens*, or clan, which embodied all presumed descendants from one stock (or rather all those who gathered in one group) was evolved, and marriage within the clan was entirely prohibited. It still remained 'communal,' but the wife or the husband had to be taken from another clan. And when a *gens* became too numerous, and subdivided into several *gentes*, each of them was divided into classes (usually four), and marriage was permitted only between certain well-defined classes. That is the stage which we find now among the Kamilaroi-speaking Australians. As to the family, its first germs appeared amidst the clan organisation. A woman who was captured in war from some other clan, and who formerly would have belonged to the whole *gens*, could be kept at a later period by the capturer, under certain obligations towards the tribe. She may be taken by him to a separate hut, and thus constitute within the *gens* a separate family, the appearance of which evidently was opening a quite new phase of civilisation.

age; and, notwithstanding their racial differences, and the distances which separate them, their modes of life and social institutions bear a striking likeness. So we cannot but consider them as fragments of the early post-glacial population of the now civilised area.

⁹ Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilisation*, New York, 1877. Also, 'Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity in Human Family,' in *Smithsonian Contributions*, vol. xvii. When Morgan first described the clan organisation, and concluded as to its all but general extension, maintaining that the marriage-laws lie at the very basis of the consecutive steps of human evolution, he was accused of exaggeration. But the most careful researches prosecuted since, by a whole phalanx of students of ancient law, have proved that all races of mankind bear traces of having passed through the same stages of development of marriage laws as we now see in force among various savages. See the works of MacLennan, Bachofen, Dargun, Post, Kovalevsky, Lippert, and so on.

Now, if we take into consideration that this complicated organisation developed among men who stood at the lowest known degree of development, and that it maintained itself in societies knowing no kind of authority besides the authority of public opinion, we at once see how deeply inrooted social instincts must have been in human nature, even at its lowest stages. A savage who is capable of living under such an organisation, and of freely submitting to rules which continually clash with his personal desires, certainly is not a beast devoid of ethical principles and knowing no rein to its passions. But the fact becomes still more striking if we consider the immense antiquity of the clan organisation. It is now known that the primitive Semites, the Greeks of Homer, the prehistoric Romans, the Germans of Tacitus, the early Celts and the early Slavonians, all have had their own period of clan organisation, closely analogous to that of the Australians, the Red Indians, the Eskimos, and other inhabitants of the 'savage girdle.'¹⁰ So we must admit that either the evolution of marriage laws went on on the same lines among all human races, or the rudiments of the clan rules were developed among some common ancestors of the Semites, the Aryans, the Polynesians, &c., before their differentiation into separate races, and were maintained, until now, among races long ago separated from the common stock. Both alternatives imply, however, an equally striking tenacity of the institution—such a tenacity that no assaults of the individual could break it down through the scores of thousands of years that it was in existence. The very persistence of the clan organisation shows how utterly false it is to represent primitive mankind as a disorderly agglomeration of individuals, who only obey their individual passions, and take advantage of their personal force and cunningness against all other representatives of the species. Unbridled individualism is a modern growth, but it is not characteristic of primitive mankind.¹¹

Going now over to the existing savages, we may begin with the

¹⁰ For the Aryans, see especially Prof. M. Kovalevsky's *Primitive Law* (in Russian). Moscow, 1886 and 1887. Also his lectures delivered at Stockholm.

¹¹ It would be impossible to enter here into a discussion of the origin of the marriage restrictions. Let me only remark that a division into groups, similar to Morgan's *Hawaiian*, exists among birds; the young broods live together separately from their parents. A like division might probably be traced among some mammals as well. As to the prohibition of marriages between brothers and sisters, it is more likely to have arisen, not from speculations about the bad effects of consanguinity, which speculations really do not seem probable, but to avoid the too easy precocity of like marriages. Under close cohabitation it must have become of imperious necessity. I must also remark that in discussing the origin of new customs altogether, we must keep in mind that the savages, like us, have their 'thinkers' and *savants*—wizards, doctors, prophets, &c.—whose knowledge and ideas are in advance upon those of the masses. United as they are in their secret unions (another almost universal feature) they are certainly capable of exercising a powerful influence, and of enforcing customs the utility of which may not yet be recognised by the majority of the tribe.

Bushmen, who stand at a very indeed that they have no dwellings on soil, occasionally protected by some Europeans settled in their territories. They began stealing the settlers' cattle, a crime too horrible to be related here, was committed. Bushmen were slaughtered in 1771 by the Farmers' Alliance, and so on. One killed by hunters lying in ambush for an animal, killed wherever met with. Bushmen, being chiefly borrowed from, exterminated them, is necessarily the case when the Europeans came, the Bushmen (clans), sometimes federated together, but common, and divided the spoils. They never abandoned their wounded, but their comrades. Lichtenstein had a Bushman, nearly drowned in a river, and his companions. They took off their own skins; they dried him, and smeared his body with warm grease. He lived. And when the Bushmen found a European who treated them well, they expressed their touching attachment to that man. They represent them as good-hearted, diligent, and grateful,¹⁴ all qualities which are practised within the tribe. As to the matter of saying that when a European wished to take a slave, he stole her child: the mother was obliged to share the fate of her child.¹⁵

The same social manners characterise a little more developed than the Bushmen, as 'the filthiest animals,' and filthy habits, such as to the neck and worn till it falls off. Their huts are a few sticks assembled together, with no kind of furniture within. And yet they seem to have known the use of fire, and with the Europeans, they still occupy a high human scale. And yet those who are noted for sociability and readiness to aid each

¹² Col. Collins, in Philip's *Researches in Africa*, vol. ii, p. 334.

¹³ Lichtenstein's *Reisen im südlichen Afrika*, p. 386.

¹⁴ Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, p. 386.

¹⁵ W. Bleek, *A Brief Account of Bushmen Folk*.

¹⁶ Elisée Reclus, *Géographie Universelle*.

Bushmen, who stand at a very low level of development—so low indeed that they have no dwellings and sleep in holes dug in the soil, occasionally protected by some screens. It is known that when Europeans settled in their territory and destroyed deer, the Bushmen began stealing the settlers' cattle, whereupon a war of extermination, too horrible to be related here, was waged against them. Five hundred Bushmen were slaughtered in 1774, three thousand in 1808 and 1809 by the Farmers' Alliance, and so on. They were poisoned like rats, killed by hunters lying in ambush before the carcass of some animal, killed wherever met with.¹² So that our knowledge of the Bushmen, being chiefly borrowed from those same people who exterminated them, is necessarily limited. But still we know that when the Europeans came, the Bushmen lived in small tribes (or clans), sometimes federated together; that they used to hunt in common, and divided the spoil without quarrelling; that they never abandoned their wounded, and displayed strong affection to their comrades. Lichtenstein has a most touching story about a Bushman, nearly drowned in a river, who was rescued by his companions. They took off their furs to cover him, and shivered themselves; they dried him, rubbed him before the fire, and smeared his body with warm grease till they brought him back to life. And when the Bushmen found, in Johan van der Walt, a man who treated them well, they expressed their thankfulness by a most touching attachment to that man.¹³ Burchell and Moffat both represent them as good-hearted, disinterested, true to their promises, and grateful,¹⁴ all qualities which could develop only by being practised within the tribe. As to their love to children, it is sufficient to say that when a European wished to secure a Bushman woman as a slave, he stole her child: the mother was sure to come into slavery to share the fate of her child.¹⁵

The same social manners characterise the Hottentots, who are but a little more developed than the Bushmen. Lubbock describes them as 'the filthiest animals,' and filthy they really are. A fur suspended to the neck and worn till it falls to pieces is all their dress; their huts are a few sticks assembled together and covered with mats, with no kind of furniture within. And though they kept oxen and sheep, and seem to have known the use of iron before they made acquaintance with the Europeans, they still occupy one of the lowest degrees of the human scale. And yet those who knew them highly praised their sociability and readiness to aid each other. If anything is given to

¹² Col. Collins, in Philip's *Researches in South Africa*, London, 1828. Quoted by Waitz, ii. 334.

¹³ Lichtenstein's *Reisen im südlichen Afrika*, ii. pp. 92, 97. Berlin, 1811.

¹⁴ Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, ii. pp. 335, *seq.* See also Fritsch's *Die Eingeboren Afrika's*, Breslau, 1872, p. 386, *seq.*; and *Drei Jahre in Süd-Afrika*. Also W. Bleck, *A Brief Account of Bushmen Folklore*, Capetown, 1875.

¹⁵ Elisée Reclus, *Géographie Universelle*, xiii. 475.

a Hottentot, he at once divides it among all present—a habit which, as is known, so much struck Darwin among the Fuegians. He cannot eat alone, and, however hungry, he calls those who pass by to share his food. And when Kolben expressed his astonishment thereat, he received the answer: 'That is Hottentot manner.' But this is not Hottentot manner only: it is an all but universal habit among the 'savages.' Kolben, who knew the Hottentots well and did not pass by their defects in silence, could not praise their tribal morality highly enough.

'Their word is sacred,' he wrote. They know 'nothing of the corruptness and faithless arts of Europe.' 'They live in great tranquillity and are seldom at war with their neighbours.' They are 'all kindness and goodwill to one another. . . . One of the greatest pleasures of the Hottentots certainly lies in their gifts and good offices to one another.' 'The integrity of the Hottentots, their strictness and celerity in the exercise of justice, and their chastity, are things in which they excel all or most nations in the world.'¹⁶

Tachart, Barrow, and Moodie¹⁷ fully confirm Kolben's testimony. Let me only remark that when Kolben wrote that 'they are certainly the most friendly, the most liberal and the most benevolent people to one another that ever appeared on the earth' (i. 332), he wrote a sentence which has continually appeared since in the description of savages. When first meeting with primitive races, the Europeans usually make a caricature of their life; but when an intelligent man has stayed among them for a longer time, he generally describes them as 'the kindest' or 'the gentlest' race on the earth. These very same words have been applied to the Ostyaks, the Samoyedes, the Eskimos, the Dyaks, the Aleoutes, the Papuas, and so on, by the highest authorities. I also remember having read them applied to the Tunguses, the Tchuktchis, the Sioux, and several others. The very frequency of that high commendation already speaks volumes in itself.

The natives of Australia do not stand on a higher level of development than their South African brothers. Their huts are of the same character; very often simple screens are the only protection against cold winds. In their food they are most indifferent: they devour horribly putrefied corpses, and cannibalism is resorted to in times of scarcity. When first discovered by Europeans, they had no implements but in stone or bone, and these were of the roughest description. Some tribes had even no canoes, and did not know barter-trade. And yet, when their manners and customs were carefully studied, they proved to be living under that elaborate clan organisation which I have mentioned on a preceding page.¹⁸

¹⁶ P. Kolben, *The Present State of the Cape of Good Hope*, translated from the German by Mr. Medley, London, 1731, vol. i. pp. 59, 71, 333, 336, &c.

¹⁷ Quoted in Waitz's *Anthropologie*, ii. 335, *seq.*

¹⁸ The natives living in the north of Sydney, and speaking the Kamilaroi language, are best known under this aspect, through the capital work of Lorimer Fison and A. W.

The territory they inhabit is divided into numerous gentes or clans; but the hunting and gathering are kept in common, and the food is shared to the whole clan; so also the meals are taken in common. The meals are taken in common, and respect certain regulations as to what grasses may be collected.²⁰ They do not do better than transcribe the questions of the Paris Anthropologist, a missionary who sojourned in N

The feeling of friendship is known to be usually supported; the ill ones are never abandoned or killed. These tribes are very kind to their own tribe (when immolated) and to strangers only. The parents love their children, and infanticide meets with common approval. Marriage is never put to death. No religion, no marriage. Quarrels arising within the tribe are settled with wooden swords and shields. No dress, save an apron sometimes worn. The tribe consists of four or five hundred individuals, divided into four sections, being only permitted within the usual

For the Papuas, closely akin to those of G. L. Bink, who stayed in New Guinea from 1871 to 1883. Here is the questioner:²²—

They are sociable and cheerful; courageous. Friendship is relatively strong within the tribes, and still stronger within the tribe, the stipulation being that the children of the lender. They take care not to be abandoned, and in no case are they killed. War prisoners are sometimes kept long time. War prisoners are sometimes petted and loved. Old and feeble war prisoners are slaves. They have no religion, no gods, and the oldest man in the family is the judge. The part of it goes to the *negoria* (the common name for the barter-trade) the crop belongs to those who have the barter-trade—the custom being that the

Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, Melbourne, 1841, Note on the Australian Class Systems, 1889, vol. xviii. p. 31, showing the wide spread of the custom.

¹⁹ *The Folklore, Manners, &c., of Australia*, London, 1841, vol. ii. pp. 298, 300.

²¹ *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 1889, p. 386.

²² *Ibid.* p. 386.

The territory they inhabit is usually allotted between the different gentes or clans; but the hunting and fishing territories of each clan are kept in common, and the produce of fishing and hunting belongs to the whole clan; so also the fishing and hunting implements.¹⁹ The meals are taken in common. Like many other savages, they respect certain regulations as to the seasons when certain gums and grasses may be collected.²⁰ As to their morality altogether, we cannot do better than transcribe the following answers given to the questions of the Paris Anthropological Society by Lumholtz, a missionary who sojourned in North Queensland: ²¹—

The feeling of friendship is known among them; it is strong. Weak people are usually supported; the ill ones are very well attended to; they never are abandoned or killed. These tribes are cannibals, but they very seldom eat members of their own tribe (when immolated on religious principles I suppose); they eat strangers only. The parents love their children, play with them, and pet them. Infanticide meets with common approval. Old people are very well treated, never put to death. No religion, no idols, only a fear of death. Polygamous marriage. Quarrels arising within the tribe are settled by means of duels fought with wooden swords and shields. No slaves; no culture of any kind; no pottery; no dress, save an apron sometimes worn by women. The clan consists of two hundred individuals, divided into four classes of men and four of women; marriage being only permitted within the usual classes, and never within the gens.

For the Papuas, closely akin to the above, we have the testimony of G. L. Bink, who stayed in New Guinea, chiefly in Geelwink Bay, from 1871 to 1883. Here is the essence of his answers to the same questioner: ²²—

They are sociable and cheerful; they laugh very much. Rather timid than courageous. Friendship is relatively strong among persons belonging to different tribes, and still stronger within the tribe. A friend will often pay the debt of his friend, the stipulation being that the latter will repay it without interest to the children of the lender. They take care of the ill and the old; old people are never abandoned, and in no case are they killed—unless it be a slave who was ill for a long time. War prisoners are sometimes eaten. The children are very much petted and loved. Old and feeble war prisoners are killed, the others are sold as slaves. They have no religion, no gods, no idols, no authority of any description; the oldest man in the family is the judge. In cases of adultery a fine is paid, and part of it goes to the *negoria* (the community). The soil is kept in common, but the crop belongs to those who have grown it. They have pottery, and know barter-trade—the custom being that the merchant gives them the goods, whereupon

Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, Melbourne, 1880. See also A. W. Howitt's 'Further Note on the Australian Class Systems,' in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, 1889, vol. xviii. p. 31, showing the wide extension of the same organisation in Australia.

¹⁹ *The Folklore, Manners, &c., of Australian Aborigines*, Adelaide, 1879, p. 11.

²⁰ Grey's *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia*, London, 1841, vol. ii. pp. 298, 237.

²¹ *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie*, 1888, vol. xi. p. 652. I abridge the answers.

²² *Ibid.* p. 386.

they return to their houses and bring the native goods required by the merchant; if the latter cannot be obtained, the European goods are returned.²³ They are head-hunters, and in so doing they prosecute blood revenge. 'Sometimes,' Finsch says, 'the affair is referred to the Rajah of Namototte, who terminates it by imposing a fine.'

When well treated, the Papuas are very kind. Miklukho-Maklay landed on the eastern coast of New Guinea, followed by one single man, stayed for two years among tribes reported to be cannibals, and left them with regret; he returned again to stay one year more among them, and never had he any conflict to complain of. True that his rule was *never*—under no pretext whatever—to say anything which was not truth, nor make any promise which he could not keep. These poor creatures, who even do not know how to obtain fire, and carefully maintain it in their huts, live under their primitive communism, without any chiefs, and within their villages they have no quarrels worth speaking of. They work in common, just enough to get the food of the day; they rear their children in common; and in the evenings they dress themselves as coquettishly as they can, and dance. Like all savages, they are fond of dancing. Each village has its *barla*, or *balai*—the 'long house,' 'longue maison,' or 'grande maison'—for the unmarried men, for social gatherings, and for the discussion of common affairs—again a trait which is common to most inhabitants of the Pacific Islands, the Eskimos, the Red Indians, and so on. Whole groups of villages are on friendly terms, and visit each other *en bloc*.

Unhappily, feuds are not uncommon—not in consequence of 'overstocking of the area,' or 'keen competition,' and like inventions of a mercantile century, but chiefly in consequence of superstition. As soon as anyone falls ill, his friends and relatives come together, and deliberately discuss who might be the cause of the illness. All possible enemies are considered, everyone confesses of his own petty quarrels, and finally the real cause is discovered. An enemy from the next village has called it down, and a raid upon that village is decided upon. Therefore, feuds are rather frequent, even between the coast villages, not to say a word of the cannibal mountaineers who are considered as real witches and enemies, though, on a closer acquaintance, they prove to be exactly the same sort of people as their neighbours on the sea-coast.²⁴

Many striking pages could be written about the harmony which prevails in the villages of the Polynesian inhabitants of the Pacific Islands. But they belong to a more advanced stage of civilisation.

²³ The same is the practice with the Papuas of Kaimani Bay, who have a high reputation of honesty. 'It never happens that the Papua be untrue to his promise,' Finsch says in *Neuguinea und seine Bewohner*, Bremen, 1865, p. 829.

²⁴ *Izvestia* of the Russian Geographical Society, 1880, p. 161, *seq.* Few books of travel give a better insight into the petty details of the daily life of savages than these scraps from Maklay's note-books.

So we shall now take our illustration, however, before leaving even the Fuegians, whose reputation is seen in a much better light since they were visited by the French missionaries who stay in their country, 'not out of malevolence to complain of.' In the case of the Fuegians, to 150 souls, they practise the same system as the Papuas; they share everything with the people very well. Peace prevails

With the Eskimos and their neighbours, the Koloshes, and the Aleoutes, the same system of mutual aid prevails. The conditions of what man may have been in the past are elements hardly differ from those of the present. The Eskimo tribes do not yet know fishing: the Eskimos do not know of harpoon.²⁵ They know the use of harpoon, but the Europeans, or find it on wrecked ships, or find it on a very primitive kind, though the Eskimos are at a stage of 'communal marriage,' even in the case of the Eskimos. They live in families, but the Eskimos do not have husbands and wives are often separated, and the Eskimos remain united in clans, and the Eskimos could they sustain the hard struggle of life? So they do combine their forces? So they do where the struggle for life is hard. The 'long house' is their lodge in it, separated from each other by a common passage in the shape of a cross, and in such a shape as to form a centre. The German expedition of those 'long houses' could ascertain that the Eskimos, in peace, no dispute arose about the long winter. 'Scolding, or as a misdemeanour, if not produce a fine, namely, the nith-song.'²⁶ Close cohesion and mutual aid are sufficient for maintaining the interests of the community. Even in the larger communities, the Eskimos formed the real judgment seat, the offenders being shamed in the

²⁵ L. F. Martial, in *Mission Scient. au C.*

²⁶ Captain Holm's Expedition to East G.

²⁷ In Australia whole clans have been to conjure a calamity (Post, *Studien zur E.* 1890, p. 342). More brotherhood is their spirit.

²⁸ Dr. H. Rink, *The Eskimo Tribes*, p. 1887.

²⁹ Dr. Rink, *loc. cit.* p. 21. Europeans,

So we shall now take our illustrations from the far north. I must mention, however, before leaving the Southern Hemisphere, that even the Fuegians, whose reputation has been so bad, appear under a much better light since they begin to be better known. A few French missionaries who stay among them 'know of no act of malevolence to complain of.' In their clans, consisting of from 120 to 150 souls, they practise the same primitive communism as the Papuás; they share everything in common, and treat their old people very well. Peace prevails among these tribes.²⁵

With the Eskimos and their nearest congeners, the Thlinkets, the Koloshes, and the Aleoutes, we find one of the nearest illustrations of what man may have been during the glacial age. Their implements hardly differ from those of palæolithic man, and some of their tribes do not yet know fishing: they simply spear the fish with a kind of harpoon.²⁶ They know the use of iron, but they receive it from the Europeans, or find it on wrecked ships. Their social organisation is of a very primitive kind, though they already have emerged from the stage of 'communal marriage,' even under the gentile restrictions. They live in families, but the family bonds are often broken; husbands and wives are often exchanged.²⁷ The families, however, remain united in clans, and how could it be otherwise? How could they sustain the hard struggle for life unless by closely combining their forces? So they do, and the tribal bonds are closest where the struggle for life is hardest, namely, in North-East Greenland. The 'long house' is their usual dwelling, and several families lodge in it, separated from each other by small partitions of ragged furs, with a common passage in the front. Sometimes the house has the shape of a cross, and in such case a common fire is kept in the centre. The German expedition which spent a winter close by one of those 'long houses' could ascertain that 'no quarrel disturbed the peace, no dispute arose about the use of this narrow space' throughout the long winter. 'Scolding, or even unkind words, are considered as a misdemeanour, if not produced under the legal form of process, namely, the nith-song.'²⁸ Close cohabitation and close interdependence are sufficient for maintaining century after century that deep respect for the interests of the community which is characteristic of Eskimo life. Even in the larger communities of Eskimos, 'public opinion formed the real judgment seat, the general punishment consisting in the offenders being shamed in the eyes of the people.'²⁹

²⁵ L. F. Martial, in *Mission Scient. au Cap Horn*, Paris, 1883, vol. i. pp. 183-201.

²⁶ Captain Holm's Expedition to East Greenland.

²⁷ In Australia whole clans have been seen exchanging all their wives, in order to conjure a calamity (Post, *Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Familienrechts*, 1890, p. 342). More brotherhood is their specific against calamities.

²⁸ Dr. H. Rink, *The Eskimo Tribes*, p. 26 (*Meddelelser om Grønland*), vol. xi. 1887.

²⁹ Dr. Rink, *loc. cit.* p. 21. Europeans, grown in the respect of Roman law, are

Eskimo life is based upon communism. What is obtained by hunting and fishing belongs to the clan. But in several tribes, especially in the West under the influence of the Danes, private property penetrates into their institutions. However, they have an original means for obviating the inconveniences arising from a personal accumulation of wealth which would soon destroy their tribal unity. When a man has grown rich, he convokes the folk of his clan to a great festival, and, after much eating, distributes among them all his fortune. On the Yukon river, in Alaska, Dall saw a family distributing in this way ten guns, ten full fur dresses, 200 strings of beads, numerous blankets, ten wolf furs, 200 beavers, and 500 zibelines. After that they took off their festival dresses, gave them away, and, putting on old ragged furs, addressed a few words to their kinsfolk, saying that though they are now poorer than any one of them, they have won their friendship.³⁰ Like distributions of wealth appear to be a regular habit with the Eskimos, and to take place at a certain season, after an exhibition of all that has been obtained during the year.³¹ In my opinion these distributions reveal a very old institution, contemporaneous with the first apparition of personal wealth; they must have been a means for re-establishing equality among the members of the clan, after it had been disturbed by the enrichment of the few. The periodical redistribution of land and the periodical abandonment of all debts which took place in historical times, must have been a survival of that old custom. And the habit of either burying with the dead, or destroying upon his grave, all that belonged to him personally—a habit which we find among all primitive races—must have had the same origin. In fact, while everything that belongs *personally* to the dead is burnt or broken upon his grave, nothing is destroyed of what belonged to him in common with the tribe, such as boats, or the communal implements of fishing. The destruction bears upon personal property alone. At a later epoch this habit becomes a religious ceremony: it receives a mystical interpretation, and is imposed by religion, when public opinion alone proves incapable of enforcing its general observance. And, finally, it is substituted by either burning simple models of the

seldom capable of understanding that force of tribal authority. 'In fact,' Dr. Rink writes, 'it is not the exception, but the rule, that white men who have stayed for ten or twenty years among the Eskimo, return without any real addition to their knowledge of the traditional ideas upon which their social state is based. The white man, whether a missionary or a trader, is firm in his dogmatic opinion that the most vulgar European is better than the most distinguished native.' *The Eskimo Tribes*, p. 31.

³⁰ Dall, *Alaska and its Resources*, Cambridge, U. S., 1870.

³¹ Dall saw it in Alaska, Jacobsen at Ignitok in the vicinity of the Bering Strait. Gilbert Sproat mentions it among the Vancouver Indians; and Dr. Rink, who describes the periodical exhibitions just mentioned, adds: 'The principal use of the accumulation of personal wealth is for *periodically* distributing it.' He also mentions (*loc. cit.* p. 31) 'the destruction of property for the same purpose' (of equality).

dead man's property (as in China), or brought to the grave and taking it back to his family when the mourning is over—a habit which still prevails among the Aleuts. They guard swords, crosses, and other marks of property.

The high standard of the tribal morality has been mentioned in general literature. The following remarks upon the manners of the Eskimos—will better illustrate savagery than any that were written, after a ten years' stay at Igloolik, a remarkable man—the Russian missionary, Veniaminoff, says, up, mostly in his own words:—

Endurability (he wrote) is their chief feature. They do they bathe every morning in the frozen sea, inhaling the icy wind, but their endurability is sufficient. Food, surpasses all that can be imagined. The Aleoute cares first for his children; then for his wife, then for his fasts. They are not inclined to stealing; the Russian immigrants. Not that they never have having sometime stolen something, but it is always returned. The attachment of the parents to their children is expressed in words or pettings. The Aleoute is very miserly, but once he has made it he will keep it very close. He made Veniaminoff a gift of dried fish, but in the hurry of the departure. He took it home. The missionary was in January; and in November the scarcity of food in the Aleoute encampment. The starving people, and in January it was severe. The morality is both varied and severe. It is a punishment, an unavoidable death; to ask pardon from an enemy; to be convicted of stealing; to capsulize; to go of going to sea in stormy weather; to be the first to become an invalid in case of scarcity of food; to be divided, in which case everyone gives his own share to him; to divulge a public secret to his wife; to be invited, not to offer the best game to the partner of the hunt; to invent ones; to scold anyone in scorn. To be in the presence of the people's presence, and to dance with her; to be invited, always be made through a third person, who is invited, a shame not to know sewing, dancing, and all the things of husband and children, or even to speak to a stranger.³²

Such is Aleoute morality, which may be seen by their tales and legends. Let me add that Veniaminoff wrote (in 1840) one murder only had been committed in the last century in a population of 60,000 Aleoutes not one single common law had been observed for forty years. This will not seem strange if we consider the scorning, and the use of rough words.

³² Veniaminoff, *Memoirs relative to the Diocese of Kamtschatka*, St. Petersburg, 1840. Extracts, in English, from a like description of the Australians' morality

dead man's property (as in China), or by simply carrying his property to the grave and taking it back to his house after the burial ceremony is over—a habit which still prevails with the Europeans as regards swords, crosses, and other marks of public distinction.

The high standard of the tribal morality of the Eskimos has often been mentioned in general literature. Nevertheless the following remarks upon the manners of the Aleoutes—nearly akin to the Eskimos—will better illustrate savage morality as a whole. They were written, after a ten years' stay among the Aleoutes, by a most remarkable man—the Russian missionary, Veniaminoff. I sum them up, mostly in his own words:—

Endurability (he wrote) is their chief feature. It is simply colossal. Not only do they bathe every morning in the frozen sea, and stand naked on the beach, inhaling the icy wind, but their endurability, even when at hard work on insufficient food, surpasses all that can be imagined. During a protracted scarcity of food, the Aleoute cares first for his children; he gives them all he has, and himself fasts. They are not inclined to stealing; that was remarked even by the first Russian immigrants. Not that they never steal; every Aleoute would confess having sometime stolen something, but it is always a trifle; the whole is so childish. The attachment of the parents to their children is touching, though it is never expressed in words or pettings. The Aleoute is with difficulty moved to make a promise, but once he has made it he will keep it whatever may happen. (An Aleoute made Veniaminoff a gift of dried fish, but it was forgotten on the beach in the hurry of the departure. He took it home. The next occasion to send it to the missionary was in January; and in November and December there was a great scarcity of food in the Aleoute encampment. But the fish was never touched by the starving people, and in January it was sent to its destination.) Their code of morality is both varied and severe. It is considered shameful to be afraid of unavoidable death; to ask pardon from an enemy; to die without ever having killed an enemy; to be convicted of stealing; to capsize a boat in the harbour; to be afraid of going to sea in stormy weather; to be the first in a party on a long journey to become an invalid in case of scarcity of food; to show greediness when spoil is divided, in which case everyone gives his own part to the greedy man to shame him; to divulge a public secret to his wife; being two persons on a hunting expedition, not to offer the best game to the partner; to boast of his own deeds, especially of invented ones; to scold anyone in scorn. Also to beg; to pet his wife in other people's presence, and to dance with her; to bargain personally; selling must always be made through a third person, who settles the price. For a woman it is a shame not to know sewing, dancing, and all kind of woman's work; to pet her husband and children, or even to speak to her husband in the presence of a stranger.³²

Such is Aleoute morality, which might also be further illustrated by their tales and legends. Let me also add that when Veniaminoff wrote (in 1840) one murder only had been committed since the last century in a population of 60,000 people, and that among 1,800 Aleoutes not one single common law offence had been known for forty years. This will not seem strange if we remark that scolding, scorning, and the use of rough words are absolutely unknown in

³² Veniaminoff, *Memoirs relative to the District of Unalashka* (Russian), 3 vols. St. Petersburg, 1840. Extracts, in English, from the above are given in Dall's *Alaska*. A like description of the Australians' morality is given in *Nature*, xlii. p. 639.

Aleoute life. Even their children never fight, and never abuse each other in words. All they may say is, 'Your mother does not know sewing,' or 'Your father is blind of one eye.'³³

Many features of savage life remain, however, a puzzle to Europeans. The high development of tribal solidarity and the good feelings with which primitive folk are animated towards each other, could be illustrated by any amount of reliable testimony. And yet it is not the less certain that those same savages practise infanticide; that in some cases they abandon their old people, and that they blindly obey the rules of blood-revenge. We must then explain the co-existence of facts which, to the European mind, seem so contradictory at the first sight. I have just mentioned how the Aleoute father starves for days and weeks, and gives everything eatable to his child; and how the Bushman mother becomes a slave to follow her child; and I might fill pages with illustrations of the really *tender* relations existing among the savages and their children. Travellers continually mention them incidentally. Here you read about the fond love of a mother; there you see a father wildly running through the forest and carrying upon his shoulders his child bitten by a snake; or a missionary tells you the despair of the parents at the loss of a child whom he had saved, a few years before, from being immolated at its birth; you learn that the 'savage' mothers usually nurse their children till the age of four, and that, in the New Hebrides, on the loss of a specially beloved child, its mother, or aunt, will kill herself to take care of it in the other world.³⁴ And so on. Like facts are met with by the score; so that, when we see that these same loving parents practise infanticide, we are bound to recognise that the habit (whatever its ulterior transformations may be) took its origin under the sheer pressure of necessity, as an obligation towards the tribe, and a means for rearing the already growing children. In fact, the savages, as a rule, do not 'multiply without stint,' as Mr. Huxley puts it. On the contrary, they take all kinds of measures for diminishing the birth-rate. A whole series of restrictions, which Europeans certainly would find extravagant, are imposed to that effect, and they are strictly obeyed. But notwithstanding that, primitive folk cannot rear all their children. However, it has been remarked that as soon as they succeed in increasing their regular means of subsistence, they at once begin to

³³ It is most remarkable that several writers (Middendorff, Schrenk, O. Finsch) described the Ostyaks and Samoyedes in almost the same words. Even when drunken their quarrels are insignificant. 'For a hundred years one single murder has been committed in the *tundra*;' 'their children never fight;' 'anything may be left for years in the *tundra*, even food and gin, and nobody will touch it;' and so on. Gilbert Sproat 'never witnessed a fight between two sober natives' of the Aht Indians of Vancouver Island. 'Quarrelling is also rare among their children.' (Rink, *loc. cit.*) And so on.

³⁴ Gill, quoted in Gerland and Waitz's *Anthropologie*, v. 641. See also pp. 636-640, where many facts of parental and filial love are quoted.

abandon the practice of infanticide; they obey that obligation reluctantly, they resort to all kinds of complicity with the new-born. As has been so well said by Reclus,³⁵ they invent the lucky charm to spare the children born on the land; they are sentenced for a few hours, and then released; one day it must live all its natural life; the little ones coming from the forest; they forbode a misfortune for the children; they farming nor *crèches* for getting rid of them recoils before the necessity of infanticide; they prefer to expose the baby in the forest than to expose its life by violence. Ignorance, not morality, and, instead of moralising the savages, we would do better to follow the example of the man who, year till his old age, crossed the Sahara on his feet or travelled on dogs among his people, carrying his bread and fishing implements, and his life.

The same is true as regards the practice of parricide. We just now saw that the practice is not so widely spread as some writers have been extremely exaggerated, but it is nearly all savages; and in such cases the exposure of children. When a 'savage' tribe; when every morning his shadow is cast on the children—and the little ones cry when they are hungry; when they walk across the stony beach, or the virgin forest, among the people—there are no invalid carriages; when in savage lands—he begins to repel; he says until nowadays: '*Tchujoi vek z...*' 'to take other people's life: it is time to re-venge what the soldier does in a similar manner; a detachment depends upon its fortune; he knows more, and knows that he must die; he sends his best friend to render him the same service in the campment. And the friend, with his gun into the dying body. So the man who saves himself to die; he himself insists on the death of the community, and obtains the consolation of a grave; he invites his kinsfolk to die; if he has done so, it is now his turn; and he leaves marks of affection. The savage s...

³⁵ *Primitive Folk*, London, 1891.

abandon the practice of infanticide. On the whole, the parents obey that obligation reluctantly, and as soon as they can afford it they resort to all kinds of compromises to save the lives of their new-born. As has been so well pointed out by my friend Elie Reclus,³⁵ they invent the lucky and unlucky days of births, and spare the children born on the lucky days; they try to postpone the sentence for a few hours, and then say that if the baby has lived one day it must live all its natural life.³⁶ They hear the cries of the little ones coming from the forest, and maintain that, if heard, they forbode a misfortune for the tribe; and as they have no baby-farming nor *crèches* for getting rid of the children, every one of them recoils before the necessity of performing the cruel sentence; they prefer to expose the baby in the wood rather than to take its life by violence. Ignorance, not cruelty, maintains infanticide; and, instead of moralising the savages with sermons, the missionaries would do better to follow the example of Veniaminoff, who, every year till his old age, crossed the Sea of Okhotsk in a miserable boat, or travelled on dogs among his Tchuktchis, supplying them with bread and fishing implements, and thus really preventing infanticide.

The same is true as regards what superficial observers describe as parricide. We just now saw that the habit of abandoning old people is not so widely spread as some writers have maintained it to be. It has been extremely exaggerated, but it is occasionally met with among nearly all savages; and in such cases it has the same origin as the exposure of children. When a 'savage' feels that he is a burden to his tribe; when every morning his share of food is taken from the mouths of the children—and the little ones are not so stoical as their fathers: they cry when they are hungry; when every day he has to be carried across the stony beach, or the virgin forest, on the shoulders of younger people—there are no invalid carriages, nor destitutes to wheel them in savage lands—he begins to repeat what the old Russian peasants say until nowadays: '*Tchujoi vek zayedayu, Pora na pokoi!*' ('I live other people's life: it is time to retire!') And he retires. He does what the soldier does in a similar case. When the salvation of his detachment depends upon its further advance, and he can move no more, and knows that he must die if left behind, the soldier implores his best friend to render him the last service before leaving the encampment. And the friend, with shivering hands, discharges his gun into the dying body. So the savages do. The old man asks himself to die; he himself insists upon this last duty towards the community, and obtains the consent of the tribe; he digs out his grave; he invites his kinsfolk to the last parting meal. His father has done so, it is now his turn; and he parts with his kinsfolk with marks of affection. The savage so much considers death as part of

³⁵ *Primitive Folk*, London, 1891.

³⁶ Gerland, *loc. cit.* v. 636.

his duties towards his community, that he not only refuses to be rescued (as Moffat has told), but when a woman who had to be immolated on her husband's grave was rescued by missionaries, and was taken to an island, she escaped in the night, crossed a broad sea-arm, swimming, and rejoined her tribe, to die on the grave.³⁷ But the savages, as a rule, are so reluctant to take anyone's life otherwise than in fight, that none of them will take upon himself to shed human blood, and they resort to all kinds of stratagems, which have been so falsely interpreted. In most cases, they abandon the old man in the wood, after having given him more than his share of the common food. Arctic expeditions have done the same when they no more could carry their invalid comrades. 'Live a few days more! *may be* there will be some unexpected rescue!'

European scientists, when coming across these facts, are absolutely unable to understand them; they cannot reconcile them with a high development of tribal morality, and prefer to cast a doubt upon the exactitude of absolutely reliable observers, instead of trying to explain the parallel existence of the two sets of facts: a high tribal morality together with the abandonment of the parents and infanticide. But if these same Europeans were to tell a savage that people, extremely amiable, fond of their own children, and so impressionable that they cry when they see a misfortune simulated on the stage, are living in Europe within a stone's throw from dens in which children die from sheer want of food, the savage, too, would not understand them. I remember how vainly I tried to make some of my Tungus friends understand our civilisation of individualism: they could not, and they resorted to the most phantastical suggestions. The fact is that a savage, brought up in ideas of tribal solidarity in everything for bad and for good, is as incapable of understanding a 'moral' European, who knows nothing of that solidarity, as the average European is incapable of understanding the savage. But if our scientist had lived amidst a half-starving tribe not possessing among them all one man's food for so much as a few days to come, he probably might have understood their motives. So also the savage, if he had stayed among us, and received our education, may be, would understand our European indifference towards our neighbours, and our Royal Commissions for the prevention of 'baby-farming.' 'Stone houses make stony hearts,' the Russian peasants say. But he ought to live in a stone house first.

Similar remarks must be made as regards cannibalism. Taking into account all the facts which were brought to light during a recent controversy on this subject at the Paris Anthropological Society, and many incidental remarks scattered throughout the 'savage' literature, we are bound to recognise that that practice was brought into existence by sheer necessity; but that it was further developed

³⁷ Erskine, quoted in Gerland and Waitz's *Anthropologie*, v. 640.

by superstition and religion into the or in Mexico. It is a fact that compelled to devour corpses in the tion, and that in cases of absolute s disinter and to feed upon human c These are ascertained facts. But the conditions which man had to fa damp and cold climate, with but litt if we take into account the terrible among underfed natives, and reme are the only restoratives which they who formerly was a granivorous anim the glacial period. He found plenty often migrate in the Arctic region abandon a territory for a number o resources disappeared. During like h resorted to even by Europeans, and it Until the present time, they occasio own dead: they must have devoured th to die. Old people died, convinced rendering a last service to the tribe. sented by some savages as of divine ori ordered by a messenger from the sky. of necessity, and survived as a supersti in order to inherit their courage; the enemy's eye or heart was eaten among other tribes, already having developed mythology, evil gods, thir vented, and human sacrifices required gods. In this religious phase of its e its most revolting characters. Mexico in Fiji, where the king could eat any o a mighty caste of priests, a complicated ment of autocracy. Originated by ne at a later period, a religious institution long after it had disappeared from a practised it in former times, but did no of evolution. The same remark must b and the abandonment of parents. It been maintained as a survival of olde tradition of the past.

I will terminate my remarks by ment also is a source of most erroneous concl of blood-revenge. All savages are unde shed must be revenged by blood. If :

³⁸ W. T. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminisc*
VOL. XXIX.—No. 170.

by superstition and religion into the proportions it attained in Fiji or in Mexico. It is a fact that until this day many savages are compelled to devour corpses in the most advanced state of putrefaction, and that in cases of absolute scarcity some of them have had to disinter and to feed upon human corpses, even during an epidemic. These are ascertained facts. But if we now transport ourselves to the conditions which man had to face during the glacial period, in a damp and cold climate, with but little vegetable food at his disposal; if we take into account the terrible ravages which scurvy still makes among underfed natives, and remember that meat and fresh blood are the only restoratives which they know, we must admit that man, who formerly was a granivorous animal, became a flesh-eater during the glacial period. He found plenty of deer at that time, but deer often migrate in the Arctic regions, and sometimes they entirely abandon a territory for a number of years. In such cases his last resources disappeared. During like hard trials, cannibalism has been resorted to even by Europeans, and it was resorted to by the savages. Until the present time, they occasionally devour the corpses of their own dead: they must have devoured then the corpses of those who had to die. Old people died, convinced that by their death they were rendering a last service to the tribe. This is why cannibalism is represented by some savages as of divine origin, as something that has been ordered by a messenger from the sky. But later on it lost its character of necessity, and survived as a superstition. Enemies had to be eaten in order to inherit their courage; and, at a still later epoch, the enemy's eye or heart was eaten for the same purpose; while among other tribes, already having a numerous priesthood and a developed mythology, evil gods, thirsty for human blood, were invented, and human sacrifices required by the priests to appease the gods. In this religious phase of its existence, cannibalism attained its most revolting characters. Mexico is a well-known example; and in Fiji, where the king could eat any one of his subjects, we also find a mighty caste of priests, a complicated theology,³⁸ and a full development of autocracy. Originated by necessity, cannibalism became, at a later period, a religious institution, and in this form it survived long after it had disappeared from among tribes which certainly practised it in former times, but did not attain the theocratical stage of evolution. The same remark must be made as regards infanticide and the abandonment of parents. In some cases they also have been maintained as a survival of olden times, as a religiously kept tradition of the past.

I will terminate my remarks by mentioning another custom which also is a source of most erroneous conclusions. I mean the practice of blood-revenge. All savages are under the impression that blood shed must be revenged by blood. If anyone has been killed, the

³⁸ W. T. Pritchard, *Polynesian Reminiscences*, London, 1866, p. 363

murderer must die; if anyone has been wounded, the aggressor's blood must be shed. There is no exception to the rule, not even for animals; so the hunter's blood is shed on his return to the village when he has shed the blood of an animal. That is the savages' conception of justice—a conception which yet prevails in Western Europe as regards murder. Now, when both the offender and the offended belong to the same tribe, the tribe and the offended person settle the affair.³⁹ But when the offender belongs to another tribe, and that tribe, for one reason or another, refuses a compensation, then the offended tribe decides to take the revenge itself. But primitive folk so much consider everyone's acts as a tribal affair, dependent upon tribal approval, that they easily think the clan responsible for everyone's acts. Therefore, the due revenge may be taken upon any member of the offender's clan or relatives.⁴⁰ It may often happen, however, that the retaliation goes further than the offence. In trying to inflict a wound, they may kill the offender, or wound him more than they intended to do, and this becomes a cause for a new feud, so that the primitive legislators were careful in requiring the retaliation to be limited to an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and blood for blood.⁴¹

It is remarkable, however, that with most primitive folk like feuds are infinitely rarer than might be expected; though with some of them they attain quite abnormal proportions, especially with mountaineers who have been driven to the highlands by foreign invaders, such as the mountaineers of Caucasia, and especially those of Borneo—the Dyaks. With the Dyaks, the feuds have now gone so far that a young man can neither marry nor be proclaimed of age before he has secured the head of an enemy. This horrid practice has been fully described in a recent English work.⁴² But it appears under quite another aspect when we learn that the Dyak head-hunter is not actuated by personal passion. He acts under what he considers as a moral obligation towards his tribe, just as the European judge who, in obedience to the same, evidently wrong, principle of 'blood for blood,' hands over the condemned murderer

³⁹ It is remarkable, however, that in case of a sentence of death, nobody will take upon himself to be the executioner. Everyone throws his stone, or gives his blow with the hatchet, carefully avoiding to give a mortal blow. At a later epoch, the priest will stab the victim with a sacred knife. Still later, it will be the king, until civilisation invents the hired hangman. See Bastian's deep remarks upon this subject in *Der Mensch in der Geschichte*, iii. *Die Blutrache*, pp. 1-36.

⁴⁰ In Africa, and elsewhere too, it is a widely spread habit, that if a theft has been committed, the next clan has to restore the equivalent of the stolen thing, and then look itself for the thief. A. H. Post, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz*, Leipzig, 1887, vol. i. p. 77.

⁴¹ See Prof. M. Kovalevsky's *Modern Customs and Ancient Law* (Russian), Moscow, 1886, vol. ii., which contains many important considerations upon this subject.

⁴² See Carl Bock, *The Head-Hunters of Borneo*, London, 1881.

to the hangman. Both the Dyak and the hunter feel remorse if sympathy moved them to spare the offender, why the Dyaks, apart from the cruelties which they practise by their misconception of justice, are different from them, as otherwise most sympathetic people. The same author who has given such a terrible picture writes:

As regards morality, I am bound to assign a low scale of civilisation. . . . Robberies and thefts are common. They also are very truthful. . . . If I did not always get, at least, nothing but the truth from the same of the Malays (pp. 209 and 210).

Bock's testimony is fully corroborated by Ida Pfeiffer. 'I fully recognised,' she wrote, 'that I was travelling among them. I usually found the same customs . . . much more so than any other nation. . . . almost the same language when speaking to them. . . . usually have but one wife, and treat her as a slave, and every morning the whole clan goes to the fields gardening, in large parties. Their villages are of which is inhabited by a dozen families, and some of a hundred persons, peacefully living together, with respect for their wives, and are fond of their children. If one of them falls ill, the women nurse him. Their habits are very moderate in eating and drinking, and they lead his daily life.

It would be a tedious repetition if more examples of this life were given. Wherever we go we find the same spirit of solidarity. And when we look back into the darkness of past ages, we find the same associations of men, however primitive, and therefore, Darwin was quite right when he said that the chief factor for his further evolution was the fact that they are entirely wrong when they maintain that

The small strength and speed of man (he writes of the Dyaks &c., are more than counterbalanced, firstly, by his courage, and secondly, by his intelligence, which he has remarked on another page, have been chiefly of benefit to the benefit of the community); and secondly, by his habit of giving and receiving aid from his fellow men.⁴³

In the last century the 'savage' and 'barbaric' nature were idealised. But now science has taken a more extreme site, especially since some of

⁴³ Ida Pfeiffer, *Meine zweite Weltreise*, Wien, 1827; Müller and Temminch's *Dutch Possessions in Ar*, Leiden, 1824; Reclus, in *Géographie Universelle*, xiii.

⁴⁴ *Descent of Man*, second ed. pp. 63, 64.

to the hangman. Both the Dyak and the judge would even feel remorse if sympathy moved them to spare the murderer. That is why the Dyaks, apart from the cruelties they commit when actuated by their misconception of justice, are depicted, by all those who know them, as otherwise most sympathetic people. Thus Carl Bock, the same author who has given such a terrible picture of head-hunting, writes:

As regards morality, I am bound to assign to the Dyaks a high place in the scale of civilisation. . . . Robberies and theft are entirely unknown among them. They also are very truthful. . . . If I did not always get the 'whole truth,' I always got, at least, nothing but the truth from them. I wish I could say the same of the Malays (pp. 209 and 210).

Bock's testimony is fully corroborated by that of Ida Pfeiffer. 'I fully recognised,' she wrote, 'that I should be pleased longer to travel among them. I usually found them honest, good, and reserved . . . much more so than any other nation I know.'⁴³ Stoltze used almost the same language when speaking of the Dyaks. They usually have but one wife, and treat her well. They are very sociable, and every morning the whole clan goes out for fishing, hunting, or gardening, in large parties. Their villages consist of big huts, each of which is inhabited by a dozen families, and sometimes by several hundred persons, peacefully living together. They show great respect for their wives, and are fond of their children; and when one of them falls ill, the women nurse him in turn. As a rule, they are very moderate in eating and drinking. Such is the Dyak in his daily life.

It would be a tedious repetition if more illustrations from savage life were given. Wherever we go we find the same sociable manners, the same spirit of solidarity. And when we endeavour to penetrate into the darkness of past ages, we find the same tribal life, the same associations of men, however primitive, for mutual support. Therefore, Darwin was quite right when he saw in man's social qualities the chief factor for his further evolution, and Darwin's vulgarisers are entirely wrong when they maintain the contrary.

The small strength and speed of man (he wrote), his want of natural weapons, &c., are more than counterbalanced, firstly, by his intellectual faculties (which, he remarked on another page, have been chiefly or even exclusively gained for the benefit of the community); and secondly, by his social qualities, which led him to give and receive aid from his fellow men.⁴⁴

In the last century the 'savage' and his 'life in the state of nature' were idealised. But now scientists have gone to the opposite extreme, especially since some of them, anxious to prove the

⁴³ Ida Pfeiffer, *Meine zweite Weltreise*, Wien, 1856, vol. i. p. 116, *seq.* See also Müller and Temminch's *Dutch Possessions in Archipelagic India*, quoted by Elisée Reclus, in *Géographie Universelle*, xiii.

⁴⁴ *Descent of Man*, second ed. pp. 63, 64.

animal origin of man, but not conversant with the social aspects of animal life, began to charge the savage with all imaginable 'bestial' features. It is evident, however, that this exaggeration is even more unscientific than Rousseau's idealisation. The savage is not an ideal of virtue, nor is he an ideal of 'savagery.' But the primitive man has one quality, elaborated and maintained by the very necessities of his hard struggle for life—he identifies his own existence with that of his tribe; and without that quality mankind never would have attained the level it has attained now.

Primitive folk, as has been already said, so much identify their lives with that of the tribe, that each of their acts, however insignificant, is considered as a tribal affair. Their whole behaviour is regulated by an infinite series of unwritten rules of propriety which are the fruit of their common experience as to what is good or bad—that is, beneficial or harmful for their own tribe. Of course, the reasonings upon which their rules of propriety are based sometimes are absurd in the extreme. Many of them originate in superstition; and altogether, in whatever the savage does, he sees but the immediate consequences of his acts; he cannot foresee their indirect and ulterior consequences—thus simply exaggerating a defect with which Bentham reproached civilised legislators. But, absurd or not, the savage obeys the prescriptions of the common law, however inconvenient they may be. He obeys them even more blindly than the civilised man obeys the prescriptions of the written law. His common law is his religion; it is his very habit of living. The idea of the clan is always present to his mind, and self-restriction and self-sacrifice in the interest of the clan are of daily occurrence. If the savage has infringed one of the smaller tribal rules, he is prosecuted by the mockeries of the women. If the infringement is grave, he is tortured day and night by the fear of having called a calamity upon his tribe. If he has wounded by accident any one of his own clan, and thus has committed the greatest of all crimes, he grows quite miserable: he runs away in the woods, and is ready to commit suicide, unless the tribe absolves him by inflicting upon him a physical pain and sheds some of his own blood.⁴⁵ Within the tribe everything is shared in common; every morsel of food is divided among all present; and if the savage is alone in the woods, he does not begin eating before he has loudly shouted thrice an invitation to anyone who may hear his voice to share his meal.⁴⁶

In short, within the tribe the rule of 'each for all' is supreme, so long as the separate family has not yet broken up the tribal unity. But that rule is not extended to the neighbouring clans, or tribes, even when they are federated for mutual protection. Each tribe, or clan, is a separate unity. Just as among mammals and birds the

⁴⁵ See Bastian's *Mensch in der Geschichte*, iii. p. 7. Also Grey, *loc. cit.* ii. p. 238.

⁴⁶ Miklukho Macklay, *loc. cit.* Same habit with the Hottentots.

territory is roughly allotted among separate tribes, and at times of war, the boundaries are respected. In the case of his neighbours one must show that he has no intention of attacking them; if he enters a house, he must deposit his hands; if he kills, he must pay compensation. But no tribe is bound to share its food with its neighbours, or it may not. Therefore the life of the savage is a series of sets of actions, and appears under two different aspects: the relations within the tribe, and the relations with other tribes (like our international law) the 'inter-tribal' relations. Therefore, when it comes to the common law. Therefore, when it comes to revolting cruelties may be considered as a violation of the admiration of the tribe. This double conception is seen through the whole evolution of mankind, and is still true now. We Europeans have realised some progress, but at any rate—in eradicating that double conception also must be said that while we have in some cases ideas of solidarity—in theory, at least—over other nations as well, we have lessened the solidarity within our own nations, and even within our own families.

The appearance of a separate family and the accumulation of property disturbs the established unity. A separate family and property and accumulation of wealth. But it is one of the duties to obviolate its inconveniences; and it is one of the duties to study to follow in the course of ages the evolution of village communities, guilds, and so on) and the masses endeavoured to maintain the tribal unity. On the other hand, the first rudiments of knowledge and science, in an extremely remote epoch, when they conferred a power, witchcraft, also became a power in the hands of the initiated, and could be used against the tribe. They were used against the initiated only, in the hands of witches, shamans, and priests which we find in all ages. At the same time, wars and invasions created new castes of warriors, whose associations or clubs were formed. But at no period of man's life were wars the exception. While warriors exterminated each other, the masses celebrated their massacres, the masses continued to live, they prosecuted their daily toil. And it is one of the interesting of studies to follow that life of the masses, the means by which they maintained their unity, which was based upon their own conceptions and mutual support—of common law, in a sense, which were submitted to the most ferocious theories of the state. That life we shall hope to analyse in

territory is roughly allotted among separate tribes, and, except in times of war, the boundaries are respected. On entering the territory of his neighbours one must show that he has no bad intentions; and if he enters a house, he must deposit his hatchet at the entrance. But no tribe is bound to share its food with the others: it may do so or it may not. Therefore the life of the savage is divided into two sets of actions, and appears under two different ethical aspects: the relations within the tribe, and the relations with the outsiders; and (like our international law) the 'inter-tribal' law widely differs from the common law. Therefore, when it comes to a war the most revolting cruelties may be considered as so many claims upon the admiration of the tribe. This double conception of morality passes through the whole evolution of mankind, and maintains itself until now. We Europeans have realised some progress—not immense, at any rate—in eradicating that double conception of ethics; but it also must be said that while we have in some measure extended our ideas of solidarity—in theory, at least—over the nation, and partly over other nations as well, we have lessened the bonds of solidarity within our own nations, and even within our own families.

The appearance of a separate family amidst the clan necessarily disturbs the established unity. A separate family means separate property and accumulation of wealth. But we saw how the Eskimos obviate its inconveniences; and it is one of the most interesting studies to follow in the course of ages the different institutions (village communities, guilds, and so on) by means of which the masses endeavoured to maintain the tribal unity, notwithstanding the agencies which were at work to break it down. On the other hand, the first rudiments of knowledge which appeared at an extremely remote epoch, when they confounded themselves with witchcraft, also became a power in the hands of the individual which could be used against the tribe. They were carefully kept in secrecy, and transmitted to the initiated only, in the secret societies of witches, shamans, and priests which we find among all savages. By the same time, wars and invasions created military authority, as also castes of warriors, whose associations or clubs acquired great powers. But at no period of man's life were wars the *normal* state of existence. While warriors exterminated each other, and the priests celebrated their massacres, the masses continued to live their daily life, they prosecuted their daily toil. And it is one of the most interesting of studies to follow that life of the masses; to study the means by which they maintained their own social organisation, which was based upon their own conceptions of equity, mutual aid, and mutual support—of common law, in a word, even when they were submitted to the most ferocious theocracy or autocracy in the state. That life we shall hope to analyse in a subsequent article.