Address delivered at the fourth annual meeting of the Anthropological Society of London / by James Hunt.

ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT

THE FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.

By JAMES HUNT, Esq., Ph.D., etc., President.

Jan 1. 1867

Gentlemen,—I appear before you this day to perform my last duty as your president.

As my efforts to promote the interests of this Society during the past four years have so often met with your approval, and as I have so often received marks of your kindness and confidence, I am tempted to ask you to bear with me for a short period while I touch on a few subjects which appear to me to deserve especial attention as bearing on the future history and working of our Society.

I had intended to give you on this occasion a succinct history of the origin and development of this Society. I feel, however, that the future is of so much more consequence than the past, that I have relinquished the design of speaking of the past, in order to be able to offer a few remarks on the present and the future of the Society. The time, too, has probably not arrived when great advantage would be gained, either to the Society or to Science, by detailing our past history. What we have done is mostly before the world, and, for the present, I must leave each one to form his own opinion of the same.

I shall endeavour to restrain a somewhat natural glow of satisfaction at what this Society has effected for anthropological science in this country. All I shall do will be to ask each Fellow to examine into and compare the state of anthropological science in England in the year 1862, and in the year 1866. The change is greater than many can well realise, and how far our Society has been instrumental in effecting this change, I must leave for your decision on some future occasion. The late illustrious President of our sister Society in Paris, Dr. Pruner-Bey, has, like many continental men of science, expressed his surprise at the progress of our Society. He writes thus:—"I must confess that I never expected such rapid and solid progress from that side of the channel, considering that even a few years ago it would have been impossible even to discuss matters there publicly which now form a starting point in your researches."

The primary principle, and most important object in forming this Society, was to endeavour to promote the study of anthropology in

this country. In this we have to some extent succeeded, and I shall dwell on how we can best continue this good work. We have also to consider how we can most effectually make this Society worthy of the great science which she represents.

Gentlemen,—our past must be to some extent our guarantee for our future. What we have done badly in the past, we must in future endeavour to do well. Far be it from me to hint that our past could not be done over again with more success and with less opposition; but I do but scant justice to my colleagues when I say that if our past had to be enacted over again, I believe that more honesty of purpose could not be brought to bear on the establishment of a society by any set of men. If we have erred, it has been from want of experience rather than from any other cause. To those who think they could do better than we have done, I would only say that we did our best under the circumstances; and only those who know how adverse the circumstances have often been can fully estimate the difficulties we have overcome. I for one believe that the Anthropological Society of London has loyally and truly performed her duties to the science which she represents, and I now beg to offer a few suggestions which I think will conduce to make her continue in the same noble path she has begun.

First, then, how can we best assist to promote the study of anthropology in this country? At present we have seven hundred and six Fellows, twenty-nine honorary Fellows, forty-two corresponding members, and one hundred and four local secretaries. This makes altogether a good foundation for future work; but we have entered on such a vast field of research that this staff requires to be largely increased before we can fully carry out the enormous work which now lies before us. Some four years ago, those who had the temerity to suggest that it was possible to get even five hundred Fellows, were accused of holding entirely Utopian ideas. Now, however, the case is entirely changed. The experience of the past four years has demonstrated that our Society has only arrived at a very early stage of its development. As we proceed with our labours, our work appears to increase. For the last half century the utter neglect in this country of all genuine anthropological research has culminated in bringing disgrace on this portion of British science. While, in other branches of science, England takes a proud position amongst the nations of Europe, in the science of man, she is far behind nearly every other civilised country. The recall from public circulation of the lectures of our esteemed Honorary Fellow, William Lawrence, in the year 1820, was the signal for the downfall of all real anthropological science in this country. The sporadic efforts of Prichard and Knox were incapable of arresting the downward steps which anthropological research had first taken in England about half a century ago. Little could Dr. Prichard have imagined that the depth to which the science of man had sunk, in 1847, would have been still greater ten years later. In 1847 Dr. Prichard occupied the greater portion of his time in endeavouring to correct the misunderstanding which existed respecting his favourite pursuit in the British Association. We have been rejoicing during

the past year in the success our science has obtained in that great body. But a somewhat melancholy feeling is produced by this success, and while we have cause for congratulation in having gained for our science a position which she has for a long period been consistently and perseveringly denied, our position now in the Association is only that against which Dr. Prichard protested twenty years ago. Dr. Prichard was not content that his favourite science should occupy only a subordinate position in the zoological section. Shall we follow his example, and also protest against this error? or shall we take warning from the failure of Dr. Prichard's efforts to remove this anomaly, and be content, at least for a time, with the subordinate position in which we are placed as a mere department of some other science? The authorities of the Association have, however, done what will, ere long, settle this question. They have admitted anthropology as a department, and if they will now only give us fair play, we shall not be many years in convincing them that this subordinate position of anthropology cannot be long maintained. Let us not attempt again to decide this question by argument, but let us rather show that facts speak with more influence than words. Let us convince them that anthropology is not only one of the grandest branches of natural science, but that it is also one in which the public generally will, before long, take the most interest. During the past year we have, as it were, got in the thin edge of the wedge, and it depends on our own discretion and zeal whether we shall soon obtain the object for which Dr. Prichard contended just twenty years ago. We have now succeeded in again placing the science of man in, to some extent, its right position in the Association; it now only remains for us to show, by our genuine love and work at our science, that the time has come when anthropology should be placed in her natural position, as one great department of natural science, by the side of, and at least equal in rank to, her sister sciences, zoology and botany. The attempt to make anthropology a part of biology is certainly most ingenious, and for a few years it may suit our purpose, as the exponents of the claims of anthropological research in this country, to accept it. But let it be well understood, there are many Fellows of our Society who only look on this arrangement as temporary, and as the most satisfactory expedient under existing circumstances. Let the authorities well understand that we do not look upon the present position of anthropological science in the Association as either satisfactory or final. I believe I speak the sentiments of nearly all my colleagues when I say that we accept the position we have obtained in all good faith and sincerity, and that we do not intend to try to alter that position until we have fully established ourselves in the place which has been allotted to us.

This subject assumes an importance, because we cannot greatly increase the study of anthropology in this country until we have removed the misconception existing in the public mind respecting its scope and object. Now, what are the objects aimed at by having a society for the special study of anthropology?

I have answered that question so often, that on this occasion

I must allow others to speak on it. What Dr. Prichard said twenty years ago respecting the benefits to be derived from allied branches of study can be said now with equal, if not still greater, truth and force. At that time he remarked that his favourite pursuit did not, "however, owe its late rapid extension to those only who have cultivated it for its own sake, but is, perhaps, still more indebted to the attention which has been given by the learned men and learned societies to correlative inquiries bearing more or less directly on the human race."* In other words, twenty years ago it had become advisable, in his opinion, that all the branches of study which throw light on "the past history of the human race" should be carefully studied together. Is that not the opinion of every scientific man who has investigated this subject since that time? But not to weary you with examples, let me call your attention to the formally expressed opinion of a man of science, who is, unfortunately, not yet a member of our Society. The sentiments which he has here so fully and clearly expressed, appear to me to apply not specially to the immediate paper which called forth the remarks, but is alike applicable to every paper at all bearing on the science of man which shall in future be read before Section E of the British Association. Professor Huxley, speaking in Section E, at Nottingham, remarked,—"It has, in the wisdom of the council of the Association, been thought proper that a department shall be instituted in Section D, of which I have the honour to be the head. It is called the Department of Anthropology, and if I have any comprehension of scientific method or arrangement, the paper we have just heard read is a purely anthropological paper, and can only be competently discussed by those persons who are familiar with all the sciences necessary for the student of anthropology." No one here, I am sure, will doubt the truth of these remarks. They are alike honourable to Professor Huxley's candour and good sense. We go a little further, and say that this is true, not only of the particular paper which called forth these remarks, but that these words might with great advantage be read aloud, after every paper bearing on the science of man which shall in future be read either in Section E of the British Association, or any other place where the whole bearing of such communication cannot be fully and freely discussed. Thus the existence of our Society, and a department for our science in the annual scientific congress of this country, is not only a scientific, but also a logical necessity. Our fiercest opponents must admit that our principles on this fundamental point are unassailable. Our existence and our success alike proclaim the truth of this law. During the past year it has fallen to my lot to make an attempt to convince some of our brother students of the truth of these propositions. In this I regret to say I have failed. Passion and prejudice are yet too strong, it may be, on both sides to allow of a unanimous agreement on this point. But the time is, most assuredly, fast approaching when the truth can be no longer ignored. The sooner that time arrives the better for the credit of British science, and espe-

* Address to E. S., 1847.

cially for British anthropological science. The existence of our Society is not an isolated phenomenon; but we have sister societies springing up in all parts of the civilised world. On us devolves the task of representing anthropological science in this country. We have, on our own part, offered to make the greatest possible sacrifices, in order to make this Society more worthy of the science we desire her to represent. The officers and Council of this Society have offered to give up their places of honour and trust to any one who would come and aid them in their good and great work. These proposals on our part have met with no generous response. There are, however, some notable exceptions to this. It has always been my wish and desire to render homage where homage is due, and it gives me more than ordinary satisfaction to assure you that one of my own most bitter scientific opponents, Professor Huxley, was one of the first to come forward and consent voluntarily to sacrifice his own peace, in order to bring about so desirable an amalgamation. Nor must I omit to mention that great praise is due to Sir John Lubbock, for the generous way in which he assisted to bring this about. There are certain dark figures moving about on this planet which produce entirely opposite effects on Professor Huxley and myself. These bodies act as disturbing forces on the harmony which ought to exist between us. Professor Huxley cannot yet bring himself to believe that I can hold my views on the negro without being influenced by the slave-holding interest; and I cannot yet convince myself that he can be a good, sound anthropologist, when he allows his name to be associated with those who wish to persecute a man for successfully putting down a negro revolt.

As, therefore, I may not again for a long time have occasion to agree with Professor Huxley, let me here be allowed the pleasure of acknowledging the important services which that gentleman has rendered to the cause of anthropological science in England by his recent bold and consistent conduct respecting anthropology at the British Association. The ever memorable division of the general committee of the Association at Birmingham paved the way for our success; but it was to Professor Huxley that we were mainly indebted for an immediate victory last year. Such conduct will be remembered by our descendants when the bitter disputes about the negro have long been forgotten. My own sentiments, however, with regard to Professor Huxley, may be best gathered from the fact that, notwithstanding my differences of opinion with him, when I was asked whom I should like to be my successor in this chair, I mentioned the name of Professor Huxley. I was further authorised by the council to request him to take this office; and, had we been successful in convincing Mr. Crawfurd that the words anthropology and ethnology had different meanings, I should this day have had the pleasure of committing to Professor Huxley the position which, by your kind indulgence, I have held during the last four years. In concluding this portion of my address, I feel it only right to say that the terms of union which we submitted for their consideration were fully agreed to by both Professor Huxley and Sir John Lubbock, and I trust that some day they may form the basis of a more successful negotiation.

In the meantime, however, our duty is plain. If we cannot, by a *coup d'état*, obtain additional strength, we must try a more certain, and, perhaps, more successful plan.

The problem before us now is how we can best promote the study of anthropology, and how our own Society may be rendered worthy of this country. We must not only promote the study of anthropology, but we must do so in such a manner as to redound to the credit of our common country. If others will not make any sacrifice to feelings of national pride, we are at least called upon to do so. If the task before us be simply that of promoting the study of anthropology, we should be at liberty to use means which at present are not admissible. We must remember that our doings are becoming to a great extent the pattern for other societies. As the second Anthropological Society established, we are looked to as an example, and we should be careful not to do that which might bring us temporary eclat, but could not be of lasting benefit to our science. This must be our maxim in the future, whatever we may have done in the past. I shall, therefore, now briefly consider these two questions at the same time, in touching upon the various objects which are contemplated in our programme. I shall take these objects in the order in which they appear in our prospectus, and briefly touch on each.

Meetings.—It no doubt often occurs to those who attend our meetings, or read reports of the same, that they do little towards the establishment of a science of mankind. This feeling is, no doubt, greatly based on truth. The necessarily brief form of a paper, and the limited time for discussion, are alike against much being done in one evening towards the solution of any question that may be submitted to us. Our papers and the discussions thereon rather indicate what is going on than do much to assist the cause of science. All scientific men agree that it is of the greatest advantage for scientific students of any branch of science to meet together and compare notes on the various subjects which they may be investigating. It is, alone, by free and fair discussion that the truth can be obtained. Complaints have, it is true, been made that sometimes our discussions are thought to be a little too free ; but no one can justly charge the Society as a body. It has been my good fortune to have listened to the discussions which have taken place in this Society during the last four years, and I am glad to know that, however free the discussions have been, they have never degenerated into either frivolity or licentiousness ; nor have I often felt it necessary to request speakers to confine their remarks to the subject immediately under discussion. Experience has taught me that one branch of our science is so immediately connected with another, that it becomes frequently very difficult to decide whether the apparent foreign matter submitted to us may not have a most important bearing on the subject under discussion. The system we have adopted, of referring papers before they are read, is valuable ; but it requires to be used with very great caution. The council submit each communication to some Fellow of the Society, and ask if it is suitable to be read before the Society? If the answer is in the affirmative, it is read ; if in the negative, it is again referred to some one unac-

quainted with the decision of the previous referee. If these referees differ, the paper is then submitted to each member of the council, or to a special committee. I have said that the power thus assumed by the council to refuse to read any communication submitted to them must be used with very great caution. A tendency is sometimes felt to refuse a paper because it is thought to be too dreamy or unscientific; but it must be borne in mind that the object of the Society is not to formulate or promulgate any one set of opinions, but rather to develope the expression of opposite opinions, both in written communications and in the discussions. It must also be borne in mind that we do not feel bound to print the whole of each of the papers read before us, or the discussions on the same, at full length. Sometimes it is considered that the publication of an abstract answers sufficiently well. This point, too, requires great care, for an abstract does not often give a correct idea of the contents of a paper. I am myself inclined to think, that, with certain limitations, more will be done to advance our science by printing all the communications read before us at length, than by sending forth abstracts of them: always premising that such communications are written in a *bonâ fide* scientific spirit. So, too, with the reports of discussion. Each speaker is wholly and solely responsible for his own remarks. It is neither the object nor the business of the council to assume the office of a scientific censorship. It is, however, necessary that the council should have this power: but it is equally necessary that they should exercise it with great caution and discretion.

Journal and Memoirs.—The publication of reports of papers and abstracts of discussions, in the form of a Quarterly Journal, forms one of the most important items contemplated in our formation. The advantage of a regularly published periodical over the issue of the same at irregular intervals, cannot, I think, be too highly estimated. Our Journal has always been associated with an independent Review; but the latter publication is in no way under the influence or control of the Society. It has hitherto been found mutually advantageous that this connection should exist, and, as long as such is the case, I presume the present arrangements will continue. The connection of the official journal of a scientific society with an independent publication is an experiment; but it is thought, by many competent judges, to be a highly successful one.

Up to this time our published Memoirs have been of very considerable value, and offer a favourable contrast to any similar publication ever issued from the English press in this form; and, as time goes on, I trust that their scientific interest and practical value will still more increase.

Local Secretaries.—During the past four years we have been enabled to make a large number of appointments of local secretaries in different parts of the world. This is all we have hitherto been able to do. It now remains for us to utilise them. This may be done to some extent by some general instructions; but still more by a personal correspondence with and encouragement of these officers. While, however, we may now be able to begin to make use of our present local secretaries, we

have still largely to increase their numbers before we are able successfully to compete with the gigantic work which we have before us. It would be very advisable that a more intimate connection between these officers should be kept up, either by personal interviews, or, where that is impossible, by frequent correspondence.

Museum and Library.—In four years we have collected together one hundred and five skulls, beside a large number of flint, stone, and other weapons and implements of ancient and modern races of man. This forms a good nucleus for future collections. We have now to do the work which has hitherto fallen on one man in this country, and who, in his efforts to collect an anthropological museum, has been to a great extent successful. I allude to the anthropological collection of our colleague, Dr. Barnard Davis. If one man can accomplish so much, how much more can be done by a Society like our own ?

Our Library is not only incomplete, but as yet only a nucleus of books on our science ; nevertheless, it is perhaps the most valuable which has existed on this subject in this country, although only amounting to some nine hundred volumes.

Translations.—The work before us under the head of translations is very vast indeed. We have to publish all classical works on anthropology, and at the same time we should endeavour to publish translations of modern works which represent the work that is being done by other students of science on the continent. The anthropological literature of the last century is especially deserving of reproduction. We have already sent forth to the world the works of Blumenbach ; and we ought now to do the same with the writings of Camper, Herder, Soemmering, Kant, Virey, Desmoulins, and Bory de St. Vincent. We have prepared for the printer the works of Retzius, Gratiolet, and the second volume of Waitz. It is highly desirable that we should publish as soon as possible the works of Nilsson and Von Baër, so as to have the advantage of their assistance in the translation of such works.

Besides those enumerated above it would be well for us to publish translations of some of the important works issued by the continental press on our science. Our object is to increase the study of anthropology in this country, and this we cannot do by issuing only standard and classical works. We must publish works which shall have the effect of inducing persons in this country to study our science. We have to show the people of England that our science does not simply treat of anatomy and physiology, but that it includes all the sciences which throw light on the past, present, or future history of mankind.

Besides translations of foreign works it also comes within the range of our Society to publish original works. At the present time I know of more than one original work, by Fellows of this Society, the publication of which would bring credit on ourselves and be doing good to our science. This one object is sufficient to tax the whole of the energies and resources of any scientific society, and gives at once to us a speciality which does not belong to any other scientific body. But let it always be remembered that this publication of both transla-

tions and original works is one of the fundamental objects of this Society. If we cannot do it in as satisfactory a manner as we could wish, we must still attempt to do it as well as we can. There are yet hundreds of men in England who ought, and I believe do sympathise with this special object of our Society, and would have gladly joined us had we no other in view. I trust that the knowledge of the fact that our present resources will not enable us to carry out fully, and satisfactorily, this part of our programme, will induce them to aid us. What the Ray Society has done, and is doing for zoology, we are aiming to do for anthropology. As therefore it is alone by large numbers, or by large resources, we can carry out this one object, it is incumbent on all who are conscious of the surpassing benefits to be derived from the publication of such works, to come forward and assist us in this labour.

The Council have had continually before them the question as to how they could obtain the large resources necessary to carry out in a satisfactory manner all the objects conceived in the formation of the Society, and especially the one by which translations and original works on anthropology may be published ; and although proposals have been made for increasing the subscription, or introducing an admission fee, they have, in my opinion, wisely refrained from advising either the one or the other. They have decided to recommend neither the one nor the other until there are two thousand ordinary Fellows on our list. This at first sight appears a startling announcement ; but the more the amount of work even at this time, before the Society is investigated, the more it will be found that we must either strive in this matter to become worthy of the high position which we are called on by the unanimous voice of scientific Europe to take, or that we must acknowledge that our organisation is unable to cope with the duty before us. If the latter alternative be true, then, without attempting to impede scientific progress and advancement, we must give place to an organisation more suited to the requirements of the time. I know, however, too well the present elements which compose this Society to even suppose such a contingency is soon about to happen. If our successors at some future day should think differently, I trust it will not be from either the precepts or examples which we shall hand down to them. The Society has already done so much that I feel sure she will not now hesitate to take the position which is expected of her ; nor, I feel sure, will the Fellows of this Society generally, allow the printing-press to be stopped for lack of energy in inducing their friends to enlist in our cause.

Committees.—If more funds or more members are required for the printing of our publications, the same want is felt to nearly as great an extent for the furtherance of other objects of anthropological science generally. One of our plans is the appointment of official committees. During the past year we have felt so much the necessity for funds for special purposes, that an attempt was made to raise by private subscriptions a special fund to be applied to original researches in archaic anthropology. This has already yielded satisfactory results, and will

continue to do so if we are able to continue the same. But archaic anthropology is after all but a very small part of the science of anthropology. It is no doubt quite true that the destruction which has been going on for centuries of ancient crania, both in this country and in our colonies, is not very creditable to those who have gone before us. With the exception of perhaps Norway, Englishmen may enjoy the somewhat melancholy satisfaction of knowing, that in this country there exists the most imperfect collection of ancient crania of any people in Europe. So too this country excels all others in the ruthless manner in which ancient tumuli and other objects throwing light on the past history of man have been destroyed. If we appoint some one to make an investigation of the ancient remains of this country, it is with no desire or intention of interfering with the work of the antiquary. We take this step merely in self-defence, and as a protest against the little care which they have shown in the preservation of objects of anthropological interest. Efforts have been made during the past year to awaken the archæologists of both England and Scotland to a sense of the importance of a collection of crania, and I am glad to be able to announce that a sort of treaty is in progress between ourselves and the archæologists of both countries by which we may mutually assist each other's researches. This is so far satisfactory as regards this country; but England, or even Europe is not the whole world. Leaving this aside, we have still to insist on the importance of making collections of crania in our colonies, and indeed in every part of the world where opportunities may offer.

We want funds to repay our Local Secretaries or others any expense they incur in obtaining and transmitting to us either skulls or objects of human industry which throw light on man's past or present state and history. We want funds for increasing original work in other branches of our science. Where, for instance, have we got an authenticated series of drawings of the existing races of man? where are portraits of those peoples who have but lately become extinct? Not only have we lost their skulls, but what I hold to be of equal if not of greater importance, we have also lost their living forms. In many cases our neglect is almost irremediable. Races or tribes of men have within the last half century become utterly extinct, and the apathy of British Societies, whose duty it was to preserve these, has caused all this disgrace on British anthropological science. A like neglect on our part may bring ours to the state in which they now find themselves; while had such societies properly performed their duty, this country would have been second to none in collections of skulls of extinct races. They have neglected to insist on the preservation of portraits, of vocabularies, of traditions, or even of crania. Instead of receiving the homage of the present students of the science of man for what they have done, they only have the finger of scorn pointed at them for not being able to collect, during twenty years' existence, more than about thirty crania!

The past history of our Society has shown that we have not been so apathetic in this matter, for in four years we have collected

together more than one hundred well preserved crania. We have also collected a considerable number of authentic photographs and drawings of the different races of men. It has been said that the distinguishing characteristics of scientific societies are that of ingratitude towards, and an entire want of conscience in their dealings with, those who put themselves, not only to considerable labour and inconvenience on their account, and a tardiness in returning thanks for large expenses which are frequently incurred on their behalf. We must endeavour to avoid being justly charged with such conduct. I hold that it is only right and just, that we as a society should repay all the *bonâ fide* expenses to which our Local Secretaries and others are put in procuring objects for our museum or our library. We must remember that unless we are able to do this, we shall be entirely beaten out of the field by private collectors.

I may but indicate the extent of the demands on our funds when I briefly inform you of a plan brought before the Council only this year for making a collection of authentic portraits of some of the most available African tribes. Mr. Baines, the accomplished traveller and artist, submitted for our consideration a plan by which he would undertake such a duty, but we found that this alone, in the expenses to be incurred by that gentleman, would absorb more than a year's entire income ; we were therefore compelled to relinquish the idea of obtaining the portraits of African races in this manner. Shall we allow them to pass away without making an effort to preserve for our own and our descendants' use some record of their form and features? Shall the form of a river or the height of a mountain be investigated at the expense of thousands of pounds, while the form and height of such fleeting objects as men and women be lost for ever, through our apathy? The anthropologist and the geographer should for the future work hand in hand ; but if this is not to be, and if only one set of investigations can go on at the same time, then, I say, let investigation and description of man come first, for future generations may study physical geography, as well as we can do now.

The approaching anthropological congress at Calcutta offers to us another illustration of what we are called on to do. A communication has been made to us requesting the attendance of a committee to represent our Society on that interesting and important occasion. It would be very advisable that we should be able to send at least one anthropologist, accompanied by an artist or a photographer : but where are the funds to come from? If we cannot do this, we must leave it to chance whether we shall be able to preserve any useful records of this important event.

Local Societies.—The establishment of local or branch societies is an experiment which has been tried during the past year. Such societies will become a source of strength or weakness to us, according to the manner in which they are governed. These societies will be chiefly useful in giving Fellows of the Society and others an opportunity of meeting together to discuss certain anthropological topics of the day. If they content themselves with this, they will no doubt do good both to our Society and to science ; but there is a fear

that such branch societies may not be content with this much, but may become ambitious to rival the parent Society. Any attempt, however, to interfere with the legitimate action of the parent and central Society cannot but do injury. A small reference library and typical museum is all that should be aimed at, and any attempts to make a large collection of either books or specimens for a local museum should as yet be strictly avoided. Both the books and the specimens of the parent Society are at the disposal of the branch societies whenever they may be required. It is not proposed to limit these branch societies to this country. Ere long I hope to see local branches of our Society in every great city of the British dominions.

Lectures.—In the original rules of the Society the Council had no power to sanction the delivery of lectures before the Society other than in the form of ordinary papers; now, however, the Council have power to allow lectures to be delivered before the Society under such limitations and restrictions as may from time to time be thought advisable. By exercising this power they will simply be carrying out the great object of the Society—the promotion of the study of anthropology. How many otherwise well educated men of the present day, for instance, are not ignorant of the meaning now applied by nearly every scientific man in Europe to the word anthropology? How many erroneous impressions respecting our science have we not now to remove? How many, even of our own Fellows, would not benefit by attending, or even reading a systematic course of lectures on the different branches of our science?

By the delivery of lectures we shall be able to do what is now impossible at our ordinary meetings. There are some subjects which cannot be successfully treated in one or two papers, and the time allowed for the ordinary meetings of the Society is too valuable to be given up to the enunciation of well known and undisputed facts. Our meetings are chiefly occupied with the investigation of new facts; our lectures will chiefly be confined to application and deduction from facts already known. These lectures may also sometimes take the form of oral instruction. How many of our Fellows, for instance, would not be glad to have instruction in the employment of the different craniometers now in use, or even on craniology generally? How many more would not gladly listen to a practical descriptive anthropologist, like Dr. John Beddoe, while he discoursed on his system of making observations? Or who would not be glad to attend a course of lectures by such men as Captain Burton, Mr. Eyre, Sir S. Baker, or Mr. George Catlin, on the races of man with whom they have come in contact?

Besides such subjects it would be well to have from time to time series of lectures detailing the progress being made in different branches of our science or on its practial application. With what interest and profit might we have a series of lectures on the history of anthropological science? How much might we do to preserve savage races by exciting an interest in the public mind on their behalf? The good work that might be done is vast enough, and

I trust that my successor in this office will be able to announce to you that the delivery of lectures before the Fellows of the Society and the public generally, has alike proved beneficial to the Society and to the science.

I have now discharged the duty, incumbent on me, of saying a few words on each of the chief objects of the Society. I must now dwell for a short period on the general aspects of our science.

If we look around us at the present aspect and position of our science in this country, we see cause both for fear and for congratulation. We live in an age when the public mind seems to oscillate with every new doctrine that is brought before it. At the present time, many a man whose name, position, and abilities should enable him to assist the cause of our science, is wasting this good opportunity by promulgating some of the most reckless speculations and assumptions which the history of science will have to record.

Some four years ago, a shout of execration was raised against us, for daring to assert that the question of the origin of man was one of physical science. Even some of the Fellows of the Society resigned, and others relinquished the offices they held. I thought it my duty to make that statement. We have, however, lived down opposition on this point. Our right to discuss the *modus operandi* of the origin of man is granted to us even by theologians. All they now ask is, that we should discuss the whole bearings of the case, and not promulgate crude speculations. Our right to discuss this question as our own being no longer denied, we readily acquiesce in this request. The history of our science for the last two thousand years, has shown us that all attempts to promulgate a satisfactory theory respecting man's origin have been meagre, conjectural, and, for all practical or scientific purposes, worthless. We have felt it our duty to oppose the assumptions of the theologian, when he has dictated to us on this question. But how much more does it become our duty to oppose the speculations and assumptions of our contemporaries in science, when they become guilty of doing what we so much condemn in the theologian? We must not, and ought not, to have two measures; one for the theologian, and another for the man of science. At this minute, assumptions as valueless as any of those promulgated by the theologian, are being industriously circulated by men of science, under the garb of science. Our Society has been blamed for the speculations of some modern anatomists and naturalists: but we can, as a society, justly plead not guilty. It has been our duty to be perfectly consistent with regard to different theories. To the monogenist, of whatever sort, we have had to say, yours is an assumption unsupported by fact, reason, or analogy. To the polygenist we have to say, your hypothesis is an assumption of no great scientific value; but, under all the circumstances, it is the most reasonable. A French anthropologist not long since asked the question, whether the majority of the Society were in favour of the monogenist or the polygenist theory of the origin of mankind? The reply I gave him was, that the majority would be in favour of whichever theory should eventually appear to be true, and that at present they suspended

their judgment, and did not give any preference to the various theories of man's origin. I further, however, added that I thought, and I knew many of my colleagues agreed with me, that there were at present several distinct species, if not genera, of man, but we declined to assert how they originated. I, for one, think that the doctrine of the absolute intellectual inequality of the different races or species of man is demonstrated by well ascertained facts. I further consider that, without pretending to say how or when these differences originated, these species have different instincts, and that, judging from past experience, it is as difficult to get a race like the Australian to accept European civilisation, as it is to get a monkey to understand a problem of Euclid, or a cat to bark like a dog. That the instincts of races differ, I take to be an established fact, which all the erudition of a Prichard, or all the special pleading of a Quatrefages cannot invalidate. I shall make no apology for telling you on this occasion, what I take to be the tendency of our science, because I know too well that the more freely a man speaks his mind in this Society, the more is he thanked, however much his colleagues may differ from him. As Lord Stanley well observed, "the state of the public mind is the best defence of the existence of this Society. It is something for a man who has got a word to say, to know there is a society where he will get a fair and considerate hearing; and whether the judgment goes against him or not, at least he will be met by argument, and not by abuse."*

It has been said by one of England's greatest anthropologists, Robert Knox, "that a race which admires its own inventions, despises truth", and that the theory of race was despised in this country because it ran counter to the theories of historians, statesmen, theologians, and philanthropists—whom he describes as "impostors all". Whether there be any truth that the people of England are the despisers of truth, I will not stop to inquire. It is sufficient for my purpose to know that there are some men, at least, in this country who do not despise truth, but who seek for it, and welcome it wherever and whenever it is to be found.

Dr. Knox, however, was neither the first nor the last who has seen the antipathy manifested by historians, theologians, statesmen, and philanthropists, to the theory of race; nor did his peculiar style do much to remove this antipathy. We live in different times. At present we fight with facts rather than with sarcasm or invective. To give a complete or satisfactory answer to the cause of this antipathy to admit the influence of race or diverse instincts in mankind, would take me beyond the limits of an address. I shall on this occasion content myself with offering a few suggestions for your consideration, which may perhaps assist to explain some of the extraordinary phenomena to which I have alluded.

In the first place, it appears to me that a large majority of the opponents of the theory of race may be divided into two great parties, and that their antipathy is produced by entirely opposite causes.

* Anthropological Review, No. ix, 1865.

Knox was a good anatomist, and, on the whole, a philosophical writer; but he did not understand why his teaching was objected to. He looked on his opponents as dishonest men and impostors. This explanation, I am bound to say, does not meet the requirements of the case; and I am glad, both for the sake of human nature and for the credit of my countrymen, that such is not the case. Anthropologists, I think, are no longer justified in making such sweeping charges against the large class who oppose the doctrine of diversity of race-instincts to explain human history, both past and present. Anthropologists must try to seek for some other cause; and, if they should fail in their first efforts, they must renew them whenever they have a chance, for most assuredly there must be a cause for such extraordinary phenomena. My reflection on this subject has led me to think that the cause of the antipathy to even admitting the existence of comparative anthropology, is alone to be discovered by the medical psychologist and the cerebral physiologist.

The opponents of comparative anthropology may be enumerated under different general heads. As an illustration, I will take the two largest classes who exhibit the greatest antipathy to that science. They are, first of all, persons suffering from what I will call respectively the religious mania, and the rights-of-man mania. These two classes are quite distinct, and both forms of the disease do not often attack the same person. The causes which produce religious mania, which shows itself in the manner I have indicated, compose a very large, and I think, on the whole, a harmless class. Those who have had an opportunity of examining persons suffering under religious mania, cannot but have been struck with the large number of cases which have exhibited symptoms of arrested brain-growth. Those who have watched the development of youth, must have observed certain physical signs, which I need not here enumerate, which accompany those persons who suffer to any appreciable extent from religious mania. I believe that all attempts to cure religious mania, when it is combined with either arrested brain-growth, or early closing of one or more of the sutures, have proved utterly abortive. Nor do all persons who suffer from religious mania exhibit this antipathy to comparative anthropology. In this it differs from those whom I would describe as suffering from what I believe to be an incipient form of disease, or at least mental idiosyncracy, called, for the want of a better name, rights-of-man mania. This disease afflicts alike statesmen, philosophers, and men of science. It is apparently produced in early manhood from having thoroughly assimilated in their mind the one gigantic assumption of absolute human equality, which is generally known under the title of rights of man. Persons of the greatest ability, eloquence, and mental power, are afflicted with this disease. It is always however accompanied by more or less defective reasoning power, and often by a want of harmony between the organs of sense and expression,—between the brain and the face. This assumption of human rights is often the mainspring of action, and in such cases persons become what are called philanthropists—

holding a sort of mongrel philosophy, like that of which Ben Jonson speaks as certain characters' religion.

"Almanac says: I wonder what religion he is of?

"Fitton rejoins: No certain species, sure; a kind of mule that; half an ethnic, half a Christian."

This assumption of human equality was first heard of in the latter half of the last century, and since then it has been industriously taught in our universities; and at the present day it has become a part and parcel of the systems of political economy on which we rear our legislators. The mischief done by those suffering from rights-of-man mania is incomparably greater than any other. In politics these persons are necessarily and logically radicals. The late Henry Thos. Buckle imbibed this assumption from its great modern teacher, Jeremy Bentham; and his work, which was rendered nearly useless to science on this account, is, I understand, about to be edited by one who exhibits one of the worst phases of this disease. I allude to Mr. John Stuart Mill, the son of the late private secretary to Jeremy Bentham.

The case of Mr. Mill is perhaps the most painful ever recorded. It demonstrates to what absurdities the greatest minds may be driven when thus afflicted. Human equality once accepted, drives the philosopher madly forward, he knows and cares not whither. There is no such thing as a science of comparative anthropology; and all who dare deny that all men are equal, are exposed to much the sort of abuse which Mr. Abernethy applied to the teaching of Mr. Lawrence. We can only answer with the latter gentleman, "When favourite speculations have been long indulged, and much pains have been bestowed on them, they are viewed with that parental partiality, which cannot bear to hear of faults in the object of its attachment. The mere doubt of an impartial observer is offensive; and the discovery of anything like a blemish in the darling, is not only ascribed to an entire want of discrimination and judgment, but resented as an injury."

I shall do in the future as in the past, and, whenever I have a chance, shall endeavour to show that human equality is one of the most unwarrantable assumptions ever invented by man. Nay, the deduction from comparative anthropology will not enable me to stop here, but I shall have to proclaim that the theories of socialism, communism, and republicanism find not a fact in anthropological science to support such chimeras. Well did the President of the British Association, Mr. W. R. Grove, in his address at Nottingham, say: "The revolutionary ideas of the so-called rights of man, and *à priori* reasoning from what are termed first principles, are far more unsound, and give us far less ground for improvement of the race, than the study of the gradual progressive changes arising from changed circumstances, changed wants, changed habits. Our language, our social institutions, our laws, the constitution of which we are proud, are the growth of time, the product of slow adaptations, resulting from continuous struggles. Happily, in this country, though our philosophical writers do not recognise it, practical experience has

taught us to improve rather than to remedy; we follow the law of nature and avoid cataclysms."*

This disease does not solely afflict philosophers. It alike renders the action of the statesman and the man of science non-subject to the dictates of reason, or to the just and legitimate influence of facts. It shocks, they say, their moral nature to be told that human races have different instincts and aspirations; and they treat such well established statements as an insult, and resent the same by applying the most abusive epithets to those who have the temerity to utter such, to them, repulsive sentiments.

Shall we hide all the facts we have at hand, and be silent, lest we shock the moral nature of these would-be philosophers; or shall we boldly come forward and declare their teaching respecting human equality to be a sham and a delusion, and its teachers mere wind-bag philosophers?

If the remarks I have quoted from Mr. Grove are allowable to the President of the British Association, how much more does it become my duty, as your President, to come forward and avow how entirely such sentiments are supported by the science of comparative anthropology. Nay, you will expect me to go still further, and express more fully what I conceive to be the bearing of our science on the science of political economy. I shall not be accused, I hope, of holding undue conservative opinions when I go still further than Mr. Grove, and declare my emphatic opinion that the existence of a well-selected hereditary aristocracy in any country is more in accordance with nature's laws than those glittering trivialities respecting human rights which now form the stock-in-trade of some professors of political economy, and many of our politicians. In saying this, however, I ought to add that I do not think that the aristocracy of this country for instance is now, or has been, judiciously selected; but this does not alter the truth expressed by the poet:—

"Some are and must be, greater than the rest."

There is much reason to believe that peculiarities are hereditary, and if a judicious use is made of this knowledge by those who are interested in the matter, then will all cavil be answered respecting the status of any well-selected hereditary aristocracy.

During the past existence of the society we have been blamed because I and some of my colleagues have thought it to be our duty to endeavour to give a practical application of our science to political economy, and to unravel the mysteries of religion. We have had to enter on this course without having any great names, or the example of any other scientific society of a similar nature to our own for us to quote as a precedent. We have had to contend against the criticism of those who attacked us because our inductions tended to destroy castles in the air raised on their own baseless assumptions; and those who have adopted this course have found themselves opposed even by some of their own colleagues. This opposition has arisen partly from a feeling that scientific societies

* Grove, Address Brit. Association, p. 37.

should have nothing to do either with politics or religion, and also because some, following the precept though not the practice, of Agassiz, think that men of science should not concern themselves with the practical application of science.

I am, however, entirely of a different opinion. I contend that the science of political economy must be based simply and solely on the facts discovered by the anthropologist. Within the last few years there has arisen an organisation for the encouragement of the study of social science; but the published proceedings of that influential body show that their so-called social science is largely impregnated with philanthropy. Now a social science cannot be based on mere philanthropic theories. In other words, social science must be based on the facts of human nature as it is, not as we would wish it to be. We cannot assist the cause of true science by attempting to establish an artificial social system which is no part of nature's laws. We are the students and the interpreters of nature's laws, and it is our duty carefully to ascertain what those laws are, and not attempt to raise up in the name of "social science" a code of morals based on an assumption of human equality, and consequently equal human rights, because we know that human equality is a mere dream, and all systems based on it are mere chimeras.

A short time ago, at the opening of the Manchester Anthropological Society, I ventured to say to the people of that great city that I thought it would be better for the inhabitants of our globe if they were governed on scientific rather than on philanthropic principles—on facts rather than assumptions. It may interest you to know, as indicating the work before us, that the utterance of such sentiments called down upon me severe condemnation. It was even suggested by the largest circulated paper in Manchester that rather than admit such principles they would prefer to send me to the gallows! I had stated that the inductions of the anthropologist were of more value, and that their application to the government of the world would be better for mankind generally, than the assumptions of the philanthropist. On which statement it is remarked, "We begin to see Dr. Hunt's reasons for assuming that the triumph of anthropology would be the extinction of philanthropy. If he is a fair type of the science, the two cannot live together. In that case it may be a question whether we ought not to think of hanging Dr. Hunt. Anything to save us from the brutal devilism with which he threatens us."*

Gentlemen, the "brutal devilism" with which I threaten the world is the triumph of facts over assumptions. I am content here to make my stand, and to continue to teach this "brutal devilism." We live in a strange age, and I know not what organisation may arise to carry out the threat of bringing me to the gallows. The naturally savage and brutal instincts of the party from whom this threat emanates may be so much increased by the success which may result from their present pursuit of the life of a great and accomplished man, that it is quite possible that they may try to bring me to the gallows in a similar

* Manchester Examiner and Times, Nov. 3, 1866.

manner! If, however, I am not permitted longer to enunciate my sentiments to you, I shall have the satisfaction of knowing that there are those in the society who will not be deterred by my untimely fate from declaring, as I shall continue to do as long as I can, that facts and not assumptions ought to form the basis of the government of this world. If you wish me, gentlemen, to recant the odious doctrine of giving preference to facts over assumptions, I shall be willing to do so, if such a condition will save my life, on the agreement, however, that you will allow me to follow the example of Galileo, and exclaim, in the place of *è pur si muove*—FACTS AND NOT ASSUMPTIONS SHOULD GOVERN THE WORLD.

But before any committee is formed for bringing me to the gallows, let me ask my would-be persecutors to reflect before their thirst for blood has drowned their reasoning powers. May it not be better eventually for all classes and all races that they should be governed according to the laws of nature than according to artificial codes invented by man? Nay further—May not the anthropologists be right after all in the preference for facts over assumptions? Let them remember too what was taught us by Descartes, that the beginning of all real knowledge is the rejection of early prejudice, and that as long as they continue to prefer assumptions to facts they have not acquired the elements of wisdom. Let them remember too that the same philosopher insisted on the necessity of every opinion being brought to the test of individual judgment. Let them too show a firm resolution not to be influenced by the opinions of great names or old theories, and they may yet see that what they now so elegantly call "brutal devilism" will then be nothing but sound science combined with common sense. They will further see that the highest philosophy and the highest social science is that which is based on facts.

I have stated that we had no precedent to justify our attempts practically to apply our science. But in a young society like our own it will often happen that subjects will be brought before us which at first sight do not appear properly to belong to us. In some cases we may even exceed the just limits of our science. We had better, however, do this than be too rigid in our attempts to confine our science within certain assumed boundaries. Some of my colleagues have, however, thought differently, and have taken credit to themselves for their attempts to confine anthropology within such limits as will exclude all questions regarding political economy or religion. The transactions of our sister society in Paris are quoted as an example of what we should do. I am quite ready to commend the course our accomplished colleagues in Paris think proper to pursue to attentive consideration; but before we adopt their customs we must make ourselves thoroughly convinced that what they do is from choice and not from necessity. We must remember that in the year 1846 the statutes of *la Société d'Anthropologie* were drawn up, but the government of that day would not allow it to be formed. Even at this day we see a living example of the fear of anthropological science by the suppression of the sittings of the Anthropological Society of Madrid. Utterly groundless, as I believe this dread of anthropological science

to be, yet the existence of a fear of its teachings is sufficient to convince us that the examples of other scientific bodies in other countries cannot justly be quoted as an argument against the course which we think it our duty to take. Our science is dreaded, not because its deductions form the basis of all genuine political economy, but because it is supposed to threaten the destruction of a system of government which has for its goal the high sounding titles of universal equality, fraternity, and brotherhood. May it be the lot of our society to show that such chimeras are not supported by the indications of our science! May our society become a living and an active power against all Utopian dreams respecting human government, whether emanating from the politician, the theologian, or the philanthropist!

But before I leave this subject, I am glad to be able to announce to you that the course we have thought it our duty to pursue has met with the sincere approbation of, perhaps, the most distinguished anthropologist in Europe, Dr. Pruner-Bey. I certainly know of no other man who combines in his own person so many of the qualifications of what an anthropologist should be. In a letter written during the past year, he says, "I sincerely admire the extensive spirit of your inquiry in man. Indeed you do not shut yourselves up between the four walls of a THEATRUM ANATOMICUM, but the highest points of human speculation find their place in your precious works. And, indeed, can it be otherwise, when man and his characters are to form the subject of the business before you. Go always on in this way; yes, go a-head!" Most heartily do I sympathise with such sentiments, and they are all the more valuable as the spontaneous offering of a man who never writes to flatter, or to advise us to pursue a wrong path.

It would take me beyond the limits of this address to give you instances in which our science may render a service to political economy. Every fact we acquire with regard to existing races of man more or less assists to bring together what must some day become the elements of a new political economy. The great question of the acclimatisation of man must be discussed by us in all its numerous bearings, and eventually the deductions from that branch of our science would form the basis for all successful colonisation. It may be as Herder has pointed out, that we can change a man's country, but we have not the power to change his nature, and adapt it to a new order of things. In all our discussions on such important subjects, however, we must be especially careful not to rush hurriedly to conclusions. Many of the questions on which our science will be able to throw much light some day, must for the present be left in abeyance. We want more facts and more discussion of the whole question in all its legitimate bearings. Nor must we follow the dogmatic method of Dr. Prichard, and make, as anthropological inductions, such broad assertions as the following, which I find in his last contribution to one branch of our science. "Politicians," he says, "if they would condescend to receive a lesson, might learn that the mixture of races is often much more advantageous than their separation. Nothing is better established than that tribes and races of organised beings improve by the intermixture of varieties. A third stock, descended from any two

races thus blended, is often superior in physical and psychical qualities to either of the two parent stems."* These statements are the last utterances of Dr. Prichard on the science of comparative anthropology, and they are good specimens of his teaching. Bearing in mind that we have to war against assumptions of all sorts, we must not be afraid to call such statements by their right names. I do not hesitate to assert that Dr. Prichard has here stated what yet remains to be proved, and that there are, perhaps, as many facts to show that pure races are superior to mixed ones, as the reverse. To assume that the races of France and England are mixed, as Dr. Prichard has done, and then deduce a general law from such an assumption, is not at all a bad specimen of his reasoning. If we would be true to the cause of genuine science, we must fight against such assumptions passing under the garb of inductive science, as we would do if like statements emanated from the politician, the theologian, or the philanthropist. We cannot be logical and consistent, and yet be a respecter of persons. We cannot allow assumptions of any sort to be allowed to pass under a false name. If the modern anthropologist follow out this precept, he will find himself not only face to face with assumptions emanating from the legislature, the pulpit, or the lecture-room, but he will also find that he has to fight against statements which have been put forward as scientific inductions. The text book which has hitherto had the most influence in this country is the work of Dr. Prichard; but as his works are filled with assumptions, it becomes the duty of the modern anthropologist to counteract the injurious teaching which they contain. What Dr. Knox said in 1850 can be repeated with equal truth at this day. "The illustrious Prichard," he writes, "with the best intentions in the world, has succeeded in misdirecting the English mind as to all the great questions of race. This misdirection has told, as we have seen, even on the scholar and on the scientific man. As a consequence of its misdirection, in the mere mention of the word race, the popular mind flies off to Tasmania, the polar circle, or to the land of the Hottentot. Englishmen cannot be made to believe, can scarcely be made to comprehend, that races of men, differing as widely from each other as races can possibly do, inhabit, not merely continental Europe but portions of Great Britain and Ireland. And next to the difficulty of getting an admission of this great fact, has been an unwillingness to admit the full importance of *race*, militating as it does against the thousand and one prejudices of the so-called civilised state of man, opposed as it is to the Utopian views based on education, religion, government."† It is our duty to declare war against all such prejudices. Englishmen, and women too, must be made to understand the great question of race, and its importance in all human history—past, present, and future. We cannot hope to do much towards building up our science until we have succeeded in destroying both prejudice and assumption. As to the wilful ignorance with which Dr. Knox charges Englishmen, I cannot think it is well deserved. Their minds have been perverted by their teachers, whose theories and

* Trans. Eth. Soc., original series, vol. ii, p. 149.

† Races of Man, p. 24.

assumptions it was hoped, until lately, had died with them. During the last few years a more healthy and more logical tone has existed in the public mind, not only of this country, but throughout the world generally, on the question of race. But after nearly all scientific men who have devoted their lives to the investigation of this subject, have given up their prejudice and assumptions respecting the influence and diversity of race, we now see a small but somewhat influential party of zoologists come forward to take up the advocacy of views which I had fondly hoped, for the credit of British anthropological science, had long since been exploded. And here let me say that a mere zoologist is incapable of forming a correct estimate of the present state of the controversy respecting the diversity of races. His methods of observation and classification, applied to the rest of Mammalia, do not apply to man. His speculations and, indeed, too frequently dogmatic assertions respecting man's origin, do nothing to advance the cause of genuine science, but much to bring discredit on our science generally. The origin of man is a question which cannot be discussed at this time with the slightest advantage to the cause of genuine science. Let us leave the discussion of such a subject as the origin of man to those who like to waste their time and energies on so profitless a subject. Let men try and evolve man from their own moral consciousness or from an ape, as it pleases them most, but do not allow either the one plan or the other to pass as a part of anthropological science. A higher and more useful path is open to the modern anthropologist.

Let each student take up, if possible, his own special branch of research. Our subjects are so multifarious, and each question can be seen under so many aspects and from so many points of view, that every man in our Society might have his own speciality, and others still remain for our new members. But we want more than one student to pursue the same course of investigation, that they may be able to check and correct the observations and conclusions of each other.

I have spoken of two sorts of mental defects or idiosyncrasies which are now to be found rather largely prevalent in this country. I might add to these some others, only two of which I will now specify. One may be called phrenological-mania, and the other mesmeric-mania. They each, like the other forms I have named, have a certain amount of truth to support them. The world generally will not admit they have any truth at all on their side, and the world is supported by what are called "orthodox men of science". Now it unfortunately happens that many men of science are quite as full of prejudice as the rest of mankind. They make up their minds very often from *à priori* reasoning that there can be no truth in phrenology or mesmerism, and they consistently refuse to allow themselves to be influenced by any facts tending to shake their conviction. The result of this has been that both the believers in phrenology and in mesmerism are excommunicated from orthodox scientific circles, and are thus driven to associate together, until at last they too become as bigoted and as full of prejudice as the orthodox man of science. The fundamental doctrine of phrenology, or more correctly and scientifically, of cerebral physiology, is the localisation of the functions of the

brain. This is a very rational *à priori* assumption. Such an hypothesis explains mental phenomena as well, perhaps better, than any other assumption. Why, then, so much antipathy to phrenology? Simply because such an assumption is foisted upon us as an induction of science. I am fully aware that Gall and Spurzheim contended that their system was based on facts empirically observed, and in a sufficient number of cases to warrant them in promulgating their system as a general law. But the difference existing amongst phrenologists at the present day is a sufficient refutation of this pretension. New organs have been discovered, a new arrangement of the mental faculties has been propounded, until at last there is only a semblance of agreement between phrenologists themselves. We want any facts which throw light on the functions of the brain. First, let us have the facts, and then let us adopt the most rational hypothesis to explain them. In the meantime we may rest assured that every portion of the brain has a function, and we shall be under deep obligation to all who can assist in showing us how that function is performed.

After a time, I think it will be found that the study of physical anthropology will be followed by researches in psychological anthropology. The believers in mesmerism now form a class as distinct from ordinary men of science as the phrenologists. They may have some valuable facts to communicate to science, but instead of boldly coming before a scientific tribunal, they congregate together to abuse men of science, and the world generally, for not believing what they themselves consider to be true.

Not only does such a state of things do no good to the cause of science, but on the contrary it does great harm both to scientific advancement, and especially to the minds of those who by associating together seem to get their powers of belief intensified. They happen to acquire a fact themselves, and they seem then prepared to swallow any amount of absurdity that may be taught them. Let this society be free from those prejudices of other scientific bodies, and let us not care whether facts are brought to us by the believer in phrenology or mesmerism. But at the same time let it be understood by all parties that we do not wish to know what people believe, or what they think, but simply want empirically observed facts. We may be quite sure that there is some amount of truth in both phrenology and mesmerism, and to discuss how much truth without prejudice either for or against, would be what no body of men of science have yet done.

I am glad to know that there are many Fellows of this Society who are at present working on the psychological aspects of our science. In the year 1825 a book appeared in this country in which I find these words: "Association is a phenomenon of some importance in the practical part of anthropology, and when I come to speak of the modifications of the mental functions, I shall enter into its consideration at some length."* And yet at this time how little progress has been made with the practical application of the phenomena of association to psychological anthropology!

The difficulties which will beset those who in future conduct this

* A View of the Physiological Principles of Phrenology, by J. Spurzheim. London, 1825, p. 28.

Society will chiefly consist in giving each branch of our science only its legitimate attention. Each student now thinks his own especial branch the most important. The Society, however, as a body, is bound to be equally fair to all parties; and it will be for the benefit of all the Fellows of the Society that they should occasionally have their prejudices shaken by the discussion of subjects which they very strongly condemn and denounce, without a particle of investigation or research, as utterly unworthy of consideration.

If we look abroad in Europe, and, indeed, throughout the civilised world generally, we see much to give us hope for the future of anthropological science. In Germany it is again revived, and bids fair to flourish. The works in the different branches of anthropology, which issue from the press, are very numerous, and several attempts have recently been made to write text-books on our science. The time, however, has not yet come for an anthropological text-book. Materials do not exist for a history of mankind, either by the archaic or the historical anthropologist. Materials are not collected for a correct description of the existing races or species of man. Our principles of comparative anthropology can only be based on the facts we know. These I hold to be decisive as far as they go, but a load of prejudice must be removed before these principles can be discussed with much advantage to the cause of science. With regard to the general publications on anthropology I need not here enlarge or give any opinion on them. The connection of the Society with a publication specially intended to give the public the latest researches and discussions on our science renders such a task unnecessary.

I am glad to be able to announce the continued success of the Anthropological Society of Paris. They have altogether three hundred and thirty-five members.* Many facts have recently occurred to advance the Society of Anthropology of Paris as well as general anthropological science.

MM. Choiecki and Mariette have been occupied in reuniting the materials for an Egyptian exhibition of living types, and of more than four hundred ancient and modern crania, which will form part of the great exhibition of 1867, and to which the members of this Society will be admitted on the presentation of their card. A congress of archaic anthropologists will be held at the same time at Paris. The organisation has been confided to a committee of *savants*, amongst whom the Anthropological Society of Paris counts many members (MM. Bertrand, Broca, Pruner-Bey, De Quatrefages, De Mortillet).

Anthropology, Dr. Broca informs me, penetrates more and more amongst medical, historical, and archæological studies. It has received a great hospitality in the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique des Sciences médicales* (published by Masson). It plays an important part in the

* On the 31st December, 1866, the Anthropological Society of Paris comprehended 335 members, as follows :—

Honorary members	9
Subscribing members at Paris	157
,, ,, out of Paris	65
Foreign associates	49
National correspondents	29
Foreign correspondents	26

questions put by the committee of the International Medical Congress, which will take place at Paris in 1867. Two of these questions, *The Acclimatisation of European races in hot climates*, and *Menstruation, according to race, climate, and description of life*, are purely anthropological.

It is, however, wonderful how small is the amount of knowledge we possess respecting man generally. What Rousseau said in his day is nearly true now:—"The most useful, and the least successfully cultivated of all human knowledge, is that of man." When shall this stigma on the good sense of civilised man be removed? When shall the time arrive when it can be no longer said with truth that we know more of the formation and the laws regulating the movements of the heavenly bodies than we do of the formation and the laws regulating mankind generally?

With these questions I might have closed my last address as President of the Society, did I not desire to add a few words of personal explanation for my past and future action, in regard to this Society, to both friends and foes. In the first place, I desire most earnestly to thank, not only my more immediate friends and supporters, but the Fellows of the Society, for the support and confidence they have reposed in me. During the past four years there have been periods in the history of the Society, when, but for the support I have received from the executive and council of the Society, I should not this day be able to announce to you that the establishment of an Anthropological Society, and the introduction of a science into this country of that name, is an accomplished fact. I must now ask those who have supported me to continue that assistance to my successors in the high office which I now resign. I have felt it no small honour to be the elected and trusted chief of so important and influential a Society as ours has now become. I relinquish this office, then, with some feelings of regret, for I can assure both friends and foes that I consider the office of President of such a Society as our own to be one of the highest offices to which any scientific man in this country can aspire. Happily, it is unnecessary for me now to enter into a justification of the policy I have thought it my duty to pursue. My policy, if such it can be called, has merely been to follow the dictates of what I have felt to be my duty, and this duty for four years has been my greatest pleasure. I am not conscious that I have ever allowed my conduct, as President, to be influenced by feelings of either personal friendship or animosity.

To those who have assisted me and the Society by their consistent and persevering opposition, I also now beg publicly and sincerely to return my thanks. It would not have been natural nor desirable that such a Society as our own should have come into existence without having to pass through the fiery ordeal of criticism, opposition, and calumny. We have had our share of all these, and if it has fallen to my lot to be signalled out as the victim on whom the indignant public might vent their wrath, I do not complain, but rather thank my worst enemies, that they have never charged me with unfairness in the manner I have felt it my duty to preside over the deliberations before the Society. I can only commend to my

successors the principle which has guided me, and which will, if followed, be their best safeguard. My motto, as your chairman at the meetings of the Society, has been, "Truth, not victory." It is no small satisfaction to me to be able to retire from the chair with no charge of unfairness on such an important matter.

With regard to other attacks both on myself and the Society, let me here say I do not complain of any attack on myself which has not imputed to me a sinister motive. When I have been charged with holding my views from interested motives, I have repelled such a calumny with all the scorn and contempt it deserved. Such charges have brought down upon those who used them, their own punishment. The man who had the effrontery publicly to state that I wrote a certain paper on the Negro "in behalf of the slave-holding confederacy," is the one against whom charges are now being made that he himself is bringing forward his views "from his hatred of Christianity." With this solitary exception I have never been attacked in a manner of which I have any right to complain.

With regard to the Society, I would here remark, that all institutions of this sort must expect to have their affairs fully investigated and criticised by those whose business and duty it is to do so. No institution or society, conducted in perfect good faith and sincerity, can object to any amount of investigation or fair criticism on its affairs. During the past four years ample opportunities have been afforded for examining and criticising the affairs of the Society, and the more such a practice is continued, the better for us.

In conclusion, allow me to say, that it would have been more agreeable to my own feelings and more consonant with my own desire for peace and rest, had I this day been able to announce to you my retirement from all active participation in our affairs.

But, gentlemen, it so happens that my friends think very differently, and insist that the time has not come when I can be allowed thus to leave off working for the Society. They have urged that I can render our science good service by becoming the head of the executive, and by devoting my time to its further development.

At times I must confess I shrink from the labours, responsibility, and anxiety which the office I have been requested to take, will cause me. I can assure you that it is not a mere form of speech, which induces me to say that another course would have been more agreeable to my own feelings, and that I am alone influenced by what I believe to be my duty. You have already heard the conditions on which that office is taken, and I need hardly tell you that if I feel I cannot discharge the duties belonging to it, for the benefit of the Society, I shall not hesitate to ask you on another occasion to relieve me from the same.

In the meantime I have only to ask that the support you have accorded to me hitherto will be given to me as long as I continue to discharge my duties, whatever they may be, to the best of my ability. On my part I can only promise that my action in the future shall be guided by the same desire as it has been in the past—the success of anthropological science in the first place, and the success of the Anthropological Society of London in the second.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.

PASSED JAN. 1ST, 1867.

The Treasurer submitted the following balance-sheet, which had been passed by the auditors:—

Income.	£	*s.*	*d.*
Balance from last year...	56	4	11
Subscriptions for 1863 ...	3	19	11
Do. 1864 ...	30	2	4
Do. 1865 ...	71	16	2
Do. 1866 ...	1023	18	8
Do. 1867 ...	16	13	3
Life compositions	161	14	9
Donations to Library and Museum Fund.....	1	1	0
Publications sold:—			
Waitz	13	3	9
Vogt	25	8	7
Blumenbach	5	0	7
Gastaldi	10	0	0
Broca.....	3	19	3
Pouchet.....	7	12	2
Books sold at office...	17	17	6
Donation to Exploring Fund.....	67	2	0
Total received...	1515	14	10
By Treasurer's loan.....	200	0	0
	£1715	14	10

Expenditure.	£	*s.*	*d.*
Rent	65	0	0
Salaries.....	262	10	0
Office expenditure	119	2	9
Stationery	56	14	0
Furniture.....	35	4	3
Postage.....	67	11	8
Advertisements	84	16	0
Library and Museum.....	18	17	3
Reporting.....	23	12	6
Memoirs	210	17	6
Anthrop. Rev. & Journal	296	0	4
Vogt	50	0	0
Blumenbach	50	0	0
Gastaldi	25	13	2
Capt. B. Pim's meeting Expenses	3	12	0
Miscellaneous printing...	142	9	6
Explorations	100	0	0
Total expended	1613	2	10
Balance in hand.....	102	12	0
	£1715	14	10

D. I. HEATH, *Treasurer.*

Examined and approved.
SAM. R. I. OWEN,
J. E. VILLIN,
} *Auditors.*
January 1, 1867.

The following Report of the Council was read:—

Report of Council.

THE Council of the Society, on terminating the year 1866, and entering upon the fifth year of the Society's existence, has to report the continued prosperity which has attended its operations during the past year.

Meetings.—During the year 1866, fifteen meetings have been held, at which the following papers have been read:—

J. MEYER HARRIS, Esq., F.R.S., F.A.S.L. "On the Gallinas of Sierra Leone."

G. W. MARSHALL, Esq., LL.M., F.A.S.L. "On Genealogy in relation to Anthropology."

Capt. Bedford Pim, R.N., F.A.S.L. "On the Negro, at Home and Abroad."
Hyde Clarke, Esq., LL.D., Loc.Sec.A.S.L. "On Moravian Wallachia."
H. J. C. Beavan, Esq., Hon. Sec. "Notes on the People inhabiting Spain."
Hyde Clarke, Esq., LL.D., "Observations on the Materials for Anthropology at Smyrna."
T. Baines, Esq. "On Articles of Dress and Implements of War from Africa."
L. O. Pike, Esq., F.A.S.L. "On the Psychical Characteristics of the English People."
A. Higgins, Esq., Hon. For. Sec. A.S.L. "On the Orthographic Delineation of the Skull."
W. H. Wesley, Esq., F.A.S.L. "On the Iconography of the Skull."
C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L. "On certain Simious Skulls, with especial reference to a Skull from Louth, in Ireland."
Dr. Paul Broca, Sec. Gen. Soc. Anth. Paris. "On a new Goniometer, for the Measurement of the Facial Triangle."
George Petrie, Esq., Loc. Sec. A.S.L. "Notes on the Brochs and Picts' Houses of Orkney."
Joseph Anderson, Esq., Hon. Sec. A.S.L. "Report on the Ancient Remains of Caithness."
John Cleghorn, Esq. "A New Reading of Shell-Mounds and Graves in Caithness."
G. Petrie, Esq., Loc Sec. A.S.L. "On Human Remains fron Keiss."
Joseph Anderson, Esq., Loc. Sec. A.S.L. "On Human Remains from Keiss."
R. I. Shearer, Esq. "On Human Remains from Keiss."
Dr. J. Hunt, Pres. A.S.L. "On Human Remains from Keiss."
W. Bollaert, Esq., Hon. Sec. A.S.L. "Contributions to an Introduction to the Anthropology of the New World."
Capt. R. F. Burton, V.P.A.S.L. "Notes on an Hermaphrodite."
Major Samuel R. I. Owen, F.A.S.L. "On Hindu Neology."
Dr. John Shortt, F.A.S.L. "On a Living Microcephale."
E. Sellon, Esq. "On Sacti Puja."
R. B. N. Walker, Esq. "On the Fecundity of Negro Women."
Hodder M. Westropp, Esq. "On the Analogous Forms of Flint Implements."
Col. Beauchamp Walker, Lieut. Ardagh, C. Carter Blake, and W. Topley, F.G.S. "On a Kjökkenmödding at Newhaven."
Capt. R. F. Burton, V.P.A.S.L. "On a Kjökkenmödding at Santos."
Rev. W. H. Brett. "On the Opening of a Tumulus at Essiquibo."
Dr. Beddoe. "On the Head-forms of the West of England."
J. P. Morris, Esq. "Report on the Kirkhead Bone Cave at Ulverstone."
Dr. James Hunt, F.S.A., Pres. A.S.L. "On the Influence of Peat in Destroying the Human Body."
Dr. James Hunt, F.S.A., Pres. A.S.L. "On the Interpretation of some Inscriptions on Stones found in Zetland."
Dr. B. Seemann, V.P.A.S.L. "On the Resemblance between Inscribed Stones in Veraguas and in Northumberland."

Dr. Bower. "On the History of Slavery."

Dr. A. Mitchell, F.A.S.L. "On the Influence of Blood-relationship in Marriage."

C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S. "Report on the Anthropological Papers read at Nottingham."

Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, M.A., Treas. A.S.L. "Report on the Formation of an Anthropological Society at Manchester."

C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L. "Report on the Belgian Bone Caves."

A. Higgins, Esq., Hon. For. Sec. A.S.L. "Report on Scandinavian Museums."

Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, M.A., Treas. A.S.L. "On the Great Race Elements in Christianity."

Col. Lane Fox, F.S.A. "On the Remains of Lake Habitations in London Wall."

Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, M.A., Treas. A.S.L. "On Mute Societies of Man."

The total number of Fellows on the Society's books is at present 706.

Honorary Fellows.—No Honorary Fellow has been elected in 1866.

Corresponding Members.—The number of Corresponding Members on the Society's books amounts to forty-two.

Local Secretaries (Great Britain).—The number of Local Secretaries in Great Britain amounts to forty-nine. Your Council would especially draw your attention to the fact that many of the Local Secretaries have neglected to communicate with the Society during the past year, and that the Local Secretaries in England form, in this respect, an unenviable contrast with those abroad. Your Council submit for your consideration some rules respecting the election and retention of these officers.

Local Secretaries Abroad.—The number of Local Secretaries abroad has been now increased to fifty-seven.

Executive.—In the report of Council for last year it was stated that Mr. T. Bendyshe had thrown out a suggestion for the more effectual management of the Society's affairs by the appointment of a director as its chief responsible officer. His opinion concerning the matter had grown so strong in the early months of the present year, and so convinced was he of the great desirability, not to say necessity, for such a change, that at a meeting of Council in May last, he laid before them this resolution—"That it is expedient the executive be strengthened." Due deliberation by all the officers of the Society, and long discussion by a full Council, resulted in the endorsement of the views of Mr. Bendyshe, and in the moving of the following series of resolutions by the Honorary Secretary, Mr. Beavan:—

"1. That the Council are of opinion that it would be desirable that the offices of Honorary Secretaries and Honorary Foreign Secretary be abolished, and that the three offices be incorporated into one, under the title of Director.

"2. That this Council considers it advisable that any expenses incurred by this officer on behalf of the Society, and approved of by the Council, shall be refunded to him.

"3. That the number of Vice-Presidents be increased from four to six.

"4. That the foregoing Resolutions be referred to the Publication Committee, to be incorporated in the regulations, and that the same be submitted to the next general meeting of the Society.

"5. That this Council is also of opinion that from the time of the above Resolutions taking effect, the Assistant Secretary shall have the title of Secretary.

"6. That the Secretary and the Curator and Librarian both act immediately under the orders of the Director.

"7. That during the remainder of the present year, the President be requested to undertake the duties which will be hereafter assigned to the Director.

(Signed) "HUGH J. C. BEAVAN, *Hon. Sec. A.S.L.*

"15th May, 1866."

These Resolutions were each and all carried unanimously, and are now embodied in this Report for your approval to-day.

On recommending this change, the Council desire briefly to state the principle which has guided them in their decision. The offices of the Honorary Secretary and Honorary Foreign Secretary, however well they may be filled by gentlemen of high attainments and great energy, appear to be too limited in their range of action in respect of responsibility, and too little under immediate direction in virtue of their individual irresponsibility, to allow of the efficient discharge of the numerous and varied duties allotted to them. This undesirable complication has been much aggravated since the appointment of the salaried officers, who, under existing rules, receive their instructions from three separate Secretaries, who again are collectively, not in their individual capacities, responsible to the Council. As might be expected, such a state of ill-defined authority has resulted in a loss of executive power, and as a natural sequence the interests of the Society have suffered to some appreciable extent.

This proposed change of merging the offices of the Honorary Secretaries into that of a Director, who will be immediately responsible to the Council, is intended to remedy a defect which has been long seen and understood in the present organisation. The Curator and Secretary will in future (should this receive your sanction) be placed under the control of one officer.

It is the decided and well-considered opinion of the Council that the removal of the above defect in the manner indicated will give a strength and stability to the Society which may not have been necessary in its early years to insure the brilliant success it has attained, but which it will assuredly want in the future, when its prosperity will depend solely on the good and substantial work it accomplishes, not partly as hitherto, on the novelty of its aims and objects.

On considering the most important question that will be laid before you on this occasion, namely, the appointment of a gentleman to occupy that irksome, highly responsible, and not very enviable office of Director of the Society's affairs, the Council recognises one who possesses all the requisite qualifications, and who is able to steer us clear of any difficulties that may arise in future years, and who has the

energy and will to exercise these qualities for the complete and lasting establishment of the Society. The determined retirement of Dr. Hunt from the Presidency this year affords your Council an opportunity of placing on record a few words, inadequate though they must necessarily be, in testimony of his rare qualities and of the debt we, as a Society, owe to him.

As Founder of the Anthropological Society of London, he has earned a world-wide reputation, and his name will always be inseparably connected with the most brilliant early career of any scientific society hitherto in the history of such bodies. But only those whose lot has thrown them in association with him can possibly know, and not all those perhaps can possibly understand, how rare are the administrative ability, the keen foresight, and the admirable tact and judgment which are united in his character. In him we see an example of that individuality which is so indispensable to a successful leader; of firmness in conjunction with wise yielding, when new light is thrown on his path, and another course is to be preferred, as opposed to the stubborn will that brooks no opposition.

The difficulties attending on the successful working of a society which is almost entirely new in its scope of systematically pursued studies are enormous, and, even if it were desirable, could not be here detailed. Your President leaves the chair this day to his successor, amid our deep regret; but with such qualifications as almost turn our regrets into congratulations. It is our pleasure to announce to you that Dr. Hunt, heartily wishing for the prosperity of the Society, and holding in high esteem your earnest wish to see that prosperity extended in the future, has consented (though, your council are aware, at a large sacrifice of time and personal convenience) to fill the office of Director, should you think fit to endorse their recommendation.

That office, however, in the opinion of the council, should be made on two conditions. 1st. Of its permanency; for the complete organisation, that seems so necessary for the retention of the present number of members on our list, will be still more required when the Society has passed its early years, during which the curiosity attending most undertakings of a character entirely new, has worn off. The greatest diligence will in future be required to retain the proud position in which the President has placed us, and also to gain that useful extension of the Society which the council has in contemplation. 2nd. Of its remuneration. On this question it is anticipated there can hardly be a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of the condition. No man can be expected to undertake, and no council would presume to recommend, that work of the extent and nature involved in the management of so large a society, should be undertaken by any gentleman for a continuance on any other condition. Our President has already, during the last four years, made larger sacrifices than members can be aware of; and to those sacrifices, of personal inconvenience, we owe our present position. Our financial state does not now allow of the attachment to the new office of a salary; but your Council consider it most desirable that as soon as our treasury will permit it, an *honorarium* shall be attached thereto.

The above proposed changes have been deliberately drawn up after careful discussion in Committee and in Council, and are incorporated in the amended Rules, which are submitted to you for your consideration and approval.

Apartments.—The Society's rooms during the past year have been much frequented, and have undergone considerable improvement. The south end of the large room is now furnished with two book-cases, which it is calculated will meet all the probable additions to the Society's Library during the next six months. There is a great probability that these rooms may be required for the enlargement of the National Gallery; when this takes place, your Council earnestly recommend that application be made to Her Majesty's Ministers for suitable apartments for a society having for one of its objects the investigation of the principles on which all good and sound government must be conducted.

Library.—The condition of the Library during the past year has been such as to call for considerable congratulation. The book-shelves above alluded to have been easily almost filled, and the books have for the convenience of arrangement been temporarily classified under the five heads, Archaic, Historical, Descriptive, Comparative Anthropology, and Periodical Publications. The state of the books themselves has been sedulously examined, and a catalogue of all works in the possession of the Society up to the end of last Session has been in the hands of the printer for more than five months. It is to be hoped that it will be soon issued to the Fellows. Donations have been received for the Library from the following gentlemen :—T. Bendyshe, Esq., V.P.A.S.L.; Dr. J. Hillier Blount; Dr. Paul Broca; C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.; Charles Blake, Esq.; Dr. Richard S. Charnock, F.S.A.; J. W. Conrad Cox, Esq., B.A.; S. Edwin Collingwood, Esq., F.Z.S., F.A.S.L.; J. Fred. Collingwood, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.; Dr. Barnard Davis, F.S.A., F.A.S.L.; J. Downe, Esq., F.A.S.L.; Dr. P. M. Duncan, Hon. Sec. G.S., F.A.S.L.; W. Eassie, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.; Dr. B. Foster, F.A.S.L.; Prof. Garbiglietti; James Gowans, Esq., F.A.S.L.; A. Higgins, Esq., Hon. For. Sec. A.S.L.; G. A. Hutchinson, Esq.; Prof. Hansen; Dr. James Hunt, F.S.A., Pres. A.S.L.; M. Louis Lartet; K. R. H. Mackenzie, Esq., F.S.A., F.A.S.L.; Prof. Möbius; G. W. Marshall, Esq.; J. E. Morgan, Esq.; Dr. Nicolucci; C. O. Groom Napier, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.; Prof. Owen, Hon. F.A.S.L.; M. Pruner-Bey, Hon. F.A.S.L.; G. N. Rankin, Esq.; B. Seemann, Esq., V.P.A.S.L.; W. Scott, Esq.; Dr. Ryan Tenison; Dr. Thurnam; W. Topley, Esq.; N. Trübner, Esq.; R. B. N. Walker, Esq.; Dr. Zeltner.

Museum.—The Council regret that, owing to the state of the Society's finances, they have not been able during the year 1866 to carry out the recommendation they made last year that a large glass case should be erected in the principal room of the Society to contain our rapidly increasing collection of crania. They trust, however, that the improved condition of the funds of the Society in 1867 may admit of the necessary expence being incurred for this very important object. Donations have been received from the following gentlemen : —J. Bainbridge Baxter, Esq., M.R.C.S.; E. B. Bogg, Esq., M.D.;

The Belgian Minister of the Interior; Dr. Collyer; F. Chittenden, Esq., M.R.C.S.; S. Edwin Collingwood, Esq., F.Z.S., F.A.S.L.; J. Fraser, Esq., F.A.S.L.; J. R. Gregory, Esq., F.A.S.L.; M. Lartet, Hon. F.A.S.L.; W. F. Lawrence, Esq.; H. Prigg, Esq., jun., F.G.S.; R. W. Payne, Esq., F.A.S.L.; W. Salmon, Esq.; Dr. Shortt, F.A.S.L.; Dr. F. Skues, F.A.S.L.; Dr. Ryan Tenison, F.A.S.L.; R. B. N. Walker, Esq., F.A.S.L.

Increase of Members.—The question of increasing the number of Foundation Fellows has on several occasions been laid before the Council during the past year. They have expressed the extreme difficulty of maintaining the Society in its present condition of working organisation with a small number of members, and have felt that a much larger number is necessary in order to carry out adequately the objects proposed in the first prospectus of the Society. After due and careful deliberation they have thought it their duty to recommend that the number of Foundation Fellows be increased to 2000, feeling that the large income required to carry out the objects of the Society and maintain its efficiency in working order, can only be attained by this increase in the number of the Foundation Fellows. In the early history of the Society it was thought possible to accomplish this object with five hundred Fellows. Your Council find, however, that to conduct the affairs of the Society on the liberal and comprehensive basis now demanded for it, requires a vast increase upon the original calculation. Your Council have expressed a wish to the President that he should touch on this subject in his Address, as it is far too extensive to be embodied in this Report.

Translations.—The Council have not been able to issue any translations during the past year, but they are happy to state that the translation of the work of Retzius, undertaken by Mr. Higgins, is in the printer's hands. Arrangements have been made for illustrating this work by a series of plates. The translation of the Paris instructions for anthropologists and travellers is also in an advanced condition, and will be issued to Fellows of the Society during the present year. The Council are happy to state that the editing of this important work has been kindly accepted by Dr. Beddoe. They hope that the importance of this work, and its appearance under such auspices, will lead to an increased amount of interest in the means by which anthropological observations are recorded.

Memoirs.—The second volume of the Society's *Memoirs* was issued during the past autumn. The Council hope that the circulation of the second volume of *Memoirs* will be equal to that of the first. In the last annual report it was announced that the first volume of *Memoirs* was nearly out of print. At the present time the number of copies is exceedingly small, and those Fellows who wish to complete their sets of the Society's works should make immediate application.

Anthropological Review and Journal of the Society.—This publication has been issued, as heretofore, quarterly to the Fellows. It is hoped that the arrangements which were made last year, by which the delivery of written speeches before the Society was prevented, has relieved the *Journal* of much superfluous matter.

The Council have received from the proprietors of the *Anthropological Review* an offer of all the back numbers in stock as a donation to the Society. This liberal offer has accordingly been accepted.

Anthropological Exploration Fund.—In June last, a circular informed the Fellows of the Society that it had been resolved to form a special fund, for the purpose of carrying on original researches in archaic anthropology, under the title of the "Anthropological Exploration Fund". This circular was promptly responded to, and the following sums received :—

	£	s.	d.
Dr. James Hunt, Pres. A.S.L.	10	0	0
Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, Treas. A.S.L.	10	0	0
W. Robinson, Esq., F.A.S.L.	5	0	0
Henry Johnson, Esq., F.A.S.L.	10	0	0
C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L.	5	0	0
James Bischoff, Esq., F.A.S.L.	5	0	0
George Harris, Esq., F.S.A., F.A.S.L., Pres. Branch Manchester Society	5	0	0
John Parnell, Esq., F.A.S.L.	5	0	0
George C. Joad, Esq., F.A.S.L.	5	0	0
T. E. Partridge, Esq., F.A.S.L.	5	0	0
H. Charlton, Esq., F.A.S.L.	1	1	0
T. Wodderspoon, Esq.	1	1	0
	£67	2	0

These sums were applied as follows :—

	£	s.	d.
To Joseph Anderson, Esq., Loc. Sec. A.S.L., for Explorations in Caithness	10	0	0
G. Petrie, Esq., Loc. Sec. A.S.L., Explorations in Orkney	5	0	0
A. Higgins, Esq., Report on Scandinavian Museums	10	0	0
C. Carter Blake, Esq., Report on Belgian Bone Caves	20	0	0
Dr. James Hunt, Dorsetshire Explorations	20	0	0
	£65	0	0

It is much to be desired that additional funds should be raised.

Days of Meeting.—During the recess, some difficulty arose as to the days fixed for the meeting of the Society. Our card was drawn up on the same principle as that which has regulated it during the past three years. These days have now received the unanimous sanction of the Council of the Royal Society of Literature, and, to prevent any further misunderstanding, are now incorporated in our Rules.

Conversazione.—Our ordinary meeting-room was, however, not available for the day on which the first ordinary meeting was fixed, and your Council decided to hold a conversazione, the success of which was they considered sufficiently great to warrant a repetition of the attempt another year.

Branch Societies.—The Council have incorporated in the Rules the arrangements that have been made for the management of Branch Societies.

British Association.—The official report which has been already laid before the Society by Mr. Carter Blake has stated to you the circumstances under which a department of the British Association was created under Section D, and devoted to Anthropological Science. The

Council have felt it their duty to remind you of the fact, inasmuch as the arrangements entered into at Nottingham, being avowedly of a temporary nature, its continuance at the Dundee meeting must depend entirely on the energy and industry of Anthropologists. They, therefore, beg to urge that all papers intended for the Dundee meeting shall be sent in at least a fortnight before-hand, and hope that a far larger amount of papers will be sent in. While congratulating the Society on the successful establishment of a department for the Science of Man, your Council hope that the events of the last few years may act as an encouragement to those timid anthropologists whom the dread of being in a minority may have deterred from expressing their individual opinions.

To those gentlemen who have been chiefly instrumental in the accomplishment of this success we should tender our best and warmest thanks. To Dr. Hunt, in the first place, whose leadership in the struggle with the determined and powerful opposition of the Committee of the Association has extended over four years ; to Mr. Carter Blake, whose zeal and constant work in the cause is far better known in the Association than in our Society ; and to Professor Huxley, whose influence with that body was largely exercised for the benefit of anthropological recognition. To the latter gentleman's honest and disinterested action in the matter of his impartial conduct as President of the Section of Biology, and his general courtesy to the delegates and members of this Society, our best acknowledgments and thanks are due.

Conclusion.—The Council have only, in concluding this report, to impress on the minds of each individual Fellow the necessity of vigorous action to attain the proper number of the Society. If each Fellow were to nominate a single friend as member, the Society would be at once doubled in number. Some Fellows have nominated a considerable number, and all can nominate at least one. United and active exertion alone can place the Society's finances in the position they must eventually occupy, and the Council hope that the next year (1867) will close with a Society at least double its present limits.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

DUNBAR I. HEATH, *Chairman.*

December 18, 1866.

T. RICHARDS, PRINTER, 37, GT. QUEEN STREET.

Anthropological Society of London.

4, ST. MARTIN'S PLACE, TRAFALGAR SQUARE.

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL FOR 1867.

President.

CAPTAIN RICHARD F. BURTON, F.R.G.S., H.M. Consul at Santos, etc.

Vice-Presidents.

DR. BERTHOLD SEEMANN, F.L.S., Vice-Pres. Impl. Acad., Dresden.
THOMAS BENDYSHE, ESQ., M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
RICHARD STEPHEN CHARNOCK, ESQ., Ph.D. F.S.A., F.R.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.,
JOHN BEDDOE, ESQ., M.D., For. Assoc. of the Anthrop. Soc. of Paris.
J. BARNARD DAVIS, ESQ., M.D., For. Assoc. Anthrop. Soc. of Paris.
C. ROBERT DES RUFFIÈRES, ESQ., F.G.S., F.R.S.L., F.E.S.

Director.

JAMES HUNT, ESQ., Ph.D., F.S.A., F. AND HON. FOR. SEC. R.S.L., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris, etc.

Treasurer.

REV. DUNBAR I. HEATH, M.A., F.R.S.L., F.R.A.S.

Ordinary Members.

H. G. ATKINSON, ESQ., F.G.S.
C. CARTER BLAKE, ESQ., F.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Societies of Paris, Spain, and Moscow.
W. BOLLAERT, ESQ., F.R.G.S., Corr. Mem. Univ. Chile, and Ethno. Socs. London and New York.
E. W. BRABROOK, ESQ., F.S.A., F.R.S.L.
J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD, ESQ., F.G.S., F.R.S.L., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.
S. EDWIN COLLINGWOOD, ESQ., F.Z.S.
J. W. CONRAD COX, ESQ., B.A., F.G.S.
LANGDON H. DOWN, ESQ., M.D.
COLONEL LANE FOX, F.S.A.
GEORGE DUNCAN GIBB, ESQ., M.A., M.D., LL.D., F.G.S., etc.
GEORGE HARRIS, ESQ., M.A., F.S.A., President of the Manchester Branch of the Anthropological Society.
J. MEYER HARRIS, ESQ., F.R.G.S.
HENRY HOTZE, ESQ.
RICHARD KING, ESQ., M.D., F.E.S.
VISCOUNT MILTON, M.P., F.R.G.S.
MAJOR S. R. I. OWEN, F.L.S., F.R.M.S.
LUKE OWEN PIKE, ESQ., M.A.
CAPTAIN BEDFORD PIM, R.N.
WILLIAM TRAVERS, ESQ., F.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.
WILLIAM SANDYS WRIGHT VAUX, ESQ., M.A., F.S.A., F. and Hon. Sec. R.S.L., President of the Numismatic Society of London.
EDOUARD VILLIN, ESQ., F.R.S.L.

Curator and Librarian.

C. CARTER BLAKE, ESQ., F.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Societies of Paris, Spain, and Moscow.

Secretary.

J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD, ESQ., F.R.S.L., F.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.