

MAN

INAUGURAL DISSERTATION,

ON

*The Diversity of the human species*

SUBMITTED TO THE

PRESIDENT, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AND MEDICAL FACULTY

OF THE

University of Nashville,

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF MEDICINE.

BY

*Newton C. Miller*

OF

*Tennessee*

18

CHARLES W. SMITH,  
BOOKSELLER AND STATIONER,  
NASHVILLE, TENN.



To Thomas R. Jennings, M.D.  
Professor of Anatomy in the Medical  
department of the University of Nashville  
Sir.

Permit me to inscribe the following  
pages to you, as an evidence of my  
appreciation of the valuable information  
derived from your instructions, and  
also as a testimonial of the zeal and  
efficiency with which you have  
labored to build up a southern  
school of medicine, of which the south  
may well feel proud.

A. C. Miller

# Diversity of the human species.

Few subjects have received, and at the same time have deserved more attentive consideration from Physiologists and scientific men generally, than that which stands at the head of this paper. This question, notwithstanding the many attempts that have been made to remove the doubts hanging over it, still remains unsettled, though recent investigations have thrown much light on the subject, and have done a great deal towards bringing about a unity of opinion among men of science. The reason why, the earlier efforts of writers on the human species have been attended with so few results, is to be found, I think, in the fact, that their investigations were not conducted upon scientific principles.

but were conducted with reference to some favorite preconceived opinion, religious or political, of the writer. It must be obvious to every reflecting mind, that investigations thus conducted can never be attended with any valuable results. Instead of clearing up the mist, they increase it, and hence we are not astonished that there should have been such a diversity of opinion upon this subject.

Had the same mode of reasoning been employed upon this subject as would have been employed upon any other similar subject, there would have been but little difficulty in settling the question. Instead however of proceeding according to the inductive method, the only correct mode of procedure, All fact, Anatomical, Physiological, Psychological, Historical &c were utterly discarded, and religious or political opinion or some favorite

3

Scriptural interpretations were made the landmarks to guide men in their researches. Most of those who have written upon the subject have undertaken the task, not to settle the question as to the unity or diversity of the races as a question of science, but to prove that a particular theory must be right because it harmonized with some favorite religious dogma which the writer assumed to be Bible doctrine. The theory adopted by this class of writers, "is the unity of origin," which they contended must be <sup>the</sup> true one, because it harmonized with the Mosaic account of the creation of the world, and in this way they attempted to forestall all investigation, and they did forestall investigation so far as concerns those who received <sup>their</sup> interpretation of the Mosaic account. Science having thus been ignored, the controversy became a purely

5

religious one, in which three parties were engaged, the advocates of the unity, the advocates of the diversity, and the advocates of infidelity, the latter having been challenged to the contest by the bold and I am constrained to think reckless assertions of the advocates of the unity theory. The contest as between the latter and infidelity was quite an easy going one, the infidel having decidedly the advantage as would have been expected from the manner in which the issue was made up. The friends of the unity asserted that the Bible taught the doctrine for which they contended, which assertion the infidel accepted as true and then proceeded to prove that the idea of all the human family having descended from one origin, was absurd and opposed to all scientific investigation and conclusion. Having established the fact of a diversity of origin and having the admission of their opponents, that the Bible taught the doctrine of a unity of origin, they had the

5

the conclusion fast <sup>upon</sup> them, that the Bible was not an inspired book. The Bible so far as its defense by those who professed to be it, especial defenders, was concerned, was gone and but for the timely rescue of its more rational defenders, infidelity must have trodden it under foot and walked triumphant throughout the earth. Fortunately however, the true friends of the Bible saved it from the ruin to which it seemed inevitably doomed. The unity theorists have <sup>now</sup> been vanquished the advocates of the diversity theory now entered the field of conflict and by showing a perfect harmony to exist between the Bible, and the doctrine of a diversity of species, they soon regained for the Bible the position it had lost. And yet these <sup>men</sup> who have saved the bible from the disgrace to which it was exposed by its indiscreet friends, have been and are still taunted with the charge of infidelity, for daring to declare their belief in the doctrine

of a plurality of origins of the human family.

I submit the question to the decision of all impartial judges, as to who have done the Bible the greatest injury the advocates of the unity or of the diversity of species.

The former have encouraged infidelity by raising an issue between the Bible and science when there was none, the result of which issue was of course unfavorable to that sacred volume.

The latter have recovered the Bible from the clutches of infidelity, by proving that the issue had been falsely raised between the scriptures & science.

It is a remarkable fact that the professed friends of the Bible in all ages of the world have been its greatest enemies, and have by their misguided zeal, done more to retard the progress of Bible truth, than all the cohorts of infidelity combined. They have been the opponents of every science that has dawned upon the world from its earliest history down to the present hour.



8

The ground of opposition in every instance was, that the new science was opposed to the Bible. Thus, at the introduction of Astronomy, it was violently assailed because it was alleged that it was opposed to the scriptures; that the new science taught that the sun stood still whereas the Bible teaches that the sun is a moving body. Time proved the truth of Astronomy and its opponents had the mortification of knowing that they had furnished infidelity with a weapon against the scriptures, which had been made good use of by the latter. Similar opposition was made to biology and other sciences and again as in the case of Astronomy, their truth was demonstrated by time and their enemies had to hang their heads in shame and confusion. So now, those special protectors and defenders of the Bible, who have inflicted upon it a thousand wounds in their blind zeal for its defense,

are repeating the stereotyped cry of "it is opposed to the Bible", against the theory of the diversity in the human races, although it has been brought forward and advocated by some of the firmest friends of the Bible in the world.

It is said, "this is a horrid doctrine, for it runs in direct conflict with the scriptures, which teach a unity of origin" The opposition to this view of the origin of the human family, I predict will result as in the former instances; time and future researches will establish the correctness of the theory, and its opponents will be compelled to acknowledge that in opposing it they have done a great injury to the Bible, and to science. The researches which are being made by such men as Agassiz, Huxley, Nett, Gliddon and others, are casting a flood of light upon this subject, which cannot but tend <sup>to</sup> the enlightenment of the scientific

world. Without going into a scriptural discussion of the question, I will here make a statement of my belief with reference to the Bible in connexion with science; it is, that all allusion in scripture to scientific subjects, are merely incidental to the matter on which the writer is engaged, and is not intended as an inspired statement upon the scientific subject alluded to. Let it not be said that this is scepticism; by no means, but on the contrary this view of the subject if universally adopted would remove all scepticism from the minds of scientific men. What is the object of the scriptures? Is it to teach men science? Evidently not. The object of the Bible I think may safely be said to be, to give to man an inspired statement of Gods intentions toward him, of mans duties to his creator, and fellow man, and of such matters as man can

not by his unaided reason and observation  
obtain a knowledge of. The sciences  
being amenable to man's observation and  
reason, would not be included within the  
objects intended by inspiration. Any other  
view of the scriptures than the one here taken,  
must, I think, make shipwreck of that Book.  
With any other view of the subject, how are we  
to reconcile the statements in the scriptures  
relating to Astronomy, Geology, History, Geog-  
raphy &c in a manner consistent with the  
truths of those sciences. For instance, we have  
in the Bible the declaration that on a certain  
occasion the sun stood still for a period of time.  
Now what are we to infer from this declaration  
; that the sun <sup>was</sup> actually a moving body?  
This would be in conflict with a well  
ascertained truth of Astronomy. Are we  
to infer from it, that the writer intended

to give an inspired statement of an Astronomical fact; if so then are the scriptures a forgery, for they assert by authority of inspiration, as a fact, that which is not a fact. We are then left to but one conclusion, that is, <sup>that</sup> the declaration in question, is simply an incidental allusion to an Astronomical fact, made for the purpose of illustrating some truth in which language is employed adapted to the understandings of the reader, or it may be regarded as indicative of the state of science among that particular people, the writer himself only reflecting the knowledge possessed <sup>so</sup> by the community of which he is a member, and that such declaration is in no sense intended to be understood as inspiration. So again, it is stated in the first chapters of Genesis, that God created the heavens and earth and all things therein, in six days. Shall

we understand this as inspiration, or as the uninspired opinion of the writer, we cannot adopt the first construction, because that would bring the Bible in direct conflict with one of the fundamental truths of geology; that which affirms that the earth was many hundreds of times longer in the process of creation, than is mentioned in the Mosaic account.

We must then adopt the latter construction and believe that the current opinion among the contemporaries of Moses, was that the earth was created within six days and that Moses himself had imbibed the same opinion, erroneous as it was. Nor does this fact in the least invalidate the account given by Moses.

His object doubtless was, or rather the object of the creator was, to give some account of his dealings towards his favorite people, which the writer thought proper to preface with a

short traditional account of the creation. Again, from the Mosaic account of the creation, we would suppose, that all creation, including the innumerable worlds and systems of worlds, which Astronomy has demonstrated to exist, was made subservient and subordinate to the inhabitants of this mere speck of creation, an idea not <sup>at</sup> all consistent with an enlarged knowledge of Astronomy. Surely no one will contend that Moses was under the guidance of inspiration when he declared the sun was made to give light by day and the Moon and stars to give light by night. In the state of Astronomical knowledge, which existed at the time Moses wrote, no other purpose could be assigned to the creation of the sun, Moon, and stars but that which Moses assigned to them, and hence the statement with reference to them, does not prove that those

bodies have not other and greater objects than those assigned them, but simply shows the very limited amount of Astronomical knowledge possessed by the people of that age.

Applying the principle which I have been contending for, to the question under consideration, the scriptural objection to the theory I am urging, the objection which has been mainly relied upon to disprove it, is easily removed. It has been urged against the theory of the diversity of <sup>the</sup> Species, that <sup>it</sup> was opposed to the scriptural account of man's creation.

The testimony relied upon, is rather of a negative than positive character, it being contended that as mention is made of but one pair of beings having been created, and that as we have a history of only this couple and their offspring, it is fair to conclude that no other beings were created. But according to the principle



contended for, we must conclude, that, either  
Moses, <sup>was</sup> ignorant of the existence of other fami-  
lies besides those descended from Adam, or  
that if he were cognizant of the fact, he omit-  
ted to mention it as being unnecessary to the  
purpose of his narrative. I have been thus prolix  
in the consideration of the subject in its scripture  
bearings, for the reason that the advocates of the  
"unity" rest principally the defense of their  
theory upon the authority of the Bible.

I trust that I have succeeded in separating  
the question altogether from the Bible.

This being accomplished, the question admits  
of easy solution, being reduced to one of pure  
science. Are the existing varieties in the human  
family referable to one parentage or not?  
I firmly believe that they are not, for reasons  
which I will now proceed to mention.

I will here state that in the following pages

the discussion will be confined to a consideration of some of the differences between the white man and Negro as presenting the most characteristic differences of all the races, for if I can succeed in showing that there are such differences in the conformation, habit, &c. between these two races as utterly to forbid the idea of their having sprung from one origin, I will accomplish the object of this paper which is to prove a diversity of origin in the human family. We will first notice some of the Anatomical differences between the white man and Negro. A very marked difference exists in the shape of their heads, that of the white man being round or oval, <sup>and</sup> symmetrical, with an elevated and expanded forehead; while that of the Negro is flat, with a retreating forehead. A striking difference is observable also in the facial angle, the white man, being about 80 on an average, the Negroes about 70, the difference being attributable

principally to the protrusion of the upper jaw of the latter. The following differences serve likewise to mark the two races as distinct. The nose of the white man is high and sharp; that of the Negro is flat and blunt. The nasal apertures, the internal cavities of the nose, the external meatus of the ear, and the orbital cavities are all larger in the Negro than in the white man. The pelvis of the Negro is longer and narrower, while the Iliac bones are more vertical than in the white man. The legs of the Negro as a general rule bow outwards, while for the most part those of the white man are perpendicular to the pelvis. The foot of the Negro is flat on both its upper and lower surface, the white man's foot is rounded above and hollowed beneath. The differences in the hair of a Negro and white man are more distinctive in their character than any that we have yet mentioned. The hair from the heads of the white man

and Negro placed in the field of the microscope exhibit several interesting points of difference.

1<sup>st</sup> The hair of the white man is either oval or cylindrical in shape; that of the Negro is excentrically elliptical or flat.

2<sup>nd</sup> The hair of the white man is straight, flowing or curled, that of the Negro is crisped, frizzled or spirally twisted.

3<sup>rd</sup> The hair of the white man issues out of the epidermis at an acute angle, that of the Negro comes out at a right angle.

4<sup>th</sup> Each hair of the white man, has a central canal which contains the coloring matter of the hair, the hair of the negroes head, has no central canal, but has its coloring matter diffused in the cortex, or in the cortex and intermediate fibres.

5<sup>th</sup> The scales of the cortex of a white man's hair are few in number, smooth and blunt, and embrace the shaft very closely. Those of the negroes hair are

numerous, pointed and do not embrace the shaft closely.

6<sup>th</sup> and lastly. The hair of the white man will not felt, that of the negro will <sup>be</sup> felt as has been demonstrated by experiment.

From the foregoing facts, it would <sup>appear</sup> that the hair of the negro's head, bears a very close resemblance to ~~wool~~, and in the opinion of many, the resemblance is so close as to make it impossible to distinguish any Anatomical or physical differences between them.

It remains now, to consider the last of the Anatomical differences between the Negro and white <sup>man</sup>, which I design to notice, the color of skin.

It would seem at first view, to be impossible for any one, with a black jet negro and a <sup>man</sup> fair skin white before him, to come to any other conclusion than that they have descended from different stocks. That this would be the only

conclusion that would be come to, I am well assured  
could the mind be brought to examine the  
subject impartially, freed from the extraneous  
influences of religious and political prejudices.  
But the influences just named, have been  
most potent in causing the invention of many  
ingenious theories to account for the varieties  
in color of the skin observable among the several  
races of men. Among the theories thus invented,  
the most prominent, is that which attempts  
to account for those varieties of color upon the  
principle of climatic influence, and it is  
this theory which I propose briefly to consider.  
This theory finds in Dr Carpenter one of its  
ablest defenders. The position taken by this  
distinguished Physiologist is that the development  
of Pigment cells upon which the color of skin  
depends, is greatly influenced by light, comparing  
the skin in this respect to a plant which is dependent

exclusively up<sup>on</sup> "light for its color. The deep  
blackness of the Negro, he contends, is owing to the  
operation of this cause for successive generations.  
If the position assumed by Dr Carpenter and  
those who contend with <sup>him</sup> for the climatic theory,  
be correct, why is it, that we find in Tropical  
climates, nations of people with comparatively  
fair skins, while on the other <sup>hand</sup>, we find in  
higher latitudes, nations of a dark hue?  
The incorrectness of this theory will appear  
manifest from a consideration of a few  
facts. For instance, the people of Bardiema's  
land are among the blackest of the earth, and  
yet they live in a high Northern latitude,  
while the Indo Chinese nations living within  
the Tropics are of a brown or olive complexion.  
Again, the Esquimaux of North America, living  
in a region where snow is perpetual, are a  
much darker tribe of Indians, than those which

inhabit the temperate zones of the United States. The Puelches also, living between the 53<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup> degrees of south latitude are darker than the Abipones, Tobas and other tribes, who live much nearer the Equator. The Charruas like wise, who inhabit the southern portion of South America are a black race, while <sup>the</sup> Guaycas under the line are among the fairest of the American tribes. These facts refute completely the theory of climatic influence and show that there is no relation between climate and the color of skin. An other refutation to this theory is found in the fact, that although individuals of the Caucasian race have become inhabitants of the Torrid zone and have lived there for a long period of time, no instance is on record, of a single transformation to the African. Neither do their descendents, who have been under the influences of climate for many



centuries, exhibit any evidences of such transformation; and it <sup>is</sup> refuted by the further fact, that in no instance has the African been changed to a Caucasian, although individuals of that race have been long ~~from~~ under the influences of a Tropical climate. For more than two centuries the African race has been under the mild and genial influences of a temperate climate and to day the Negro exhibits the same black hue, the same flat head, the same flat nose, and the same flat foot which characterize the Negro who lives in the hottest part of Africa. From all the facts, which have been deduced, I think we are entitled to conclude that climate does not possess the power of imparting color, though I am free to admit that it may modify it to some extent. Thus, a hot climate may cause a fair

complexion to assume a slightly darker hue, but there is a point at which this change ceases, beyond which climate is powerless.

Even in the cases where there is a slight change of color, such change is not permanent, but disappears, when the person in whom it has occurred has been removed from the climate producing it; nor is the offspring of such person affected in the least by the change.

It is a law of zoological science that peculiarities ~~in~~ varieties are <sup>not</sup> transmissible from parent to offspring, but that the peculiarities of species are transmissible.

Now the peculiarities of the white man and of the Negro are transmissible and therefore they are distinct species. If they be mere varieties of the same stock we would expect no regularity, according to the above law, in the transmission of their respective characteristics; but

as there is a constant regularity observable in this respect, the Negro invariably transmitting his own peculiarities, and the white man his, it follows as an inevitable conclusion that the Negro and white man are not varieties, caused by accident.

Dr Carpenters analogy between the animal and plant I believe to be fallacious. In the case of the plant the change of color effected is nothing more than a chemical change, produced by the absence of light, which rapidly disappears when the plant is brought under the influence of light. No constitutional change takes place in the plant; it resumes its original character so soon as restored to the influence of its proper element and is also capable of propagating its original species. Now if the analog be a good one, the skin of the Negro ought to return to its original fair hue when removed from the influence of the

cause that produced it, which according to Dr  
Carpenter is the strong light of the Tropics and he  
ought to propagate a white offspring accordi-  
ng to his former type. But as these results have  
been shown not to occur, the fallacy of the  
analogy is apparent. Dr Carpenter will  
never be able to satisfy scientific minds,  
that color of skin is alone due to the influence of light,  
because the thing itself is unphilosophical, and  
besides, it is contradicted by numerous facts  
collected by careful observers, with reference  
to this very subject. The truth of the matter  
I believe to be this: the different hues of color  
observable in the different races of men, are owing  
to the different amounts of *Pigmentum Nigrum*  
secreted by the *lenticula vera*. The different powers  
possessed by different races of furnishing this  
coloring matter, is owing doubtless to the inherent  
property of the true skin itself, and is only to be

explained by referring the cause to him who hath created all things as seemed best to him. The reason of these differences, it is not our purpose to enquire into. They were no doubt made for wise and beneficent purposes. It is sufficient for our present object to know the fact <sup>that</sup> they do exist and that they serve as landmarks of distinction between the several nations of the earth, pointing with unerring certainty to the fact of a diversity in origin of the human species. There is a fact connected with the Physiology of the Negro, which tends still further to prove his separate origin; I allude to the fact of his low powers of enduring cold and his high powers of enduring heat. Those who have seen much of the Negro, know the facts here stated, to be true, and <sup>they</sup> therefore require at my hands nothing more than the bare mentioning, to obtain assent to their correctness.

25

Whether these peculiarities are due to a defect in the calorific function, or to an exalted sensibility in the nervous system to cold, and a depressed sensibility to heat, is a question which does not admit of ready solution. It may be owing to one or to both of the causes just mentioned, or it may be dependent upon an entirely <sup>different</sup> cause. The fact itself is incontrovertible and furnishes another one of the many proofs of the Negroes Isolation in character and origin from the balance of the human family. There is another peculiarity in the habit, of the Negro to which I beg leave now to direct attention, I mean the almost universal custom of the Negro when he sleeps to shut out the pure oxygen from the air passages by covering his head and face with a portion of his covering. This fact may be thought to be

of trivial import, but considered in connexion with the subject now under consideration, it becomes of much importance, as illustrating most strikingly the great diversity of habit which exists between the Negro and other races.

Imperfect aeration of blood seems to be necessary to the well being of the Negro, since he never fails, before sleeping, to put himself in a situation to secure such a state of the blood. The similarity in this respect between the adult Negro and the child is very striking, and furnishes some interesting reflections with reference to another resemblance between them not less striking than the <sup>first</sup> "a resemblance in mental capacity. The Negro it is well known always sleeps with his head entirely enveloped whether in the midst of the heat

of summer or the cold of winter and breaths  
over and over again for many hours together  
the same air loaded with carbonic acid,  
without experiencing the least inconvenience from  
it, while under the same circumstances, the white  
adult would experience the most distressing  
sensations. I intimated above, that there seemed  
to <sup>be</sup> a relationship existing between the aeration  
of the blood and the intellect, proof of which  
is afforded by the facts which we have been  
considering. The law seems to be, in the case  
of the Negro and child at least, that the intellect-  
ual powers of individuals or races are  
to each other in the direct ratio of the  
degree in which the blood is oxygenated.  
It is a fact well authenticated by Physiolog-  
ical investigation, that in order to the exercise  
of high intellectual powers of mind, it is neces-  
sary that the brain should receive a due supply



of well aerated blood and without it the mind is necessarily depressed and incapable of making a vigorous effort. Whether the defective oxygenation of the Negroes blood, be the cause of his inferior mental capacity or not, the fact itself of the existence of such inferiority will not, cannot be denied, and upon this fact I base my closing argument in favor of a diversity of the species.

Are there any Psychological differences in the races of men which would authorize us to conclude that they have had separate origins. We think there are such differences and we will now endeavor to justify this opinion.

There are very few persons in my candid opinion who really believe in the equality of the races.

Most of the advocates of the unity, admit that there are important Psychological differences but they insist that those differences can all be

accounted for by education, position and similar influences. The opinions of those few who contend for an absolute equality are not worth considering, as they are entertained by that miserable and degraded class of Abolition fanatics who literally know nothing at all about the character of one race at least about which they assume to know so much.

But the opinions of the first class of opponents to our theory are deserving of a more respectful notice at our hands. To come then at once to the subject, can the difference in mental capacity and in moral nature, be explained in the manner stated? In considering this branch of the argument, we will follow the course that has been pursued in the discussion of the preceding part of the argument; I will confine my remarks to the Negro and white man, knowing that if I can show

The existence of such Psychological diversities of character between two races, as will establish the fact of their separate origins, will have attained the purpose of this paper.

If the differences in question can be explained by the influences of education, social position and so forth, why have not these causes operated more potently in those cases where the Negro has had all the facilities afforded him for the reception of their full benefits.

In the United States, we have had ample opportunity to test the elevating tendency of these agents, where a false and misguided sympathy for the Negro has placed him on a footing of social equality with the white man and where he has had all the advantages of education and other ameliorating influences furnished him, and yet we see no marked improvement in the Psychological

character of the race. In the North no pains have been spared to elevate the Negro to the standard of the Caucasian, and if he possessed any capacity to advance, he would not have failed to manifest it. But he has not advanced, which is a proof of his incapacity to advance. Let us look at the condition of the two races in those situations where they have been left free and unrestrained to develop their respective mental capacities; and what do we behold? In the one case, (Caucasian) the progress has been onward constant and invariable in science, art, commerce and all things which are evidences of high intellectual development. In the other case (African) no change whatever has taken place. Ignorant, uncivilized and degraded at the commencement of his existence, he remains to day the same being, a living monument of his own inferiority.

It may be urged in reply that, it is not fair to compare the Caucasian, with all his advantages of intercourse with the balance of the world to the African shut up in his native wilds, and deprived of those ameliorating influences which are secured by communication with the world. But this fact, instead of being an extenuating circumstance to the Negro, is really one of the strongest arguments that can be brought forward, to prove his inferiority. What has caused him to be thus shut out from the world, but his own want of mental capacity? Had he possessed the intellect, the enterprise and indomitable will of the Caucasian, he would have broken through the shackles that bound him to Africa's soil and he would have had intercourse with his fellow man; he would have made discoveries in science and

inventions in art; he would have built up a commerce internal and external; he would have established manufactories, and schools and developed the agricultural and mineral resources of the country. In short he would have had his country to take a front position among the nations of the earth and its people feared and respected by all. But he has done none of these things, because his creator saw proper to endow <sup>him</sup> with an intellect wholly incapacitated to the accomplishment of these objects. What has the Negro done to entitle him to be called the equal of the white man?

What important discovery in science has he made or for what invention of art is the world indebted to him? Where are the trophies of his victories gained in war or where the monuments erected to perpetuate his military or civic fame? With what new idea in

Government, in war or in religion has he startled the world. Who is the woolly head that has commanded the admiration of the world, by the masterly policy with which he has conducted a nation on to power, and prosperity. Where are the kinked headed Demosthenes or Ciceros who have electrified large assemblies of their fellow citizens with their eloquence. Where are the flat nosed Websters, Clays and Calhouns, whose effusions in the senate of the United States, afford the most perfect models of Oratory and Logic extant. Where will you look for the flat footed Story or Tarry whose opinions have received the sanction of law and become the supreme authority of the land. Finally, who is the colored gentleman that has won imperishable renown to himself and conferred benefits incalculable upon his race by his skill in the noblest

profession in the world, the profession of medicine. Where the Hippocrates, the Galens, the Sydenhams and Rushes who have attained to immortal fame in this profession and who have made themselves worthy to be called benefactors.

They have never yet appeared upon the earth, nor will they till the creator shall by his omnipotent fiat endow the Negro with a new Psychological constitution. Abolitionists and Negro sympathisers may assert the equality of the Negro with the white man, but stubborn facts will ever prove the falsity of these assertions.

In the conclusion of this paper, in view of all the facts that have been adduced, in view of the great Anatomical Physiological and Psychological differences between the white and black races, are we not entitled to conclude that they



are separate and distinct families,  
that they have descended from different  
origins and finally as a corollary to this  
that the human family are not the  
offspring of a single parentage.

Newton Cannon Miller.