also to put the truth before his fellows with a
demonstrative evidence that another man
could not bring out; and along with this
there is a moral sense, childlike in its can­
dor, manly in its vigor, which will not allow
him to approve anything illogical or wrong,
though it be upon his own side of a question
which attains the depths of his moral nature.
One cannot help entertaining a great esteem
for him, even when he is most in earnest and at
his tens.
A poor reviewer needs to summon all his
professional omniscience to comment upon
fifty-two discussions with such a range as
these; but he can plead the stern exigencies
of space as a reason for only noticing a few
of them. The seventh essay gives a remark­
ably luminous and distinct popular account
of the different families of monkeys. The
reader is disposed to wonder what set Al­
fred Russel Wallace writing such indisput­
able matter; but be finds out what it was
when, the description being done, in review­
ning the order, he pronounces monkeys to be
rather low down in the scale of quadruped­
al life, both physically and mentally. He still
acknowledges that man is the crown of the
animal kingdom in both respects. One of
these days, perhaps, will come a writer of
opinions less humdrum than those of Dr.
Wallace, and less in awe of the learned and
official world—for why is it not this as sup­
posable as a fourth dimension of space?—
who will argue, like a new Bernard Mande­
ville, that man is but a degenerate monkey,
with a paranoid talent for self-satis­
faction, no matter what snapes he may get
him into, calling them "civilization," and
who, in place of the unerring instincts
of other races, has an unhappy faculty for
occupying himself with words and abstrac­
tions, and for going wrong in a hundred ways
before he is driven, willy-nilly, into the right
one. Dr. Wallace would condemn such an
extravagant paradoxer. If a man must indulge
in paradoxs, let him do so in moderation.

Somewhat like the monkey essay in meth­
od is the first one in the book, which sketch­
es, not without artistic skill, the Yellow­
stone Park, the somewhat differently won­
derful Grizzly valley in New South Wales, and
other inaccessible valleys, the text being
beauty by excellent sketches, or by the illu­
strations in the book, by the way, are
choice); but all this is but a preamble to an
argument that these wells, as they might be
called, with their lofty vertical sides, have
been worn out by running water.

The anthropological essays relate mainly
to the Australians and to the Polynesiens;!—
though there is interesting information
about the Malays, the Papuans of New
Guinea, the Veddahs of Ceylon, the Aborigines
of Japan, and the Khmers of Cambodia, ante­
tentually, and modern. The admirable portraits here
are given, not only from old and modern
art, but from the writings of those who have
had the opportunity of living in the lands we
are describing. And the contrast between the
Australian physiognomies, with their large,
round heads, broad and long foreheads,
beating brows, shapely ears, good muscular
development, and full beards, would be re­
markable European in the impression they
make, before they come to the Japanese,
their thick lips, and great gobs of noses.
The only Aino face here shown has a still better
forehead, an excellent nose, not a bad mouth,
and might perfectly well pass for a modern
Greek of superior intellect. The Veddahs
are naked and completely savage, but human,
looked upon by the other inhabitants of Cey­
lon as little higher than wild beasts; yet
their faces betoken tremendous intensity
and no little subtlety of intellect, refinement
of judgment, humanity of feeling, observa­
tion, power of will, along with utter absence
of civilized discipline. When Wallace pro­
nounces these three races to belong to the
same fundamental division of the human
race as ourselves, the feeling their portraits
excite ascends to us. With the sculptured
heads of the ruins in Cambodia, it is different.
This civilization is not very ancient. It was
in all its grandeur only about six centuries
ago; and the most ancient work goes back
only to 250 B. C. But the faces recall the
theory of M. de la Coubert that Chinese
civilization was derived, probably indirectly,
from Babylonia, about 3800 B. C., and was
brought by a tribe which slowly migrated
from Western Asia, perhaps Bactria or
Chorasmia. For, along with Mongol eyes,
we see high foreheads, strong jaws, some­
what Assyrian mouths, and remarkably fine,
large noses, of a peculiar character. The
two untrustworthy drawings of modern Khmers
look European enough, but do not in
any respect resemble the ancient sculpt­
cures, except in their general intelligence.
In regard to the Polynesiens, whom Wallace
also believes belong to the Caucasian stock
(for he takes it for granted that there is
such a stock), it can be only a piece of self­
complacency for us to deem them like our­
selves, since they are far superior physical­ly,
as well as in the sentiments which their
portraits bespeak; nor do they strike us as
intellectually much below us. Their inferiority,
if they have any, shows itself here
only in oppositively defective energy. Wallace
combats the theory, founded on their tra­
ditions and language, that they came from
Malaysia, and certainly shows that, physical­
ly and morally, they are the very antipodes
of the Malays, while the Malay word for the
ir relevant languages to us too modern a dialect
of Malay to prove anything. But he quite
fails to notice that there are other resem­
bances between the languages of a deeper
character, such as the prevalence of dysil­
abic roots in both, the use of intensive reduc­
tions (for instance "mendupa,
the inter­
vention of words from Malay­
ese, not without artistic skill, the Yellow­
stone Park, the somewhat differently won­
derful Grosve valley in New South Wales, and
other inaccessible valleys, the text being
beauty by excellent sketches, or by the illu­
strations in the book, by the way, are
choice); but all this is but a preamble to an
argument that these wells, as they might be
called, with their lofty vertical sides, have
been worn out by running water.
centuries; and that the real reason why it is the insensible, and not the large, variations that are efficient in natural selection is, that the changes in the environment are so slow that, a species having been already adapted to one state of its environment, any variation not quite minute would render it less fitted for continuance than none at all. He will also observe that the author draws a strong line between the acceptability of natural selection as the only cause of the differentiation between allied species, which he holds to be as good as proved, and the acceptability of it as the cause of the differentiation between families and higher classes, which he thinks extremely doubtful. He is decidedly disposed to accept the doctrines (or some of the doctrines) of Weismann, although he sometimes slips back into modes of thought which we venture to think inconsistent with those doctrines. Thus he says:

"We may, I think, say that variation is an ultimate fact of nature, and needs no other explanation than a reference to general principles which indicate that it cannot fail to exist. Does any one ask for a reason why no two gravel-stones, or beach-pebbles, or even grains of sand, are absolutely identical in size, shape, surface, color, and composition? When we trace back the complex series of causes and forces that have led to the production of these objects, do we not see that their absolute identity would be more remarkable than their diversity? So, when we consider how infinitely more complex have been the forces that have produced each individual animal or plant, and when we know that no two animals can possibly have been subject to identical conditions throughout the entire course of their development, we see that the perfect identity in the result would be opposed to everything we know of natural agencies."

But if he refers to vicissitudes in the life of the individual animal in question, they have no bearing on variation at birth; while if he refers to vicissitudes of his parents' lives, Weismann often speaks as if such circumstances could have no effect upon the germ-plasm, and often makes the offspring a mathematically exact resultant of the germ-plasms of its parents, in so far as they enter into it, and quite independent of aught else. Wallace, however, does not go so far as positively to deny the transmission of acquired characters; he only maintains that there is no real evidence of such a thing. If there should ultimately turn out to be such evidence, the theory of germ-plasm would, apparently, collapse at once; and Wallace seems to admit that the Darwinian theory must stand or fall with germ-plasm.

We do not mean to discuss Mr. Wallace's socialist doctrines. We only note that he holds, at once, strongly to the freedom of the individual and to socialist arrangements, such as the state owning all the land, issuing paper money, etc.