

THE RED MAN IS NOT A TANNED MONGOLIAN

BY ARTHUR C. PARKER, ARCHEOLOGIST AND ETHNOLOGIST, UNIVERSITY, STATE OF NEW YORK



THE Red Man of America is not a Mongolian according to the Indian Commissioner, Hon. Cato Sells. Judge Sells is correct and several of the school book historians are wrong—foolishly wrong. There were native Americans, American Indians, in America thousands of years before there were such races as the Chinese or Tartars, Manchus or Turanians. When the first Americans entered this continent in remote geological times there were no distinct races. All the individuals of primitive humanity were of the same human stock—plain primitive human beings. As branches split off from the parent stock and became isolated in the various geographical areas races of humanity commenced to form. Food, climate, habits and geography all conspired to mould the various races.

That the American Indian is not a Mongolian is common knowledge to every anthropologist. Any similarity that the Indian has to the Chinaman, for example, is merely a superficial similarity. Every argument presented by illinformed theorists fails when the truth is brought up againts it. The idea of such similarity originated in an odd way with Cuvier, who divided the human family into three grand divisions, based on physiological traits. Cuvier took his clue from Bichat, who recognized three physical systems in mankind—the vegetative or visceral, osso-muscular and the cerebro-spinal. Happy thought was this to Cuvier who separated the black race from others because it was vegetative—it filled its stomach and just lived; the yellow race was bony and sinewy, and was active, while the white race was brainy, and sensitive. The Indians and Malays, being left outside were shoveled over into the sinewy and bony race—and dubbed Mongolians.

Now it seems idle for the writer, who professionally is an anthropologist, to repeat the well-known arguments against the alleged Mongolian affinities of the American race. However, to catalogue them we shall first say that there is no evidence in the language. "Oh yes there is," says someone. "So-and-so says there is." But, we still answer that no student of languages known to the world of science has found one single thread of evidence showing similarity. The linguistic systems of the American tribes are far different in grammar and word compounding from the Mongolian. So great an authority on Ural-Altic