

source with ourselves, and for whom therefore Christianity can make no provision,—why the distinction? It is only to those whom we believe to be of our own blood that the distinction extends. It is as lawful to shoot an ourang-outang or a chimpanzee as a dog or a cat; and with but mere expediency to regulate the matter, it might become quite as necessary to hunt down and destroy wild men, as to hunt down and destroy wild dogs. Nay, we are not sure whether a somewhat mysterious admission to this effect may not be found in a passage quoted by Dr Smyth, from the writings of one of the American assertors of the diversity of races—Dr Nott. “The time must come,” says this latter gentleman, “when the blacks will be worse than useless to us. What then? Emancipation must follow, which, from the lights before us, is but another name for *extermination*.” But though the remark, viewed in connection with such a doctrine, seems strangely ominous, we do not profess fully to understand it.

Within the limits of a newspaper article,—narrow for such a subject when amplest,—we can scarce be expected even to indicate the line which we think ought to be taken up in this controversy by the Churches. To the historic evidence we find ample justice done by Dr Smyth; and the historic evidence, so far as it goes, is, be it remembered, *positive*,—not merely *inferential*. We are less sure, however, of the line specially adopted against Agassiz in the field of natural history. The analogies *may* be on the side of the naturalist, as he says they are, and he may be quite right in holding that varieties of the race so extreme as that of the negro on the one side, and the blue-eyed, fair-haired, diaphanous Goth on the other, could not have originated *naturally* in a species possessed of a common origin, during the brief period limited by authentic history on the one hand, and the first beginnings of a family so recent as that of *man* on the other. But